

Schedule of Responses – Appendix H.1

Hinkley Point C Main Site Theme

When reading this schedule, it is useful to have read the following complementary documents:

- **Chapter 5 of the Consultation Report** – the main chapter which describes how EDF Energy has analysed the consultation responses and details how the schedule of responses works
- **Schedule of Responses Framework** from Appendix H – the categorisation framework used by EDF Energy when analysing the consultation responses
- **Consultee Comment Key** from Appendix H – to allow consultees who returned a response to consultation to identify which topics contain their comments

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Quantock Hills AONB Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	-3.3 Construction Activities It is inconsistent not to provide any information on landscape and visual impact for the construction phase given that you have done so for the Permanent Development section.	8734-230-3508	/			<p>Responses received during the consultation process identified the Environment Agency's regulatory requirements on prevention and control of pollution, National Grid's requirements for work in the vicinity of its overhead on underground assets, and the Ministry of Defence's requirements in respect of the Lilstock Range. A number of consultees expressed concern at potential noise, light and air quality impacts (especially in settlements close to the main site), loss of habitat and ecological damage, seeking a coherent plan to minimise these. Some consultees identified specific concern at the impact of the proposed extension of working hours subsequent to Stage 1. Use of the jetty was viewed as beneficial in reducing road use, though one consultee expressed concern at potential pile driving noise during its installation.</p> <p>The construction impacts are described in detail within Volume 1 of the Environmental Statement. In addition, Environmental Management and Monitoring Plans will require contractors to comply with requirements designed to limit environmental impacts. A description of construction activities can also be found within the Construction Method Statement.</p> <p>Although the use of the Hinkley Point C (HPC) site for the construction of the power station would impact the local ecology, most of Green Lane would be preserved and kept clear of construction activity. Additional mitigation and compensatory works are identified in Volume 1 of the Environmental Statement and would be implemented in order to reduce the net impact to acceptable levels. The post-construction landscaping would enhance the value of the area for biodiversity and public amenity.</p> <p>Through the consultation process, measures have been developed to limit construction activity south of grid line 144750mN and early landscaping works have been proposed to enhance the effectiveness of this area as a buffer zone to reduce the noise, visual and air quality impacts on local residents. In addition, landscaping works along the western site boundary would reduce the visual impact to receptors to the west of the site.</p> <p>The noise impact of piling for the jetty would be reduced through the use of drill-and-drive or drill and socket piling techniques.</p> <p>The proposed jetty would enable the delivery of</p>
Homes & Communities Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The Stage 1 consultation says that the impact on neighbouring properties during construction will be reduced by implementing a landscape buffer on the southern boundary, but it notes that there will be areas for spoil storage to the south of Green Lane. All measures should be sought to ensure that visual and noise intrusion are kept to a minimum.	8694-230-1765	/			
Homes & Communities Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Increased traffic during construction and operation may have adverse effects on the neighbourhood and the landscape, including, for example, noise, light and dust pollution that can affect tranquillity. Further details need to be supplied including limiting hours of construction working, routes for delivery and construction traffic and so on.	8694-230-5646	/			
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	5.General comments on pollution prevention We require that the risks of pollution are reduced in all aspects of development this includes construction as well as the operation phase.	88820-230-3748			/	
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Any facilities, above ground, for the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals shall be sited on impervious bases and surrounded by impervious bund walls. The volume of the bunded compound should be at least equivalent to the capacity of the tank plus 10%. All filling points, vents, gauges and sight glasses must be located within the bund. The drainage system of the bund shall be sealed with no discharge to any watercourse, land or underground strata. Associated pipework should be located above ground and protected from accidental damage. All filling points and tank overflow pipe outlets should be detailed to discharge into the bund.	88820-230-5226			/	
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	3.4.9 The response also recommends that EDF considers all the comments and recommendations set out in the Technical Evaluation Report (Appendix 3) including comments on geology, soils and land use, land contamination and waste, hydrogeology, hydrology, drainage and flood risk, fresh water quality, marine water and sediment quality, hydrodynamic and coastal geomorphology, terrestrial, marine and coastal flora and fauna, noise and vibration, landscape and visual amenity, archaeology and cultural heritage and amenity and recreation.	88790-230-25558	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The submission identifies that intake pipes to extract coolant water from Bridgewater Bay will need to be built in the sea floor as well an outfall pipe to discharge used water. The potential area for the development of intake and outfall pipes, and associated infra-structure (as shown in Figure 10.7) extends northwest from the development site across Bridgewater Bay directly through Lilstock Range.	8775-230-6475			/	containerised freight as well as bulk aggregate, sand and cement. In limiting the impact on the internationally designated areas off the coast of Hinkley to acceptable levels, it was not possible to incorporate the capability to import Abnormal Indivisible Loads via the jetty. Additionally, the weather and sea conditions will limit the availability of the jetty, such that at times of peak aggregate requirements there could be relatively few spare windows for delivery of other goods.
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The proposal outlined for the construction of a temporary jetty within the range, will obstruct operationally important air gunnery practice from being undertaken by virtue of the presence of the jetty structure, ships and associated personnel in the firing area. In addition other marine structures (such as water intake and outfall pipes for the new power station) could also be located within the range and may permanently affect firing activities by introducing hardened surfaces which projectiles might hit and ricochet off. The document identifies that there is not a viable alternative location for the development of a jetty (section 4.12.12). The MOD recognises the national importance of the construction of this new nuclear power station and is receptive to modifying the range area to accommodate the proposed jetty structure.	8775-230-8116			/	The on-site campus capacity has also been reduced in response to comments received during the consultation process. The campus contains social and recreational amenities for the workforce and the campus football pitches would be made available for public use by prior arrangement. The cooling water system tunnels would be constructed by boring tunnels from on-site access shafts with no impact on the foreshore or near-shore areas. The intake and outfall shafts would be bored at about 3.3km and 1.8km respectively from the coast using jack-up rigs. The tunnels and intake/outfall structures, in addition to the jetty, would lie within the area associated with the Lilstock Royal Navy aircraft range. However, safe co-existence would be ensured through effective liaison arrangements with the Ministry of Defence.
Tractivity 746	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Wish you luck for speedy construction but not at expense of local people?s lives, or wildlife or vegetation. The jetty is a good idea but minimise the period when there is no access along the north coast of site. A round walk is a pleasure and you are taking it away. Give positive though to what else you could bring in via the jetty. Preliminary works should not disturb local people at night	9504-230-1998			/	The jetty and sea wall construction would require access to the foreshore for construction. However, access would be arranged from the HPC site without the need to traverse the foreshore in front of the existing HPA and HPB power stations. The coastal path would need to be closed for health and safety reasons during the construction of the jetty and sea wall but would be reopened following completion of the sea wall. It should also be noted that the path would again need to be closed during the dismantling of the jetty.
Tractivity 839	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Whilst we have no objection to the building of Hinkley Point ?C? Station, EDF Energy seems ?hell - bent? on causing as much disruption to local villages as possible. 2 previous power stations were built int he 60s and 70s with far less upset to the local communitas as is being proposed now. We see on the national television that "EDF are the green team, the company that promotes reduction of the carbon footprint" - How can this possibly be with the proposals they are suggesting here - taking up acres and acres of good farming land and putting dozens of unnecessary buses on the roads, when everything should be contained at H/Point. make better use of the land to hand - go back to the drawing board and get someone local who knows the needs of the community better.	9597-230-8356			/	The existing helipad associated with the Hinkley complex is located within the area for the HPC permanent development. In order to provide a helipad that is usable by all the power stations at Hinkley Point, it is proposed to relocate the helipad to a position between the site entrances of the three plants.
Tractivity 947	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Any reduction would be beneficial for the local residents	9705-230-391			/	In relation to site related traffic, construction traffic on site would be subject to speed limits which would be enforced through speed checks. Three car parks

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 968	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below We understand the need for a new powerstation and in principal do not object to the proposal. However we do consider that greater consideration should be given to the effect the construction is going to have on the quality of life in the locality.	9726-230-8056	/			<p>would also be constructed for the HPC development and some of the spaces would be reserved for HPB, to replace the spaces lost as a result of HPC construction. During construction, the south car park would be dedicated to the use of construction worker buses and part of the south-eastern car park would be used as construction working area for the substation, with only the remainder available for HPC construction parking.</p> <p>The permanent development would incorporate storage facilities for intermediate level radioactive waste and spent fuel generated during the operational life of the plant. The storage would be designed to safely contain this material without any significant impact on the local community.</p> <p>The construction would require a number of tower and other types of crane but the actual numbers cannot be determined ahead of the appointment of the relevant contractors so cannot be specified at this stage. However, envelopes for the locations and heights of the various buildings and structures, including tower cranes, are specified in the Construction Method Statement.</p> <p>Some consultees have also referred to the possibility of radioactive contamination of the area within the construction site. This has been the subject of investigations and a report by the Environment Agency which concluded that the radioactive species are within the normal range of natural occurrence.</p>
Tractivity 971	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Clearly there will be a level of of disruption during the work but at the moment there appears to be no cohesive plan on how to minimise this. Nothing appears to be thought through with any degree of awareness of the local area and population.	9729-230-6668	/			
Tractivity 1002	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Get the whole project done as quickly as possible! Keep local people fully informed frequently. Use the existing helipad - no need for another. Plant landscaping vegetation a.s.a.p. keep roadside hedges as high as possible to limit view of security fences/hostel.	9760-230-125	/			
Tractivity 1040	Public	Stage 2	1. What are your views on the proposed arrangement and landscaping of the Hinkley Point C site? Box ticked: No opinion 1. Any other ideas or comments? Require more information	9798-230-0a	/			
Tractivity 1040	Public	Stage 2	2. We have reduced the amount of land to be used during construction in the southern part of the site in response to concerns from local residents. What are your views on this proposal? Box ticked: No opinion	9798-230-0b			/	
Tractivity 1040	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? again difficult to visualise without more information.	9798-230-0c	/			
Tractivity 1040	Public	Stage 2	3. In order to speed up the process of building the new power station, and enable us to finish work earlier, we intend to apply this summer to undertake preliminary works to prepare the main site and build a temporary jetty for the delivery of bulk materials. If permission for the power station is not obtained, we will be required to reinstate this land. What are your views on our plans for Preliminary Works? Box ticked: No opinion	9798-230-0d			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1040	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? You should not start until permission has been given. You are assuming...or perhaps you already know you will have consent!	9798-230-0e		/		
Tractivity 1067	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I support the need for the new power station but living only 800m directly west and with views across the site my concerns are with the impact of the construction on both my quality of life and to the value of my property. I note that an off site mitigation programme from Edf has yet to be submitted and agreed. Why have only selected properties in Shurton been advised of this? In general I find that the stage 2 submission lacks objective detail and in many areas lacks the professional approach necessary for a project of this complexity. I support and endorse the views expressed and separately communicated to you by West Somerset County Council and Stogursey Parish Council.	9825-230-9090	/			
Tractivity 1091	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? You have conceded 200m, a token gesture when your border finishes 0.5km from local residents. The proposed on site accommodation is going to be 3 storeys/12m high, with a 13m high Sports Centre. Will this 200m really stop light, noise, air pollution affecting the local residents? Unlikely!	9849-230-1136	/			
Tractivity 1099	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Site boundary is too close to Shurton amd construction works will make life intolerable to residents for many years to come.Little in concrete terms has yet been offered in way of mitigation. Tree planting proposed is toolittle and toolate with none shown on the Western boundary as a visual/noise buffer for Burton and Knighton residents.	9857-230-129	/			
Tractivity 1120	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Good as far as it goes. However, the site is still too close to Shurton and should be confined as planned originally to land lying to the North of the green lane. Tree planting designed to act as a visual and noise barrier is taking place at toolate a stage to provide any effective mitigation.	9878-230-704	/			
Tractivity 1122	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? The direct consequence of this "reduction" has been to transfer the disruption, noise, dirt and chaos resulting from the construction to other equally local environments. The plain fact is that a project of this size inevitably impacts on local people and their lives. EDF?s duplicity in pretending otherwise has been breathtaking.	9880-230-472			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1141	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? The land will be irreperably damaged by the proposed clearance. The network of interdependant natural systems will be broken and take hundreds of years to recover as will the regrowth of the oak trees, which cannot be "put back" overniht as is implied.	9899-230-817			/	
Tractivity 1153	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? You may have gone some way to appeasing local residents but not nearly far enough. Parts of the site will be within 500 metres of residential dwellings, rendering a normal lifestyle for these people virtually impossible. Looking at the plans it seems that other options were available and I cannot understand why this land so close to Shurton has to be used.	9911-230-584		/		
Tractivity 1188	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Whilst I?m certain that much thought has gone into alleviating the impact on the local community I?m not convinced the proposals in this questionnaie are driven by accountants. Whilst the impacts during construction are at their greatest, the long trm problems generated by taking the cheapest travel route will have far greater cost implications in the future. 1) I feel the power station is essential. 2) I live in the area but have no business interests here.	9946-230-7432			/	
Tractivity 1194	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? We welcome the reduction of the above mentioned land, but its hard to imagine at the moment what the effects will be, in terms of noise and air pollution on the daily life of residents nearest to the land involved.	9952-230-670			/	
Tractivity 1206	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Despite the reduction in land, hinkley C will leave us with generations of radioactive waste. The reduction of the amunt of land to be used during construction doesn?t change the health and ecological threats a new plant will bring.	9964-230-653			/	
Tractivity 1262	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? At public meeting on 2nd March 2011 at Stogursey Village Hall I (we) spoke to (Personal details removed) (EDF) regarding our concern for the temporary jetty pile driving and subsequent noise/dust/light pollution to those living down wind of Hinkley C site. (Personal details removed) advised putting our concerns in writing on this form.	89528-230-1294	/			
Tractivity 1263	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? The changes to Stage 2 proposals are a step in the right direction. I still have reservations concerning the total impact of the construction over the time stated. i fear that the real impact will be much greater than we are led to believe.	89529-230-1262			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1270	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? No comment as long as EDF will ensure the night-time construction work will not cause insurmountable environmental impacts, noise and dust nuisance to the local communities.	89536-230-594			/	
Tractivity 1279	Public	Stage 2 Update	I feel sorry for the people living near the main construction site.	89545-230-1182			/	
Tractivity 1279	Public	Stage 2 Update	I dont think people are aware of the disruption that this construction is going to cause to our area for a number of years.	89545-230-1291			/	
Tractivity 1297	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	EdF will be building on a Greenfield site, completely destroying habitats and adding further pollution as the site is constructed. There will be so much light, noise and dust pollution created by the preliminary works,	89563-230-866			/	
Tractivity 1299	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? I agree with your proposal of double shifts initially, so that Hinkley C can be built as quickly as possible to lessen the length of construction impact on local residents.	89565-230-2028			/	
Tractivity 1300	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	The current proposals to route the preliminary works traffic through Cannington prior to the construction of any mitigation roads/haul roads is totally out of order and contrary to the EDF's first corporate aim of "Zero harm"	89566-230-3583		/		
Tractivity 1307	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	I?m fed up with filling this form in, writing letters about possible plans. you keep moving the goal posts and not giving us all the facts.	89573-230-161			/	
Tractivity 1312	Public	Stage 2 Update	Due to prevailing winds STOLFORD will be in the path of dust and noise coming from hinkley C construction day and night. Do include us in your proposals for mitigation.	89578-230-1238	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1313	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	(Personal details removed) and I will be disturbed by the noise of the building work and the lorries once they start their shifts.	89579-230-951			/	
Tractivity 1357	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	We seem to be the hamlet that is having to endure all of the construction/workers/noise, etc in this location for a number of years. We are the forgotten	89623-230-1937			/	
Tractivity 1367	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? A step in the right direction, but more needs to be done to shield local residents from the workings of the power station.	89633-230-865	/			
Tractivity 1369	Public	Stage 2 Update	Stogursey and District will bear the brunt of 10 years construction and light pollution and noise	89635-230-401			/	
Tractivity 1371	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	It is nice to see you start on the tree planting as declared. Would you now press on with the local mitigation so at least we are ready for the noise, dust, light pollution, etc.	89637-230-1706	/			
Tractivity 242	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? A small wood further south of this buffer, perhaps with a small lake of some sort. If this is going to be built 24/7 there will also be the glare from the lights to contend with.	8938-230-348	/			
Tractivity 242	Public	Stage 1	4. Any other ideas or comments? Accommodation of 700 people on site is inpractable. There are no leisure facilities for this number, and building these would only add to a very busy work site. Surely it would be more practacle to accomodate these site workers in the local towns, which would add to their economy, whilst keeping the very local villages quiet.	8938-230-1498	/			
Tractivity 242	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? We moved to the area 5 years ago on the understanding that Hinkley C would be built, we are in support of this , however we feel very strongly about the amount of workers being kept on site , (Personal details removed). So would very much like some personal involvement from the	8938-230-5210	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			Management team to help overcome this immense problem.					
Tractivity 263	Public	Stage 1	4. Any other ideas or comments? It appears that the jetty is currently only planned to be used for aggregates. This is completely unsatisfactory as much of the other bulk materials such as steel reinforcing, shuttering, pipes etc can and must be brought in this way to limit road movements	8952-230-1589	/			
Tractivity 323	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? I am not able to comment seriously on this until more details emerge and some of the questions I have asked are answered.	9011-230-5159			/	
Tractivity 365	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? Do not build another "Atomkraftwerk" on this site. I was part of the team that excavated the Plesiosaur remains from the slate rock a few years ago. Constructing this will destroy the surrounding environment and further discoveries of english history and heritage. Back in the '80's, a chap called (Personal details removed) worked at Hinkley point site B and told me the horror stories of the events that took place at his place of work. The leaks, fires and the ruptures that occurred at this site and equipment. He also informed me how close Somerset and surrounding areas were almost devastated by the same scenario that occurred at Sellafield and on more than one occasion. Also the contamination of the surrounding Bristol channel was a key factor and will be once again extremely polluted from the pipeline. Sadly (Personal details removed) is no longer with us as he died from Cancer. So placing a "Landscape Buffer" up on this site will make difference to anyone, as the	9345-230-351		/		
Tractivity 366	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Very positive about the need for a new nuclear power station. Very unsatisfied about the proposals for construction phase in relation to housing of temporary workers and movement of goods and services.	9053-230-4426	/			
Tractivity 597	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Workers do on the whole drive slowly on your site and I hope this will continue when full construction goes ahead. After all we live here. You are destroying our lovely countryside!!!	9263-230-5109			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 671	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? As a residents of Williton, I do not know the impact of the work on the environment at Hinkley Point either during or after the development. The minimum disturbance must be imperative and must be permanent. This should be agreed with local residents and adhered to regardless of cost restraints. This should not be restricted to only the south of the site but all around.	9334-230-359			/	
Tractivity 62337	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	We spend a lot of our leisure time outside and enjoy the darkness the peace and tranquility and the clean air. A build as big as this will have a massive impact	10017-230-597			/	
Tractivity 62437	Public	Stage 2	9. I am not opposed in principle to the development of Hinkley Point C, but I am opposed to the plans as they currently stand. The benefits of providing power to the masses are unreasonably outweighing the deleterious effect the construction will have on the local population. This balance must be tipped back more towards the locals.	10069-230-4412			/	
Mendip Hills AONB Unit	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	I understand it is likely that stone would be required from quarries within the Mendip Hills to construct the proposed development. In this event, we would wish EDF to provide details of this and its proposals for mitigating environmental impacts e.g arising from increased stone extraction and transportation.	10186-230-215			/	
Fulcrum Pipelines Limited	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We can confirm that Fulcrum Pipelines Limited do not currently have any existing pipes or equipment on or around the above site address. However we are aware that this project is likely to take several years to complete, therefore we would recommend that you make periodic enquires in order to ensure that we have not constructed any new networks which could be affected by your proposals. Please note that other Gas Transporters may have plant in this locality which could be affected by your proposed works.	10206-230-191			/	
South Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	Therefore our attention is on the balancing of impacts and opportunities that Hinkley Point C brings. South Somerset District Council acknowledges that the greatest physical impact will be within the 10 miles of the site. It is not our intention to focus on these issues, which are being addressed immediately by Sedgemoor District Council, West Somerset District Council, and Somerset County Council.	10210-230-808			/	
Cheddar Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Work on the Hinkley Point C site is referred to as 'temporary' when the construction phase is likely to be 10 years or more, this most would agree is a very significant period.	10222-230-1920			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Timberscombe Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>1. The influx of a great number of workers at the site and transportation of raw materials and these workers to the site has not been sufficiently recognized nor taken into account.</p> <p>2. The build period is likely to be 10 years and therefore the impact of 1. above will be huge and change the character of the areas affected permanently.</p>	10234-230-146			/	
Stogursey and District Parish Plan Steering Committee	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>2) Reduction in the amount of land to be used during construction</p> <p>Partially satisfactory</p> <p>All and any efforts made by EdF to recognize the impact they will have on the local community are to be welcomed. It is regrettable that it took the company so long to accept what the community repeatedly told them - that unexciting as the area may seem to many, those who live here love it for the subtlety of the landscape and the tranquility they find here. They do not want to see it damaged or subject to drastic alteration.</p>	10259-230-1210			/	
Forum 21	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>Although EdF has "re-arranged the furniture" in its Stage 2 proposals in the sense that the location of various facilities - such as accommodation hostels and transport-related provisions - has been moved around, this does not alter the fact that this is one of the largest construction projects ever in this region and will have multiple negative effects.</p>	10262-230-2976			/	
Forum 21	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>The total area affected by EdF's construction activity for Hinkley C covers 435 acres. This is approximately four times the land area of the existing Hinkley A and B power station sites combined.</p> <p>This area, described as the Development Site, includes attractive farmland and woodland, falling away from a central ridge to the Bristol Channel to the north and to the village of Stogursey to the south. There are long established areas of woodland, footpaths overhung by thick hedgerows and attractive views across the countryside to the sea and the Quantock Hills. If you stand in the middle of this area at the moment, before serious development work has taken place, it is possible to imagine that there is no industrial site in the vicinity, despite the nearby presence of the still operating Hinkley B complex.</p> <p>Among the bird species which breed in or frequent this area are Peregrine Falcon, Cetti's Warbler, Lesser Whiethroat, Nightingale, Reed Bunting and a range of other songbirds and warblers. A number of bat species, including the relatively rare Lesser Horseshoe, have also been registered.</p> <p>All this habitat will be erased and the wildlife displaced if the Hinkley C proposal goes ahead. In addition, there is no proposal to create any alternative habitat for these or other species until well after the construction period has passed and the power station has become operational.</p>	10262-230-5518			/	
Forum 21	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>Construction activity of this extent, covering a total area of 435 acres and running over a period of up to seven years, and then the installation and operation of the largest nuclear power station ever proposed in the UK, will inevitably impinge on these protected areas and the wildlife which inhabits them.</p>	10262-230-7548			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>Comment: It is stated that the EPR units will be delivered on the same timescale (15.10.1 Page 50). However this is not the case and the environmental statement is required to reflect this as this will have implications on the extent and scope of the in combination and cumulative impacts assessment.</p> <p>Action: The impacts of building one EPR at a different rate to the other will need to be considered within the environmental assessment process.</p>	89087-230-101		/		
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Main site scale of accommodation and parking, visual impacts, safety and conventional waste management during construction.	89196-230-1802			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	2.43 The proposed parking provision at the HPC Site requires further justification. It is concerning that up to 350 spaces will be provided in the early years of construction (2011-2012) when the transport strategy is not in place, which is likely to lead to a large number of car trips. In addition, the reasons for increasing the level of car parking during the latter parts of the construction phase are queried, from up to 50 spaces (during 2016), to up to 250 spaces (by 2017) and up to 500 spaces (by 2018). It is understood that the P&R facilities would still be operational during 2017/2018 and therefore the reasons for additional on-site car parking are not understood; this should be clarified.	89222-230-15999	/			
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>9. Local impacts during construction and operation</p> <p>The construction of Hinkley C will have a major impact on the transport and services infrastructure of West Somerset and Sedgemoor district council areas. This is the largest nuclear power station ever considered for construction in the UK, with a generating capacity over twice as large as the existing Hinkley B. The area to be taken up by the building and associated works is more than 430 acres</p> <p>Although EdF has "re-arranged the furniture" in its Stage 2 proposals in the sense that the location of various facilities, such as accommodation hostels and traffic-related provisions, have been moved around, this does not alter the fact that this is one of the largest construction projects ever in this region and will have multiple negative effects.</p>	89451-230-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	This area, described as the Development Site, includes attractive farmland and woodland, falling away from a central ridge to the Bristol Channel to the north and to the village of Stogursey to the south. There are long established areas of woodland, footpaths overhung by thick hedgerows and attractive views across the countryside to the sea and the Quantock Hills. If you stand in the middle of this area at the moment, before serious development work has taken place, it is possible to imagine that there is no industrial site in the vicinity, despite the nearby presence of the still operating Hinkley B complex.	89451-230-5021			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	However, the Environmental Appraisal prepared by EdF (Volume 2) is concentrated on the construction site itself and does not present any detailed information about how the proposed development could affect the adjacent protected habitats and species.	89451-230-7167	/			
RSPB	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Although the stage 2 documents include a lot of information about likely construction and operational works, information is dispersed and critical information seems to be missing. We would like a full account of the type, scale, duration, timing and potential overlap of all activities likely to contribute to disturbance at both Hinkley and Combrich Wharf, in order to fully assess the combined disturbance impacts on waterbirds and to agree a comprehensive series of suitable mitigation measures.	89457-230-6191		/		
RSPB	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	There is recognition at 18.7.55 that construction and operational activities would cause disturbance within the SPA in the absence of effective mitigation. We agree that noise, lighting and human activity are likely to provide the main sources of disturbance to the SPA foreshore and functionally linked offshore areas. The jetty, sea wall extension and possibly onshore cooling water intake and outfall activity, are identified as major sources of disturbance, although future operational activities at the plant itself should be included.	89457-230-6691	/			
RSPB	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	It is not clear from the documentation whether there would be significant construction activity within the 300m corridor for the intake/outfall tunnels in the vicinity of C1-3, and we seek clarification on whether the SPA foreshore and its environs are likely to experience any additional disturbance from this source.	89457-230-7237	/			
RSPB	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	There is an assumption in chapter 18 that CS4 and 5 would not be exposed to significant disturbance from this scheme. We are particularly concerned about the sensitivity of CS4 given its proximity to the proposed sea wall extension and cooling water tunnel corridor. We seek assurances that there would be no access through CS4-5 in order to carry out construction or operational activities for the sea wall extension, the jetty or any other works, or further traffic long the northern edge of the existing Hinkley A/B site. Any mitigation measures required to prevent significant disturbance need to be set out clearly.	89457-230-10845	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
RSPB	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>The mitigation measures outlined in 18.7 and 18.8 are proposed against a background of anticipated temporary, low to medium magnitude disturbance effects on SPA waterbirds. There do not seem to be any mitigation measures proposed to minimise disturbance impacts during the operational phase of the project.</p> <p>It is stated at 18.7.71 that there are limited measures which can be taken to reduce construction disturbance effects. We do not believe that the measures listed are comprehensive or would prevent significant disturbance to SPA waterbirds in CS1-4. There is no information, for example, on how the timing of the commencement or completion of construction activities might be programmed to minimise activity during the critical months of December to February when SPA waterbird use is at its peak. We note that decommissioning of a jetty could [our emphasis] be undertaken from July but there is no information about eg the duration of decommissioning which might allow us to assess whether this is appropriate in relation to the SPA.</p>	89457-230-11557	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>The authorities recognise the discussion provided within the draft Nuclear National Policy Statement, and encourage the findings of this to be considered with regards specifically to individual sites, including Hinkley. In particular, the authorities welcome recognition by EDF Energy that development would be associated with 'inevitable disturbance to the land used for development including areas required on a temporary basis for construction' and that development would be associated with 'disturbance to the land and the community local to the site' (para 6.2.2 bullet 5). The authorities would also encourage broader consideration of these potential issues, to take full account of community disturbance at other associated development sites including those at Bridgwater, Combrich, Cannington and Williton.</p>	89331-230-766			/	
Tractivity 62907	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>While we all use electricity and see the need for new power-producing units like Hinkley C, and are prepared to put up with some disruption, we really need you in your plans to recognize that while workers may go home after their shifts to peace and quiet, those of us in Stolford live here 24/7!</p> <p>With horror we read your proposals that there will be 24 hours a day shift work most days for 7 years, including weekends and lorries every 90 seconds on the main road.</p> <p>Our family retired here to Stolford, just over a mile from your site, in May 2002, a big factor in our choice being the quietness of the location (some noise from time to time from Hinkley B in operation). And country living, meaning relatively traffic-free roads.</p> <p>My Dad at nearly 89 is not up to another house move; our house price, already low because of Hinkley B, will sink dramatically if the conditions you propose do happen.</p>	89662-230-0			/	
Tractivity 62940	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>- We are concerned about the affect night lighting and dust from the excavations will have on our immediate environment.</p>	89675-230-1769			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62972	Public	Stage 2 Update	My main points regarding negative impacts: Additional shift hours will add to negative impact on health and wellbeing of local residents: unrelenting noise from the site; increase in road congestion. EDF's desire to complete asap needs to be weighed against the human rights of local residents to peace and quiet if they have chosen to live in a rural location. It is not sufficient for EDF to state (as on BBC Points West December 2010) that it will give financial support to those residents who wish to move. EDF needs to show that it can implement its plans with due heed to the welfare of the existing community and not push them out by industrialising the countryside on a massive scale.	89687-230-135			/	
Tractivity 62972	Public	Stage 2 Update	I think it is significant that Hinkley Point News from EDF Energy Consultation Special February/March 2011 has a map of the area on the first page which omits to name Stogursey! It is simply shaded. The nearest community to Hinkley Point is going to be the most affected by this development. EDF has a long way to go before it shows that it has taken on board local concerns and is coming up with the kinds of solutions which would show that energy needs have been balanced with the welfare of Stogursey Parish.	89687-230-3373			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
National Grid	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	<p>1. There are High Voltage Overhead Lines which run outside of the proposal area - Taunton - Hinkley Point - Spans - ZZ0, Hinkley Point - Bridgwater - Span -VQ - and Hinkley Point - Melksham - Span -ZG</p> <p>National Grid's overhead lines are protected by renewable or permanent agreements with landowners. These grant us legal rights that enable us to achieve efficient and reliable operation, maintenance, repair and refurbishment of our electricity transmission network. However unrestricted vehicular access needs to be maintained at all times.</p> <p>National Grid recommends that no permanent structures are built directly beneath overhead lines, at least 10 metres clearance is maintained at the base of our towers.</p> <p>National Grid will also need to ensure that our tower access is maintained during and after construction.</p> <p>Please consult the Technical Specification EN-43-8 for "Overhead Line Clearances" Issue 3 (2004), you need to be sure that any existing clearances are not infringed. The construction can not be closer than 5.3m to the nearest (lowest) conductor.</p> <p>The overhead line is held under the terms of a permanent easement which grants rights to retain the line in its current position.</p> <p>The relevant guidance in relation to working safely near to existing overhead lines is contained within the Health and Safety Executive's (www.hse.gov.uk) Guidance Note GS 6 "Avoidance of Danger from Overhead Electric Lines" and all relevant site staff should make sure that they are both aware of and understand this guidance.</p> <p>The statutory minimum safety clearance is 7.6 metres to ground and 8.1 metres to a normal road surface. Further detailed information can be obtained from the Energy Networks Association's (www.energynetworks.org.uk) Technical Specification 43-8 for "Overhead Line Clearances", Issue 3 (2004).</p> <p>Plant, machinery, equipment, buildings or scaffolding should not encroach within 5.3 metres of any of our high voltage conductors when those conductors are under their worse conditions of maximum "sag" and "swing" and overhead line profile (maximum "sag" and "swing") drawings should be obtained via the National Grid's Plant Protection Team at Hinckley.</p> <p>If any changes in ground levels are proposed either beneath or in proximity to our existing overhead lines then this would serve to reduce the available safety clearance to such overhead lines. Safe clearances to existing overhead lines must be maintained in all instances and circumstances.</p> <p>If a landscaping scheme is proposed as part of the works, we request that only low growing and slow growing species of trees and shrubs are planted either directly beneath or immediately adjacent to the existing overhead line, as ultimately they may grow to attain heights that compromise safe statutory clearances to the conductors.</p> <p>Drilling or excavation works should not be undertaken if they have the potential to disturb or adversely affect the foundations or "pillars of support" of any existing tower. These foundations always extend beyond the base area of the existing tower and foundation ("pillar of support") drawings can be obtained via the Plant Protection Team at Hinckley.</p> <p>Flammable or explosive, (e.g. fireworks), substances or materials should not be stored near to a tower or beneath an overhead line.</p>	89728-230-723			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
National Grid	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	<p>2. There are High Voltage Underground Cables which runs outside of the proposal area, Bridgewater - Hinkley Point 1 & 2.</p> <p>National Grid has safety concerns regarding works around our easement strip for ground alterations near to our cable.</p> <p>Our underground cables are protected by renewable or permanent agreements with landowners or have been laid in the public highway under our licence. These grant us legal rights that enable us to achieve efficient and reliable operation, maintenance, repair and refurbishment of our electricity transmission network. Hence we require that no permanent structures are built over or under cables or within the zone specified in the agreement, materials or soil are not stacked or stored on top of the cable route or its joint bays and that unrestricted and safe access to any of our cable(s) must be maintained at all times.</p> <p>The information supplied is given in good faith and only as a guide to the location of our underground cables. The accuracy of this information cannot be guaranteed. The physical presence of such cables may also be evident from physical protection measures such as ducts or concrete protection tiles. The person(s) responsible for planning, supervising and carrying out work in proximity to our cable(s) shall be liable to us, as cable(s) owner, as well as to any third party who may be affected in any way by any loss or damage resulting from their failure to locate and avoid any damage to such a cable(s).</p> <p>The relevant guidance in relation to working safely near to existing underground cables is contained within the Health and Safety Executive's (www.hse.gov.uk) Guidance HS(G)47 "Avoiding Danger From Underground Services" and all relevant site staff should make sure that they are both aware of and understand this guidance.</p> <p>Our cables are normally buried to a depth of 1.1 metres or more below ground and cable profile drawings showing further details along the route of the particular cable, a PDF drawing of the cable route is enclosed within this response. (Go to Sheet Numbers, 5,6,7,8,9,10,16,17,18,21,22)</p> <p>If a landscaping scheme is proposed as part of the works, we request that no trees and shrubs are planted either directly above or within 3 metres of the existing underground cable, as ultimately the roots may grow to cause damage to the cable.</p> <p>Ground cover above our cables should not be reduced or increased.</p> <p>Our cables are protected by a permanent agreement. Hence we require that no permanent structures are to be built over our cables or within the easement strip. National Grid will require assurances as to what measures the developers will be taking to ensure the safety of our assets.</p> <p>The relocation of existing underground cables is not normally feasible on grounds of cost, operation and maintenance and environmental impact and we believe that successful development can take place in their vicinity.</p>	89728-230-4114			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	Nevertheless, there remain substantial concerns around the impacts of the project at the construction phase as well as issues around fully compensating and mitigating the impact of the project, including the storage of nuclear waste for over 100 years.	89735-230-2073			/	
Stockland Bristol Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	1) In response this Parish notes, yet again, that this Parish is not recognised by Edf and it would seem to not exist in the eyes of EdF. It is also noted that the small Villages of Steart and Otterhampton also fail to be recognised even though we live within 2 to 3 miles of the site,	89756-230-205			/	
32	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	We are not against the building of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point. We accept that it is necessary. However we are now seriously concerned about the effect that this will have on Stogursey and the other small communities around it during the lengthy construction period.	89821-230-2			/	
Countryside Council for Wales	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Section 8.3.15- we welcome the proposed mitigation measures to avoid and reduce disturbance to birds during the construction phase and recommend that they are included as conditions of any permission, and are fully implemented. We refer you to Natural England for detailed comments on birds.	89836-230-3194			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	However these few positive elements are completely overwhelmed by the massive negative impacts of the proposed increase in working hours, the additional 1.1 million tonnes of material to be imported to site, and the increase in the numbers of workers	89871-230-1323			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Overall the updated proposals will be to the very substantial detriment of those parishioners who live nearest to the site and the access roads. The proposed changes that will adversely affect those residents are wholly unacceptable.	89871-230-3151			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1.7 [4.1.19] How many tower cranes will be used, and what height will they be?	89872-230-3761	/			
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	there remain substantial concerns around the impacts of the project at the construction phase as well as issues around fully compensating and mitigating the impact of the project, including the storage of nuclear waste for over 100 years.	89876-230-2298			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	While acknowledging the increased level of detail with regards to shift patterns, the Councils remain unsatisfied as there is insufficient information to provide a full and transparent understanding of the implications of the proposals.	89891-230-4228			/	
42	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2 Update	In addition, we are raising concerns about the reported contamination of the proposed Hinkley C site by substantial amounts of enriched uranium. According to a recent press report we have seen, the reported contamination is being ignored by the relevant authorities involved and this is unacceptable.	89911-230-176			/	
42	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2 Update	We submit that the site in question is left undisturbed on the grounds of public safety	89911-230-480			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62207	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	Hinkley Point Pre-Application Stage 1 Thank you for sending me details of the above. I am sending a written reply because I am a landowner that you have identified as owning land which may be of interest to EDF during the construction of Hinkley Point C. I am willing to discuss possible use of my land. Please respond to this letter letting me know that you have received it. Thank you.	8726-229-0			/	Throughout the consultation process EDF Energy has received comments from a variety of consultees, both public and statutory, relating to proposed construction land use at Hinkley Point C (HPC). A substantial number of consultees welcomed the northward move of the southern boundary of the main construction activity, away from Shurton, albeit with some scepticism on whether this had always been intended. Many consultees commented that the site was still very large compared with the existing stations, and favoured consolidation of as much construction activity as possible onto the main site or the existing power station complex – particularly the HPA turbine hall – in preference to construction / fabrication at Combwich. A number favoured relocation of the campus away from the main site.
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	We would ask that the possibility of reusing some of the existing Hinkley A & B site should be investigated in order to reduce the area of land take. If this has already been discounted then we would ask that this is clearly indicated in future consultation information so that a more comprehensive understanding of the reasons for not reusing components of this site including the existing electric Sub-station can be established.	88840-229-10498			/	
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	2.2.4 Land Use Requirements for Construction - Spoil Storage Whilst the topsoil stripping, site levelling and spoil storage works are likely to form part of the preliminary works proposals that will be submitted to West Somerset Council, concern is expressed over the lack of information available on the extent of soil/spoil storage proposed to take place within the vicinity of residential properties. Further consultation with West Somerset Council, Stogursey Parish Council and the West Hinkley Action Group (residents of Shurton, Burton and Knighton) regarding this element of the proposals is required.	88110-229-595	/			In general terms, the proposed HPC development is located at Hinkley Point as this is one of the sites nominated as potentially suitable in the National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6). No other sites in the immediate vicinity were considered suitable. During the consultation process a number of respondents commented on the amount of land required for the development itself and the temporary land requirement during construction, comparing these unfavourably with Hinkley Point A and B power stations. As stated in the Main Site Design and Access Statement, the final HPC development would occupy 67.5ha, which represents 49MW per hectare, compared with 41MW per hectare for the existing Hinkley complex, despite a layout at HPC which is more ordered and uncongested and incorporates landscaped areas to create a managed transition to the surrounding countryside.
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The consultation document also identifies that a temporary jetty is needed in Bridgewater Bay to allow importation of large volumes of construction materials. The proposed site of the jetty, as shown in Figure 10.7, also occupies the MOD Danger Area. The area identified for the construction of the jetty will infringe the target zone of the range.	8775-229-6881	/			
Tractivity 696	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? concerns about the position of the "southern line" have been addressed	9456-229-127			/	
Tractivity 731	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Still too close to Shurton - a very quiet village	9489-229-393			/	
Tractivity 735	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? It is certainly an improvement on the original southern boundary plan.	9493-229-594			/	The total proposed construction area is 175.3ha for the twin-unit HPC plant. Account has been taken of the experience gained from construction of the single-unit EPR at Flamanville to estimate the required space for contractors' areas. However, EDF Energy expects the construction contractors to take advantage of the phasing of the construction of the two units to achieve improvements in space efficiency so that the allocated area is not increased in direct proportion to the amount of construction to be undertaken. Nevertheless the total site accommodates significant areas for spoil storage, landscape screening and protection of existing features. Details of the allocation are given in the Construction Method

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 737	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? There was no clearly justified reason for needing it in the first place, unless of course you propose to build Hinkley D there as well but haven't got around to telling us yet.	9495-229-438			/	Statement. The assessment of land required for the construction of HPC specifically excludes any consideration of future developments of any kind.
Tractivity 750	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Provided it now satisfies the local residents this is acceptable. I do wonder if you have allowed for enough temporary storage for the larger equipment parts, which will be needed during construction, but assume this has been checked by your planners.	9508-229-563			/	The southern limit for main construction work has been moved north to grid line 144750mN following feedback received during the Stage 1 Consultation. The early landscaping of the southern area will increase the effectiveness of this area as a buffer between the construction works and the village of Shurton.
Tractivity 750	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I consider the proposals to be sound and a good considered response to the comments received in (stage 1) consultation. My only reservation concerns adequate site storage for much of the mundane materials such as aggregate, sand, cement and reinforcing steel as well as the specialist items.	9508-229-8178		/		The proposed construction area includes storage space for plant and materials as shown in the Construction Method Statement. The size of the stockpiles for materials imported via the jetty takes account of the potential disruption to deliveries due to bad weather, particularly during the winter months, so as to minimise the potential need for road deliveries to maintain concrete production. Plant and equipment deliveries would require space for temporary storage prior to installation. The concept of 'just in time' deliveries has been considered but is better suited to mass production, where the supply chain logistics can be refined over time, rather than the non-repetitive activities of power station construction.
Tractivity 751	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I think it's all good and will be good for the local economy. Some care needs to be taken over the site at Hinkley and what those in the accommodation do, but otherwise, all good! I am very much in favour.	9509-229-5837			/	The volume of spoil from the site preparation and excavation works has been assessed based on the quantities of material involved and the bulking factors associated with excavation. Storage space has then been allocated to avoid, as far as possible, the need to transport spoil off-site. The opportunity is also being taken to place spoil in the turbine hall basement at HPA. The proposed storage locations within the HPC site have been chosen to take advantage of the natural low points in the landscape to minimise stockpile visibility and enable the creation of an additional level contractor working area. These temporary storage areas have been based on the assessed volumes, taking account of the need to segregate different types of material and limit storage heights for topsoil. However, the proposal to bring forward the landscaping of the southern area (south of grid line 144750mN) would utilise some of the spoil and reduce the total volumes required to be stored.
Tractivity 772	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? If more land is used on site there would be less disruption to a larger number of people	9530-229-476		/		The relationship between the HPC main site and the various associated developments is described in the Construction Method Statement which explains why various facilities are located off-site. Car parking space at the main site is deliberately limited as part of an overall transport strategy to limit the numbers of vehicles travelling to and from the site and utilise park and ride for the construction workforce. Whilst a larger accommodation campus at Hinkley Point would
Tractivity 799	Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments? Move the freight logistics facilities and park and rides to the Hinkley Point C site, which should be expanded to the west to allow for these. We as residents do not trust your company should you build them because you may move nuclear waste to these sites past our homes and store it there, which will affect our health. Also we were here first and don't want our house prices dropped. If you do go ahead will you pay compensation? Also the capacity of Taunton Road is NOT sufficient for another 120 lorries every 24 hours. We live here and we know our area the best, it is already congested.	9557-229-3292		/		
Tractivity 803	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? We in Bridgwater will have the problem	9561-229-393			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 809	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Although further land could be gained from basing facilities off site while retaining housing on-site.	9567-229-547		/		improve efficiency and further limit daily journeys, the capacity has been reduced from 700 to 510 in response to consultation comments. In addition, the balance of activities between the Combwich Freight Laydown Facility and the main site has been changed to eliminate prefabrication at Combwich in favour of storage, particularly of sea-delivered freight.
Tractivity 826	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? This is certainly better than the initial proposal, but as already stated on the previous page I fell too much land is being enclosed.	9584-229-493		/		The location of the accommodation campus at the south-east corner of the main site has been retained as this facility would operate under a separate regime from the main site and would have to be segregated with its own access. The layout of the campus locates the sleeping accommodation on the south side, closest to the local residents, with the potentially noisier amenity and recreation facilities adjacent to the main site entrance. Alternative locations or configurations would position noisier activities closer to residents.
Tractivity 839	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Completely unsatisfactory because although this is good for the villages of Burton and Shurton you are now pushing this construction/presite fabrication onto the village of Combwich which everyone strongly objects to and which could be contained on site with better planning more to the NW of the site.Surely on the A-site you could utilise the empty A-station turbine hall which is one of the biggest buildings in the south west and would be ideal for fabrication work!!	9597-229-533	/			Some consultees have suggested that the southern construction limit should be moved northwards as the power station approaches completion. However, as the area concerned includes topsoil storage and the accommodation campus, this land could not be released until the main construction area is cleared and the final landscaping work takes place.
Tractivity 839	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments? Park and Ride on the motorway Junctions seems practical, however the one at Cannington is completely un-needed. the freight/logistics at Combwich is completely un-needed. The frieght/logisitcs at Combwich is completely opposed as this is putting far too much stress on the residents and countryside and flora and fauna. There is sufficient redundant land between the ?C? site and the ?A? station to accomodate the freight logisitcs and pre-fabrication sheds now recently announce for Combwich!	9597-229-2899	/			The need to facilitate sea deliveries has been recognised in the development proposals. A jetty is proposed for import of bulk materials for concrete production. Minor modifications to the initial jetty design also allow the crane offloading of containerised freight via the jetty. However, offloading of the large indivisible loads at Hinkley would require a much more substantial structure, possibly with additional breakwaters to provide protection. Such massive structures could not be justified, given the international designation of the area concerned and the availability of an existing heavy load facility at Combwich.
Tractivity 839	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Whilst we have no objection to the building of Hinkley Point ?C? Station, EDF Energy seems ?hell - bent? on causing as much disruption to local villages as possible. 2 previous power stations were built int he 60s and 70s with far less upset to the local communitas as is being proposed now. We see on the national television that "EDF are the green team, the company that promotes reduction of the carbon footprint" - How can this possibly be with the proposals they are suggesting here - taking up acres and acres of good farming land and putting dozens of unnecessary buses on the roads, when everything should be contained at H/Point. make better use of the land to hand - go back to the drawing board and get someone local who knows the needs of the community better.	9597-229-8356			/	The emergency access road which exits the site into Shurton crosses Bum Brook. The bridge has been designed to ensure that extreme floods, which have a very low probability of occurrence, would not drown the bridge structure and that the bridge structure and embankments do not significantly exacerbate the impact of more likely flood events. Detail of the flood risk assessment can be found in the Main Site Flood Risk Assessment.
Tractivity 844	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? I think that as this is a Hinkley Point expansion that as much a possible should be done onsite and not be allowed to affect other areas.	9602-229-784		/		The cooling water tunnels and intake/outfall structures, as well as the jetty, would lie within the area associated with the Lilstock Royal Navy Aircraft

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 846	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Too close to Shurton. No camp	9604-229-129		/		range. However, safe co-existence would be ensured through effective liaison arrangements with the Ministry of Defence.
Tractivity 846	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? EDF should never, ever have considered buying land so close to Shurton. You've given us back 200m that you shouldn't have taken in the first place, if you consider 'your neighbours' as you keep saying, we should put your boundary back to the woods at least.	9604-229-416		/		
Tractivity 849	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Reduce it even more	9607-229-393		/		
Tractivity 868	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? The use of Hinkley A site could reduce the land used on the southern part	9626-229-397		/		
Tractivity 869	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below The A station turbine is a mile long, has built in cranes, why not use it for freight logistics. Surely you can get a ring fence from your site for access and rent the building during construction. N11 would surely give a dispensation to use it as all the nuclear stuff is in the reactor fence area.	9627-229-5986		/		
Tractivity 881	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Any reduction on site size is desirable	9639-229-449			/	
Tractivity 889	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Moving the boundary further away from the houses is a good thing. Pity the trees (Personal details removed) has been planting over the last twenty years are now going to be bulldozed out!	9647-229-127			/	
Tractivity 898	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Much better for the village	9656-229-811			/	
Tractivity 903	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? if reducing the amount of land to the south has resulted in the proposed industrial park being sited at Combwich then this must be considered a retrograde step.	9661-229-393			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 908	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Anything you can do to reduce concerns of local residents is a positive more.	9666-229-506			/	
Tractivity 913	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? This proposal seems a very good solution/compromise.	9671-229-832			/	
Tractivity 915	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Campsite should be on North of Hinkley C site. EDF needs to negotiate use of vacant Hinkley A site	9673-229-129		/		
Tractivity 923	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? As above, too much land has been proposed for temporary construction and permanent constructions - a further eyesore opposite tourist attractions and residents	9681-229-448			/	
Tractivity 927	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? I suspect that this was your plan all along. Plan initially to take more land than needed and then make a "peace offering" as a show of goodwill. Smoke and mirrors in my opinion.	9685-229-833			/	
Tractivity 931	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Clearly, the whole thing is put up as a ?hostage to fortune?, so that you can say that you have taken local views into account when in reality you are not.	9689-229-473			/	
Tractivity 932	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Yes, you have moved the boundary fence back but this is just a minor gesture to the concern of local people which is that far too much land is being made sterile for residents of the hamlets and Stogursey for far too long. Couldn?t it come on stream for EDF use as it is needed.	9690-229-793		/		
Tractivity 933	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Why build on greenfield site when you could develop the construction site at Hinkley Point itself? This would reduce transport/haulage costs, congestion on country roads, noise and disruption to existing residents. What assurances are there that you will return the construction site to open land once you have finished, and what is to stop you from later declaring it a brown-field site and making it available for further development for housing or industrial use? What about the mainly negative impact this will have on people already living here, who never wanted to live near industry, noise, etc?	9691-229-6038		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 934	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? I think that more use should be made of the land that is already in use - e.g. Hinkley A and parts of Hinkley B	9692-229-129		/		
Tractivity 935	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? In this age of environmental awareness and recycling I think that the land used for Hinkley A should be used, rather than taking a whole new tract of coastline and encroaching on an unspoilt area west of the current powerstations.	9693-229-129		/		
Tractivity 936	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? EDF must think that we are all fools! The probability is that EDF originally extended the southern portion of the site up to a few feet of the residents' homes to create a furor, then move northwards to give the impression that EDF were good guys and listening to the people's concerns. Get real EDF no one believes anything anymore!	9694-229-558			/	
Tractivity 937	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? The further away from dwellings the better but it is regrettable that EDF chose to put the boundary near houses in the first place. It was probably a concession you were planning to give to appease the locals if needs be.	9695-229-595			/	
Tractivity 940	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? We don't live quite as close but am sure people who live nearer will be relieved.	9698-229-476			/	
Tractivity 968	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Unsatisfactory. Yes. You have reduced the amount of land to be used in construction in the southern part of the site in response to local residents, at the expense of Combwich. There is ample space on A and B sites to compensate for this reduction. It appears that the reduction is at the expense of Combwich. Surely the same criteria to Combwich residents as well as those residents close to the south of the proposed EDF site.	9726-229-594		/		
Tractivity 985	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? My concern is that you are taking far too much land from the local people. When EDF moved the Southern boundary it was only after much arguing and I feel that this was a tactical approach by EDF to give the impression that they had actually listened to local views. If the logistics of the movement of materials and machinery were thought about more thoroughly there would be no need to take so much land away from us.	9743-229-1222		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 986	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Powerstation far bigger than I was led to believe, when first told about it by EDF. Worried and upset that so much (500 acres) of land being bulldozed away and the old barns to be demolished. Rare and precious wildlife killed and disrupted. Trees to be planted not big enough. I wont see them mature in my lifetime. Worried about EDF?s attitude to this and to the local people. Very worried indeed about this proposal.	9744-229-129			/	
Tractivity 986	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? EDF are using far too much land - this is unnecessary. the moving of the Southern boundary was what I would call a con. Movements of materials etc needs to be thought through - if this was done, less land would be needed. Very worried about this.	9744-229-805		/		
Tractivity 992	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? The amount of land being used during the construction phase is vast when compared to that used in constructing Hinkley A and B. EDF has not persuaded local people that the use of such a large area is necessary.	9750-229-489		/		
Tractivity 993	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? A very small concession on you part but a big help to the residents of Shurton.	9751-229-426			/	
Tractivity 996	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Initial plan was completely inappropriate and unsympathetic	9754-229-393			/	
Tractivity 1006	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Reducing the area of land required at Hinkley Point only makes more land required at Combwich for fabrication, and subsequently more large loads on the road to Hinkley Point.	9764-229-393	/			
Tractivity 1017	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? EDF could manage with even less land if they had to.	9775-229-404		/		
Tractivity 1027	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Disgusting plans that would not even be thought of if any of your top people lived here. use the empty land where ther are NO villages between us and hinckly and leave us alone	9785-229-7064		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1030	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? The extension of the southern site boundry is a small help, but you are still taking up a huge area of land for the construction site. This will totaly ruin our present standard of living, in what is at the moment,a peacefu, rural setting.l	9788-229-908			/	
Tractivity 1031	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Good that it?s been moved but I would like to see a more compact site. I do understand is a lot of earth movement required and have concerns regarding flooding when valleys are filled in.	9789-229-485		/		
Tractivity 1033	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Satisfactory for near local residents- however the reduced amount of land should be used more efficiently so that this does not seem to create more off-site developments in Cannington and local villages. The site must look after all temporary workers as any other company.	9791-229-480		/		
Tractivity 1036	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Disruptive, unnecessary.	9794-229-499			/	
Tractivity 1043	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Any excess amount of farming land is not acceptable.	9801-229-452			/	
Tractivity 1062	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? I think the response is the correct one. It probably caused more grievance than was necessary if good communications channels and the ability to make decisions and act had been in place.	9820-229-513			/	
Tractivity 1062	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? The sooner work starts the sooner it will be finished.	9820-229-1185			/	
Tractivity 1063	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Satisfactory for local residents (Burton, Shurton and Stogursey) but available land on site should be used as much as possible.	9821-229-438		/		
Tractivity 1063	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Overall, many of the EDF proposals seem to be the cheapset options. Please do not treat Somerset residents as country ?yokels?..we are not, and can see through these transparent proposals.	9821-229-7326			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1064	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? The amount which has been reduced is a small help but do you really need the whole field? In my opinion the construction site is taking over the whole village of Shurton ruining the ?feel? of living in the countryside.	9822-229-397		/		
Tractivity 1067	Public	Stage 2	2. We have reduced the amount of land to be used during construction in the southern part of the site in response to concerns from local residents. What are your views on this proposal? Box ticked: No opinion 2. Any other ideas or comments? The land originally proposed for use was demonstrated to not be required only following considerable lobbying by local residents. Edf made no concessions.	9825-229-1112			/	
Tractivity 1081	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? The land required for fabrication has now been moved to Combwich which is equally unfair on the residents of Combwich. Use the land available at Hinkley Point A station instead of using greenfield sites. The turbine hall when filled in will make an excellent fabrication facility. Restore and retain the existing barns in the construction area and use as part of the site a piece of rustic charm in an industrial landscape would be good for EDF publicity.	9839-229-534		/		
Tractivity 1081	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Maintain access to the West Somerset Coast Path throughout the constuction time. Restore and retain the existing barns in the construction area and use as part of the site a piece of rustic charm in an industrial landscape would be good for EDF publicity.	9839-229-1474		/		
Tractivity 1081	Public	Stage 2	12. Any other ideas or comments? Consider the use of the railway for container traffic with a terminal at Dunball and a new Bridgwater bypass from the A38 north of Bridgwater to the Cannington to Hinkley Point road. Also consider the use of Dunball docks. The residents of Combwich agreed to use of the Combwich dock for AILs only and also agreed to a small holding area for AILs prior to their transport to Hinkley Point. We did not agree to loads other than AILs coming by sea to Combwich nor did we agree to a freight logistics site, a bus park and a fabrication facility. It is not right to use a green field flood plain when there is adequate land at Hinkley Point for these facilities on the A station site. It also makes sense to fabricate on site and not 6 miles away. Combwich is a quiet and peaceful village and we are concerned about the noise and disruption that these facilities would cause	9839-229-9207	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1081	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>The planned deliveries of 16 to 20 loads a month by sea to Combwich are unrealistic and do not take account of the weather.</p> <p>The freight logistics and fabrication facilities have been moved to Combwich from near Shurton and Burton due to the objection of residents. Well, we are also objecting to these facilities being on our doorstep when there is adequate land at Hinkley Point. The A station turbine hall would make an excellent fabrication facility and land to the north of it could be used for freight logistics. It seems that EDF have not quite got it right for Combwich which has angered the residents and put EDF at risk of a failed consultation. This is not what I wanted to see</p>	9839-229-10117	/			
Tractivity 1083	Public	Stage 2	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>I think it is great you have listened to local residents concerns but it only makes me think you did not need to buy so much land in the first place</p>	9841-229-494			/	
Tractivity 1087	Public	Stage 2	<p>9c. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>No justification for such a large site. We were told by your own French engineers at a meeting that they could see no need for a work camp at Hinkley Point.</p>	9845-229-5104		/		
Tractivity 1091	Public	Stage 2	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>You have conceded 200m, a token gesture when your border finishes 0.5km from local residents. The proposed on site accommodation is going to be 3 storeys/12m high, with a 13m high Sports Centre. Will this 200m really stop light, noise, air pollution affecting the local residents? Unlikely!</p>	9849-229-1136			/	
Tractivity 1099	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Site boundary is too close to Shurton and construction works will make life intolerable to residents for many years to come. Little in concrete terms has yet been offered in way of mitigation. Tree planting proposed is too little and too late with none shown on the Western boundary as a visual/noise buffer for Burton and Knighton residents.</p>	9857-229-129	/			
Tractivity 1108	Public	Stage 2	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Cutting down on the size of the main site has probably meant unsatisfactory fabrication and buses ending up at Combwich. Use some of Hinkley A and B site, not swamp small villages.</p>	9866-229-397		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1120	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The site boundary is too close to Shurton and the construction noise and visual impact will have a detrimental effect on the lives of residents. Planning blight will also affect their ability to move away should they wish to do so. Traffic on the C182 generated by the construction will also adversely affect residents.	9878-229-129		/		
Tractivity 1120	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Good as far as it goes. However, the site is still too close to Shurton and should be confined as planned originally to land lying to the North of the green lane. Tree planting designed to act as a visual and noise barrier is taking place at toolate a stage to provide any effective mitigation.	9878-229-704	/			
Tractivity 1122	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? The direct consequence of this "reduction" has been to transfer the disruption, noise, dirt and chaos resulting from the construction to other equally local environments. The plain fact is that a project of this size inevitably impacts on local people and their lives. EDF?s duplicity in pretending otherwise has been breathtaking.	9880-229-472			/	
Tractivity 1140	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Too big an impact on countryside	9898-229-129			/	
Tractivity 1142	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? No direct impact on our home, but I hope the final solution helps the local resiedents	9900-229-458			/	
Tractivity 1143	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? What will you do with the rest?	9901-229-404			/	
Tractivity 1151	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? By reducing the land available on site you now wish to use unsuitable land at Combwich	9909-229-393	/			
Tractivity 1153	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? You may have gone some way to appeasing local residents but not nearly far enough. Parts of the site will be within 500 metres of residential dwellings, rendering a normal lifestyle for these people virtually impossible. Looking at the plans it seems that other options were available and I cannot understand why this land so close to Shurton has to be used.	9911-229-584		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1164	Public	Stage 2	12. Any other ideas or comments? Why not use the turbine hall on the site of A power station?	9922-229-6085			/	
Tractivity 1165	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Depends on the scale of the reduction	9923-229-389			/	
Tractivity 1166	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Regarding Stage 2 - purchase of land required - off site associate development. What purpose do you want to use the extra land for and where will that be? We would definitely not be in favour of any affordable housing, etc. being built in Shurton. Briefly, when we moved to Shurton we were told by the local authority (planning) that no further new builds would be allowed in this hamlet, due to evacuation measures for Shurton in case of any emergencies at Hinkley C. IN CONCLUSION: Our opinion has not changed since the beginning of any of the proposals regarding the new build at Hinkley (Continued on associated enquiry)	9924-229-7520			/	
Tractivity 1170	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? You have only moved the line back slightly. You could move it back considerably more if the campus is moved back to Hinkley point A or more appropriately to Bridgwater.	9928-229-397		/		
Tractivity 1171	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? As long as you stick to your promises	9929-229-395			/	
Tractivity 1175	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Will have an unacceptable bearing on the local (adjacent) community who have to live there! It matters little whether the landscaping is carried out to a high standard or not. A blot on the coast line of Somerset is unavailable, if the project goes ahead.	9933-229-129			/	
Tractivity 1179	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Initial plan was completely inappropriate and unsympathetic	9937-229-393			/	
Tractivity 1182	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? It is good that you listen to local concerns. You should be guided by local view, effort here will bring long term benefits.	9940-229-560			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1188	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Any more to minimise the amount of land used or disturbed in this essential building project has got to be a good thing	9946-229-393			/	
Tractivity 1189	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? There has to be give and take with a project of this size	9947-229-393			/	
Tractivity 1193	Public	Stage 2	2. We have reduced the amount of land to be used during construction in the southern part of the site in response to concerns from local residents. What are your views on this proposal? Box ticked: No opinion 2. Any other ideas or comments? Thats good. they will be most affected	9951-229-176			/	
Tractivity 1194	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? We welcome the reduction of the above mentioned land, but its hard to imagine at the moment what the effects will be, in terms of noise and air pollution on the daily life of residents nearest to the land involved.	9952-229-670			/	
Tractivity 1195	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? This move of boundary I believe was planned well in advance to give the impression of compliance to the wishes of the local community. The totla area of land being destroyed would reduce the area required. Also the 700 bed campus is not needed on site feeing up more land.	9953-229-801	/			
Tractivity 1196	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Very pleased that EDF has listened to local concerns over this aspect but one wonders if this has gone far enough. I suspect not for Burton residents.	9954-229-637			/	
Tractivity 1198	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? If its only during construction whats the issue	9956-229-391			/	
Tractivity 1203	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? I am still amazed that the area of land you need but grateful for this small reduction.	9961-229-599			/	
Tractivity 1209	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Get lost	9967-229-397			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1220	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? You have no right to use any of this land for this purpose.	9978-229-973			/	
Tractivity 1312	Public	Stage 2 Update	Small changes on site plans will not make it any easier for local residents living close by	89578-229-1104			/	
Tractivity 1313	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	WHy do you need to build here? Why can't you build on the other side of the motorway?	89579-229-1730			/	
Tractivity 1324	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	The southern site boundary should be rolled-back northwards on a periodic basis as soon as possible after the requirement for the land has ended. Planting to screen the visual impact must be effective year-round. The campus should be removed altogether or moved northwards on site.	89590-229-2487		/		
Tractivity 1369	Public	Stage 2 Update	Moving any boundary away from houses.	89635-229-1019		/		
Tractivity 1372	Public	Stage 2 Update	EDF do not listen to the concerns of locals and blow their trumpet for a minor climb down like the southern boundary. There should be compensation for the destruction of my way of life.	89638-229-484			/	
Tractivity 204	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? I would still like to know why you need so much land.	9335-229-8096	/			
Tractivity 243	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? Don't use as a construction site in the first place.	8939-229-696		/		
Tractivity 303	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? A new power station is greatly needed but in should be contained more on site with far less disruption to the communities of Cannington, Comwich and Williton ie your Park and Rldes and workers accomodation and freight facities should be housed at Hinkley.	8991-229-5027		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 314	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? I don't know if this is the best way of minimising impact. If set back far enough, it would be part of an impact-reducing scheme, if planted with trees or hedgerows.	9002-229-359	/			
Tractivity 389	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? i dont rate any of the options as i dont want it in the village in the first place	9074-229-613			/	
Tractivity 435	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? It should be a lot bigger and go to the west as well	9114-229-348		/		
Tractivity 473	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? There is already concern that a 2nd development (Hinkley D) may follow on immediately from Hinkley C, causing a total of 15 - 20 years of misery and disruption in the local communities. The area of land purchased for Hinkley C appears larger than required for the construction of just one nuclear power station.	9149-229-4840	/			
Tractivity 499	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? I am very much in favour of Hinkley C; the new reactors are obviously needed for security of electricity supply in the future. However, I am concerned at the amount of land that will be needed during construction, it is a much larger area than anyone had envisaged. This has obviously upset many of the local residents (Shurton and Burton etc) who will be adversely affected. I think they had assumed that the work and hostel would be 'in the distance' rather than 'on our doorstep'.	9172-229-5372			/	
Tractivity 510	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Nuclear power, to me, is a necessary evil. If a new station is to be built, two points would sweeten the pill. A) All facilities required during construction, must be temporary and removed as soon as construction is complete, returning the land to its original state, with the exception of the landscape buffer on the southern boundary. B) A 10% discount on energy bills for all households in West Somerset and Sedgemoor area would help to reduce nimbyprow. I live in Burnham, so look across Bridgwater Bay at the Hinkley Point eyesore, spoiling the beautiful view of the hills and coast of the Quantocks, Brendons and Exmoor. I spend a lot of my leisure time on that side of the bay and hope to move house over there in the near future, so I have a vested interest in this development.	9182-229-7223		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 535	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? The Southern site boundary should be moved North to Lat. 144750 to take into account the natural ridge which will negate the need for a landscape buffer. Trees should be planted along this southern ridge as a screen. This would form the main community benefit for local residents and is directly within EdF's remit to allow. It would also go a long way in furthering good community relations.	9205-229-351	/			
Tractivity 535	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? If Edf should move their Southern boundary to the Norththe land which is released would provcide a valuable amenity area for local residents.	9205-229-1010	/			
Tractivity 550	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Why does EDF have to take up so much land, encroaching on the local residents. It is going to be such an eyesore, with light poillution. I feel EDF should be doing more to minimise the development's impact on the local surroundings.	9219-229-5696	/			
Tractivity 597	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? We all know we need a new power station to keep the lights burning - Why Hinkley I ask myself!!! Why did you buy/rent 250 acres first of all, then move the goal posts and acquire another 200 acres - Both existing Hinkley sites don't sit on any where near that amount. Worry about selling my house during construction of your site.	9263-229-5323			/	
Tractivity 62307	Public	Stage 2	Despite the concession on the Southern Boundary the local population, who WHAG try to represent, remain very anti EDF. The main reason is the huge area of land that you have taken and lhe damaging effect this will have on our lives, it is not accepted that you need it.	9996-229-198			/	
Tractivity 62313	Public	Stage 2	The majority of residents of Burton, Knighton, Shurton and Wick are very disgruntled with the contents of your stage 2 proposals. From the beginning we were shocked by the amount of land that will be needed for the construction of the power stations and concerned about the damaging effect that it will have on our quality of life. After a major confrontation we settled for the movement of the southern boundary, even though we knew that our lives would still be severely affected for the long period of construction. As you could now progress a power station we thought that you would be very pleased, and did not expect you to load us with other major disadvantages which are not essential for completion of the work. Your stage 2 proposals have shown that we were very wrong to make that assumption. Your attitude has turned local people against you. They are now at least going to fight your proposals and many are sympathising with the Stop Hinkley group.	10000-229-35			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62352	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2) As stated in the attached, we want EDF to confine all of their operations to their own on-site land at Hinkley Point and this to include the construction of a Wharf for the job,	10029-229-2813		/		
Tractivity 62385	Public	Stage 2	- Is it correct that the current Hinkley are dismantling a turbo that will leave a large building vacant, sited very close to the proposed development area? If so, why cannot EDF use/lease this building for the fabrication? What else can they make use of without building new?	10048-229-5013		/		
Tractivity 62423	Public	Stage 2	Hinkley Point site - EDF already have already have around 266 acres of land at the Hinkley point site including a number of empty, decommissioned buildings. Why do they want to ruin our countryside, our village, our wharf and our lives with the noise, construction, fabrication, traffic, upheaval and pollution when they already have all the facilities they need ON SITE?	10060-229-2590		/		
Tractivity 62450	Public	Stage 2	At the Hinkley Point site, EDF already have acres of land plus empty decommissioned buildings which could be put to better use than vandalising an area of peace, beauty and tranquillity.	10076-229-1776		/		
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	The proposals breach the covenant of trust between the British Nuclear industry, the Government and the public. It has long been promised that nuclear sites would be decommissioned and then used for further nuclear build, brown field sites or returned to Greenfield. All of the proposals are for Greenfield site use and will lead to the industrialisation of a rural area. None of the proposals go any way to honour this commitment when they easily could. The intention to use Greenfield land for everything including freight logistics and fabrication when existing 'Nuclear land' could be utilised is immoral.	10091-229-622			/	
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	There are buildings on the B site which were used during its construction. Decommissioning activity on 'A' site has all but ceased due to shortage of funds. The site & its massive Turbine Hall facility (largest single span building in Europe when built) containing two very large overhead gantry cranes could easily, with a bit of refurbishment, be used as fabrication workshops and freight storage facilities immediately adjacent to the C site. The land of the C site was used for construction of A & B so the ground between would take the load.	10091-229-1238		/		
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	The 'A' site unfinished (due to lack of funds) 'safestore' facility foundations are in place and the building could be completed and used for C site construction then handed back for its original purpose thus saving on greenfield use and saving taxpayer money. EDF could take over the 'A' site decommissioning project as a sign of its commitment to future decommissioning and to gain valuable organisational experience in the work.	10091-229-1788		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	All the nuclear industry pundits believe that at least one additional twin EPWR power station will be built after/during the one proposed, if not two, to ensure long term financial , if not two, to ensure long term financial viability. There would be little point in believing that areas would be returned to Greenfield after 8 years.	10091-229-6340			/	
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2. Comment Much improved for the people of Shurton/Burton etc. The site needs to be kept as far away from houses as possible.	10124-229-460			/	
Tractivity 62577	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2 We have reduced the amount of land to be used during the construction in the southern part of the site in response to concerns from local residents. What are your views on this proposal? Unsatisfactory - That the encroachment of the southern boundary upon a small settlement was ever contemplated at all and considered potentially acceptable is indicative of the barbarity of EdF's approach. That it took over a year of protest for the company to move the boundary slightly back, to a point that was already a generous compromise proposal on the part of the residents and that this should have been done only when the company realized that without this agreement, secured at ever more desperate and angry meetings with residents, they would not be able to proceed to Stage 2 is further indication of the absence of local consideration and responsiveness on EdFs part. That having moved the boundary back at the very last minute the company should then make the conscious effort to bring this action to repeated prominence in their Stage 2 publications and that they should use this to display their skilled local negotiating skills while overlooking many other omissions and errors of fact in the rest of their documents seems profoundly opportunistic and cynical.	10128-229-1467			/	
Tractivity 62577	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	- Moving the boundary back is no more than the very least the company should have done. At that, it is reserving the right to fence the land rerieved, to run a road along it and to pile mountains of spoil on it.	10128-229-2744	/			
Tractivity 62582	Public	Stage 2	Q2 My feeling is that you used the southern boundary as a tactic and you always intended to have it further back. I believe EDF thought to appease the local residents with this and now intend to do whatever they like afterwards with no regard for the residents of our Parish.	10133-229-2211			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62631	Public	Stage 2	The reduced use of land in the South of the construction site will be an almost insignificant change compared to the enormous negative disruption to the lives of the Shurton residents living with the largest building site in the UK for at least 10 years within a few hundred metres of their homes.	10175-229-1877			/	
Tractivity 62671	Public	Stage 2	EDF are building a 760 metre long sea wall at Hinkley. They already have around 266 acres of land at the Hinkley Point site including a number of empty, decommissioned buildings. Why do they want to ruin our countryside, our village, our wharf and our lives with their noise, construction, fabrication, traffic, upheaval and pollution when they already have all the facilities they need on site?	10180-229-5838			/	
Hinkley Point Site Stakeholder Group (A+B) Sites	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	3) The A Station Turbine Hall would make an excellent store and construction/fabrication facility, this idea was mooted by the SSG some 3 years ago, this would then save a large area of 'Green field' land being put under concrete at Combwich and it would also mean that the facility was 'on site'. As 1 SSG member put it a 'No Brainer'	10255-229-1389		/		
Forum 21	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	This is the largest nuclear power station ever considered for construction in the UK, with a generating capacity over twice as large as the existing Hinkley B. The area to be taken up by the building and associated works is more than 430 acres.	10262-229-2728			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	Moving the line back a little bit on site from Burton and Shurton is also inadequate. It needs to move much further back.	89470-229-447		/		
Otterhampton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We are surprised at this proposal as we are advised by those involved in the construction industry that fabrication normally takes place at the construction site. It makes sense that large fabricated structures should be put together as near as possible to where they are going to be used, rather than clogging up already busy roads by transporting them to the site. It is worth noting that all fabrication was on site during the construction of Hinkley B.	89266-229-509	/			
Otterhampton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We are advised that ample land already exists adjacent to the Hinkley C construction site, the Hinkley B site and the decommissioned Hinkley A site including the disused turbine hall. We are also aware that EDF decided in Stage 2 to move the southern boundary of the main construction site north therefore reducing the available land.	89266-229-1262			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[7.3.9] Just in time delivery is stated as reducing waste by preventing over-ordering and reduction in stockpile requirements. Has EDF considered this philosophy, as suggested by SPC in Stage 1, to reduce the land take required by the project?	89291-229-8480		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	1.10 It is not apparent from the information presently available that the volume of excavated material to be removed from the site during the construction phase can be accommodated within the earthworks design. The Estate requires clarification that these volumes, adjusted to include the relevant bulking factor, can be accommodated within the proposed landform, and how and where any surplus material would be incorporated into the existing landscape to achieve a naturalistic effect.	89439-229-6730		/		
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	2.12 Given that EDF has reduced the land use needed for the southern part of the site, the Estate is concerned that the amount of land available for use with the accommodation and landscaped mounds might also therefore be reduced.	89440-229-5621		/		
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We are particularly concerned about the scale of the development. The proposed Hinkley C construction site will be approximately four times the area of the existing Hinkley A and B power station sites combined, with an installed capacity eight times that of Hinkley A and three times Hinkley B.	89447-229-840			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Effect on local environment The total area affected by EdF's construction activity for Hinkley C covers 435 acres. This is approximately four times the land area of the existing Hinkley A and B power station sites combined.	89451-229-4791			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	It also remains unclear as to the approach that the scheme will adopt in terms of materials balance, cut-and-fill and reuse of excavated material, both from the site and from construction of cooling water tunnels. While significant quantities will be generated, the capacity of the site to accommodate these, either owing to the proposed final ground levels proposed, or owing to the nature, character and reusability (i.e. geotechnical properties/ contamination) of materials for on-site fill, remains unknown.	89336-229-6329	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Section 12 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Appraisal considers that the effect on soil quality due to construction disturbance such as soil stripping, would represent a moderate adverse effect. Soil stripping at associated development sites, including those considered best and most valuable land, would also be expected to result in significant impacts. Mitigation has been proposed in the form of a soil management plan which is expected to reduce the significance of the effect, although long-term end use of the soil is expected to be for landscaping or fill, rather than the original agricultural function.	89413-229-3368			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62992	Public	Stage 2 Update	Question 7 I heard at the last Hinkley A + B Site Stakeholder Group Meeting in February that agreement had been reached to receive spoil from earthworks on HPC site to fill in the old Turbine Hall basement and to use the Turbine Hall itself as a workshop and storage area. I applaud this and consider you should maximise use of the HPA Turbine Hall plus any other part of the HPA site which may become available. Can you say more on this point in your next documents?	89691-229-824		/		
Tractivity 62998	Public	Stage 2 Update	Reduced use of green field on site at Hinkley positive.	89692-229-1594			/	
Tractivity 62998	Public	Stage 2 Update	More considerate to small community of Shurton Good less green field land used	89692-229-4966			/	
National Grid	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	<p>1. There are High Voltage Overhead Lines which run outside of the proposal area - Taunton - Hinkley Point - Spans - ZZ0, Hinkley Point - Bridgwater - Span -VQ - and Hinkley Point - Melksham - Span -ZG</p> <p>National Grid's overhead lines are protected by renewable or permanent agreements with landowners. These grant us legal rights that enable us to achieve efficient and reliable operation, maintenance, repair and refurbishment of our electricity transmission network. However unrestricted vehicular access needs to be maintained at all times.</p> <p>National Grid recommends that no permanent structures are built directly beneath overhead lines, at least 10 metres clearance is maintained at the base of our towers.</p> <p>National Grid will also need to ensure that our tower access is maintained during and after construction.</p> <p>Please consult the Technical Specification EN-43-8 for "Overhead Line Clearances" Issue 3 (2004), you need to be sure that any existing clearances are not infringed. The construction can not be closer than 5.3m to the nearest (lowest) conductor.</p> <p>The overhead line is held under the terms of a permanent easement which grants rights to retain the line in its current position.</p> <p>The relevant guidance in relation to working safely near to existing overhead lines is contained within the Health and Safety Executive's (www.hse.gov.uk) Guidance Note GS 6 "Avoidance of Danger from Overhead Electric Lines" and all relevant site staff should make sure that they are both aware of and understand this guidance.</p> <p>The statutory minimum safety clearance is 7.6 metres to ground and 8.1 metres to a normal road surface. Further detailed information can be obtained from the Energy Networks Association's (www.energynetworks.org.uk) Technical Specification 43-8 for "Overhead Line Clearances", Issue 3 (2004).</p> <p>Plant, machinery, equipment, buildings or scaffolding should not encroach</p>	89728-229-723			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			<p>within 5.3 metres of any of our high voltage conductors when those conductors are under their worse conditions of maximum "sag" and "swing" and overhead line profile (maximum "sag" and "swing") drawings should be obtained via the National Grid's Plant Protection Team at Hinckley.</p> <p>If any changes in ground levels are proposed either beneath or in proximity to our existing overhead lines then this would serve to reduce the available safety clearance to such overhead lines. Safe clearances to existing overhead lines must be maintained in all instances and circumstances.</p> <p>If a landscaping scheme is proposed as part of the works, we request that only low growing and slow growing species of trees and shrubs are planted either directly beneath or immediately adjacent to the existing overhead line, as ultimately they may grow to attain heights that compromise safe statutory clearances to the conductors.</p> <p>Drilling or excavation works should not be undertaken if they have the potential to disturb or adversely affect the foundations or "pillars of support" of any existing tower. These foundations always extend beyond the base area of the existing tower and foundation ("pillar of support") drawings can be obtained via the Plant Protection Team at Hinckley.</p> <p>Flammable or explosive, (e.g. fireworks), substances or materials should not be stored near to a tower or beneath an overhead line.</p>					
National Grid	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	<p>2. There are High Voltage Underground Cables which runs outside of the proposal area, Bridgewater - Hinkley Point 1 & 2.</p> <p>National Grid has safety concerns regarding works around our easement strip for ground alterations near to our cable.</p> <p>Our underground cables are protected by renewable or permanent agreements with landowners or have been laid in the public highway under our licence. These grant us legal rights that enable us to achieve efficient and reliable operation, maintenance, repair and refurbishment of our electricity transmission network. Hence we require that no permanent structures are built over or under cables or within the zone specified in the agreement, materials or soil are not stacked or stored on top of the cable route or its joint bays and that unrestricted and safe access to any of our cable(s) must be maintained at all times.</p> <p>The information supplied is given in good faith and only as a guide to the location of our underground cables. The accuracy of this information cannot be guaranteed. The physical presence of such cables may also be evident from physical protection measures such as ducts or concrete protection tiles. The person(s) responsible for planning, supervising and carrying out work in proximity to our cable(s) shall be liable to us, as cable(s) owner, as well as to any third party who may be affected in any way by any loss or damage resulting from their failure to locate and avoid any damage to such a cable(s).</p> <p>The relevant guidance in relation to working safely near to existing underground cables is contained within the Health and Safety Executive's (www.hse.gov.uk) Guidance HS(G)47 "Avoiding Danger From Underground Services" and all relevant site staff should make sure that they are both aware of and understand this guidance.</p> <p>Our cables are normally buried to a depth of 1.1 metres or more below</p>	89728-229-4114			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			<p>ground and cable profile drawings showing further details along the route of the particular cable, a PDF drawing of the cable route is enclosed within this response. (Go to Sheet Numbers, 5,6,7,8,9,10,16,17,18,21,22)</p> <p>If a landscaping scheme is proposed as part of the works, we request that no trees and shrubs are planted either directly above or within 3 metres of the existing underground cable, as ultimately the roots may grow to cause damage to the cable.</p> <p>Ground cover above our cables should not be reduced or increased.</p> <p>Our cables are protected by a permanent agreement. Hence we require that no permanent structures are to be built over our cables or within the easement strip. National Grid will require assurances as to what measures the developers will be taking to ensure the safety of our assets.</p> <p>The relocation of existing underground cables is not normally feasible on grounds of cost, operation and maintenance and environmental impact and we believe that successful development can take place in their vicinity.</p>					
3	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	We have been investigating a number of power station sites within Europe, either under construction or completed. Their infrastructure appears to be on site and none or very little disruption has taken place in or around the surrounding countryside or villages. Whilst we appreciate the number of variances which will occur between sites there does appear to be one thing in common, sufficient land to accommodate most if not all of the above proposals on site.	89792-229-461			/	
8	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	2) As stated in the attached, we want EDF to confine all of their operations to their own on-site land at Hinkley Point and this to include the construction of a WHARF FOR THE JOB.	89797-229-1564		/		
27	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	6. Hinkley Point Site EDF are building a 760 metre long sea wall at Hinkley. They already have, around 266 acres of land at the Hinkley Point site including a number of empty, decommissioned buildings. Why do they want to ruin our countryside, our village, our wharf and our lives with their noise, construction, fabrication, traffic, upheaval and pollution when they already have all the facilities they need on site?	89816-229-5751		/		
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.17 Page 36 Emergency access road and junction: It is entirely unacceptable for the works to construct the substantial bridge over Bum Brook and the junction with Shurton Road to be accessed from Shurton. The road is simply not suitable for the type and volume of traffic required. This work must be carried out by accessing the area from the main construction site.	89871-229-14926		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1.6 [4.1.16 referring to Figures 4.1-4.4] Figure 4.4 shows the site layout in late 2019 when the programme shows both units operational and therefore construction finished. Why then is the entire southern area still shown as construction space complete with on-site campus? The need for this has finished and it should have been removed and work carried out to start landscaping the area from the south as soon as it is vacated.	89872-229-3327		/		
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.3.6 [6.3.12] Whilst it is operationally sensible to store some materials on site to ensure continuity of supply in the event of problems, one month's supply based on peak production levels is unnecessarily cautious. Smaller stockpiles would release valuable space on site which could be used to keep activities further away from residents.	89872-229-11972		/		
Tractivity 881	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Any reduction on site size is desirable	9639-225-449			/	
Tractivity 1121	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Still using far too much land	9879-225-397			/	
Tractivity 1137	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? See above - also at the cost of plans to use Combwich	9895-225-458			/	
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	2. We have reduced the amount of land to be used during the construction in the southern part of the site in response to concerns from residents. What are your views on this proposal? Satisfactory Unsatisfactory No Opinion Don't know - That the encroachment of the southern boundary upon a small settlement was ever contemplated at all and considered potentially acceptable is indicative of the barbarity of EdF's approach. That it took over a year of protest for the company to move the boundary slightly back, to a point that was already a generous compromise proposal on the part of the residents and that this should have been done only when the company realised that without this agreement, secured at ever more desperate and angry meetings with residents, they would not be able to proceed to Stage 2 is further indication of the absence of local consideration and responsiveness on EdF's part. That, having moved the boundary back at the very last minute, the company should then make the conscious effort to bring this action to repeated prominence in their Stage 2 publications and that they should use this to display their skilled local negotiating skills while overlooking many other omissions and errors of fact in the rest of their documents seems profoundly opportunistic and cynical.	89806-225-1515			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	- Moving the boundary back is no more than the very least the company should have done. At that, it is reserving the right to fence the land reprieved, to run a road along it and to pile mountains of spoil on it.	89806-225-2827			/	
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	- So yes, it is satisfactory that the boundary has been slightly re-drawn but it is no more than the minimum the company could do, and that grudgingly, so in terms of the 'social and environmental responsibility' of which the company boasts, it altogether fails to make a case.	89806-225-3043			/	
Tractivity 1140	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Still too much	9898-234-419			/	
Tractivity 1153	Public	Stage 2	1. What are your views on the proposed arrangement and landscaping of the Hinkley Point C site? Box ticked: Unsatisfactory 1. Any other ideas or comments? The proposed landscaping seems completely inadequate as the power station will be seen and heard for miles around which I believe is totally unacceptable in a developed country in this day and age. 2. We have reduced the amount of land to be used during construction in the southern part of the site in response to concerns from local residents. What are your views on this proposal? Box ticked: Unsatisfactory 2. Any other ideas or comments? You may have gone some way to appeasing local residents but not nearly far enough. Parts of the site will be within 500 metres of residential dwellings, rendering a normal lifestyle for these people virtually impossible. Looking at the plans it seems that other options were available and I cannot understand why this land so close to Shurton has to be used. 3. In order to speed up the process of building the new power station, and enable us to finish work earlier, we intend to apply this summer to undertake preliminary works to prepare the main site and build a temporary jetty for the delivery of bulk materials. If permission for the power station is not obtained, we will be required to reinstate this land. What are your views on our plans for Preliminary Works? Box ticked: Unsatisfactory 3. Any other ideas or comments?	9911-34-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1296	Public	Stage 2 Update	2. failure to explain how emergency vehicles will gain least obstructed access to HP in the event of an emergency	89562-233-2007			/	<p>Statutory and non-statutory consultation responses at Stage 2 centred on the requirement under REPPiR for an emergency plan covering an Off-Site Nuclear Emergency at adjoining Hinkley Point licensed sites. This would need to be co-ordinated with other parties in a similar way to the arrangements currently in place, covering sheltering, provision of potassium iodate tablets and evacuation of construction workers. However it would need to identify practicable arrangements to ensure prompt access by emergency services and timely evacuation of a greatly increased number of workers within the constrained road infrastructure, particularly west of the main site.</p> <p>The proposed preliminary works take place within and just outside the licensed site area of the existing Hinkley Point B (HPB) power station and are therefore subject to the site licence conditions for HPB, including the requirements and detailed arrangements for emergency planning in the event of an incident arising at Hinkley Point A (HPA) or HPB.</p> <p>The equivalent condition under the new site licence required for Hinkley Point C (HPC) will require suitable emergency arrangements to be in place. These would initially cover the possibility of incidents at HPA or HPB but, prior to the possibility of any incidents arising within the HPC site, the plans and arrangements would be reviewed and extended as necessary to cater for such incidents. The emergency arrangements would cover emergency evacuation arrangements and would be developed in conjunction with relevant stakeholders and communicated with the general public in accordance with the relevant legislation.</p> <p>The need for evacuation of HPC construction workers or the general public is not expected to occur within the initial period of any site incident, giving time for worker buses to be called to the site. In addition, it is expected that a proportion of worker buses will be parked at the site during the construction shifts, in order to reduce unnecessary bus movements and the use of off-site parking areas.</p>
Tractivity 50717	Public	Stage 1	We live on (Personal details removed), in a house approximately half a mile from Nether Stowey. I understand that this road may become the emergency route of preference if the Hinkley Point road is closed. Obviously this would only affect the amount of traffic dramatically on the road in emergencies. However, the amount of traffic on the road is likely to increase significantly despite this.	9389-233-761			/	
Devon & Somerset Fire & Rescue Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The proposal does not appear to consider the implications of an off-site nuclear emergency at either the Hinkley Point A or B sites during the construction phase, and given the large increase in the number of people to be expected within the boundaries of the Designated Emergency Planning Zone, the corresponding effects such an incident may have for the Emergency Services.	10184-233-3213	/			
Cheddar Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	a bypass would be the only feasible option although this also is rejected by EDF as too expensive, and taking too long to construct. How any emergency situation could be handled either during the construction phase, or when 'on line' is too horrible to imagine, if no bypass is present.	10222-233-3324			/	
Avon and Somerset Constabulary	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Concern is raised regarding the potential for multiple emergencies to occur, either at Hinkley A or B or indeed within the area such as town centre or major motorway incident. These combined with the increase in population from construction will serious stretch the existing service in times of public sector funding difficulties.	89052-233-6642	/			
Avon and Somerset Constabulary	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The Hinkley accommodation site is expected to hold in the region of 700 workers. What preparations / arrangements do EDF plan to have in place if an off site nuclear emergency occurs. How do they intend to shelter or move such a vast amount of people to safety.	89054-233-2754			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	44. With regard to the Hinkley Point C construction site and the Hinkley Point onsite accommodation, the proposals do not identify the arrangements to be taken to protect the staff and the local community in the event of an "off-site nuclear emergency" being declared at either Hinkley Point A or Hinkley Point B.	89193-233-3689	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	With regards to the Hinkley Point C construction site and the Hinkley Point onsite accommodation, the proposals do not identify the arrangements to be taken to protect Hinkley C staff and visitors in the event of an "off-site nuclear emergency" being declared at either Hinkley Point A or Hinkley Point B.	89243-233-197	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>Hinkley Point C Site - Construction Phase</p> <p>EDF is required to put in place measures to protect the workforce and visitors to the site in the event of an "off-site nuclear emergency" being declared at either Hinkley A or Hinkley B sites. These emergency arrangements are required by the provisions of Radiation (Emergency Preparedness & Public Information) Regulations (REPPPIR) to cover the following procedures in the event of the declaration of an "off-site nuclear emergency":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How workers and visitors will be briefed on the emergency action to be taken. - How workers and visitors will be alerted to such an event. - How workers and visitors will be sheltered in appropriate accommodation. - How workers and visitors will be provided with potassium iodate tablets. - How workers and visitors will be evacuated from the site and the arrangements made for their longer-term care and accommodation. - How vehicle movement to the site will be prevented and site traffic cleared from emergency services routes and evacuation routes. <p>All measures to take account of the changing demographic make up of the workforce.</p>	89243-233-953	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>Hinkley Point C Site - Occupied Temporary Accommodation</p> <p>EDF is required to put in place measures to protect the occupants and staff in the event of an "off-site nuclear emergency" being declared at either Hinkley A or Hinkley B sites. These emergency arrangements are required by the provisions of REPPPIR to cover the following procedures in the event of the declaration of an "off-site nuclear emergency":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How occupants and staff will be briefed on the emergency action to be taken. - How occupants and staff will be alerted to such an event. - How occupants and staff will be sheltered in appropriate accommodation. - How occupants and staff will be provided with potassium iodate tablets. - How occupants and staff will be evacuated from the site and the arrangement made for their longer-term care and accommodation. <p>All measures to take account of the changing demographic make up of the workforce.</p>	89243-233-2095			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The Hinkley Point Off-Site Plan does not consider the protection or evacuation of subsequent workers at either Hinkley A or B sites. Under REPPiR the site operators remain responsible for the safety and protection of their site personnel. Issue: The proposal does not identify the arrangements to be taken to protect the construction site workforce and site visitors in the event of an off-site nuclear emergency.	89243-233-5556	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	1. Alerting of Workforce and Visitors. There will be an immediate requirement to alert the workforce and Visitors Centre and advise them to take shelter. The following measures are required: - Robust procedures to ensure that workers throughout the various sites are alerted and know what actions to take to shelter. - Adequate procedures to ensure that the general public at the visitors centre are briefed and cared for. Arrangements should be made to move them from the DEPZ as soon as possible, using their own transport if appropriate.	89243-233-5989	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	2. Sheltering. Shelter facilities are required at the construction sites with adequate facilities for a stay of up to 6hrs: - In the early stages of construction there will not be sufficient or appropriate infrastructure on site to provide adequate sheltering facilities at the construction sites. - If appropriate shelter facilities are not available then the work force should be evacuated as soon as possible from the construction sites and from the DEPZ.	89243-233-6539	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	3. Potassium Iodate Tablets. Sufficient stocks of tablets should be held on site for the workforce and visitors in the Visitors Centre: - Stocks should be effectively stored and maintained to allow their rapid distribution. - The workforce and visitors should be briefed on reasons and dose requirements.	89243-233-7007	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>4. Evacuation from the DEPZ. Arrangements are required to evacuate the workforce should immediate and appropriate shelter facilities not be available. In addition, if full evacuation from the area is required, procedures should be put in place to evacuate the workforce. The large number of the workforce involved (up to 5,000) poses a number of concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A full evacuee transport plan is required; transport resources available to the local authority are not sufficient for this task. It is assessed that 100 coach movements would be required for this task. The resilience of the existing transport network, together with additional transport impacts associated with the development and its associated developments and, in addition cumulative impacts of other significant developments, will need to be taken into consideration and mitigated against as part of this. - A traffic plan is required to model the traffic density and flow rates on the proposed evacuation route along the C182 to Cannington. - An appropriate strategy and plan for the care and provision of emergency accommodation for the evacuated workforce is provided. 	89243-233-7321			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>5. Control of Construction Traffic in to the DEPZ. Site traffic, including workforce commuter traffic, heading towards Hinkley C could adversely affect the deployment of emergency vehicles and the outflow of traffic required in an evacuation scenario. While the civil police would seek to control and prevent further egress in to the DEPZ towards Hinkley C there should be robust procedures in place to halt this site and workforce commuter traffic from entering the DEPZ.</p>	89243-233-8469			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>6. Training. Measures should be put in place to ensure that the workforce and visitors to the site or Visitors Centre know their individual response in the event of an off-site nuclear emergency including the sheltering and evacuation plan.</p> <p>Moreover, that visitors and the workforce are briefed on the reason for taking potassium iodate tablets and the correct dosage.</p>	89243-233-8945	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>7. Equalities and Diversity Requirements. The workforce may consist of a high proportion of migrant workers who may or may not have a good command of English. Appropriate arrangements should be put in place to ensure that training and briefing material for what they should do in an emergency is provided.</p>	89243-233-9320			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>People working and residing in the accommodation will be deemed to be members of the public and are therefore covered under the same requirements for emergency preparedness laid down in REPPIR as detailed in Part 1. In the event of the declaration of an off-site nuclear emergency at either Hinkley A or Hinkley B immediate countermeasures are required to protect the public:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sheltering. All residents and accommodation staff should take shelter in the accommodation. - Take Potassium Iodate Tablets. All residents and accommodation staff should have ready access to these tablets. <p>In the event that evacuation of the accommodation facility is required then arrangements to evacuate the accommodation residents and staff should be subsumed in to the requirement to evacuate the construction workforce from the site.</p>	89243-233-9885			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The proposal does not identify the arrangements to be taken to protect the residents or administrative staff of the temporary accommodation in the event of an off-site nuclear emergency.	89243-233-10724			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>1. Alerting Accommodation Staff & Residents. There will be an immediate requirement to alert accommodation occupants to take shelter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Procedures to ensure that all occupants are alerted (tannoy system). - Occupants know what actions are required to take shelter and how they will receive further information. 	89243-233-10927			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>2. Sheltering. Sheltering facilities are suitable for the hazard and capable of occupation for 6 hrs. If no suitable shelter facility is available then staff and residents should be evacuated as soon as possible.</p>	89243-233-11247			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	3. Potassium Iodate Tablets. Sufficient stocks of tablets should be held in the facility for staff and residents in the accommodation facility: - Stocks should be effectively stored and maintained to allow their rapid distribution. - The workforce and visitors should be briefed on reasons and dose requirements.	89243-233-11463			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	4. Evacuation from the DEPZ. Arrangements are required to evacuate the staff & residents should immediate and appropriate shelter facilities not be available. In addition, if full evacuation from the area is required, procedures should be put in place to evacuate the staff and residents: - Using own transport, or - Subsumed in to the evacuation arrangement for the construction sites.	89243-233-11785			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	5. Training. Measures should be put in place to ensure that residents and staff know their individual response in the event of an off-site nuclear emergency including the sheltering and evacuation plan. Moreover, that they are briefed on the reason for taking potassium iodate tablets and the correct dosage.	89243-233-12181			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	6. Equalities and Diversity Requirements. The workforce may consist of a high proportion of migrant workers who may or may not have a good command of English. Appropriate arrangements should be put in place to ensure that training and briefing material for what they should do in an emergency is provided.	89243-233-12493			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	In the event of a major incident or emergency, it is usual practice for the local authorities to lead on the humanitarian aspects of the emergency response. Such emergencies could involve the loss of residential accommodation through either damage/total loss of the facility or loss of use as the facility is in an evacuation area. While the local authorities may be able to assist, they do not have the resources to provide temporary accommodation for displaced workers in particular if the emergency affects other members of the community in Somerset.	89243-233-13033			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
NHS Somerset Primary Care Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	1.5 A further consideration from the public health perspective will be the appropriate level of emergency preparedness for both the construction and operational phases. Due consideration should given to the views of the South Western Ambulance Service Trust (SWAST) with regard to the strategic and tactical management of emergency service support. With regard to the greater question of major incident management, the views of the Emergency Planning Consultative Committee for Hinkley Point should be incorporated in the planning process and should take account of any formal response to the Stage 2 consultation by the Avon and Somerset Local Resilience Forum.	89459-233-2476			/	
NHS Somerset Primary Care Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	7.1 REPPiR(1) requires that emergency plans be in place for the protection of the public in the event of a release of radioactive material from a licensed nuclear site. To this purpose a Multi Agency Off-site plan has been developed so in the event of a declaration of an off-site nuclear emergency at either Hinkley Point A or B then immediate counter measures will be implemented to protect the public. These counter measures will include:	89463-233-28			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
NHS Somerset Primary Care Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>7.4 During the peak phase of construction there will be around 5000 people working at the Hinkley Point C site, this will result in a new off-site plan having to be developed to ensure all immediate counter measures are able to offer appropriate protection to all 5000 workers.</p> <p>7.5 Changes to the plan will need to include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Sheltering facilities for up to six hours for the workforce 2) Sufficient stocks of Potassium Iodate Tablets for the workforce 3) Evacuation arrangements to evacuate the workforce, alongside the residents 4) Traffic control measures to ensure construction traffic does not adversely affect the evacuation from the site 5) Transport strategy to evacuate workers, due to their own vehicles being located at Park and Ride locations 6) New training and exercise programme to ensure workers and visitors understand how to respond in the event of an off-site nuclear emergency and are briefed on the reason for taking the potassium iodated tablets and the correct dosage. <p>7.6 This additional provision will put an extra burden on the Emergency Planning Community in terms of resource time and costs associated to developing, training and exercising a new off-site plan.</p> <p>7.7 The complexity of managing a further 5000 people during the response to a off-site nuclear emergency should not be underestimated and will have a direct impact on health and social care in terms of providing shelter, medication, primary and secondary care and psychological support to those affected by the evacuation.</p> <p>7.8 Up to 3000 - 3500 of the workforce will be living in rented accommodation across Somerset, plus there will be up to 900 in temporary accommodation onsite; therefore during the worst case scenario where a return to site is no longer an option, the workforce will need to be repatriated.</p> <p>7.9 Further work and clarity is need from EDF on how they plan to provide financial support and care for its workforce during an off-site nuclear emergency, both in the short and long term.</p>	89463-233-1506			/	
NHS Somerset Primary Care Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>9.2.7 Further work and clarity is need from EDF on how they plan to provide financial support and care for its workforce during an off-site nuclear emergency, both in the short and long term. (7.9)</p> <p>9.2.8 These issues should be addressed in a detailed and resourced health action plan. (8.1)</p>	89463-233-6515			/	
Wembdon Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>Recent evidence in Japan has also highlighted to everybody that in the event of an unexpected catastrophe there is the need for the emergency services to access the Nuclear stations directly from a National Freight Route.</p>	89758-233-3459			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Labour Group	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	- Obviously any such development is going to have serious impacts on the surrounding communities in Sedgemoor and West Somerset. We need to ensure that there are adequate safety precautions built into the system: Chernobyl and Fujiyama, over the last two weeks, come to mind. It is no good saying that the situation is very different and we don't have earthquakes or tsunamis in the Severn estuary.	89779-233-7318			/	
Sedgemoor District Labour Group	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	- We believe that there remains insufficient detail regarding emergency procedures in terms of emergency vehicles accessing the main site in the event of an emergency, should there be severe congestion on the roads, and in terms of evacuation of local residents.	89779-233-7719			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	Emergency Planning EDF is required to put in place measures to protect the workforce and visitors at the Hinkley Point C (HPC) site, and occupants and staff of temporary accommodation to be constructed within the main site, in the event of an "off- site nuclear emergency" being declared at either Hinkley A or Hinkley B sites. At the time of writing, negotiations are continuing for the agreement of these arrangements but there remain a number of outstanding matters. In particular, the Council requires details of the on-site arrangements for the Hinkley Point C Site, linked with the Hinkley Point B site arrangements, in order to assess the suitability of the arrangements for the C site and protect people working on site and those residents in temporary accommodation at HPC.	89861-233-0			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1.3 [3.3.2] SPC is concerned that only the 1 in 30 year storm event is being used for a construction period of 10 years. We would need to understand the effect of a more serious event in the period.	89872-233-2770			/	
Tractivity 62578	Public	Stage 2	You state very clearly in your Masterplan that the C182 (Rodway) will be the main access to Hinkley Point C, but it's a "C" road, not even an "A" or "B" road - it's a country lane that passes through rural countryside and which was last upgraded in 1957 when Hinkley A was built!! How on earth will this road, not to mention Bridgwater town centre sustain all this additional traffic? Where is your risk assessment with regard to how the emergency services will cope with all these additional people in the area? And what about when (not if) there's an accident at the power station? Where is your evacuation programme for these 5000 workers and neighbouring residents?	10129-41-4412			/	
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	3.97 The Agency has reviewed the Flood Risk Study Reports and Appendix C of the Transport Appraisal focussing on flood risk and the potential impact on the SRN. It is noted that Hinkley Point C and the on-site associated development is located within Flood Zone 1 and is not at risk of flooding, however, the main access road (C182) is at risk. As such, the Agency requires details of the strategy that EDFE has in place should this road flood and what the potential impact is on the SRN. Confirmation is also required that in the event of a road closure any freight storage sites have the capacity to store the additional material being delivered to the holding sites but not being taken onwards.	89174-41-443	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
NHS Somerset Primary Care Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>3) Evacuation arrangements to evacuate the workforce, alongside the residents</p> <p>4) Traffic control measures to ensure construction traffic does not adversely affect the evacuation from the site</p> <p>5) Transport strategy to evacuate workers, due to their own vehicles being located at Park and Ride locations</p>	89463-41-1972			/	
Tractivity 63141	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	At a public exhibition on the 11th July, I asked (Personal information removed) for details of the Hinkley evacuation plan in the event of a nuclear disaster on site. He said he was sure there was one but he did not have the details. I particularly wanted to know how EDF would plan to handle an emergency evacuation should there be an incident at Hinkley B while Hinkley C was under construction. There will be thousands more people on site then. He promised to obtain these and let me have them. Again, I am still waiting.	90074-233-3126			/	
Tractivity 63141	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	With the proposals indicating that a large number of staff would be bussed onto site it follows that they would have to be bussed off site. Presumably the return busses would be off site in a holding area. In the event of a nuclear disaster how would these busses be able to get to site for rescue purposes against the flow of a mass exodus of vehicles travelling along a single carriageway, away from the area? Again, surely a sound argument for a second route if only from a safety point.	90074-233-7618		/		
Tractivity 63202	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	<p>On a question safety, to both workers and residents in the area, (Personal information removed) stated that if the CI82 and A39 became grid locked and it was necessary to either evacuate, or for emergency vehicles to gain entrance to the proposed site for Hinkley "C" then roads to the west of the site towards Williton would be used.</p> <p>This statement is nothing short of ridiculous as the roads he is referring to are little more than country lanes which average size cars have difficulty in navigating and are mainly used by farm tractors to gain access to fields.</p> <p>With the proposed increase of vehicles, over and above normal, estimated by EDF as being in excess of 2000 per day, 450 of these being HGV's of up to 40 tonnes, concern is for the safety of our many older village residents and the many older houses and structures, some of which are grade II listed.</p>	90105-233-1258			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Homes & Communities Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The Stage 1 consultation says that the impact on neighbouring properties during construction will be reduced by implementing a landscape buffer on the southern boundary, but it notes that there will be areas for spoil storage to the south of Green Lane. All measures should be sought to ensure that visual and noise intrusion are kept to a minimum.	8694-234-1765	/			<p><u>1 - Visual screening of construction and HPC from villages to the south</u></p> <p>During construction of Hinkley Point C (HPC) the land south of Green Lane would be used to create construction and storage platforms required to enable the construction of this large and complex project, as outlined in Volume 2, Chapter 2. In addition to the requirement of space for construction operations, this area of land would include an on-site accommodation campus for workers. Many consultees, in particular local residents, commented on the proximity to local villages of the proposed construction works and the on-site accommodation campus, the adequacy of screening during construction, and the potentially over-bearing visual impact of a bund located close to the villages. As a result, it was agreed that the land south of latitude 144750 N, which was originally proposed to be used as part of the construction site, would be excluded from the main construction works. Further comments recommended more effective use of this land as a buffer between the villages and the construction site.</p> <p>At the Stage 2 Update consultation, it was further proposed that after the implementation of site preparation works, the restoration of land south of latitude 144750 N – which had originally been proposed for completion of HPC – was brought forward to the start of construction phase. This change was welcomed by many consultees at the Stage 2 Update Consultation. The early restoration of this southern land enabled a much higher and more naturalistic screening landform to be implemented, and supported the early implementation of screen planting. This would have the effect of improving the screening both of the construction works and of the completed HPC from villages to the south due to the earlier establishment of the screening landscape and planting. A number of consultees expressed concern over the visibility of the site construction fence and on-site campus. The proposal to implement the early restoration of the southern land would effectively screen the fence from the properties in Shurton and would also screen the lower section of the campus buildings from the south.</p> <p><u>2 – HPC Accommodation Campus scale and impacts</u></p> <p>At the Stage 2 consultation the proposed on-site accommodation campus was a larger development to the south of the construction site, providing up to 1000 bed spaces. During the process of consultation many consultees commented on the location of the on-site</p>
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	The form and expected visual effect of the landscape buffer has not been detailed within the Stage 1 Consultation document. There is limited information on any alternatives to the landscape buffer. There is limited information on future landscape treatment that might be made to the landscape buffer were it to be retained as a feature in the future. Further information / clarity on these issues is required in order to form a response to this question. In particular the following items are requested: - Confirmation on final form of landscape buffer including plans and sections relative to existing topography; - Photomontages at key points through to the southern boundary and at varying distances to confirm on scale of the feature in the context of the surrounding area (particularly around Shurton);	88600-234-628	/			
Tractivity 750	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Even if the landscaping results do not produce a satisfactory screening outcome, this can always be increased or modified until it is satisfactory once the station is functioning.	9508-234-127			/	
Tractivity 908	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Looks fine and will be a visual indication of whether the environment around the powerstation is clean and sustains growth.	9666-234-127			/	
Tractivity 968	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Unsatisfactory. No amount of landscaping will hide the Hinkley C site. We know this because the existing landscaping for the present A and B sites do not make the view of those sites any less objectionable.	9726-234-129	/			
Tractivity 973	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? 500 acres of land will be devastated by the building and development of Hinkley C. EDF do not appear to be trying to minimise the environmental impact - there will be huge car parks, 420 spaces for the hostel alone. The light pollution from the three storey high hostel so close to the village will be terrible. The hostel has been sited on high ground, close to the southern boundary and will tower over the village. Not only will local residents have to cope with unbearable traffic, light pollution and noise from the preliminary works. EDF have not given any clear indication or plans as to how they will minimise the noise. I feel that the planting that is planned needs to include mature trees - 30-40 years old, the cost would be insignificant to such a large, profitable company and small improvements could make a huge difference to local residents.	9731-234-129	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 986	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Powerstation far bigger than I was led to believe, when first told about it by EDF. Worried and upset that so much (500 acres) of land being bulldozed away and the old barns to be demolished. Rare and precious wildlife killed and disrupted. Trees to be planted not big enough. I wont see them mature in my lifetime. Worried about EDF?s attitude to this and to the local people. Very worried indeed about this proposal.	9744-234-129			/	<p>campus and its proximity to the local residential areas, and the potential noise, visual and lighting impact, especially if the planting scheme used only small trees.</p> <p>Following these comments the proposed on-site campus has been reduced in overall size and located to the eastern section of the site as far away as possible from the local villages of Shurton, Knighton and Burton. Several comments queried the height and scale of the proposed buildings and as a result the buildings have been restricted in height and the ground level reduced from existing ground levels to further reduce impacts. Only the top section of the campus buildings would be visible from the south over the top of the early restoration bunding and planting, which would screen much of the low-level campus activity. The proposed layout of the on-site campus has been arranged so that the residential blocks look to the south and the more active building uses are orientated to the north and west to further reduce impacts of noise and light. The eastern boundary of the on-site campus would be set back from Wick Moor Drove and planting is proposed to form a visual buffer between the road and the campus buildings.</p> <p>3 – Site boundary treatments during construction</p> <p>The issue of landscape treatments to site boundaries during the construction period was raised by many local consultees over the period of design and consultation. Existing vegetation on the boundaries of the site has been retained wherever possible in order to help mitigate the visual and noise impact of the construction activities. The most mature vegetation on the site boundaries exists along Benhole Lane on the western boundary of the site and along the southern boundary of Bum Brook. Several consultees asked for additional screen planting to be undertaken around the southern perimeter in advance of any construction activities. A scheme of native screen planting was undertaken in spring 2011 along the length of Bum Brook and next to Benhole Lane. Advance planting was also undertaken adjacent to properties within the field north of Shurton Lane. A further programme of advance planting works to the south of 144750 is proposed for the 2011-2012 planting season.</p> <p>The proposal to undertake early restoration of the southern land at the start of construction was generally welcomed by consultees as it enabled a much higher and more naturalistic screening landform to be implemented, and supported the early implementation of screen planting. This would have the effect of improving the screening of construction from villages to the south. Land adjacent to the site</p>
Tractivity 1002	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Get the whole project done as quickly as possible! Keep local people fully informed frequently. Use the existing helipad - no need for another. Plant landscaping vegetation a.s.a.p. keep roadside hedges as high as possible to limit view of security fences/hostel.	9760-234-125	/			
Tractivity 1007	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Keeping works as far away and screened as much as possible from local residents is of utmost importance.	9765-234-393	/			
Tractivity 1011	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? It is insulting to ordinary people?s intelligence to be asking what we think about your landscaping ideas when you?re not actively engaging people in discussion about far more pressing issues such as the health & safety issues brought up by your proposal, such as the issue of ionising radiation, or the fact that the reactors that you are proposing are far bigger, dirtier and more dangerous than the current 2nd generation reactors that we are currently saddled with. Or the fact that you intend to turn one of the most beautiful places in the UK into a long term toxic dump by storing radioactive waste so hot that it cant be moved for at least 160 years. All of the research that has been published so far regarding nuclear waste only refers to what is known as legacy waste and doesn?t consider new nuclear waste. This is not a legacy I wish to leave for my children and I am not so arrogant or blindly faithful in human ingenuity to assume th	9769-234-129			/	
Tractivity 1031	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Good that it's been moved but I would like to see a more compact site. I do understand is a lot of earth movement required and have concerns regarding flooding when valleys are filled in.	9789-234-485			/	
Tractivity 1043	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? More trees - and vegetation around the perimeter would be pleasant.	9801-234-127	/			
Tractivity 1047	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The impact of the development on the landscape will be huge. The siting of the accommodatin block makes it very visible. The boundary fence is too close to the nearby village.	9805-234-129	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1067	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>I am not opposed to the building of the plant but the construction phase does not address the implications for the local communities ie</p> <p>1.Edf must make proposals for landscaping the construction site (no obligations have been specified).</p> <p>2.A cumulative assessment of the residual effects of the combination of noise, air quality, visual, transport, recreational and amenity impacts on villages such as Shurton and Burton appear to be omitted from the appraisal.</p> <p>3. Detailed arrangements for public access, footpaths, need to be agreed prior to the construction of boundary fencing.</p> <p>4. The planting of additional trees to the west of the site (full length of Benhole Lane) should be actioned immediately to minimise the visual impact to the residents of Knighton.</p> <p>5. Under the definition of Environment Zones the proposed construction site is defined as a Zone 1 (intrinsically dark) lighting of outdoor work places must comply with BS 12464-</p>	9825-234-127	/			<p>north of Green Lane has been of particular concern to a few consultees due to its landscape scale, landform and landscape quality. The mitigation proposals of bunding and planting along this boundary have been brought forward into the Preliminary Works phase of the project. The proposals have endeavoured to provide a 3m screen above the haul road through a combination of bunding and planting. Recognising that construction activities could not be completely screened from the adjacent land, the proposals along the North West boundary aim to screen the low level construction activities and some vehicular movements.</p> <p><u>4 – Planting proposals and programme of implementation</u></p> <p>A temporary screening buffer was originally proposed along parts of the southern boundary, with temporary woodland screen planting programmed to be implemented at the start of construction activities. Many consultees commented that this temporary buffer and screen planting should be retained after construction of HPC, and that the earlier screen planting was implemented the better, so it had longer to establish and grow.</p>
Tractivity 1069	Public	Stage 2	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>It will be totally disruptive to any way of life for local residents.</p>	9827-234-467			/	<p>Following these comments it was agreed to undertake a programme of permanent advance planting prior to work starting on site in order to aid early establishment of the planting. This programme of advance planting was undertaken in consultation with local residents in spring 2011. In addition the proposed temporary bund was replaced by a larger more naturalistic screening landform which will be retained and incorporated into the construction site landscape restoration. The advance screen planting in the south and elsewhere within the site has been designed to be retained as part of the scheme for reinstatement of the construction areas, providing value by promoting early establishment of both vegetation and continuity of habitat across the site.</p>
Tractivity 1078	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The destruction of existing young trees is unacceptable. They should be reused.</p>	9836-234-129		/		<p><u>5 – Planting proposals ecological values of proposed landscape areas</u></p> <p>A few consultees were concerned that the screen planting proposals, particularly the species mix, would not fully mitigate the impact on ecology and biodiversity across the site. The value of the site in respect of ecology, habitats and biodiversity has been thoroughly surveyed, and the proposals for all</p>
Tractivity 1083	Public	Stage 2	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>I think it is great you have listened to local residents concerns but it only makes me think you did not need to buy so much land in the first place</p>	9841-234-494			/	
Tractivity 1087	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The landscaping near the village could be done now. Especially the planting of trees to enable growth.</p>	9845-234-129	/			
Tractivity 1092	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>There is no doubt that this will affect tourism in the area, since the station will be clearly visible from the A39 and the coast from Burnham northwards. We have been given no details of any proposed landscaping of other sites, elsewhere, (e.g. where we live and work), related to the construction phase.</p>	9850-234-129	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1099	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Site boundary is too close to Shurton and construction works will make life intolerable to residents for many years to come. Little in concrete terms has yet been offered in way of mitigation. Tree planting proposed is too little and too late with none shown on the Western boundary as a visual/noise buffer for Burton and Knighton residents.	9857-234-129	/			landscape areas retained and created for the construction phase reflect the ecological requirements identified for the site. In addition areas of wildflower pasture off-site have been created to replace habitat that would be lost in the Preliminary Works. All species selection for the screen planting has been identified as native and wildlife friendly species.
Tractivity 1099	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? This relatively small concession will still not mitigate for loss of amenity and planning blight which will inevitably be inflicted on local residents.	9857-234-724			/	6 – The reuse of existing vegetation within Bishops Wood A small number of local residents requested that consideration be given to replanting the trees within Bishops Wood elsewhere on the site. It was agreed that this would be investigated as a possible source of stock for the advance planting proposals implemented spring 2011.
Tractivity 1119	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? You can not ?reinstate? land to the ecology it had before.	9877-234-951			/	The results of this initial study identified that although a small proportion of the stock in Bishops Wood would be suitable for transplantation and might survive, it would require extensive management and it was felt that more effective screening could be achieved by nursery grown and prepared stock. To this end, all species specified for the advance planting are native species which are represented in Bishops Wood. The advance planting was undertaken in spring 2011 and therefore will have a period of establishment prior to site clearance operations resulting in the removal of Bishops Wood.
Tractivity 1120	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Good as far as it goes. However, the site is still too close to Shurton and should be confined as planned originally to land lying to the North of the green lane. Tree planting designed to act as a visual and noise barrier is taking place at too late a stage to provide any effective mitigation.	9878-234-704		/		7-Off-site proposals to achieve screening of construction process A few consultees requested that off-site land be secured to mitigate the loss of habitat and help to provide screening of the construction process. The construction site is a defined area with no opportunity to extend the site boundary. The eastern boundary is contained by Wick Moor Drove and Bridgwater Site of Special Scientific Interest and the western boundary by Fairfield Estate land. Nevertheless, within these constraints biodiversity and habitat protection and creation has been increased during the construction phase by the identification of further areas for habitat retention during site preparation works. The habitat creation and enhancement proposed during construction has been designed to protect biodiversity in the shorter term. In addition off-site planting of woodland and hedgerows on Fairfield Estate was undertaken in spring 2011 and further planting is proposed in 2012. To mitigate the loss of grassland habitat extensive wildflower meadow has been created on nearby off-site agricultural land.
Tractivity 1124	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? I understand that even with this reduction the villagers are still concerned and rightly so.	9882-234-469			/	8 – Public access during construction During the construction of the site all public access
Tractivity 1136	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Southern part of the site should be used for further landscaping for the benefit of local residents.	9894-234-397	/			
Tractivity 1137	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? See above - also at the cost of plans to use Combwich	9895-234-458			/	
Tractivity 1159	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? it is still completely inappropriate and large and invasive to the local community.	9917-234-434			/	
Tractivity 1167	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? If the land is returned to original state following completion of the work - (this must be guaranteed) then the land should be used as required.	9925-234-510			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1173	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The overseeing of the landscaping of the site seem to have taken on board some of the concerns of local residents by proposing to move the workers accomodation a little further away from properties in Shurton but I was dismayed to hear the new proposed site is on top of the ridge nearby, therefore it will be much more visible to Shurton, Burton and all surrounding areas. You are planning to put a band of trees to the south of the site to minimise the eyesore of the boundary fence but I fear there will only be a small line of trees on the outside of the west boundary fence therefore the view from Burton, other hamlets and some public footpaths will have adequate screening.	9931-234-125	/			<p>routes would be diverted around the boundary of the site to run adjacent to the security fence. Several comments primarily from local residents were raised about the network of public access for the duration of the construction phase. By limiting construction to north of 144750 an additional area of land close to Shurton will now be accessible for passive recreation during the construction phase. During site preparation works a footpath route will connect Benhole Lane to Wick Moor Drove. After early restoration a bridleway is also proposed through this area to link into the existing bridleway network. The footpath routes would be modified once the early restoration works are complete in this area to reflect the final restoration footpath network.</p> <p>9 – Emergency Access Road</p> <p>An emergency access route would be required to connect the site to the Shurton Road during the construction and operation phases. A few comments have been raised about access from the Shurton Road. There is no intent to use the emergency access route as access for any construction activities for HPC. However access would be from the Shurton Road would be required in order to undertake the advance planting and maintain this to help it become established</p>
Tractivity 1187	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? As long as it?s not at the expense of any kind of security or safe operating parameters	9945-234-393			/	
Tractivity 1190	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? No amount of tree planting, bund building or other fancy features will hide or even soften the stark ugliness of a nuclear power station. If it is built it will be another blight on this beautiful stretch of unspoilt coastline.	9948-234-129			/	
Tractivity 1190	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? I don?t agree with any alteration to the landscape. I dont want a nuclear power station built here.	9948-234-612			/	
Tractivity 1192	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Cutting out a large portion of countryside and removing access for workers, destroying the natural coastline. Is this landscaping?	9950-234-127			/	
Tractivity 1194	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The arrangements seem satisfactory for the power station and its functions, but they cannot be seen as satisfactory for the residents here. We cannot easily adjust to a ?blot on the landscape? The people in the villages nearest to Hinkley Point have many concerns which are not answered.	9952-234-129			/	
Tractivity 1324	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Planting to screen the visual impact must be effective year-round. The campus should be removed altogether or moved northwards on site.	89590-234-2632		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1371	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	You are using the emergency road entrance for your landscaping work.	89637-234-1481		/		
Tractivity 191	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Do you agree that EDF Energy's proposal to provide a landscape buffer on the southern boundary of the site is the best way of minimising the potential impact of the construction site for nearby local residents?</p> <p>Box ticked: Yes</p> <p>1. If yes, should this be retained as a permanent feature once construction is completed?</p> <p>Box ticked: Yes</p> <p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The hill closest to bishop wood should be raised to minimise visual impact.</p> <p>Great care is required due to risk to watercourses increasing the risk of flooding.</p>	8906-234-0	/			
Tractivity 208	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Do you agree that EDF Energy's proposal to provide a landscape buffer on the southern boundary of the site is the best way of minimising the potential impact of the construction site for nearby local residents?</p> <p>Box ticked: No</p> <p>1. If yes, should this be retained as a permanent feature once construction is completed?</p> <p>Box ticked: no data</p> <p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Why can't you locate this nearer to Hinkley Point</p>	8914-234-0	/			
Tractivity 242	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>A small wood further south of this buffer, perhaps with a small lake of some sort. If this is going to be built 24/7 there will also be the glare from the lights to contend with.</p>	8938-234-348			/	
Tractivity 263	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>It is not clear from the plans what is intended as a buffer, and how or if it will make any difference to noise etc. It is necessary to be on the site with the plans to make any judgement</p>	8952-234-357	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 263	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? Any scheme will have to balance the benefits to the locals with the environmental impact of removing the spoil elsewhere. Any spoil removal off site should be done using the jetty, not by road. The jetty must therefore be the first piece of construction	8952-234-802			/	
Tractivity 265	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? Would be a good place to plant trees/ community orchard.	8954-234-348	/			
Tractivity 266	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? I am concerned that a high security fence should be set back from the perimeter of the land owned by EDF, with natural planting of native trees between it and the roads or properties adjacent to the area so that its visual impact is reduced as much as possible.	8955-234-4465	/			
Tractivity 305	Public	Stage 1	1. Do you agree that EDF Energy's proposal to provide a landscape buffer on the southern boundary of the site is the best way of minimising the potential impact of the construction site for nearby local residents? Box ticked: Yes 1. If yes, should this be retained as a permanent feature once construction is completed? Box ticked: Don't Know 1. Any other ideas or comments? Need a clearer idea of what it will look like. Maybe if it is attractive and in keeping. It is very close to the boundary of my house and at the moment we look out at trees and open land. How high will it be? Will we feel blocked in? Will it affect the light? Will building it effect our bats and other wildlife?	8993-234-0	/			
Tractivity 307	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? Spoil from the site could be initially placed at the southern edge (but a distance away from existing dwellings to be agreed). This soil could become a permanent landscape etc fairly soon during the construction period, because later backfill would then be taken from the northern (more recent) spoil. This would allow an east to west right of way footpath to be installed earlier rather than waiting for the whole project to be finished	8995-234-619	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 307	Public	Stage 1	<p>3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction?</p> <p>A new permanent right of way could be placed north to south along EDF's western boundary from the top of Benhole Lane all the way to the sea. This could be put in place almost immediately.</p> <p>Try to make it as attractive as possible eg. pay attention to the fencing marking EDF's boundary. This could be done straight away, and would engender some goodwill early in the construction/preparatory phase.</p>	8995-234-1096	/			
Tractivity 314	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>I don't know if this is the best way of minimising impact. If set back far enough, it would be part of an impact-reducing scheme, if planted with trees or hedgerows.</p>	9002-234-359			/	
Tractivity 320	Public	Stage 1	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Creating a sense of countryside outweighs or at least balances an ugly site which is created by further construction at Hinkley Point set up a wildlife park?</p>	9008-234-615	/			
Tractivity 323	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>[Re.2nd question] - How can we comment when we don't know what it will look like?</p> <p>As I live on the boundary obviously this is important to me but there are many questions. There are trees on your boundary which provide a little screening can these be retained? how high will this buffer be. The site is steep. Wouldn't we see over the bund unless it is moved further up. Would you consider a site meeting with local residents so we have a clearer idea of your plans.</p>	9011-234-355	/			
Tractivity 325	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>It is interesting that this is your first question. Obviously such landscape ideas will help to minimise the 'eye sore' which nuclear power stations have on their area. It should be maintained on completion of new nuclear development - but there are many more important points to be dealt with!</p>	9013-234-348			/	
Tractivity 377	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>This should be completed and fully landscaped before ANY construction work begins to attempt to negate the noise levels from such a massive construction project</p>	9064-234-348	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 395	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? It is obviously the easiest and cheapest way for EDF to dispose of a large quantity of the spoil, but in no way will it disguise or 'landscape' the proposed development, either for the local residents or for people using other amenities - eg. walking in the Quantocks.	9080-234-351			/	
Tractivity 395	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? This - the restoration of site - is a specious point. By the time the ground is covered in concrete the damage will be permanent and irrevocable.	9080-234-882			/	
Tractivity 397	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? See comments at end. 12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? BUND Bund to be sited further north of Shurton, this will allow land south of the bund to be used as alternative to closed PROW's. If the bund is sited further north it will be on higher ground and therefore have more of a buffer effect to noise and visual intrusions. The bund should be planted with native species of hedgerow, trees etc to compensate for the removal of wildlife habitats on the construction site. Keep the destruction of hedgerows, trees and barns to a minimum. Recycle and re-use materials to form new wildlife habitats in, on and around the bund. More information is needed on the construction, appearance, location and shape of the bund. WESTERN AND EASTERN BOUNDARIES Screening (tree planting) to the western and eastern site boundaries to be put in place before construction work commences to buffer noise and visual impact. PROW's Public rights of way need to be kept open for as long as possi	9348-234-3888	/			
Tractivity 401	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? Permanent feature if construction is completed:Should be high enough to block the view of any and all construction from the properties affected in Shurton.	9084-234-348	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 401	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? In favour of woodland/tall trees planted to be tall enough to hide any building construction on site from properties on Southern side.	9084-234-775	/			
Tractivity 410	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? Landscaping is a must, softening the building from residents and help the environment.	9092-234-348	/			
Tractivity 417	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? At the site meeting of January 8th 2010, EdF experts conceded that the "visual and noise mitigation buffer" (the bund) would not reduce the visual or noise effects of the construction. I support the views of Stogursey Parish Council, the West Hinkley Action Group and the vast majority of Shurton residents when they say that the southern site boundary fence should be moved north.	9099-234-351	/			
Tractivity 422	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? impact is from west (Watchet) north (Wales) east Burnham) and primarily from above Quantock Hills.	9104-234-349			/	
Tractivity 435	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? It should be a lot bigger and go to the west as well	9114-234-348	/			
Tractivity 444	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? Any landscape buffer should reduce the visual impact of the new buildings; however it should be designed as far as possible with a sensitivity to the local landscape and ecology; i.e. avoiding intrusive changes to the landscape and avoiding use of non-local species.	9123-234-346	/			
Tractivity 446	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? No mound of earth will be able to mask the noise and light pollution to the villages of Shurton and Burton over the 10 years of the South West's biggest industrial site.	9125-234-351			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 452	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>This barrier should be moved as far North as possible to act as a noise barrier as well as a landscape buffer. This would also lessen the visual effect on the nearest properties. This 'band' should be planted up ASAP and be created to look as 'natural' a feature as possible, as well as environmentally friendly. Your experts can surely be creative over its design!! Moving it to the North would also leave an area for walkers to the South of it.</p> <p>Mature trees should be planted there which would also act as additional sound barriers. Further measures may be needed in consultation with residents most affected, i.e. in Shurton.</p>	9130-234-348	/			
Tractivity 457	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Southern boundary seems too close to village and may be better further North as a sound barrier, but view of construction must also be shielded. Removing the boundary at the end of construction would depend on the final appearance of the new site and reiteration of surrounding land. The site seems to be very large compared to existing A and B stations.</p>	9134-234-355	/			
Tractivity 461	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Agree with proposals & tree planting should be with native species if possible.</p>	9138-234-348	/			
Tractivity 479	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>It would be better if all spoil storage, and hence vehicle movements, could be confined to the valley between the two ridges. The Southern ridge would provide a visual barrier.</p>	9155-234-348	/			
Tractivity 525	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>We need more info, we don't want a wall! Will it minimise sound? Proof? Have you done this else where, does it work? We live in SHurton, the land rises up behind us, we are level with the top of your drilling platform? Does the south end of shurton not matter? Youpropose to start the buffer further along past the bridge. We need a site visit, communication and more info. Benhole Lanr residents private consultation we have views to preserve! And daylight.</p>	9196-234-362	/			
Tractivity 539	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>DOn't knoe to what extent it will reduce noise and unsightiness. If it built it should be kept as a 'natural' landscape feature, in conultation with local residents who will have to look at it.</p>	9208-234-362	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 550	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? The suggested position of the buffer is too close to residential areas, it will tower over the houses that back onto it. If the buffer was to be situated on the natural ridge it would merge with the natural line of the landscape and minimise the impact for local residents but also for miles around. Also some tree planting should take place sooner rather than later at the end of construction as trees take years to mature.	9219-234-348	/			
Tractivity 585	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? The buffer must be appropriate to the character of both the natural and historic landscapes.	9364-234-348	/			
Tractivity 585	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? Planting of appropriate woodland species could form part of the landscape buffer	9364-234-698			/	
Tractivity 600	Public	Stage 1	- The mitigation buffer should be as far away as possible from residential properties, they do not want a wall of earth at the site boundary, it needs to be as sensitive as possible. - The more vegetation on the buffer the better.	9378-234-1137	/			
Tractivity 62313	Public	Stage 2	The majority of residents of Burton, Knighton, Shurton and Wick are very disgruntled with the contents of your stage 2 proposals. From the beginning we were shocked by the amount of land that will be needed for the construction of the power stations and concerned about the damaging effect that it will have on our quality of life. After a major confrontation we settled for the movement of the southern boundary, even though we knew that our lives would still be severely affected for the long period of construction. As you could now progress a power station we thought that you would be very pleased, and did not expect you to load us with other major disadvantages which are not essential for completion of the work. Your stage 2 proposals have shown that we were very wrong to make that assumption. Your attitude has turned local people against you. They are now at least going to fight your proposals and many are sympathising with the Stop Hinkley group.	10000-234-35			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62582	Public	Stage 2	Re. the landscaping: you mention early planting but I don't think you understand how long deciduous trees take to grow and mature. I have spoken to (Personal details removed) re. your 'landscape strategy' and she tells me that the planting will be 75% deciduous, to include willow and poplar, 25% coniferous, and hedgerow plants and scrub. The highest tree you intend to plant is only 6 feet, all the others being 'tiny saplings'. This means that it will be at least twenty years before the deciduous trees reach any reasonable size and maturity, therefore much taller trees that 6 feet need to be planted early. Many of us human residents of Shurton will probably have died by then. I am sure that the Hinkley C budget of billions of pounds can stretch to a better early planting of larger trees.	10133-234-547	/			
Tractivity 62629	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6/10/10 - He has been speaking to some people measuring for the fencing around the boundary of their house.He just wanted to speak to you to clarify a few details and also to ask about the landscaping that was due to take place early October	10173-234-48			/	
Homes and Communities Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The Stage 2 consultation says that the southern limit of construction activity has been moved further north, away from nearby residents. The landscape vision indicates compensating for loss of habitats, creating wildlife corridors, sensitive planning of site levels, woodland planting and planted earth embankments. Much of the area proposed for the landscape buffer towards the southern part of the site, will actually be the location for the temporary accommodation throughout the construction phases. Due to these phasing issues, there will therefore be a greater loss of amenity during construction than the landscape masterplan initially implies. There will continue to be a need to implement a landscape buffer on the southern boundary and visual and noise intrusion should be kept to a minimum to reduce the impact on the rural landscape both during and after construction.	10191-234-3760			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	This suggests that there needs to be early tree planting. For any possibility of the planned screening trees to have any measure of effectiveness, they need to be planted now. Will EDF start planting immediately?	89289-234-6993	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[1.6.85] Will EDF commit to starting planting now where feasible so that any trees, shrubs and hedges have a fighting chance of reaching maturity before construction ends? Planting will not grow in time to hide the accommodation campus (if built) before its removal at the end of construction.	89291-234-5866	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[7. 3 13] Ecological enhancement to include dense planting to the South of the site which will act as a visual barrier for Shurton. What plans do EDF have for visual barriers along the Western edge of the site as screening for Burton and Knighton which will have uninterrupted views of the southern site works?	89293-234-5077			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	EDF are asked to confirm the proposed maximum height and number of storeys being proposed for the accommodation, and the comparable height being considered for landscaped mounds.	89440-234-6065			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Update September 2010: The baseline studies include further ecological surveys and additional survey work has been undertaken. This has significantly strengthened the evidence base for the ecological assessment on the Development Site. However other issues remain outstanding in relation to phasing and construction impacts, a lack of a firm commitment to the landscape strategy and planting plans and the lack of commitment to monitoring.	89326-234-6348	/			
Tractivity 62940	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	- Could the planting of landscape screening around our property be started early so that it has a chance to establish and grow before the main construction starts.	89675-234-511	/			
Tractivity 62940	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	- It appears from from the Illustrative Photomontage Figure A.11. Rev 01, that the view towards the end of construction still shows the construction fence in place. We were under the impression that this fence would definately be removed after construction of the power station and the lanscape replanted? Is this correct as it still appears to be in place or is this an error?	89675-234-851		/		
Tractivity 62967	Public	Stage 2 Update	6. Main site plans : Early grounds works leading to early screening will be welcomed	89686-234-1872	/			
Tractivity 63031	Public	Stage 2 Update	Southern Boundary: The early tree planting is to be welcomed but it should be along the length of Benhole Lane from Shurton to the 'green lane' to provide some screening for residents of Burton and Knighton. However these trees will not screen the campus from Shurton or the construction activities between 'green lane and the southern boundary from Burton and Knighton. Restoration of the land immediately north of the southern boundary should be an ongoing process during construction; this land could then be used by local residents and visitors alike, with early reinstatement of footpaths. How can EDF engineers insist on this land being the last to be restored?	89704-234-4213	/			
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	Further, the Estate remains concerned at the lack of on-site and off-site landscaping proposed to mitigate the impact of the proposed development during its lengthy construction phase.	89767-234-1883	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	Earlier completion of landscaping to the southern area of the main site is considered to be an improvement to the phasing of works associated with the development of the main site.	89844-234-4708			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	In accordance with the comments we submitted at Stage 2, the Council welcomes the proposal to re-contour and landscape the area to the south of the southern construction fence, at the main site, as soon as reasonably practical if a Development Consent Order is granted.	89853-234-675			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	In the response to the preliminary works application, the Council recommended that a strip of land adjacent to the boundary line be allocated to create a significant temporary earthworks bund to screen the site during the construction period on this key Western boundary. Therefore, although the photomontages provided with the consultation material are useful, the Council also requires a series of drawings, cross-sections and photomontages showing the plant from different viewpoints at various stages of construction and at completion before it is able to comment fully upon the mitigation and compensation required.	89853-234-948	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.16 Page 34 Early restoration of the southern area: SPC welcomes this in principle as a mitigation measure, but wishes to remain engaged with EDF over the detail of the design and the timescale for its implementation.	89871-234-14704	/			
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	Hinkley Point C Main Site Proposals In addition to the proposed changes to the on-site accommodation campus (covered above), EdFe set out a number of amendments to the main site proposals. Early Restoration of the Southern Area WSC have previously raised concerns about the adequacy of the landscape buffer at the southern part of the site and a commitment to early implementation is considered an improvement to the phasing of works.	89875-234-12471	/			
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	Early Restoration of the Southern Area - WSC have previously raised concerns about the adequacy of the landscape buffer at the southern part of the site and a commitment to early implementation is considered an improvement to the phasing of works.	89897-234-2577			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	<p>10.2 Stage 2 Issues Not Addressed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The red line site boundary (as proposed within Proposed Changes) is not considered to be the appropriate extent of a landscape scheme for Hinkley Point C. - The provision of landscaping between the construction campus and nearby settlements is welcomed and viewed by the councils as an essential mitigation measure. It should be reiterated that landscaping in this location is considered to be mitigation, and not a compensation or legacy benefit. 	89897-234-5379			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
West Hinkley Action Group	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	- Effective measures to prevent light pollution from all parts of the site and from boundary lights.	8755-235-3511		/		<p>Public and statutory consultee responses raised concern on the impact of lighting, including on the Quantocks AONB and the SPA, at Stage 1, and further concerns were raised subsequently in view of the proposed extension to working hours. Separately, the potential need was identified to provide site cranes with air navigation warning lights.</p> <p>Construction lighting would be implemented in line with the Construction Lighting Strategy. This strategy requires the lighting levels to be limited to those necessary for the safe conduct of the construction activities, and also to limit light spill which could impact off-site receptors. In particular, the strategy calls for zero light output above the horizontal, so limiting the visual impact on remote receptors including the Quantocks and Exmoor. An assessment of lighting impacts is provided in Volume 2, Chapter 22 of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Detailed design of lighting would be undertaken by individual contractors for their own construction compounds and the areas where they have responsibility for lighting construction works. As most of the contractors have not yet been appointed, it is not possible to provide detail of the proposed lighting. Nevertheless, compliance with the Construction Lighting Strategy will ensure that the impacts are limited as above.</p>
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Section 3.3.6 identified that fixed tower cranes will be used at the development site during the construction programme. The heights of the cranes are not identified at this stage. It is anticipated that air navigation warning lights may need to be attached to these structures to maintain air traffic safety.	8775-235-3517	/			
Tractivity 974	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below As a supporter of nuclear power I am DISMAYED at how the consultation and the plans have alienated the local population who have lived close to Hinkley Point with few problems in the past. The Campus on site makes little benefit for the massive disruption local people expect based on past experience during A nad B construction. Local roads will be terribly affected causing great increase in risks to local road users and frequent DELAYS. Light pollution from the site is NOT being taken seriously by EDF.	9732-235-8234		/		
Tractivity 1262	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? At public meeting on 2nd March 2011 at Stogursey Village Hall I (we) spoke to (Personal details removed) (EDF) regarding our concern for the temporary jetty pile driving and subsequent noise/dust/light pollution to those living down wind of Hinkley C site. (Personal details removed) advised putting our concerns in writing on this form.	89528-235-1294			/	
Tractivity 242	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? A small wood further south of this buffer, perhaps with a small lake of some sort. If this is going to be built 24/7 there will also be the glare from the lights to contend with.	8938-235-348			/	
Tractivity 452	Public	Stage 1	EDF must be proactive in consulting and listening to the concerns of local residents at every stage and provide experts in noise minimisation. Hours of work must be daytime only. Light pollution must be minimised.	9130-235-6600		/		
Stringston Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We request further research to be carried out with regard to noise levels and light filtration to the village, during the construction phase.	10233-235-8706		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Quantock Hills AONB Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Residual Landscape Impact - The AONB Service has concerns over a number of the judgments made in tables 21.8.1 and 21.8.2 e.g. majority of hedgerows to be removed but the magnitude of change is deemed to be medium. Of key concern to the Quantock Hills AONB is the reference to light pollution under 'Changes to aesthetic and perceptual aspects' as having a medium (construction) and low (permanent) impact. There is a complete lack of any detailed assessment of light pollution impact (although issues of light pollution are mentioned under Mitigation 21.7.8) and impacts described as adverse (21.8.8 and 21.8.14) but without any detailed information on magnitude of impact and it is difficult to understand how this judgement has been reached.	89121-235-2579	/			
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	1.7 The Estate wishes to receive further information in relation to the proposed increase in lighting at both the temporary and operational stages. As this will be visible from the surrounding 'dark' rural areas, including the Quantocks AONB, and will adversely affect views and tranquillity, further information is required to understand how this will be mitigated.	89439-235-4795	/			
RSPB	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	There is recognition at 18.7.55 that construction and operational activities would cause disturbance within the SPA in the absence of effective mitigation. We agree that noise, lighting and human activity are likely to provide the main sources of disturbance to the SPA foreshore and functionally linked offshore areas. The jetty, sea wall extension and possibly onshore cooling water intake and outfall activity, are identified as major sources of disturbance, although future operational activities at the plant itself should be included.	89457-235-6691	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Authorities position May 2010: Information on light and noise impacts requested, including a lighting strategy Update September 2010: It is noted that further information on lighting design and noise impacts will be necessary. Given residents' concerns, the authorities feel that this is a priority issue, in particular given the impact on properties located on the key transport routes and where sites related to the construction phase are located beside noise and light sensitive receptors.	89327-235-3013	/			
Tractivity 62940	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	- We are concerned about the affect night lighting and dust from the excavations will have on our immediate environment.	89675-235-1769			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 63031	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>It was accepted that short periods of 24 hour working would be required during concrete pouring and later activities contained within the buildings, but 24 hour working as routine is not. With 24 hour working there will be 24 hour noise, dust and light, no longer the dark night sky and the sound of waves on the beach to send one off to sleep.</p> <p>The extended hours of the double shift working, almost from the outset of construction, is not acceptable. Residents along the C182 and other local roads will have traffic noise from 5.30am until 00.30am with workers coming to and leaving the site. Residents adjacent to the construction site will have noise, dust and light pollution from 6am until midnight, hardly the actions of a 'good neighbour'.</p>	89704-235-321			/	
Exmoor National Park Authority	Local authority	Stage 2 Update	<p>In terms of impacts there is now the further concern with the proposed changes to construction working hours. It appears that EDF is effectively proposing 24/7 working hours for 12 1/2 days in every 14. This will impact significantly on the lighting required for the main site and as a consequence the appearance of the site from the National Park. One of the special qualities of the National Park is its dark skies and the hinterland around the National Park makes an important contribution to Exmoor's darkness and tranquillity. Working such hours will also have knock-on implications for traffic movements and this will impact on local communities.</p>	89736-235-3037			/	
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	<p>The creation of noise, dust and light at all times (including during evenings and weekends) in this location will represent a significant change in the character of the area which will be to the detriment of the enjoyment of people's homes and the countryside in general.</p>	89767-235-3845			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	<p>The need for the site to be lit at night in order to allow operation of the night shift will have a significant effect for any area or dwelling that has a view of the main site, although the effect may technically be classed as temporary, it could last for a number of years.</p>	89853-235-2224			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
South West Regional Development Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The South West RDA will not provide detailed comment on individual proposals for small scale associated infrastructure (housing sites, transport infrastructure etc). Suffice to say that the Agency appreciates the need for associated infrastructure to support the Nuclear proposals and this should be provided in a sustainable manner, appreciating other development initiatives being progressed in the vicinity.	8731-231-2642			/	Public and statutory consultee responses sought the need for off-site associated developments (rather than concentrating development on the main site, with its own wharf) to be robustly established. While some responses encouraged rapid progress, particularly given the experience of delays at other EPR sites, others were concerned that transport infrastructure would not be in place before main construction started. Consultees sought establishment of clear environmental management and monitoring plans and construction environmental management plans, with a visible logistics plan. One specific concern was the risk of disturbing unexploded ordnance in the Severn Estuary
Devon County Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	i) [Section 3] The document needs to recognise the importance of submitting a Construction Environment Management Plan as part of the planning application	8713-231-420	/			A description of construction activities together with an outline programme is provided in the Construction Method Statement. This description covers construction activities and logistics and other construction-related topics, though it would not be appropriate to provide details of contractual arrangements to third parties.
Countryside Council for Wales	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	2.6 & 2.7: We note that, for the purposes of this assessment, it is assumed that the application will include elements of infrastructure and ancillary development. We support this precautionary approach at the plan level assessment and look forward to these elements being covered in more detail as the project level assessment is progressed.	87830-231-754			/	The overall projected construction duration is based on experience from previous construction sites including Flamanville in Normandy, where the first EDF EPR is under construction, and Taishan in China where two further EPRs are under construction. It is not uncommon to encounter 'first-of-a-kind' problems which are overcome when building subsequent plants. On the basis of lessons learned from these projects and EDF's experience of building multiple nuclear plants, it is judged that the proposed construction duration is achievable. However, there remains the potential for unforeseen events to affect the construction programme, so it is not appropriate to artificially constrain the schedule by the imposition of construction time limits or construction phasing restrictions.
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The Agency supports the package of mitigation measures identified at paragraph 6.1.3 to reduce or eliminate the potential impact on the local area. In particular, we actively encourage the following: - construction time limits; - construction phasing restrictions; and - Sustainable transport e.g. Travel Plan, Comwich Wharf, Temporary Aggregates Jetty, Cannington Bypass and localised road improvements. (In terms of the provision of Park and Ride facilities, freight consolidation and parking provision, the Agency reserves its position to make further comment once the evidence base is available).	88860-231-19811			/	The role of the associated developments would be to
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	3.4.8 A concern is registered that little detail is provided within the Stage 1 document on the preliminary works and the consent processes for these works. Further details are requested from EDF on the preliminary works aspects of the proposals as well as other elements of the project, including the construction of the jetty, new sea wall, cooling water intakes and outfalls, and refurbishment of Comwich Wharf.	88790-231-25139	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	<p>- The Nuclear Power Station comprising of two UK EPR reactor units. The expected output from the units would be approximately 3,260 MW, equivalent to supplying 5 million homes.</p> <p>- On-site Associated Development comprising of all infrastructure and facilities needed to support the operation of power station including a sea wall, spent fuel storage, interim radioactive waste storage, cooling water tunnels, construction areas and facilities including a temporary aggregates depot, temporary accommodation for construction workers and spoil disposal/landscape integration.</p> <p>- Off-site Associated Development comprising of options for a Cannington bypass, options for park and ride facilities, options for freight consolidation/storage facilities, refurbishment of Combrwich Wharf and heavy loads berthing facility and options for temporary laydown and storage at the Wharf, road improvements and spoil disposal/landscape integration.</p>	88890-231-20616			/	<p>support the construction activities at Hinkley Point C (HPC). This is described and justified in more detail within the Construction Method Statement, which also contains a programme showing the timing of the associated developments in relation to the main construction works. Further detail on the specific parameters relating to the developments can be found in the associated strategy documents: the Accommodation Strategy, the Freight Management Strategy and the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>The Freight Management Strategy shows the profile of freight traffic over time, with the jetty and Cannington bypass being completed well ahead of the traffic peak. In view of this, it is judged inappropriate to delay the start of the main construction works until the jetty and Cannington bypass are complete, with a consequent prolongation of the overall construction period. Similarly the build-up of Heavy Goods Vehicle traffic allows time for the freight management facilities to be constructed, initially at M5 junction 24, before traffic volumes exceed the level that can be managed through interim arrangements. Road improvements would also be undertaken early in the overall timescale so that the benefits are available in time for the higher traffic levels.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	4.9 A concern is registered that little detail is provided within the Stage 1 document on the preliminary works and the consent processes for these works. Further details are requested from EDF on the preliminary works aspects of the proposals as well as other elements of the project, including the construction of the jetty, new sea wall, cooling water intakes and outfalls, and refurbishment of Combrwich Wharf.	88890-231-27512	/			<p>The proposed jetty would enable delivery of containerised freight as well as bulk aggregate, sand and cement. In limiting the impact on the internationally designated areas off the coast of Hinkley to acceptable levels, it was not possible to incorporate the capability to import Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) via the jetty. Additionally, the weather and sea conditions will limit the availability of the jetty, such that at times of peak aggregate requirements, there could be relatively few spare windows for delivery of other goods. In refurbishing the wharf at Combrwich to cater for the AIL deliveries, it was considered prudent to facilitate the delivery of other water-borne freight that could not be accommodated by the jetty. The tidal conditions for deliveries via Combrwich have been reviewed in relation to the proposed unloading window and it is now judged that the peak monthly delivery rate via this route would be 15-16 deliveries, rather than the 16-20</p>
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Priority to have new build at Hinkley important.	88900-231-7097			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	b) We wish to see a coherent and comprehensive strategy that establishes the need for the associated development sites. This strategy should include details of the evidence that has been used to inform the type, scale and location of the associated development sites that are believed to be required to mitigate against the impacts associated with the construction phase, and to a lesser extent the operational phase, of the development at Hinkley Point. Based upon the information presented it is not clear how different approaches have been considered or assessed to inform the proposals. For example, an appraisal should be undertaken which considers the options associated with concentrating facilities at a smaller number of sites, rather than dispersing construction related activity over a wider area. Full account should be taken of regional and local planning policy when undertaking this appraisal.	87920-231-3153	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Phasing 1.54. Information on EDF's programme for construction and operation of the proposed Associated Developments is set out in various tables throughout section 4. This information should be combined into an overall phasing strategy to show how the delivery of Associated Development coincides with the predicted level of people and goods movements during the construction and operational phases for HPC.	88020-231-1246	/			previously assessed. Suggestions were made by consultees that the docks at Dunball together with a rail terminal at Dunball and a new Bridgwater bypass could provide a viable route for freight transport to the HPC site. The possibility of a new Bridgwater bypass or a more limited haul road from the Dunball area to the C182 have been considered and rejected due to the timescale required for implementation and the conflict with national policy on the construction of new roads. Further detail on this subject is provided in the Transport Assessment. Without a bypass or haul road, rail or sea deliveries to Dunball would have no significant advantages.
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1) The authorities are concerned that a detailed construction strategy for the project does not form part of the Stage 1 consultation document and we recommend that such a strategy is prepared. It has been difficult for the authorities to understand the number of off-site associated development sites, the overall area required for construction related activities, the optimum location for these sites to minimise traffic related impacts and how the sites will link together as part of a coherent construction strategy for the project.	88040-231-3495	/			The use of the jetty to import bulk materials for concrete production would be subject to interruptions due to weather and sea conditions. It would therefore be necessary to stockpile imported materials to cater for such supply interruptions, and double-handling of these materials would be inevitable. Suitable stockpile areas have been allocated within the site perimeter.
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	The authorities recommend that work on the Construction Strategy is urgently undertaken by EDF.	88040-231-4699	/			In the stage 2 consultation, it was proposed that the Combwich facility should incorporate pre-fabrication facilities. Following the feedback received in consultation, it has been agreed that prefabrication will not be undertaken at Combwich. There are a number of barns on the HPC site in various states of disrepair. One, which is adjacent to Benhole Lane, is being retained within the landscaping scheme. However, the others conflict with the planned locations of permanent or temporary works which cannot readily be relocated to accommodate the barns. It is therefore proposed that these barns be recorded and then demolished.
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	- Exclusions: The regulators have conceded that construction could conceivably go ahead despite outstanding areas of concern but only up to the point where the specific concern becomes relevant. There is some risk to EDF here but also the regulator would be under mounting pressure to give way once the momentum of the project had reached a certain point.	88960-231-4202			/	The coastal path would need to be closed for health and safety reasons during the construction of the jetty and sea wall but would be reopened following completion of the sea wall. However, the path would again need to be closed during subsequent dismantling of the jetty.
Somerset Chamber of Commerce & Industry	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Off Site Associated Development The Somerset Chamber support's EDF Energy's approach to managing the impact of the construction of the power station and the desire to leave a positive legacy for Somerset.	8756-231-2185			/	The helipad is required as part of the emergency arrangements for the power stations at Hinkley. The existing helipad is located within the area for the HPC permanent development. In order to provide a helipad that is usable by all the power stations at Hinkley, it is proposed to relocate the helipad to a position between the site entrances of the three plants.
S.Notaro Holdings Ltd	Consultee with an Interest in Land at Stage 1 Only	Stage 1	The A3 plan shows the land at Huntworth, where we are currently developing our Holiday Cottage and Hotel Complex, together with a Golf Course. Those areas are coloured yellow and light and dark green respectively. We also own approximately 80 acres of land on the opposite site of the Bridgwater to Taunton Canal, which we feel may be well suited for development as a caravan park, since it would link in with our current project. Again we enclose an identification plan.	8761-231-624			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Section 3.3.6 identified that fixed tower cranes will be used at the development site during the construction programme. The heights of the cranes are not identified at this stage. It is anticipated that air navigation warning lights may need to be attached to these structures to maintain air traffic safety.	8775-231-3517			/	The emergency access road provides an alternative access to the site for use only in emergency situations. The gates at either end of the road will be locked to prevent unauthorised use although pedestrian access will be retained. The bridge over Bum Brook carries the emergency access road and a footpath. The limited capacity of the existing bridge over the brook means that construction of the new bridge would need to be carried out from both sides of the brook.
Tractivity 709	Public	Stage 2	12. Any other ideas or comments? Get on with it soon	9467-231-6631			/	Surveys for unexploded ordnance were undertaken in Bridgwater Bay ahead of drilling the boreholes for investigation work. However, as the validity of such a survey is time limited, further surveys will be undertaken shortly before commencement of jetty construction and construction of the offshore cooling water infrastructure.
Tractivity 737	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below In general the stage 2 proposals lack substance, detailed method statements or any kind of impact assessment. There is not enough information to form a clear idea of what will be happening. It isn't the power station per se that is the problem, but the apparent lack of planning and thought in support of the construction process, which may be temporary in geological terms but represents a significant slice of a person's lifetime.	9495-231-7947	/			Feedback was received from the Stage 1 consultation on the proximity of the construction area to properties in Shurton. As a result of comments received, it was agreed to move the southern limit of the main construction works to grid line 144750mN so that only landscaping works and construction associated with the emergency access road would be undertaken south of this line.
Tractivity 750	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Provided it now satisfies the local residents this is acceptable. I do wonder if you have allowed for enough temporary storage for the larger equipment parts, which will be needed during construction, but assume this has been checked by your planners.	9508-231-563		/		A number of road improvements are proposed, including improvements on the C182, although a road safety audit does not provide support for improvements on safety grounds. Details of the proposals can be found in the Construction Method Statement.
Tractivity 750	Public	Stage 2	10. Any other ideas or comments? See my comment under 13. If you intend stock piling aggregate, sand and cement here then double handling of materials could become a problem	9508-231-6736			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 789	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. What are your views on the proposed arrangement and landscaping of the Hinkley Point C site?</p> <p>Box ticked: No opinion</p> <p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>2. We have reduced the amount of land to be used during construction in the southern part of the site in response to concerns from local residents. What are your views on this proposal?</p> <p>Box ticked: No opinion</p> <p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>3. In order to speed up the process of building the new power station, and enable us to finish work earlier, we intend to apply this summer to undertake preliminary works to prepare the main site and build a temporary jetty for the delivery of bulk materials. If permission for the power station is not obtained, we will be required to reinstate this land.</p> <p>What are your views on our plans for Preliminary Works?</p> <p>Box ticked: No opinion</p> <p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>I would like more information on the temporary jetty planned for the delivery of bulk materials, as unclear why such a jetty could not be permanent thus reducing the need to expand the facilities at Combwich</p>	9547-231-0		/		<p>The sources of materials for the construction of HPC have not been determined as they will be influenced by contractors who have yet to be appointed. However, an assessment of potential quarries has revealed a number of quarries that could provide suitable construction materials within their current production rates. In these circumstances, the project cannot justify consideration of road improvements local to the quarries.</p> <p>It is in the nature of very large infrastructure projects that a variety of temporary buildings and structures will be required on the construction site, and these cannot necessarily be determined prior to appointment of the relevant contractors. Instead, for this project, a range of height parameters are proposed for the various areas of the site, within which the visual impact can be assessed as acceptable. Details of the parameters and associated areas are provided within the Construction Method Statement, together with examples of the types of buildings and structures required, and these are proposed as an acceptable basis for granting consent.</p> <p>The requirement for imported granular fill is based on the assumption that insufficient suitable rock will be excavated in the site levelling and excavation works. This assumption cannot be validated or revised until significant quantities of material have been excavated and assessed during the site preliminary works.</p>
Tractivity 868	Public	Stage 2	<p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The building of the Cannington Bypass should be your first job in order to transport materials and buses to the site.</p>	9626-231-957			/	<p>The approach to environmental management is outlined in the Construction Method Statement. Furthermore, Environmental Management and Monitoring Plans and Subject-Specific Management Plans will be issued to the contractors, who would be required to prepare Construction Environmental Management Plans, which respond to the requirements and would be used in the management of the works.</p>
Tractivity 868	Public	Stage 2	<p>6. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The Cannington Bypass should be built before major site works</p>	9626-231-2889			/	<p>Materials and components for use within the nuclear parts of the plant are subject to stringent cleanliness requirements to ensure the absence of materials which could be harmful. Nuclear components are therefore manufactured in clean conditions and must be suitably protected during transport, storage and installation. This requires exceptional levels of packaging and protection which will increase the amount of waste generated by these items.</p>
Tractivity 874	Public	Stage 2	<p>This statement is an anomaly and complete whitewash. "Prolonged but temporary". Construction over 10 years, operational life of 60 years! It is certainly prolonged for a majority of the population. By "temporary" I assume you are talking in terms of centuries, not decades.</p>	9632-231-2259			/	<p>Once the power station construction is complete, it is proposed that the area outside of the permanent development be cleared of construction infrastructure and landscaped to provide an area with high biodiversity and amenity value which integrates with</p>
Tractivity 908	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>A nuclear powerstation is a necessity if the evr expanding population is to have electricity which we cannot do without. Whatever system is used there is going to be a need for Pylons to distribute the electricity to the grid. Hinkley Point must be constructed using the highest available technology and best quality materials and there must be a safe storage of waste.</p>	9666-231-6876			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1081	Public	Stage 2	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The land required for fabrication has now been moved to Combwich which is equally unfair on the residents of Combwich.</p> <p>Use the land available at Hinkley Point A station instead of using greenfield sites. The turbine hall when filled in will make an excellent fabrication facility.</p> <p>Restore and retain the existing barns in the construction area and use as part of the site a piece of rustic charm in an industrial landscape would be good for EDF publicity.</p>	9839-231-534	/			<p>the existing environment. Further details are provided in the Main Site Design and Access Statement.</p> <p>The peak workforce is 5,600, and is therefore the maximum likely number of workers that the area and its infrastructure would need to provide for in any one month. This is the basis of the transport, socio-economic and accommodation assessments and further detail is available in the Socio Economics chapter (Volume 2, Chapter 9) of the Environmental Statement. The 20,000 to 25,000 workforce figure represents a possible aggregate flow over the period of the main construction of the power station. It is expressed as a range, as the actual number would be dependent on the approach taken by the various contractors and sub-contractors who would be employed over the development period. It has been used for illustrative purposes, but not as a basis for assessment of impacts.</p>
Tractivity 1081	Public	Stage 2	<p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Maintain access to the West Somerset Coast Path throughout the construction time.</p> <p>Restore and retain the existing barns in the construction area and use as part of the site a piece of rustic charm in an industrial landscape would be good for EDF publicity.</p>	9839-231-1474		/		
Tractivity 1081	Public	Stage 2	<p>12. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Consider the use of the railway for container traffic with a terminal at Dunball and a new Bridgwater bypass from the A38 north of Bridgwater to the Cannington to Hinkley Point road. Also consider the use of Dunball docks.</p> <p>The residents of Combwich agreed to use of the Combwich dock for AILs only and also agreed to a small holding area for AILs prior to their transport to Hinkley Point. We did not agree to loads other than AILs coming by sea to Combwich nor did we agree to a freight logistics site, a bus park and a fabrication facility. It is not right to use a green field flood plain when there is adequate land at Hinkley Point for these facilities on the A station site. It also makes sense to fabricate on site and not 6 miles away. Combwich is a quiet and peaceful village and we are concerned about the noise and disruption that these facilities would cause</p>	9839-231-9207	/			
Tractivity 1081	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>The planned deliveries of 16 to 20 loads a month by sea to Combwich are unrealistic and do not take account of the weather.</p> <p>The freight logistics and fabrication facilities have been moved to Combwich from near Shurton and Burton due to the objection of residents. Well, we are also objecting to these facilities being on our doorstep when there is adequate land at Hinkley Point. The A station turbine hall would make an excellent fabrication facility and land to the north of it could be used for freight logistics. It seems that EDF have not quite got it right for Combwich which has angered the residents and put EDF at risk of a failed consultation. This is not what I wanted to see</p> <p>The comments in section 5 on road safety at the junctions to the villages on the Hinkley Point road need serious consideration. We have to make access to this very dangerous road daily and as our school becomes more popular, more people are at risk.</p>	9839-231-10117	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1148	Public	Stage 2	12. Any other ideas or comments? Why not build a large enough wharf/jetty right at the point which might give access at all states of the tide. I would like to a reduce any further traffic loadings on the roads near Combwich. So the Combwich wharf is a no no.	9906-231-8701		/		
Tractivity 1172	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Get the whole project done as quickly as possible! Keep local people FULLY informed. Use the present helipad at Hinkley - why is there a need for another. Keep drivers of all vehicles aware of not speeding and show tolerance from horseriders and cyclists.	9930-231-125		/		
Tractivity 1174	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below These questions are only the tip of the iceberg. A stage 3 consultation will be necessary to allow EDF to answer the many questions on the project still outstanding. The planned time for construction appears to be widely optimistic in view of the local logistic problems and problems being experienced at other EPR sites under construction.	9932-231-7353			/	
Tractivity 1229	Public	Stage 2 Update	Cheddar is the nearest quarry to the proposed power station, The roads to and from the quarry are extremely narrow and pass very close to many properties. A new access road was proposed some fifteen years ago and designs were shown to those of us who would be directly affected by it, Unfortunately Hansons would not fund it, I believe that this scheme or something similar should be instigated if our quarry is to provide the stone.	89495-231-82			/	
Tractivity 1305	Public	Stage 2 Update	Seems well planned but comment will follow when detailed construction plans are submitted.	89571-231-1924			/	
Tractivity 191	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? So far there is no evidence that any of our concerns that have been raised at Shurton meetings have been considered and that we have actually been actively mislead by the EdF representatives particularly regarding raffic control in the lanes, the use of the fields closest to the villages, the loss of rights of way and especially the potential of a hostel and permanent car park close to Shurton and Wick.	8906-231-6696	/			
Tractivity 202	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? get on with it ASAP	8909-231-4095			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 208	Public	Stage 1	<p>2. Return to land to its previous use Box ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Creation of wildlife habitats Box ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Grassland Box ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Woodland Box ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Any other ideas or comments? Don't use this site at all leave our village alone</p>	8914-231-439	/		/	
Tractivity 230	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Rapacious and brutal.</p>	8931-231-6051			/	
Tractivity 342	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? The Finnish nuclear build is running late because of design and safety problems. Lets hope EDF put the right mix of concrete in! Paramount, must be the safety and well being of the surrounding population in the villages and hamlets. I have read NOTHING which reassures me. EG will the second road access used as an emergency route be used to route site traffic through Shurton adn Burton?</p>	9030-231-6098	/			
Tractivity 384	Public	Stage 1	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments? i do not want to have this site in cannington</p>	9069-231-613			/	
Tractivity 385	Public	Stage 1	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments? i do not want this site in cannington</p>	9070-231-613			/	
Tractivity 391	Public	Stage 1	<p>11. Any other comments? These works should only be undertaken once commitment to proceed has been assured.</p>	9076-231-5722			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 508	Public	Stage 1	I find it sad that both developments of this 'new' reactor (France and Finland) have met with such cost and non conformity problems. If it can not be supervised so that the correct concrete mix is used or that the pipe is not in the right place it does not bode well for Europes largest reactors. Who remembers none stainless bolts in B station fueling m/c or the wrong rubber on the exiter plynth/ stores thought it cheaper!	9180-231-4365			/	
Tractivity 516	Public	Stage 1	I am in favour of the construction of the new station but EDF must be prepared to put the correct infrastructure in place for this major project. The cost of doing what is right will be negligible compared to the income the station will generate during its proposed 60 year life.	9188-231-5109			/	
Tractivity 666	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? The sooner work starts the better for the community and the country.	9329-231-3612			/	
Tractivity 62237	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	There are a few detailed comments which may be of assistance: i) [Section 3] The document needs to recognise the importance of submitting a Construction Environment Management Plan as part of the planning application	9437-231-390	/			
Tractivity 62352	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2) As stated in the attached, we want EDF to confine all of their operations to their own on-site land at Hinkley Point and this to include the construction of a Wharf for the job,	10029-231-2813		/		
Tractivity 62423	Public	Stage 2	Hinkley Point site - EDF already have already have around 266 acres of land at the Hinkley point site including a number of empty, decommissioned buildings. Why do they want to ruin our countryside, our village, our wharf and our lives with the noise, construction, fabrication, traffic, upheaval and pollution when they already have all the facilities they need ON SITE?	10060-231-2590		/		
Tractivity 62437	Public	Stage 2	7. Much of the supporting infrastructure such as the temporary jetty, Cannington bypass and the freight depots are not scheduled to be completed in time for the start of the main construction activities. This is unacceptable as these improvements are required as part of the Transport Strategy mitigation. These works must be completed before works starts on the main construction.	10069-231-3530		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62442	Public	Stage 2	It is simply not acceptable and I find it incredulous that EDF can even consider it when there are acres of land and decommissioned buildings already on the site at Hinkley Point. Your argument about shipping in ALL's and freight via Comwich Wharf because it's not possible to bring them into Hinkley directly is quite pathetic. You are building a 760 metre sea wall and a nuclear power station, for heaven's sake. An on-site wharf would surely be a walk in the park for your engineering masterminds!	10070-231-1672		/		
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	In summary the proposals worry because they seem to be incomplete and at minimal cost to EDF with maximum cost locally. If the budget is so restricted I do not think it is safe to go ahead.	10091-231-12517			/	
Tractivity 62502	Public	Stage 2	As set out in EDF Preferred Proposals Stage 2 there will be no positive impacts for this area. It is crystal clear that building a development on this massive scale is completely unworkable here. It should not be built on green land in an area of small communities serviced by small to medium roads, but on brownfield sites with motorway access. If pursued it will cause untold social and environmental damage. We don't need it. It will only produce 4% of our energy needs if operative. They are costly dirty dinosaurs and a huge waste of money.	10096-231-2764			/	
Tractivity 62554	Public	Stage 2	The fact is that this network of small villages and narrow roads would be devastated by the large scale construction that is planned. The destruction of a green field site and the degradation of the coastline which are part of the Bridgwater Bay SSSI should never have been considered.	10114-231-793			/	
Tractivity 62559	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	We are still not in favour of a new nuclear power station and campus being built at all.	10116-231-0			/	
Tractivity 62572	Public	Stage 2	Any road improvements, by passes and the like should be in place prior to the commencement of construction works.	10123-231-3228		/		
Tractivity 62577	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	- The excuses of energy gap and global warming are not enough to justify a scheme devised apparently in haste for a site which is too small and vulnerable to cope with the scale of the development. "If it were done when 'tis done, then t'were well it were done"...not quickly, but properly, with circumspection and careful contingent development, in such a way that the inevitable trauma to landscape and communities is mitigated not only after but during construction.	10128-231-11688			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62578	Public	Stage 2	I understand Hinkley C is going to be 7 times the size of the original Hinkley A, something you fail to mention in your Summary and which I find extremely worrying, especially when your project at Flamanville in France has been a series of disasters and the EPR system that you're planning to build at C is virtually untested,	10129-231-586			/	
Tractivity 62578	Public	Stage 2	If you are talking about the refurbishment of the Comwich Wharf, why, when you are planning to build a 760 metre sea wall at Hinkley, together with a "temporary jetty", don't you reinforce that wall and jetty to enable the delivery of ALL materials directly to Hinkley Point? You are afterall building a nuclear power station which will, I trust, be strong enough to withstand a terrorist attack? Reinforcing a sea wall and jetty to withstand heavy goods should be pretty standard stuff?	10129-231-2705		/		
Tractivity 62583	Public	Stage 2	8. If the IPC decision is favourable to EDF, your present intention is to start the construction work at Hinkley before any bypass is built - and indeed before the new Comwich wharf is built. The consequence would be that all the construction and other traffic to Hinkley, including plant and building materials, would pass along the existing route through the village for a period which has been estimated at 15 months but (since road building projects tend to overrun) might very well be substantially longer.	10134-231-3132		/		
Tractivity 62597	Public	Stage 2	4/8/10 - to (personal details removed) - Still patiently awaiting a reply to my question. It has been noted throughout Stogursey Parish that there appears to be a pattern emerging of a certain reluctance on the part of EDF to provide written answers to questions/queries connected with Stage 2. Delightful as it may be, an invitation to coffee and an informal chat is hardly a substitute for a definitive written reply. It rather begs the question as to how the IPC might view such paper-trails indicating the lack of written answers to legitimate requests when it comes to scrutinise the SOCC.	10145-231-0			/	
Tractivity 62600	Public	Stage 2	disappointment that 'EdF had built the temporary badger setts in the wrong place, and that they had to be removed. What confidence does this give the public, that we (EdF). will build the Nuclear Reactors in the right place'	10148-231-80			/	
Tractivity 62671	Public	Stage 2	EDF are building a 760 metre long sea wall at Hinkley. They already have around 266 acres of land at the Hinkley Point site including a number of empty, decommissioned buildings. Why do they want to ruin our countryside, our village, our wharf and our lives with their noise, construction, fabrication, traffic, upheaval and pollution when they already have all the facilities they need on site?	10180-231-5838		/		
Fiddington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	There is no doubt that the construction and operation of Hinkley Point C will involve considerable disruption and inconvenience to local people.	10223-231-3217			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62418	Public	Stage 2	<p>Dear Ross Care to comment? All the best Lesley</p> <p>Problems With Flamanville EPR Liner</p> <p>By (personal details removed) - Aug 30, 201010:32 AM GMT+0100</p> <p>Electricite de France SA, Europe's biggest power producer, experienced renewed problems with welding quality at the EPR nuclear reactor being built in Normandy, according France's nuclear safety agency. Faults in welds of the containment liner of the Flamanville EPR, the utility's first in France, were found during an inspection in July, the Autorite de Surete Nucleaire said in an Aug. 27 report on its website. EDF officials weren't immediately available for a comment.</p> <p>"Welding difficulties caused by the ergonomics of the welder's post" were the cause of similar problems at the building site in 2008 and 2009 and treatment by EDF "was not performed correctly," according to the report. The agency also said EDF was slow in detecting "inferior weld quality." EDF's EPR, which was designed by Areva SA, is considered key to the utility's ability to export nuclear technology to other countries. Earlier this month, EDF was asked for modifications of the control platform on the reactor, which is delayed and will cost more than expected.</p> <p>EDF is developing a similar model in Taishan, China, and plans more in Italy, the U.K. and U.S. The state- controlled operator of France's 58 nuclear reactors in July said the Normandy reactor will cost 5 billion euros to develop, about 50 percent more than initially estimated, and will be delayed by about two years to 2014. Pierced Concrete</p> <p>The agency also said a worker at the EPR site "partially pierced" a concrete block which contained a 400,000-volt cable for one of Flamanville's other reactors. The reactor was shut for refuelling at the time and had enough emergency supply, the agency said, citing "lack of information" and "poor identification of the cable" as the reasons for the incident.</p> <p>The EPR, which was rejected the United Arab Emirates in a \$20 billion nuclear order last year, was criticized for its "complexity" in a government-sponsored report this year. EDF has said the delay and cost overruns are because the reactor is a "first-of-a-kind" even as Areva experiences its own delays and budget overruns buildingan EPR in Finland.</p>	89468-231-4706			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	<p>i) incorporate contingency plans for things going wrong and needing to be done again as has been the case at the EPR build in both Finland and France. The major problems over there demonstrated your inability to ensure proper construction and therefore similar circumstances are likely to apply to this project. We have lost the expertise to build nuclear power stations in this country so such assumptions of problems must be built in to the proposals with a contingency estimated percentage of materials that may need to be removed from site as waste and brought in as replacements by road. With no track record of EPR projects going like clockwork, omitting contingency plans is reckless</p>	89470-231-4369			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	y) By pushing forward aggressively with your plans to undertake site preparation and preliminary works prior to consents being obtained for the whole concept, EDF have fundamentally lost support and trust in the community. You cannot restore ancient landscape once it has been vandalised. No clearance should be done prior to these consents. By arguing that it puts you in a position to start construction as soon as the go-ahead is given with the minimum inconvenience to the local community to meet an artificial timeline worries me no end.	89470-231-9246			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	If you were so concerned about inconveniencing the local population you'd build bypasses first. It is precisely by rushing into things that resulted in the problems at Olkiluoto 3 in Finland. This panic to get going will result in corners being cut and the whole project bodged. It does not inspire confidence. I'm going to have inconvenience and stress and additional costs whatever you do and I'd rather you took the time to get your plans straight first before devastating an existing landscape and ecosystem, evicting badgers and chopping down irreplaceable ancient hedgerows and trees, destroying archaeological artefacts, etc.	89470-231-9788			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	b) Building two EPRs at the same time is far too big a proposal. The scale of building one in a rural area is unacceptable, let alone two.	89472-231-0			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	k) A risk assessment/survey for UXO has not been done. Considering a jetty is planned and critical water intake pipes going out into the Bristol Channel, some indication of awareness should have been included in their proposals considering there are all sorts of other surveys. Its omission indicates a rather worrying complacent attitude to safety already. It is not just the usual case that there is a possibility of old World War II unexploded ordnance out there in the Bristol Channel, but the threat from the anti-tank bar mines and 20 Swingfire missile warheads that QinetiQ lost near Weston-super-Mare only a few years ago that would have probably worked their way downstream. Considering the extensive man-hours and resources expended trying to find the things, they must have posed a considerable threat beyond those of an older vintage. They may be viewed as no hazard to shipping but piling into the sediment is something different.	89472-231-11696			/	
Otterhampton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We are surprised at this proposal as we are advised by those involved in the construction industry that fabrication normally takes place at the construction site. It makes sense that large fabricated structures should be put together as near as possible to where they are going to be used, rather than clogging up already busy roads by transporting them to the site. It is worth noting that all fabrication was on site during the construction of Hinkley B.	89266-231-509	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Much of the proposed off-site mitigation infrastructure is planned to be built in parallel with the on-site works, meaning that for several years these measures will not be effective. SPC requires that, in common with other major construction projects, all infrastructure improvement work is complete before the main construction phase commences.	89288-231-3227		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Timetable: This shows the construction to be 10 years, which is what SPC has always said it would be despite EDF protestations at many meetings of shorter timescales. This period does not include the reinstatement for which there is no timetable.	89289-231-256			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[3.2.1] The construction programme assumes the Enabling Works starts summer 2010.' Since this has not been achieved, will EDF say what the programme will now be?	89291-231-8053	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[7.3.41] States that the off-site developments will only be complete by 2016, five entire years after the project has started. This is simply not acceptable. In common with other major developments such as T5 and the Olympic Site, all infrastructure works planned which will affect any traffic movements to the site must be complete before main construction starts. Will EDF reconsider their programme to ensure the infrastructure is complete before main construction starts?	89292-231-5386		/		
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	15.5 Careful consideration must be given to the phasing of the development in terms of the delivery of necessary infrastructure with reference to the construction timetable for the development and the preliminary works. The proposed phasing should be clearly set out with the effects and impacts of "what if" scenarios clearly shown.	89446-231-1763	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	In addition the authorities require further details on the approach and strategy for construction logistics for the project, which provides the basis for identifying EDF Energy's preferred approach to the location, distribution, size and intended use of associated development sites.	89296-231-3365	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There were three main areas of deficiency at Stage 1 that the local authorities were seeking further evidence at Stage 2: How sites for associated development have been selected and what criteria and techniques have been used to select sites. The approach and strategy for construction logistics for the project, that provides the basis for identifying EDF Energy's preferred approach to the location, distribution, size and intended use of associated development sites.	89318-231-11179	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	In addition the authorities require: The approach and strategy for construction logistics for the project, that provides the basis for identifying EDF Energy's preferred approach to the location, distribution, size and intended use of associated development sites;	89324-231-4717	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	A detailed construction strategy for the project did not form part of the Stage 1 consultation document to help understand the number of off- site associated development sites, the overall area required for construction related activities, the optimum location for these sites to minimise traffic related impacts and how the sites will link together as part of a coherent construction strategy for the project. The strategy should consider sustainability and environmental objectives; the benefits of concentrating facilities within a smaller number of sites Update September 2010: A detailed construction strategy has not been prepared however EDF Energy has provided further information on associated development proposals as part of Stage 2.	89325-231-4542	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The authorities however continue to have concerns regarding the appropriateness of the associated development proposals and whether or not what is presented does represent the optimum location.	89325-231-5299	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	the authorities continue to urge EDF to provide further detail and reassurance that an appropriate level of engagement on procurement, supply chain and skills development will be undertaken as soon as possible;	89329-231-16606	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>The principle of development for a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point C is driven fundamentally by national policy, as set out in draft National Planning Statement EN-6. This policy document lists Hinkley Point C as a site, following the Strategic Siting Assessment, as being potentially suitable for the deployment of a new nuclear power station by the end of 2025 (para. 5.1.1).</p> <p>The development of new nuclear capacity at Hinkley Point C does benefit from the precedent of a previous Inspector's recommendation that consent should be granted. In 1990, the Public Inquiry summary report by Michael Barnes QC examined four main issues relating to: (i) the need for major new generating capacity; (ii) economic and associated matters and government policy; (iii) safety and the effect on health of the proposed Pressurised Water Reactor (PWR); and (iv) the local and environmental effects of the proposed PWR. The report concluded that the Secretary of State for Energy should grant conditional consent under s36 of the Electricity Act 1989 for the extension of the Hinkley Point nuclear power stations by the construction of an additional PWR generating station.</p> <p>It should be recognised that the proposals of the CEGB in the late 1980s differed in many respects to the proposals that are currently the subject of consultation by EDF Energy. The main differences are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One reactor was proposed by CEGB with different technologies (PWR) compared to two reactors by EDF Energy with UK EPR nuclear reactor technology. The scale and visual impact of the current proposals are therefore greater than the proposals of the 1980s. The current proposals require the high level radioactive waste to be stored on site for at least 160 years. The storage of this type of waste on site for this length of time was not a feature of the 1980s proposals. Any proposals for supporting infrastructure, training, skills development and procurement were backed up through funding from government. This included a commitment to provide a Bridgwater bypass which was considered necessary to mitigate the traffic impacts within Bridgwater. The current proposals are being taken forward by the private sector with no guarantee of funding for essential supporting infrastructure and for training and skill development initiatives. 	89333-231-5384			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Mitigation measure such as good standard working methods which will be adopted via and EMMP must be validated/audited as happening on site.	89427-231-10297			/	
Tractivity 62907	Public	Stage 2 Update	3. Bring in ALL your materials by sea at a Hinkley Point pier and avoid any lorries on the roads	89662-231-1212		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62913	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>Hinklev Point C: Consultation on 'Update on and Proposed Changes to Preferred Proposals' Questionnaire March 2011</p> <p>1. Do you have any comments on our proposals for the workforce and for employment, skills and business engagement?</p> <p>EDF state that 25% of the 20,000-25,000 individual jobs provided over the lifetime of the construction period will go to local people. This is a disappointing proportion and means that 75% of the 20,000-25,000 jobs will go to workers from within and outside of the United Kingdom, a significant need for temporary accommodation in a rural area. It was said that no contracts have been awarded as yet, there is no information about how the number of foreign workers, for whom English is not their first language, will be supported and helped to integrate within the local community nor how the same communities can facilitate this process in the best interests of all involved.</p> <p>2. Do you have any comments on our updated accommodation proposals?</p> <p>EDF say that they will facilitate the development of some permanent housing but do not say whether this housing will be for local residents or workers moving in to the area. At every consultation to date the residents of Cannington have said that residential accommodation for workers is not wanted in the village. EDF have not named Cannington as a village where workers are to be housed in the February 2011 consultation update document. If there are plans for Cannington Court shouldn't these be included in this consultation document? Could it be that EDF, Bridgwater College and SDC have already made their plans on accommodation sites but failed to take into account residents views and intend to sneak in through the 'back door'? If so the notion of 'consultation' is purely paying patronising 'lip service.'</p> <p>3. Do you have any comments on our proposed community mitigation and benefits?</p> <p>How can the storage of radioactive fuel on site at Hinkley for at least 160 years be a benefit to the community and how can such a hazardous proposal be mitigated? The community fund is to be increased from £1m to £20m. Where has this money suddenly come from? How is it to be spent? Who will decide? No amount of money can mitigate long term storage of hazardous waste not only for us but for our children and grandchildren. EDF say that they will facilitate the development of some permanent housing but do not say whether this housing will be for local residents or workers moving in to the area. There are many processes to be followed before any permanent housing can be developed, no timetable nor further details have been given that demonstrate any commitment by EDF to local people in housing need.</p>	89665-231-0			/	
Tractivity 62927	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>- Workforce Numbers. Do the workforce numbers on site that we have quoted (5600 at peak et al) include the administrative and support personnel that will be required to service the on site campus, for example?</p>	89672-231-355			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62955	Public	Stage 2 Update	You are proposing to spend billions of pounds on a project and EDF are like headless chickens - none of you seem to have a clue how this project will be carried out.	89683-231-2260			/	
Mendip District Council	Local authority	Stage 2 Update	The consultation document says that it is not at present possible to identify exactly where materials will come from and who will supply them. East Mendip has a thriving aggregates industry with a number of active quarries. The council suggests that there is a strong probability that a substantial amount of materials will come from this area.	89738-231-3318			/	
15	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	We were, (Editor's note: information redacted) completely unaware of EDF's intention to commence building all proposed infrastructure at once, before obtaining full planning permission.	89804-231-93			/	
Highways Agency	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	3.9 Paragraph 2.1.7 of the Draft Accommodation Strategy document indicates that during the life of the construction period between 20,000 and 25,000 people will be employed. Given the 'detailed studies' that have been undertaken to establish worker numbers this 25% difference in upper and lower employment levels seems extremely large at this late stage in the process. The Agency expects EDF Energy to have a significantly greater understanding of worker levels for the construction at this stage in the project. The Agency has assumed that the peak construction worker figure of 5,600 is based upon the need for 25,000 total workers, although this is not clear from the documentation provided and as such clarification is sought.	89838-231-3986	/			
Highways Agency	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	3.52 Figure 4.4 Strategic programme appears to show that not all construction facilities will be available by the time the main construction period starts i.e. temporary jetty, Combech Wharf, freight management facilities and accommodation campuses. Clarification is needed on the strategic programme to understand how this will impact on the construction programme and the subsequent affect on vehicle movements. For example the temporary jetty and associated facilities is stated as being operational from late 2012 subject to receiving planning permission. However in the earlier FMS received internally the date stated in early 2013. This should be clarified.	89840-231-2818	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	2.127 Figure 4.4 Strategic programme appears to show that not all construction facilities will be available by the time the main construction period starts i.e. temporary jetty, Combech Wharf, freight management facilities, accommodation campuses. Clarification is needed on the strategic programme to understand how this will impact on the construction programme and the subsequent affect on vehicle movements. For example the temporary jetty and associated facilities is stated as being operational from late 2012 subject to receiving planning permission. However in the earlier FMS received internally the date stated in early 2013. This should be clarified.	89848-231-5719	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	2.134 Para 6.3.1. Further detail of the constraints and contractual requirements to be imposed on contractors will need to be agreed to provide us with confidence of the robustness of the control arrangements. This matter has been discussed in some detail at previous meetings and both authorities have made it clear that detail of contractual arrangements will be required.	89848-231-8683		/		
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	There are some elements of this updated consultation that go some small way towards addressing some of the key issues raised by SPC during the Stage 2 consultation, and these are welcomed. However these few positive elements are completely overwhelmed by the massive negative impacts of the proposed increase in working hours, the additional 1.1 million tonnes of material to be imported to site, and the increase in the numbers of workers. So it seems to be one small step forward and several very large steps back.	89871-231-1134			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1.1 [2.2.1] The proposed programme starting with preliminary works in spring 2011 is not achievable as the preliminary works application will not be in front of WSC Planning Committee until the summer. The rest of the programme assumes three-shift working, which is completely unacceptable.	89872-231-2307			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1.5 [4.1.11] How will planning approval be given for all of the temporary buildings around the construction site, given that they will be provided by the contractors, who have not yet been selected?	89872-231-3123		/		
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1.11 [4.1.42] States that appropriate granular backfill may need to be imported. When will EDF know whether this will be necessary, and what volumes are likely to be involved?	89872-231-4904		/		
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1.116 [4.3.25-28] It is not clear from these paragraphs how traffic will gain access for the construction of the Bum Brook crossing and junction with Shurton Road. Elsewhere in 2a, it is suggested that this access will be via Shurton Road. This is unacceptable as this road is entirely unsuitable for the type and volume of traffic proposed. All access must be via the main construction site using the proposed temporary access road.	89872-231-5570		/		
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.6.3 [6.3.2] It is not clear why the high standards required by the nuclear industry in itself produces more waste. If materials are correctly specified and delivered to the specification, then waste volumes should be no greater.	89872-231-19754			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	<p>10.1.4 Legacy Use</p> <p>Insufficient information is available within the Consultation: Update on and Proposed Changes to 'Preferred Proposals' Document to confirm whether valuable and sustainable legacy uses could be provided post construction. The principle of permanent development associated with the temporary accommodation campus would not be supported, and the position of West Somerset Council is that the site would need to be restored for agricultural or suitable community use immediately following the cessation of use as a construction site. The provision and retention of the landscaping is supported and the Council will wish to consult the local community on appropriate legacy uses of the campus site that are appropriate to the rural setting. These might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - integrating the public rights of way (PROW) with the visitor centre proposal (outlined in the Stage 2 consultation); - establishment of Community woodland which would address the Council's green infrastructure objectives through their respective emerging Core Strategies; and - improvements in the wider area and proposals associated with the Steart Coastal Management Project. 	89897-231-4209			/	
41	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2 Update	<p>The review of the Finish and France projects for the EPRs suggest there are possible omissions in the total project impact from all physical and emission changes. Bringing all related works into the planning process including the National Grid work is logical.</p> <p>There is more anecdotal information suggesting the timeline will be longer than EDF advocate to 2017/2018 because there can be insufficient time contingencies in the schedules of Areva and others including EDF.</p> <p>A RASP type review of strategic, planning and political risks identifies the loss of the CEBG exposed the UK to fragmented and incomplete processes for the nuclear and large project impacts. This omission of an authority with oversight of design and implementation is very significant. The privatisation of the power sector with the removal of CEBG is a significant loss to the controls and validation / verification oversight processes that were in place for the first and second nuclear build programmes / projects.</p> <p>It is hoped this project can be paced after risks and designs are more fully assessed and analysed and agreed with competence. Currently the CEBG competencies are not being applied. Coordination is not to required standards compared with the CEBG approaches.</p>	89910-231-377			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>[5.6.7] 'Greatest potential for noise disturbance will be during preparation and renewal phase. Such activities will be temporary, intermittent and restricted to day time construction hours only.' The use of the word temporary here is disingenuous, considering the scale of the work, which could last for many months. Will EDF say how long these temporary periods will be?</p> <p>[5.6.8] 'Some activities will have to be undertaken at night. Potential noise impacts are not expected to generate internal noise levels to cause sleep disturbance.' This presumably assumes closed windows, which during the summer months is not reasonable, as it is often necessary to have windows open for ventilation. Will EDF define what works are necessary and when, and will they say what mitigation measures will be put in place?</p>	89293-225-11748	/			
Tractivity 1091	Public	Stage 2	it is concerning from a safety aspect that 2 nuclear reactors are being built in such close succession, having not been done in Britain before. With rising tides, threats of terrorism and unclear waste management - what a terrible legacy for our children?s future.	9849-41-13993			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1.13 [4.3.8] Will the tunnel lining sections be made on site? If not they must be a priority for delivery by sea due to their volume.	89872-1452-5157			/	
Tractivity 1447	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	We are now told that EDF will build a new station "when the uk needs it". This means there will be plenty of time to build the road before the power station is constructed.	90021-231-186			/	
Tractivity 1449	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	(Personal information removed) has recently announced that EDF?s plans to build the reactors will be indefinitely delayed. So EDF can no longer claim that the building of a haul road would delay the project: there will be plenty of time.	90023-231-520			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	There should be no vehicles working in the watercourses and any work that may need to take place to install bridges should be done in the dry by using coffer dams to redirect the watercourse. Fuel containers/vehicle storage areas should be sited away from the watercourses and be bunded where appropriate. Land drainage consent will need to be applied for when any construction work is carried out in or within 8m of a main river.	88820-1782-4593	/			Responses by statutory and non-statutory consultees focused on the proposed culverting of Holford stream – noting that this must be robustly justified, designed to avoid increasing flood risk and with appropriate access for maintenance and consideration of ecology, including the impact on the Wick Moor SSSI downstream, and with operation and maintenance secured by perpetual agreement. Regarding the construction of the bridge over Bum Brook, advice was given that work should be carried out in the dry by use of coffer dams where necessary.
Parrett Internal Drainage Board	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Culverting of the Holford Stream This portion of the Holford Stream is within the Boards area and culverting of the stream will require consent from the Board. Culverting of the Holford stream has been discussed in significant detail previously and the principle is acceptable to the Board because EDF has assured the Boards officers that this can be undertaken without increased flood risk. It has recently been drawn to our attention in the revised Flood Risk Assessment that whilst the culvert can be designed so as not to increase the risk of fluvial flooding, there may be some increased risk if a breach of the tidal defences was to occur. The Board would wish for a satisfactory solution to be implemented to this problem to enable it to grant consent for the culvert.	10189-1782-1052	/			Significant works affecting watercourses are proposed within the Hinkley Point C development site (HPC development site). Principal among these are the permanent culverting of the west-east running Holford stream and the accompanying raising of the Holford valley itself, necessary to establish areas for construction laydown and spoil storage in association with establishing ground levels for the proposed power station. Further justification for the culvert is that it would negate the requirement to transport excess spoil material away from the site which would place a significant burden on the local road network.
Parrett Internal Drainage Board	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	In addition the future operation and maintenance of the culvert will need to be secured with EDF in perpetuity through a legal agreement as a condition of the consent.	10189-1782-1834	/			The other watercourse which would be directly impacted by the development is the small HPC Drainage Ditch which runs south-north from Green Lane ridge to the foreshore approximately in the middle of the permanent HPC development site. It is proposed that this ditch will be removed to establish ground levels necessary to build the power station. Further to the south at Shurton, Bum Brook has the potential to be impacted by the construction of a new bridge necessary to connect the emergency access road from the site to the public highway at Shurton.
Parrett Internal Drainage Board	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	This site is within the Boards boundary. Within this area the board have jurisdiction over matters relating to all Ordinary Watercourses. Should the development proceed to the next stage we would wish for suitable surface water strategies to be developed to ensure that land in and adjacent to these areas can continue to drain to a standard at least as good as that which exists currently. This will require surface water run off to be managed and for drainage features to be maintainable.	10189-1782-3519			/	In response to the consultation comments, discussions have taken place with key parties over the justification for culverting Holford Stream and the lack of alternatives. Land would be required in this area for construction laydown and to accommodate spoil which would otherwise need to be dispatched from the site via the road network. The permanent culvert would also be necessary to accommodate spoil into the final landscape restoration scheme, again negating the need to transport large amounts of material off site. Given human, ecological and landscape sensitivities south, east and west of the site, Holford valley is the only available area to accommodate these construction uses.
Parrett Internal Drainage Board	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	I can confirm that Land Drainage Consent will be required from the Board for any modifications to the Channel or works within 9m Metres.	10189-1782-4527			/	With regard to maintaining water flow, quality and the
Parrett Internal Drainage Board	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	I am pleased that maintenance is recognised as an important aspect of any future culvert and that the design will ensure that it is suitable for machine entry into a confined space. Through the Land Drainage Consent process we will expect to be consulted over the detailed design and will seek to recover our costs associated with our input to this and drawing up the necessary legal agreements from EDF.	10189-1782-4668			/	
Parrett Internal Drainage Board	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	I understand that the culvert will also be sized to accommodate future flows and there will be no increase in future fluvial flood risk as a consequence.	10189-1782-5461			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>Issue: Main site culvert designs do not incorporate ecological factors.</p> <p>Comment: The report does not mention the design of the culvert structure. It would be advisable to build a cylindrical culvert with a walkway. This can be beneficial for both wildlife and of ease of shifting potential debris.</p> <p>Action: Biodiversity issues need to be incorporated into design proposals need to take into account biodiversity issues.</p>	89076-1782-823	/			ability to ensure ease of maintenance, the Holford stream culvert will be sized accordingly and measures will be employed to ensure harmful impacts on the Wick Moor Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) are avoided. These measures will be authorised and controlled via the Site Preparation Planning Application and Land Drainage Consent from the Parrett Internal Drainage Board.
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>Issue: Design proposals do not reflect biodiversity issues within the area.</p> <p>Comment: The use of a culvert bridge needs to be reviewed. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges clearly points out that culverts are not suitable where otters occur unless they are oversized and provided on both sides with ledges. Otters frequent almost all suitable habitats in Somerset and the likelihood of otters using this site is acknowledged in para 3.10.148. A clear span bridge which allowed for otter passage along top of bank on both sides would be acceptable. As it is likely that this road will take considerable traffic we would also expect to see proposals for mammal passes which could be used by a variety of species. These are easy to provide in new build and complex to retrofit. If this is not possible because of the proximity of the roundabout, the route of the proposed flood relief channel needs to be justified in this location. There would appear to be other routes for the flood channel which have not been considered. Further to this provision should be made for mammal passes under the access for the park and ride which could reduce the risk of road kill</p> <p>Action: Proposals should incorporate how biodiversity factors are incorporated into the designs of the proposal.</p>	89084-1782-3152	/			The bridge over Bum Brook would be constructed to avoid impacts on flow rates and water quality and would be subject to Drainage Consent from the Environment Agency.
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>Topic: Design proposals and the use of culverts</p> <p>Issue: Design proposals heavily rely upon the use of culverts. We need to see design justification as to why this option was selected.</p> <p>Comment: The Environment Agency's has a national position against the use of culverts except for exceptional circumstances. We would therefore expect design proposals to explore alternatives to culverting, (such as clear span bridges). Where culverts can be justified the design of the culverts will need to be assessed to ensure the most sustainable choice of culvert design has been selected.</p> <p>Action: Design justification is required to be included within the proposals for development. We should be consulted upon the use and type of culverts .</p>	89087-1782-3346	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Natural England	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>The Holford Stream and the Bum Brook flow into a ditch system to the South East of the development site which is designated as an SSSI. Interest features associated with these designations include plant and invertebrate communities. The Conservation Objectives for the SSSI identify that increases in sediment loading, conductivity and phosphorous (P) concentrations, and contamination by toxic substances, could lead to significant adverse effects. Concentrations of P greater than 0.1mg total phosphorus/l will lead to the SSSI being in unfavourable condition. Changes in water level could also be critical to the designated interest features.</p> <p>The assessment should consider the implications of the development in terms of water level and water quality/chemistry within the SSSI ditch system. Whilst Natural England can comment on the biological implications of predicted changes on the SSSI ditch system, we are reliant on the Environment Agency to ensure the appropriateness and validity of the hydrological characterisations and modelling undertaken, leading up to these predictions, and the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures.</p> <p>The principles described above also apply to proposals considered in Volume 3.</p>	89100-1782-6720	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>- Holford Stream culverting; it is current industry best practice to avoid culverting wherever feasible, a stance promoted by the Environment Agency. It is unclear whether any alternatives to the proposed culverting have been appraised and there is no evidence of an analysis of options. Culverting should be considered as the least preferred option for dealing with the watercourse.</p>	89408-1782-9976		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Homes & Communities Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	- Impact on neighbouring properties The Stage 1 consultation indicates that disturbance to neighbouring residents during the construction phase will be minimised. Increased traffic during construction and operation may have adverse effects on the neighbourhood and the landscape, including, for example, noise, light and dust pollution that can affect tranquillity. Further details need to be supplied including limiting hours of construction working, routes for delivery and construction traffic and so on.	8694-236-5481	/			The majority of the consultation responses concerned the revised proposal to extend working hours, highlighting the impacts on traffic, noise, light and tranquillity, especially if implemented before the proposed road improvements. A number of consultees commented that these substantially changed the impacts in these respects. The proposed working hours and overall programme for the HPC site are described in the Construction Method Statement. Whilst the preliminary works will be undertaken during the daytime with a single shift, experience from other sites has shown that multiple shifts would be required to secure the build schedule during the main construction works. In order to minimise the need for night working, it is proposed to introduce double day shift working shortly after the start of the main works. A limited night shift is proposed to undertake preparatory and maintenance work as well as to cater for periods of continuous working such as large concrete pours and undersea tunnelling works. In order to reduce overnight noise impacts on local residents, the nature and location of night activities will be restricted so that noisier activities and many activities in the southern part of the site only take place during the dayshifts.
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The Agency supports the measure to move workers to and from the construction site outside peak traffic hours; however, the applicant must demonstrate that there is not a significant negative impact on the network at other times of the day linked to the development proposals, in accordance with policy.	88860-236-8679			/	
Tractivity 746	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Wish you luck for speedy construction but not at expense of local people's lives, or wildlife or vegetation.	9504-236-1998-a			/	
Tractivity 746	Public	Stage 2	The jetty is a good idea but minimise the period when there is no access along the north coast of site. A round walk is a pleasure and you are taking it away. Give positive though to what else you could bring in via the jetty.	9504-236-1998-b			/	
Tractivity 746	Public	Stage 2	Preliminary works should not disturb local people at night	9504-236-1998-c		/		The proposed site working hours would not affect the numbers of workers required to undertake the works and would therefore not affect the worker accommodation capacity required. The working hours have been taken into account in the environmental assessment and the impacts on wildlife are described in Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement.
Tractivity 1005	Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments? Reason - times of movement should be between 6AM and 6PM as outside of this time would have major impact on the local people's sleep and quality of life. * Written letter to me giving actual times you propose before any agreement. if don't agree opportunity to change them (not done and dusted)	9763-236-2630	/			The proposals for 11-day and 12-day working fortnights (one each in a four-week period) are intended to reduce the work on site for one weekend in two and enable workers who live far away to return home once a fortnight. The regular weekly shift pattern is judged more attractive to home-based workers. EDF will be responsible for managing the balance of working patterns through agreements with the relevant contractors.
Tractivity 1185	Public	Stage 2	9a. Any other ideas or comments? Shifts would need to be timed to avoid peak times when Bridgwater is going in and out 8-10am and 4-5.30pm.	9943-236-4473	/			The proposed shift times, together with the permitted variation in start and finish times have been chosen in order to limit peak traffic levels on the local roads and avoid existing peak traffic times as far as possible.
Tractivity 1185	Public	Stage 2	9b. Any other ideas or comments? See above	9943-236-4749	/			The traffic associated with the use of the park and ride sites was also taken into account in this optimisation. The measures to manage traffic levels would help to limit the impact on local traffic associated with the

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1185	Public	Stage 2	9c. Any other ideas or comments? Ideal for workers whose work patterns would not be conducive to avoiding peak times.	9943-236-4876	/			<p>settlements along the roads to the site. The assessment of impacts is provided in the relevant chapters of the Transport Assessment and the Environmental Statement. The Framework Travel Plan further describes how worker transport would be managed, including the use of park and ride, campus buses, long distance buses and public transport.</p> <p>Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) traffic on the local roads into and out of the site is limited to 07:00 to 22:00 Monday to Saturday with no HGVs on Sundays. In addition, limits are placed on the number of HGVs travelling these roads during peak hours as described in the Freight Management Strategy. This also shows the projected profile of freight traffic over time, with the jetty and Cannington bypass being completed well ahead of the traffic peak. In view of this, it is judged inappropriate to delay the start of the main construction works until the jetty and Cannington bypass are complete, with a consequent prolongation of the overall construction period.</p> <p>The associated developments (freight management facilities, park and ride sites and accommodation campuses) are designed to support the proposed shift patterns and travel plans.</p> <p>The construction lighting necessary for night time working will be designed in accordance with the Construction Lighting Strategy. This specifically limits the lighting levels to those necessary for safe implementation of the work and restricts light spill, which could adversely impact off-site receptors. Impacts on local receptors will be further reduced by the site topography and the early landscaping, which will introduce additional visual screening.</p>
Tractivity 1234	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Any arrangement of working hours will have an impact on the village of Cannington and surrounding areas. A given workforce, the size required to build the power station, is naturally going to impact however much you juggle the working times. So needs some more carefull thought.	89500-236-968		/		
Tractivity 1236	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? I don?t fully understand them, but it sounds like it would have a worse impact on local villages and roads	89502-236-290			/	
Tractivity 1238	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? FAR Too long - weekends should be reduced	89504-236-559		/		
Tractivity 1242	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Envisage that traffic at shift changes will render it virtually impossible to leave and access Stockland Bristol between 6.00am - 8.30am and 1.30 - 7.00pm... and again difficult to access the village between 8.30 - 10.00pm and leave from 10.00pm - 12 noon (without taking into account HGV traffic to and from site). Suggest it is essential that traffic control signals are installed to operate at peak times.	89508-236-318		/		
Tractivity 1243	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Impinging on villages (day and night use of park and ride, and local roads). Can be avoided (as also delays for your workers) by direct access road from M5 J23 area.	89509-236-167		/		
Tractivity 1244	Public	Stage 2 Update	Working hours should not affect anyone provided it is looked at fairly (Sundays should be carefully thought about)	89510-236-1628			/	
Tractivity 1249	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Various shift patterns will make A39/C182 almost unusable for local traffic.	89515-236-397			/	
Tractivity 1255	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? yes 5 shifts are 3 too many. Meaning much too much intereference!	89521-236-510			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1259	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? It may shorten the construction timeline but will also produce a significant environmental impact.	89525-236-617			/	
Tractivity 1262	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q1 Do you have any comments on our proposals for the workforce and for employment, skills and business engagement? Pleased for employment opportunities for Somerset personnel. Unhappy with potential of 24 hour working as i live down wind of noise/dust/light pollution	89528-236-0			/	
Tractivity 1262	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? If working hours are increased it will be difficult to relax (sleep) particularly as I live on downwind side of Hinkley C resulting in reduced quality of life.	89528-236-747			/	
Tractivity 1266	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? We are also opposed to the proposed new shift hours and feel that there will be noise from construction and traffic day and night.	89532-236-394			/	
Tractivity 1270	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? No comment as long as EDF will ensure the night-time construction work will not cause insurmountable environmental impacts, noise and dust nuisance to the local communities.	89536-236-594			/	
Tractivity 1276	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Cannot see any benefits	89542-236-368			/	
Tractivity 1277	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? The amendments to shift start and finish times, together with the existing times A and B shift changes, leaves very little time during the day when the C182 will not have Hinkley Point ttraffic on it. This will make entry and exit to/from Stockland Bristol even hazardous than at present.	89543-236-1104			/	
Tractivity 1282	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Could cause ?pinch points? which are difficult to see (?) at this point in time. Flexibility aagain is key.	89548-236-737			/	
Tractivity 1286	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Hours of work are in line with EU rules no problems	89552-236-795			/	
Tractivity 1287	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Yes - I live very near to the site and downwind of it - night work would be	89553-236-			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			unbearable.	627				
Tractivity 1288	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Work has to be done get on with it!	89554-236-326			/	
Tractivity 1294	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? As I live across the common half a mile upwind of the powerstations, both noise and light are going to be an imposition at all times. I therefore do not require them working OVERNIGHT OR AT WEEKENDS.	89560-236-823		/		
Tractivity 1297	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Contract companies should be limited to working within reasonable working hours- no night or weekend working.	89563-236-311		/		
Tractivity 1297	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? I think that the proposed 24/7 hour working pattern is outrageous. Local residents will get NO respite from the noise of the machinery and traffic going to and from the site. The shift change over at midnight means that the traffic on the roads for half an hour either side will be terrible as workers rush home. I live on the lane in Shurton and will not be able to have windows open in the warmer months as the noise from the continuous working and traffic will prevent me from sleeping. I feel that the change from silence at night to constant traffic and machinery flouts basic human rights, as it will seem like a form of torture being unable to rest at night or spend time in our gardens at weekends.	89563-236-2145		/		
Tractivity 1299	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? I agree with your proposal of double shifts initially, so that Hinkley C can be built as quickly as possible to lessen the length of construction impact on local residents.	89565-236-2028			/	
Tractivity 1300	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Around the clock onsite working means around the clock working at the Cannington park and ride which will create noise and light nuisance.	89566-236-1735			/	
Tractivity 1301	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Totally unacceptable. The original proposal of a double shift was unsatisfactorybut this coupled with plans for extended shifts plus a night-	89567-236-1174			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			time shift 24/7 for 8/9 years is OUTRAGEOUS.					
Tractivity 1302	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Yes, too much traffic created.	89568-236-357			/	
Tractivity 1303	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Only to say that the pattern proposed is only that, and that operational programmes during construction will vary these proposals considerably, particularly if the whole programme slips.	89569-236-1248			/	
Tractivity 1305	Public	Stage 2 Update	The shift handover between 1.30 and 4.00pm will coincide with the ?school run?. The earlier proposals between 2.00 and 3.00 would be preferable	89571-236-876		/		
Tractivity 1306	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Good if they work out	89572-236-305			/	
Tractivity 1310	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	We have some concerns about night and early morning shifts regarding traffic movement especially through the villages. But this will be subject to nmbers and we do understand the need to get the job done asap.	89576-236-1517			/	
Tractivity 1311	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? As many as you can, as fast as you can?!	89577-236-626			/	
Tractivity 1312	Public	Stage 2 Update	Horrified at the amount of traffic passing on the Hinkley Point road as there will be 2 shifts using the road day and night.	89578-236-731			/	
Tractivity 1313	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	I live next to the proposed site and I will be disturbed by the noise of the building work and the lorries once they start their shifts.	89579-236-953			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1315	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Whatever shifts are implemented the infrastructure is not in place to accomodate working arrangements.	89581-236-473			/	
Tractivity 1319	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Based on shift start and finish times and travelling times to Hinkley C it would appear that site at Junction 24 will be active between 5AM and 6AM and after midnight - living 100 yards from the site at junction 24. This is unacceptable due to noise.	89585-236-361	/			
Tractivity 1321	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Utterly diabolical. 24 hour working completely unacceptable unless EdF proposes to buy out local hamlets with full compensation and no additional cost to residents which, judging by EdFs pathetic mitigation offer so far, is unlikely. Why not admit you cannot do it in the time you boast about without creating hell?	89587-236-969			/	
Tractivity 1324	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Night working should only be allowed in exceptional circumstances. There should be no sunday working and very limited saturday working. Activities with the highest potential for disruption (noise / light / dust / traffic etc) should avoid these times.	89590-236-1825		/		
Tractivity 1327	Public	Stage 2 Update	Very concerned by the adoption of double shift working because of the additional nuisance from the proposed Park & Ride facility at Cannington, starting at 5.00pm in the morning to 12.00 midnight	89593-236-743			/	
Tractivity 1328	Public	Stage 2 Update	EDF's working hours proposals at both the main HPC site and Combwich are unrealistic and far too generous for EDF. Residential amenity of nearby dwellings have been ignored. These must be taken into account. Proposed mitigation measures are pathetic and affects have been underestimated by EDF.	89594-236-365	/			
Tractivity 1332	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Minimise disturbance so that we can sleep the night	89598-236-943			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1333	Public	Stage 2 Update	Concern for the effect of Weekday shifts working will midnight, and through the night and Weekend working on local residents . Increased noise and traffic during the weekends will be disruptive and unfair to local residents who will need some respite in their homes from the disruption of the construction. Weekends are classed as family time when local residents will wish to use their homes and gardens and may not be able to enjoy this time. This will have a knock on effect to th e overall health and well being of the local population.	89599-236-1010			/	
Tractivity 1334	Public	Stage 2 Update	The new working hours proposals are wholly unacceptable, on no account should there be a continuous working shift. To work 24 hours a day for 7 days a week is abhorrent and would affect the local residents to such a degree that their lives would be ruined. There should be absolutely no work carried out during the night, to allow peace to nearby residents, from onsite noise due to building works, from buses delivering workers for the shift patterns and also from the necessary light sources which would be required to provide light for workers. There must not be a shift from 8.30pm- 6am.	89600-236-2412		/		
Tractivity 1335	Public	Stage 2 Update	The working hours need to be reined back to mitigate the effect on the nearby communities concerned.	89601-236-779		/		
Tractivity 1336	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	It is ridiculous to have traffic travelling through the quiet environment for the length of time each day - and at weekends - that you propose	89602-236-1229			/	
Tractivity 1338	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? We object to overnight working. it will mean conituous 24 hour noise and inconvenience.	89604-236-327			/	
Tractivity 1339	Public	Stage 2 Update	The shift proposals are interesting; however it has been independantly computed that this could involce 20 hour daily worker movement and there may be serious health and safety considerations in using the double shift su=ystem. Changes may later result in 24 hour worker movement. It is not clear exactly how many lorries per night will be travelling between Bridgwater and the construction site,. A A detailed appraisal of all traffic flow is required.	89605-236-1733			/	
Tractivity 1340	Public	Stage 2 Update	The changes in the 2 shift work pattern is not acceptable. The extensions to early morning and late night night working will have a hugely detrimental effect on village & community life. The proposals are unacceptable. There should be NO Sunday working & Saturday should be a proper half-day, ie end working at 1pm.	89606-236-735		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1341	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? 24/7/365!	89607-236-525			/	
Tractivity 1344	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	You should ONLY work 9-5 if you must work here at all. NOT on Saturdays or Sundays. We have a right to some respite. i am worried about the impact on myself and my family and on all the village activites that ake place in tha village hall and for the school. We can hear the children playing up at school, they will hear you.	89610-236-1414		/		
Tractivity 1345	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? This will affect residents of the village especially as there will be no bypass to take vehicles away from the village	89611-236-398			/	
Tractivity 1346	Public	Stage 2 Update	AS WE LIVE VERY CLOSE BY, WE ARE OBVIOUSLY VERY STRONGLY OPPOSED TO 24 HOUR WORKING	89612-236-482			/	
Tractivity 1347	Public	Stage 2 Update	There is NO justification for your proposed working hours. you will alienate your neighbours. you are considering profit above welfare.	89613-236-732			/	
Tractivity 1348	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? No traffic to or from Hinlleyu point should be permitted to travel through the village during school opening hours and at least 30 mins. Either side of them.	89614-236-711			/	
Tractivity 1349	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	No way do we want 24 hour working. It is totally unfair	89615-236-862			/	
Tractivity 1353	Public	Stage 2 Update	It is a totally unacceptable proposition for the local residents and road users to contemplate 24 hour and double shift working. The pollution and congestion this will cause will be intolerable and cripple the local tourist economy.	89619-236-922			/	
Tractivity 1355	Public	Stage 2 Update	Twenty four hour and double shift working will produce completely unacceptable levels of noise, dust and light pollution for nearby residents and overwhelming traffic problems.	89621-236-1001			/	
Tractivity 1356	Public	Stage 2 Update	Totally unfair to residents in the area. Broken promises over the working hours.	89622-236-			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
				587				
Tractivity 1357	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Unacceptable?	89623-236-1066			/	
Tractivity 1358	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Inhuman	89624-236-272			/	
Tractivity 1359	Public	Stage 2 Update	The proposal sounds good if it results in more gradual change-overs. i?m not sure how this affects the park and ride areas as times dont quite tally - and perhaps lead to congestion increasing (it already exists - and that is before Junction 24 has a further 800+ residents with cars) - or unacceptable times for travel; current proposal implies nothing from 10 pm - 7am	89625-236-892			/	
Tractivity 1361	Public	Stage 2 Update	I believe that working 24/7 is detrimental to the local residents health and well-being. Everyone deserves a right to some peace and quiet.	89627-236-381			/	
Tractivity 1362	Public	Stage 2 Update	Yes. Your proposal to have two daytime shifts as well as night shifts will have a huge negative impact on the traffic volume on the A39, be a danger to residents and cause increased noise and light pollution. In addition to this, your proposed weekend working means that the local residents will have no peace at all. This is a quiet rural area and tourists visit it because of the special environment of the AONB. This will be ruined by the impact of traffic, noise and light as noted above. This proposal will ruin the tranquility of much the Quantock Hills.	89628-236-865			/	
Tractivity 1363	Public	Stage 2 Update	In light of transport proposals your working hours proposal as wholly inadequate as multi shifts will exacerbate the traffic issues the town already has.	89629-236-757			/	
Tractivity 1365	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? 24 hour working is unacceptable, which includes weekedn working. A gross increase in working time to what was originally stated by EDF. Much to the discomfort of the local resident in spite of reassurances are not to be believed.	89631-236-356		/		
Tractivity 1367	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Any disruption through the village and surrounding area should be kept to the minimum.	89633-236-520			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1368	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? 2 shifts 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Will bring disruption to communities in local area and B/water.	89634-236-430			/	
Tractivity 1369	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Long and unsocial hours are going to be needed. But noise reduction and light pollution management must be implemented.	89635-236-626			/	
Tractivity 1371	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Please have in mind that many of us locally are retired or work regular daytime hours and do like to sleep at night and enjoy our gardens at weekdns etc.	89637-236-1014			/	
Tractivity 1372	Public	Stage 2 Update	5 1/2 day week is enough - there should be no night or Sunday working	89638-236-736		/		
Tractivity 1373	Public	Stage 2 Update	17 day working and 24 hour working is totally unaccpetable. Also the park and ride areas will be noisy very late and early.	89639-236-1178		/		
Tractivity 1374	Public	Stage 2 Update	Night shift working is a low blow to instigate at this advanced stage in the consultation. it is also unacceptable.	89640-236-274		/		
Tractivity 1375	Public	Stage 2 Update	24 hours working is not acceptable except in circumstances such as concrete pours.	89641-236-299		/		
Tractivity 1375	Public	Stage 2 Update	24 hour working has only recently been mentioned and we were assured that this would not happenn at earlier consultations. This is not acceptable. Whilst some of the issues raised in previous consultation have been addressed, you have not gone far enough, and new things have sprung up which were not there before.	89641-236-645			/	
Tractivity 1376	Public	Stage 2 Update	I opposed the idea of 24 hour working.	89642-236-118			/	
Tractivity 1376	Public	Stage 2 Update	Unacceptable to have round the clock working for anythin other than essential tasks (e.g.concrete pouring)	89642-236-872			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1377	Public	Stage 2 Update	7 days 24 hours is totally unacceptable to be working. We may as well move now but why should we	89643-236-554			/	
Tractivity 1379	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	No night or Sunday working should be allowed	89645-236-549			/	
Tractivity 1381	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? Too long 24/7 far too much	89647-236-263			/	
Tractivity 352	Public	Stage 1	4. Any other ideas or comments? Bridgwater is easily grid locked and the park and ride schemes should ease the problem though there will still be hold ups. The idea of workers starting and finishing at different times to the Bridgwater Peaks is a good one.	9040-236-1620	/			
Tractivity 452	Public	Stage 1	EDF must be proactive in consulting and listening to the concerns of local residents at every stage and provide experts in noise minimisation. Hours of work must be daytime only. Light pollution must be minimised.	9130-236-6600	/			
Tractivity 618	Public	Stage 1	Light pollution during construction and 24 hour shifts.	9282-236-5050	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[5.6.6] Hours of work to be limited 'unless otherwise agreed'. It is not clear who will be doing the agreeing, and it is essential that the local people who will be most affected by this out-of-hours working are involved. Will EDF commit to involving local people in the process, through SPC?	89293-236-11452	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[5.6.7] 'Greatest potential for noise disturbance will be during preparation and renewal phase. Such activities will be temporary, intermittent and restricted to day time construction hours only.' The use of the word temporary here is disingenuous, considering the scale of the work, which could last for many months. Will EDF say how long these temporary periods will be?	89293-236-11748	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[5.7.5] 'Five day working week would enable many non-home-based employees to return home at weekends.' This contradicts para 5.6.6 which states 7am-9pm Monday to Friday and 7am-1pm Saturday. With these hours there will be no time to return home at weekends. Will EDF confirm which set of hours is correct?	89293-236-13412	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62907	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>While we all use electricity and see the need for new power-producing units like Hinkley C, and are prepared to put up with some disruption, we really need you in your plans to recognize that while workers may go home after their shifts to peace and quiet, those of us in Stolford live here 24/7!</p> <p>With horror we read your proposals that there will be 24 hours a day shift work most days for 7 years, including weekends and lorries every 90 seconds on the main road.</p> <p>Our family retired here to Stolford, just over a mile from your site, in May 2002, a big factor in our choice being the quietness of the location (some noise from time to time from Hinkley B in operation). And country living, meaning relatively traffic-free roads.</p> <p>My Dad at nearly 89 is not up to another house move; our house price, already low because of Hinkley B, will sink dramatically if the conditions you propose do happen.</p>	89662-236-0			/	
Tractivity 62911	Public	Stage 2 Update	The proposed shift patterns will affect the village for years on a twenty four hour daily basis.	89663-236-3193			/	
Tractivity 62913	Public	Stage 2 Update	EDF say there will be double shift working as well as possible, (probable?) night shifts. This means that the Cannington Park and Ride will be in operation 24 hours per day, Mon - Fri with a half day, (p17 'single morning shift from 6.00 to 8.00 and 1.00 to 3.00') on Saturday and 'limited maintenance activities on Saturday afternoons or Sundays'. How confusing! Why can't EDF be open and honest and say that workers will be travelling to and from the site around the clock every day? This will not only affect Cannington residents but roads throughout the area will be in use to enable access to Hinkley 24/7.	89665-236-3457			/	
Tractivity 62926	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>1. Construction Working Hours</p> <p>The intention to adopt double shift working will naturally increase the volume of traffic passing through Cannington until a new by-pass is opened. Would it be possible to arrange these shifts so that the increase in traffic does not coincide with the normal daily traffic highs such as to and from work times and the school runs?</p>	89671-236-68		/		
Tractivity 62949	Public	Stage 2 Update	The extension to the working hours results in, effectively, 24 hour working. This not acceptable, UNLESS the noise and light pollution are severely curtailed, especially during the hours of darkness. Noise and light over extended periods will not only destroy the conditions that local people enjoy, but constitute an infringement of human rights.	89680-236-1448			/	
Tractivity 62952	Public	Stage 2 Update	No way should there be any night working.	89681-236-2632			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62953	Public	Stage 2 Update	Your proposals on working hours, which would be 24/7 including 'maintenance tasks' on a Sunday, are tantamount to torture. When are local residents supposed to sleep? Sleep deprivation can be highly deleterious to health, as can constant noise from site work and traffic. Light pollution will mean an end to our dark skies and stars. Our health and well-being are not being considered and we will suffer accordingly.	89682-236-1635			/	
Tractivity 62955	Public	Stage 2 Update	When we were first consulted about the proposed building of Hinkley C we were assured that the only time there would be 24 hour working would be during concrete pours. We were assured that the maximum general hours of working would be from 7am to 7pm Monday to Friday and Saturday mornings only unless something exceptional was happening. We accepted this as fair. You now tell us we will have 24/7 working for the next seven years at least. Do you seriously think this is fair? I and most other people living in Shurton want an answer to this question.	89683-236-1070			/	
Tractivity 62955	Public	Stage 2 Update	Why were we told we wouldn't have 24/7 working nearly 2 years ago? Has it only just occurred to you that you need to do this?	89683-236-2134			/	
Tractivity 62967	Public	Stage 2 Update	4. Construction working hours : 0600-1200 is too long, 0730 to 1000 would be more acceptable. Weekend and night working are going to be the source of great aggravation to the local population.	89686-236-501		/		
Tractivity 62972	Public	Stage 2 Update	My main points regarding negative impacts: Additional shift hours will add to negative impact on health and wellbeing of local residents: unrelenting noise from the site; increase in road congestion. EDF's desire to complete asap needs to be weighed against the human rights of local residents to peace and quiet if they have chosen to live in a rural location. It is not sufficient for EDF to state (as on BBC Points West December 2010) that it will give financial support to those residents who wish to move. EDF needs to show that it can implement its plans with due heed to the welfare of the existing community and not push them out by industrialising the countryside on a massive scale.	89687-236-135			/	
Tractivity 62976	Public	Stage 2 Update	As for working 24 hours, I think you would have a problem, with noise etc from residents, we had a problem when Gerbers were in Wembdon Road, they had to rethink!	89688-236-879			/	
Tractivity 62983	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Again, we are not surprised that we will end up with working around the clock with subsequent noise, dirt etc.	89689-236-2017			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62998	Public	Stage 2 Update	Double shifts / On and off weekend working and staggered shift times will mean, constant increase in traffic on already very busy main roads.	89692-236-2491			/	
Tractivity 63003	Public	Stage 2 Update	EDF Stage 2a consultation response. I am opposed to a night shift and any overnight construction work. It may be necessary for continuous concrete pours and commissioning inside the buildings but that is all. I am opposed to the double shift start and finish times. Work from 6am until midnight is just unacceptable. Plus travelling would increase the noise nuisance from 5.30am until 00.30am. I am opposed to weekend working and the fact that on a weekend 'off' there will still be maintenance work. In fact there will be construction work on site 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for up to, and maybe more than a decade. Along with the noise and dust pollution the site will be lit, therefore local residents will not see darkness for the whole construction period.	89693-236-0			/	
Tractivity 63012	Public	Stage 2 Update	Although pleased to note that your have amended the shift start and finish times, it is still clear that these times will still have an effect on local transportation. Most people in the area leave for work, school or college between 7 and 8.30am and finish between 4.30 and 5pm so the small roads will still be congested.	89696-236-3713			/	
Tractivity 63031	Public	Stage 2 Update	It was accepted that short periods of 24 hour working would be required during concrete pouring and later activities contained within the buildings, but 24 hour working as routine is not. With 24 hour working there will be 24 hour noise, dust and light, no longer the dark night sky and the sound of waves on the beach to send one off to sleep. The extended hours of the double shift working, almost from the outset of construction, is not acceptable. Residents along the C182 and other local roads will have traffic noise from 5.30am until 00.30am with workers coming to and leaving the site. Residents adjacent to the construction site will have noise, dust and light pollution from 6am until midnight, hardly the actions of a 'good neighbour'.	89704-236-321			/	
South West Strategic Health Authority	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	- I note the significant potential change in hours of construction and consider that it is important to ensure a period of each week free of the consequences of construction site activity (such as noise impact), to protect the health and well-being of residents in the surrounding area. This should be the adopted normal construction process and activity every day/night should be significantly restricted to only essential or emergency work requirements;	89707-236-2003		/		
West Somerset County Council	Local authority	Stage 2 Update	The extended working hours set out in the Stage 2 Update are of huge concern to us as community leaders. Many, many residents have contacted the Council to express their deep misgivings about this considerable change. In this context it is important for us to receive early information to substantiate your proposals, which are not set out at all in the latest	89734-236-6461			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			<p>consultation material.</p> <p>Overall, the proposals are considered to represent a fundamental shift in the nature of the local environment, from a quiet rural setting towards that of a more urban / industrial environment with activities 24 hours / 7 days per week. Thus your proposals cannot be supported.</p> <p>We understand that the shift in working patterns has resulted from your further analysis of the build at Flamanville 3 in France and can understand, given your timescale for delivery, that you have drawn the conclusion you have. However, the physical characteristics and relationship with surrounding properties is quite different from Flamanville and this does not seem to have been given necessary weight in your decision-making. We urge you to re-consider the proposals.</p> <p>Fundamentally this change must be considered in cumulative terms alongside the size and position of the on-site campus and the other issues we have highlighted in relation to Stogursey Parish. In our view the ability to mitigate the impact of the project is very limited for those living closest to the site and therefore EDF must do all it can to create a system, through its property price support scheme, to allow all those wanting to move away without any penalty to them financially. This however, is not the only answer and this is not a 'one-size-fits-all' issue. The Council will continue to do all it can to support those who live closest to the site and we must see demonstrable progress on these issues.</p>					
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	On the basis that it would not be possible to mitigate all construction impacts such as noise and light pollution through technical means, the agreement of reasonable construction working hours is seen by the Councils as an essential means for managing down environmental impacts. In this regard, the impact of extended working hours on communities closest to the main HPC site and those directly located to the transport corridors, is considered unacceptable, due to effects on residential amenity and health.	89735-236-9884			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	the Proposed Changes do not set out the implications of shift pattern changes for collection and drop-off times at accommodation sites or for operational hours at Park and Ride sites and freight management facilities, which could be an important determining factor in the acceptability of associated development proposals.	89735-236-10407			/	
Exmoor National Park Authority	Local authority	Stage 2 Update	In terms of impacts there is now the further concern with the proposed changes to construction working hours. It appears that EDF is effectively proposing 24/7 working hours for 12 1/2 days in every 14. This will impact significantly on the lighting required for the main site and as a consequence the appearance of the site from the National Park. One of the special qualities of the National Park is its dark skies and the hinterland around the National Park makes an important contribution to Exmoor's darkness and tranquillity. Working such hours will also have knock-on implications for traffic movements and this will impact on local communities.	89736-236-3037			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
South Gloucestershire Council	Local authority	Stage 2 Update	4. Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? No, except in relation to promoting integration with public transport - the use of public transport including trains should be promoted and working hours and public transport timetables integrated accordingly.	89742-236-6817			/	
Bridgwater Town Council	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	Key changes are noted, though the increase in the peak construction work force will exacerbate perceived problems.	89746-236-1553			/	
Bridgwater Town Council	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	The intentions here are also noted but will undoubtedly have a consequential detrimental effect particularly for those residents being subject to routes accessing Hinkley Point in the absence of a northern routed bypass to Bridgwater. It will be essential to monitor all aspects of the operation, of working hours and implement measures quickly to alleviate problems as and if they arise. The changeover from single to double shift pattern will have to be examined as will Saturday and any Sunday working. Clearly the school run periods and existing heavily trafficked times need to be catered for in the final analysis of shift patterns.	89746-236-4954			/	
Cannington Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	5.0 Construction Working Hours Without a dedicated by-pass, this Council is appalled at the increases with the working hours. This is going to have a great detrimental affect on the direct life of all the residents in the village of Cannington. This Council does not agree with any of the proposals within this topic unless a dedicated by-pass is built before the construction starts at the construction site	89748-236-2094		/		
Stockland Bristol Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	4) Construction Working hours will have a considerable effect on this Parish and the residents will be greatly disturbed by any late night, early morning or 24hr working. We are already disturbed by the 'Tanoy' of the existing site and frequently by the decommissioning noise of A site. This Parish requests that this must be kept to a minimum and we should be advised when this is about to take place.	89756-236-793			/	
Miller Turner Investments	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	No updated highway analysis of the proposed amendments to construction working hours and patterns, nor an assessment of the impact of additional HGV spaces at the site is provided.	89762-236-3375			/	
Tractivity 62890	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	The proposed working hours are completely unacceptable. There should be no work at all during weekends.	89764-236-647			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Bridgwater College	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	- We have concerns that it is proposed to have some night shifts that start between 8.30pm to 10.00pm and finishing between 6.00am to 8.00am. The concern lies with the potential 8.00am finish on site that would entail buses returning into the Bridgwater A and C sites at around the same times as a majority of our students and buses would be entering the College site.	89765-236-7575			/	
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	10 The Estate is concerned to note that EDF intends to adopt "double shift working" within the first year of securing consent for the new power station. From our discussions with representatives of EDF, the Estate understands that works will be carried out on most nights and every other weekend.	89767-236-3178			/	
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	The creation of noise, dust and light at all times (including during evenings and weekends) in this location will represent a significant change in the character of the area which will be to the detriment of the enjoyment of people's homes and the countryside in general.	89767-236-3845			/	
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	13 Further, the introduction of double shift working increases the importance of establishing interim mitigation measures.	89767-236-4256			/	
West Hinkley Action Group	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	1. WORKING PATTERNS: WHAG is totally opposed to the hugely detrimental increase to proposed working hours. The introduction of a night shift will mean 24 hour working and this coupled with the increase in days to be worked, including so-called "maintenance work "will result in 24/7 working for the whole of the construction period. Although we were prepared to accept the need for 24 hour working over very short periods, eg for concrete pouring, this new development is totally unacceptable. The original proposal for a double shift would prove to be almost as detrimental to the local residents who would not be able to enjoy the peace and tranquillity of their properties for up to twelve hours a day.	89771-236-72			/	
West Hinkley Action Group	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	The proposals to increase the length of working hours even further has compounded this anxiety. The proximity of the development to family homes will result in sleepless nights as a result of noise nuisance and light pollution for the whole construction period.	89771-236-945			/	
NHS Somerset	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	However, we have some concern over the potential for a negative health impact from the move towards double shift and weekend working.	89773-236-953			/	
NHS Somerset	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Construction Working Hours The revised proposals include an earlier adoption of double shift working	89773-236-			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			<p>and possibly night shift working as well in order to comply with the original timetable for completion of the project.</p> <p>They also now propose Saturday afternoon and Sunday working every other week, as opposed to no such working previously. Such a working pattern would not normally be acceptable on grounds of reasonable expectations of residents for peace and quiet. Working hours on construction sites can be controlled both by planning conditions and by the Control of Pollution Act section 61, enforced by the District Council environmental health service. There may be grounds for allowing such working patterns when there is an unavoidable construction need, for example continuous concrete pouring.</p> <p>In general, we would expect that for major building works that are likely to disturb local residents, noisy works would only be permitted between:</p> <p>Monday to Friday 8am-6pm</p> <p>Saturday 8am-1pm</p> <p>Sunday and Bank Holidays are not allowed</p> <p>The proposed double shift working on this site will result in working hours much beyond these norms on weekdays. The loss of a quiet day in addition every other week may have deleterious effects on wellbeing for residents.</p> <p>Transport Proposals</p>	4212				
Sedgemoor District Labour Group	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>4. Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Working 24/7 with changed shifts will spread disturbance and difficulty throughout the day and night, with no let up for communities. - Shift change-over times will coincide with school finish times, exacerbating road congestion at these times. 	89779-236-4888			/	
Highways Agency	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>3.13 This is a disappointing section within the consultation document and provides little clarity on the working hours of the staff to be employed at Hinkley Point C. At this stage in the project (a matter of months prior to application stage), the Agency expected that the proposed hours of working would have been finalised and be transparently available for comment upon. Unfortunately, the consultation document results in a number of significant unanswered questions for the Agency</p>	89838-236-6104			/	
Highways Agency	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>1) Will the double shift system continue throughout the life of the construction period?</p> <p>2) Shift One is proposed to begin between 0600 and 0730. How will the workers' start times be split between the hours of 0600 and 0730? For instance will 33% of the workers begin in each half hour period therefore staggering the start times?</p> <p>3) Shift Handover will occur between 1330 and 1600 although no indication is provided as to how the overlap between the first and second shift will occur. What are the proportions of staff which will be required to depart and arrive during each half hour period?</p> <p>4) Shift Two is proposed to finish between 2200 and 2400. How will the workers' finish times be managed during this two hour period? What</p>	89838-236-6613	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			<p>proportions of staff will leave each half hour period?</p> <p>5) The Day shift proposes a start time of between 0700 and 0830 and a finish time between 1630 and 1830. How will the arrival and departure times of the day shift workers be managed? What proportions of the day shift workers will arrive and depart in each half hour period?</p> <p>6) It is stated that 'office personnel will generally start between 0730 and 0900 and finish between 1730 and 1900'. This is very ambiguous and provides little clarity of the working patterns of the office personnel. Are the shift times of office personnel fixed and how will the arrival and departure times be managed?</p> <p>7) The details of weekend working are similarly vague. The Agency has no understanding as to the proportions of staff which will work a single morning shift on Saturdays and how their arrival and departure times will be staggered. Furthermore, the proposals to operate a rolling shift pattern are ambiguous with no detail as to the arrival and departure profiles for the Saturday and Sunday working. Finally, there is no information as to what proportions of staff will work the rolling shift pattern and how the working week will be managed.</p> <p>8) EDF Energy states that 'it may be necessary to have night shifts'. This statement is very vague and provides no clarity as to the likelihood and frequency of night shift working. Again, we expected EDF Energy to have more clarity on this issue by now. The Agency is similarly concerned that there is no information regarding night working and how the arrival and departure profiles of workers will be managed.</p>					
Highways Agency	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	3.15 Overall, the Agency considers the detail within the section on working hours to be wholly unsatisfactory.	89838-236-9430			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	We also have concerns about the proposed change in shift patterns and the impact they would have on local accommodation, particularly tourist accommodation if used by workers as well as tourists.	89844-236-11065			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	27. The Council has significant concerns about the effects upon the local environment and quality of life as a direct consequence of the proposed extension in operating hours and possible night time working. This requires further assessment to quantify the impact. Significant extra mitigation and compensation measures may be needed to address in particular noise, disturbance and traffic impacts both close to site and along transport corridors.	89844-236-11892			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	36. We also consider that the document is vague in a number of areas and inaccurate in others. For example, the proposed shift times are still not clear. The wording is ambiguous, stating that "it may be necessary to have night shifts" (p. 7). We understood night-time working to be EDF's latest proposal. However, the document under emphasises the importance of this change and is therefore very misleading from a public perception point of view.	89844-236-16895			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	We also have concerns about the proposed change in shift patterns and the impact they would have on local accommodation, particularly tourist accommodation if used by workers as well as tourists.	89852-236-1870			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	The changes proposed in construction working hours will lead to a very significant increase in noise and disturbance at unsociable times for local communities in the vicinity of the main site, the residents of Combnich, and those communities that will be affected by transport movements. Under the revised proposals, the Council is concerned that future construction noise from the main site and Combnich Wharf may lead to sleep disturbance due to a significant increase over existing noise levels which will be detrimental to the rural locality.	89859-236-63			/	
Otterhampton Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	- The shift working patterns proposed will mean that buses will be travelling along the C182 from 5.30am until midnight and will be concentrated around shift start and finish times. These will be spread over a 60 to 90 minute periods during the day and, during the peak years, represents 30 to nearly 60 1 way journeys per hour during these periods (see table under Park & Ride buses). Overall we will see around 410 to 480 journeys daily along the C182.	89869-236-897			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	There are some elements of this updated consultation that go some small way towards addressing some of the key issues raised by SPC during the Stage 2 consultation, and these are welcomed. However these few positive elements are completely overwhelmed by the massive negative impacts of the proposed increase in working hours, the additional 1.1 million tonnes of material to be imported to site, and the increase in the numbers of workers. So it seems to be one small step forward and several very large steps back.	89871-236-1134			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	The proposed time extensions to the two-shift working will mean heavy traffic and noise on the C182, and noise and light from the site, from 5:30am to 00:30 am for all but a couple of days a month. The earlier implementation of two-shift working in the schedule will greatly increase the time period over which this level of disruption will be suffered by residents. The negative health impacts of this for residents close to the site are incalculable. It is not possible to mitigate against this, given the peace and quiet that exists at the moment. The extension of the hours for two-shift working and their much	89871-236-1654			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			earlier implementation in the schedule are entirely unacceptable.					
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	SPC has in the past accepted the need for limited night working during a few continuous processes such as the foundation concrete pours, and during the latter stages of commissioning which would involve a relatively few workers largely inside the buildings. The general construction work now being proposed to be undertaken at night as a matter of routine is entirely unacceptable.	89871-236-2338			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	It appears that the extension to working hours is being proposed to ensure that the station is ready for some arbitrary date. EDF are clearly putting profit for their shareholders before the health and welfare of the local residents - so much for being a good neighbour.	89871-236-2723			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Overall the updated proposals will be to the very substantial detriment of those parishioners who live nearest to the site and the access roads. The proposed changes that will adversely affect those residents are wholly unacceptable.	89871-236-3151			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Concerns expressed by SPC about the Local Mitigation Scheme have not yet been addressed. This scheme has taken on a far greater significance due to the larger number of parishioners now considering moving away due to the serious negative impact of the increased working hours and days on their quality of life.	89871-236-3388			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Now it is planned that work will be carried out around the clock from the start of the project for all but a few days of the month, and even on these supposedly quiet days it appears there will be activity. Residents who live within sight and/or earshot of the site will be unable to sleep due to the construction noise and light. The physical and mental health impacts of this are very serious.	89871-236-6112			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	The effect on the local wildlife also needs to be considered. EDF are spending a fortune relocating badgers and bats - this may all be wasted if the night time noise and light are sufficient to disturb them. Many birds and other mammals such as otters and deer are very sensitive and the noise may well disturb them especially during the mating and nesting seasons.	89871-236-7157			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.5 Page 17 Amendments to double shift start and finish times - weekdays: Workers planning to start the first shift at 6.00am will have to get to site 20-30 minutes before shift start to clear security, get into their working clothes and pick up their tools. At the end of the second shift at midnight the workers will take at least 20-30 minutes to be ready to leave site. This means bus traffic on the C182 past local residents from at least 5.30am to 12.30am, and probably over a longer period given the numbers of people to be transported to and from site.	89871-236-9003			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.6 Page 17 Amendments to double shift start and finish times - weekdays: This states that this pattern is for weekdays only. This is contradicted over the page where it is stated that some contractors will work a rolling shift pattern which includes a full shift pattern every other Saturday and Sunday.	89871-236-9567			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.7 Page 17 Weekend working: This states that some contractors will operate a single 'morning' shift on Saturdays, which will finish as late as 3.00pm - this hardly classes as morning. With travelling from site after shift end, most of the day will be included.	89871-236-9875			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.8 Page 17/18 Weekend working: States that 'every other weekend, apart from small scale maintenance or preparatory works, there will be no construction activity on Saturday afternoons or all day on Sunday.' So even on the few days when there is supposed to not be any work, there will in fact be work, bearing in mind also that Saturday 'afternoon' will not start until at least 3.30pm. Will EDF be honest and admit that they plan to carry out some form of work every single day, leaving the local residents with absolutely no peace for a decade?	89871-236-10140			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.10 Page 18 Overnight shift: States that 'it may be necessary to have an overnight shift. It may be used, for example, to maintain the programme ...' Will EDF be honest and admit that they plan to run an overnight shift from the start to meet their unrealistic deadline for completion?	89871-236-11233			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Night time working, other than for a few specific tasks over specified short timescales, is entirely unacceptable due to the seriously negative effects on local residents and wildlife. The proposed extended two-shift working hours and weekend working are entirely unacceptable, due to the disturbance for residents at shift change times which are now during the night, rather than early morning and late evening. The much earlier start of extended hours working in the schedule is extremely unwelcome. The effect on the well-being of local residents must be given greater consideration, rather than the focus being just on maximising profits for EDF shareholders.	89871-236-15499			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	The rest of the programme assumes three-shift working, which is completely unacceptable.	89872-236-2511			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.4.3 [5.1.3] These extended hours are totally unacceptable as they will lead to noise and disruption for local residents from 5:30am to 12:30am. This will lead to low level aggravation at best and sleep deprivation and subsequent serious health problems at worst. SPC is utterly opposed to these hours, which are all about allowing EDF to start generating a profit as soon as possible, and hang the health consequences to the local population.	89872-236-15727			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.4.4 [5.1.6] Again the extension to weekend working is totally unacceptable.	89872-236-16175			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.4.5 [5.1.7] This states that there will be no construction activity every other weekend, aside from small-scale maintenance activities (SPC emphasis), on site on Saturday afternoons or all day on Sundays . Firstly the definition of Saturday afternoon is after shift finish at 3:00pm. With operatives leaving site for at least 30 minutes after this, there is hardly much left of Saturday afternoon as generally understood - i.e after 'Noon', not three and half hours later. Secondly the maintenance work proposed will still create noise and traffic movements. We will therefore be suffering some form of disruption from work on site every single day for at least nine years. This is well beyond what was proposed at Stage 2 and is utterly unacceptable.	89872-236-16256			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.4.6 [5.1.9] To add injury to insult, it is now clear that a routine night shift will be in operation so the noise disruption and light pollution from site will be all night every night in addition to all day every day. Local residents are entitled to at least some time to allow peaceful enjoyment of their property - as enshrined in the Human Rights Act. SPC will fight these unacceptable hours with every means at their disposal.	89872-236-17013			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Major concerns over working hours, on-site accommodation and road traffic volumes have been raised here as well as in SPC's response to Stage 2a consultation.	89872-236-20327			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	Construction working hours are a hugely significant concern to local residents and the Proposed Changes are considered a significant and unacceptable worsening of the proposals, due to: the extension of working hours; a lack of clarity in the consultation material; and absence of assessment of environmental effects. The impact of 24 hour / 7 day a week working on communities closest to the site is considered unacceptable - in terms of residential amenity and potentially in terms of residents on-going health. .	89874-236-14297			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	Overall, the proposals are considered to represent a fundamental shift in the nature of the local environment, from a quiet rural setting towards that of a more urban / industrial environment with activities 24 hours / 7 days per week and cannot supported.	89874-236-15713			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	On the basis that it would not be possible to mitigate all construction impacts such as noise and light pollution through technical means, the agreement of reasonable construction working hours is seen by the Councils as an essential means for managing down environmental impacts. In this regard, the impact of extended working hours on communities closest to the main HPC site and those directly located to the transport corridors, is considered unacceptable, due to effects on residential amenity and health. Furthermore, the Proposed Changes do not set out the implications of shift pattern changes for operational hours at Park and Ride sites and the freight management facilities, which could be an important determining factor in the acceptability of associated development proposals.	89876-236-8693			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	We are concerned that this provides an apparent open-ended opportunity for overnight shifts and that this needs to be accurately reflected within the assessments of impacts to transport, the environment and the human population. The Councils are therefore concerned that revised Preliminary Environmental Information has not been provided to identify the significant environmental impacts associated with this change in the assumption and to consult on any necessary solutions or mitigation measures required.	89891-236-1288			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	<p>8.12 Policy and Guidance</p> <p>Excerpts from county and local policy, strategies and guidance of particular relevance are:</p> <p>West Somerset Local Plan (April 2006)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Policy PC/1: Air Pollution. Developments that generate atmospheric emissions which would cause harm or offence to human health, senses or property will not be permitted and where such uses exist the local planning authority will not permit sensitive other uses within a reasonable distance of such uses. - Policy PC/2: Noise Pollution. Proposals for developments involving potential noise nuisance to existing occupiers of land or buildings will only be permitted when measures to minimise the impact of noise likely to be generated are incorporated as part of the development. <p>Sedgemoor Core Strategy Submission (February 2011)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - D16 Pollution Impact of Development, Residential Amenity - Development proposals that would result in the loss of land of recreational and/or amenity value or unacceptably impact upon the residential amenity of occupants of nearby dwellings and any potential future occupants will not be supported. <p>In terms of local policy or guidance relating to shift patterns, the primary policy reference relates to Comwich, for which Box 31 of the Draft HPC Project SPD states the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ship/barge movements, unloading operations and associated land vehicle movements should be restricted to between 07:30 - 19:30 on weekdays and 07:30 - 13:00 on Saturdays, with no operations on Sundays and Bank Holidays, to protect residential amenity. <p>Beyond this explicit reference, policy concerns relating to working hours and shift patterns are related to the indirect effects on working hours and shift patterns, for example, in terms of the air quality and noise effects of traffic generated by construction traffic, the air quality, noise and lighting effects caused by the need for additional night-time on-site activities, and the effects on local people and amenity as a result of these changes.</p>	89891-236-1801			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	<p>Construction working hours is an issue of significant concern to the Councils and local communities and has the potential to result in a number of effects in terms of disturbance and possible nuisance. The Councils are aware of the programme issues that have affected development at Flammanville and that such delays could result in the need for increased resourcing of construction at HPC. While acknowledging the increased level of detail with regards to shift patterns, the Councils remain unsatisfied as there is insufficient information to provide a full and transparent understanding of the implications of the proposals. In particular, the effects which shift patterns, working patterns and arrivals and departures will have on traffic levels, together with air quality, noise and disturbance, need to be understood and if necessary appropriate mitigation and compensation measures will need to be discussed and agreed with the local communities and the Councils.</p>	89891-236-3837			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	<p>The effects of the Proposed Changes in working hours and shift patterns have the greatest potential impact in terms of disturbance to local people and in terms of loss of local amenity. At weekends, the result of two contractor shift patterns could be that construction could continue with weekday shift patterns, with work only ceasing every other weekend at 3pm on Saturdays and on Sunday. While the effects of the Proposed Changes remain to be properly understood or qualified by the consultation material, the Councils are concerned about changes that would result in extended hours over which construction noise, air quality and light pollution would occur.</p> <p>When considered in combination with the potential for overnight shifts, the construction project will effectively be a 24/7 operation, having a profound and unacceptable effect on the local community.</p> <p>Overall, the proposals are considered to represent a fundamental shift in the living environment, from a rural setting towards that of an urban / industrial environment and cannot be supported.</p>	89891-236-7171			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	- Changes to the operational hours of the park and ride sites to reflect the revised shift patterns, although it is noted that these changes are not specifically stated in the consultation document.	89892-236-1705			/	
Tractivity 1362	Public	Stage 2 Update	Yes. Your proposal to have two daytime shifts as well as night shifts will have a huge negative impact on the traffic volume on the A39, be a danger to residents and cause increased noise and light pollution. In addition to this, your proposed weekend working means that the local residents will have no peace at all. This is a quiet rural area and tourists visit it because of the special environment of the AONB. This will be ruined by the impact of traffic, noise and light as noted above. This proposal will ruin the tranquility of much the Quantock Hills.	89628-374-0			/	
Tractivity 1403	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	Junction 24 gets heavily congested. Steps to mitigate the impact of the development on this issue should include staggering power station / construction working hours and delivery times.	89978-236-225			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Marine and Fisheries Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Parts of the main development which fall below mean high water springs include the two cooling water intake tunnels and one outfall tunnel (approximately 6m and 7m in diameter) and the refurbishment of Combwich Wharf, although details of the construction of these facilities has not been included at this stage.	8691-1780-2939				Comments were raised during consultation requesting details of the proposed cooling water works in Bridgwater Bay and questions were raised on the impact of such infrastructure on the internationally designated features. Some comments went further, suggesting alternative methods of cooling, such as cooling towers, might be provided if impacts on the designations proved to be unacceptable. In response to the comments made during consultation, and as part of the ongoing work towards understanding impacts and applying appropriate mitigation, the intake structures have been carefully designed, including features to reduce entrainment of fish and other marine life. This mitigation has been supplemented with proposals to install an Acoustic Fish Deterrence system at the intake heads, which will have the affect of deterring fish from the vicinity and therefore reducing the risk of entrainment further. An additional system known as a Fish Recovery and Return system will be installed at the cooling water intake screens to help ensure fish and other marine life is returned to the sea via a pipe routed under the foreshore. This will further help reduce loss of marine life.
Trinity House	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	It is noted from the pre-application consultation that Combwich Wharf is to be refurbished, temporary jetties to be constructed and a cooling water infrastructure proposed (horizontal tunnels and vertical wells), in such cases Trinity House will consider any requirements for marking once details have been provided or at the time the application for consent to the Marine and Fisheries Agency is made.	8692-1780-376				Comments were made with regard to the detailed design of the sea wall; on how the termination points at each end of the wall would be designed to cater for pedestrian access and whether the wall would follow the alignment of the existing cliff.
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	1. Cooling Water tunnels and associated infrastructure - The approach described for the design of the cooling water inlet (in section 3.2.14 & 15 (page 21) and sections 3.9.35 (page 155) describe the location of the intake and the minimisation of the water velocity at the intake as the only likely practicable measures to mitigate impingement and entailment of biota in the cooling water system. We need more detail of the options considered and difficulties of implementation before we could agree with that conclusion.	88810-1780-1021				Taking into account the comments from consultation these matters have now been clarified and there will be a ramp over the return wall at each end of the sea wall to enable walkers to access the existing path either side. Furthermore the Environmental Statement (Volume 2) confirms that the sea wall will follow the existing cliff line. Further details have also been provided regarding discharge arrangements through the sea wall during construction.
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Section 3.6.1 we will need to see further detail of the construction of the intake and outfall tunnels - are these tunnels sealed? Can sea water or groundwater get into these tunnels?	88830-1780-28662				Questions have also been raised on the potential for ecological impacts to occur in connection with construction of the sea wall, The ES has assessed that due to the lack of sensitivity in the immediate area which is comprised of degraded cliffs and debris/pebbles in the upper foreshore area, no significant impacts are expected. Furthermore, construction activities in the upper foreshore will be
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Figure 10.5 shows the proposed sea wall stopping before it reaches the proposed jetty, how will the sea wall terminate at both the eastern and western boundaries?	88830-1780-30193				

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Countryside Council for Wales	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	3.39: CCW welcome the acknowledgement that if, in the detailed studies carried out at local level it is found that there are significant environmental, technical or commercial limits to direct cooling, alternative cooling methods will be considered as an alternative. You should also note that, in addition to the thermal effects resulting from direct cooling, there are potential water quality (particularly nutrient enrichment) issues that may be associated with the treatment of this cooling water, such as use of anti-fouling agents. This must also be considered in any detailed project level assessment.	87840-1780-2935				construction activities in the upper foreshore will be strictly controlled to prevent spillages and damage. Other comments regarding cooling water focused on potential use of bio-fouling agents. While there is no history of using bio-fouling agents at the Hinkley site due to the inherent marine conditions, EDF Energy would wish to maintain the option with the aim of not harming the wider marine environment. The methods by which this could be achieved are continuing through on-going discussions with the Environment Agency and other consultees.
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	25. However, one point that it is felt important to raise now is regarding the proposed new sea wall. It has been assumed until this point that any new sea wall would follow the current coastal alignment. The indicative diagrams presented in the Consultation Report and other consultation documents (e.g. Figure 3.2 in the main Report) appear to show the sea wall separated from the main station development by a large lagoon. It should be noted that, if the new sea wall is to be constructed on the foreshore, there could be impacts in terms of SPA and SAC features that have hitherto been considered unlikely. It would be useful if EDF could clarify its intentions as regards the sea wall and the manner in which the temporary jetty, intake and outfall pipes, etc will interact with the wall.	87980-1780-4728				Finally, within the marine environment, comments were received from the Ministry Of Defence regarding potential impacts within the Lillstock firing range. As a result of this feedback appropriate arrangements are being put in place to ensure safe co-existence. With regard to the design of the power station, while the majority of respondents recognised the need for the proposed development, concerns were expressed over the scale of the development. The DCO submission provides, in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) document technical and safety justification for the size of the plant. The DAS also explains how local topographic factors and the location of existing infrastructure including the A and B stations have influenced the layout and configuration of the plant which is positioned as close to the existing complex as possible. There was support for the visibility of the plant to be treated with honesty as powerful industrial objects in the landscape and the architectural approach has led to design of simple uniform facades. In response to comments,.. care has been taken to present the development in modest and muted colours to help assimilate the development into the landscape.
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	The authorities therefore require that more details are provided on preliminary works aspects of the proposals as well as other elements of the project, including the construction of the jetty, new sea wall, cooling water intakes and outfalls, and refurbishment of Combwich Wharf.	88070-1780-896				The 'masterplan' (design and layout) of the power station has also sought to bring order to the development taking its inspiration from the linear rock platform on the foreshore. This is reflected in the striations running North – South within the site and the ordering of buildings generally in accordance with this established grid. The location of the power station has also made use of the sloping levels down from Green Lane towards the foreshore by establishing platforms at 20 m and 14 m. It can also be seen that Green Lane forms the essential dividing line between the built development to the north and the restored
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	We are not convinced by the case made in the EDF documents that the heat plume from cooling water discharges into the Bristol Channel would not have an adverse impact on life in the channel. Although the reactors' electricity output is 1650 MW its heat output is 3500 MW per reactor i.e. 7,000 MW. The Bristol Channel despite its appearance is very shallow at about twenty metres (less at low water springs). Pouring so much hot water into the channel must have an adverse effect	88960-1780-28601a		/		
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	We also believe that biocides used in the cooling pipes to stop fouling build-up would also add to the toxic mixture of radionuclides as well as hot water to have a health impact on fish and other organisms.	88960-1780-28601b			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Cooling towers as have been proposed at Oldbury could be a partial solution but are unlikely to be acceptable given the already ugly outline of the proposed plant at Hinkley.	88960-1780-28601c		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	As the DECC consultation document agrees that Combined Heat and Power is feasible for nuclear power stations, we believe this should be a feature if Hinkley C goes ahead, furnishing hot water to local homes. To reduce any risk of contamination, several layers of cooling pipes could be used.	88960-1780-28601d		/		landscape to the south, post construction. The landscape scheme proposed also helps to enhance the development by complementing the large built structures in terms of its scale but also providing a screening function to conceal the lower level buildings. The scheme also takes account of the varying sensitivities depending on where the power station can be viewed from. The net effect is the development is presented from long views looking east (from the Quantocks) with large structures being visible but achieving an assimilation with the landscape which tends also to be large in scale, whereas more locally from the south the landscape scheme has the more intimate effect of screening the power station from the majority of views where people live in the Shurton valley. This would be achieved by raising land levels above Bum Brook and carrying out early tree planting in the early stages of construction, should consent be granted.
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Hinkley Point C Main Power Station and Ancillary Buildings The site identified for the main buildings and associated land uses, as depicted in Figure10.2, does not occupy any MOD statutory safeguarding zones or neighbour any MOD property. Based upon the illustrative layout design for the main buildings provided at Figure 3.2, it is not anticipated that the development of the actual nuclear power station will in itself affect any defence interests. Subject to confirming the dimensions of the taller structures included in the development it is possible that the highest points of some of the structures may need to be fitted with air navigation warning lights to maintain the safety of military air traffic that operates in the area.	8775-1780-2770				
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The submission identifies that intake pipes to extract coolant water from Bridgewater Bay will need to be built in the sea floor as well an outfall pipe to discharge used water. The potential area for the development of intake and outfall pipes, and associated infra-structure (as shown in Figure 10.7) extends northwest from the development site across Bridgewater Bay directly through Lilstock Range.	8775-1780-6475	/			
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The proposal outlined for the construction of a temporary jetty within the range, will obstruct operationally important air gunnery practice from being undertaken by virtue of the presence of the jetty structure, ships and associated personnel in the firing area. In addition other marine structures (such as water intake and outfall pipes for the new power station) could also be located within the range and may permanently affect firing activities by introducing hardened surfaces which projectiles might hit and ricochet off.	8775-1780-8116a	/			
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The document identifies that there is not a viable alternative location for the development of a jetty (section 4.12.12). The MOD recognises the national importance of the construction of this new nuclear power station and is receptive to modifying the range area to accommodate the proposed jetty structure.	8775-1780-8116b			/	
Tractivity 908	Public	Stage 2	Hinkley Point must be constructed using the highest available technology and best quality materials and there must be a safe storage of waste.	9666-1780-7215			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 985	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The proposed arrangement is very much larger than expected - the new 'reactors' are much larger than the existing sites A and B. EDF have taken far more land from the countryside than is necessary. The locality - road system, local infrastructure would not cope with this proposal. I am not impressed with the landscaping proposal - the trees EDF intend to plant will not be big enough to make a significant cover and natural looking landscape. We do not want formal planting and layout here; we enjoy the countryside looking natural as it does at the moment. I am very concerned about the bulldozing of the habitat of many of our wild animals and insects, and the trees and wild plants. I am very disappointed in EDF's attitude to the local parishioners - they dont act upon our concerns. I am very worried indeed about the proposals.	9743-1780-129			/	
Tractivity 1172	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Get the whole project done as quickly as possible! Keep local people FULLY informed. Use the present helipad at Hinkley - why is there a need for another. Keep drivers of all vehicles aware of not speeding and show tolerance from horseriders and cyclists.	9930-1780-125	/			
Tractivity 1177	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I appreciate the need for the powerstations, and consider the site to be a satisfactory one. However EDF must make every effort to minimise the impact on local communities. I am concerned that a helicopter pad is being planned, which implies that there will be movements by helicopter. This seems totally unnecessary and will cause great aggravation - we have enough nuisance at present from the MOD helicopters.	9935-1780-6587	/			
Tractivity 1221	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? LATE. Built next to an AONB and SSSI the site needs to be as hidden as possible from view. Can the colour be looked into to lessen its visual impact from the Quantock Hills.	9979-1780-125		/		
Tractivity 374	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Some concern about such a large generator adjacent to salt water. February 9th 1990 all circuits into Hinkley Point A and B were lost due to salt laden winds. The loss of 3200 MW(e) would cause huge disruption to the national Grid, a 10% loss of average national load. Please consider enclosing the 400 kV substation.	9061-1780-4716		/		
Tractivity 457	Public	Stage 1	Any barns removed - could the building materials be re-used - in visitor centre for example.	9134-1780-1193			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 585	Public	Stage 1	2. Power station design should be sympathetic to the local landscape, take the minimum amount of land and blend into the landscape rather than stand out from it. Colour is a major factor; The blue Hinkley A site is much less intrusive than Hinkley B. There is scope for innovative design to achieve this.	9364-1780-5794		/		
Tractivity 611	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Ensure the building/reactors are coloured so as to blend into the landscape as much as possible ie not red as it shows on your website! Build all buildings, fences etc as small as possible and as close to existing reactors as possible. Keep any structures eg sea wall to a minimum and ensure the beach to the west of Hinkley is left as natural as possible. Ensure temporary jetty is as small as can be, is as close as possible to existing reactors and definatley removed as soon as it can be ie once all materials have been delievered and it is no longer needed. Ensure lighting is kept to a minimum and downlight things where possible. Visually the power station is going to have massive impact both at day and night and this should be considered carefully.	9275-1780-5066		/		
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	I believe the second stage consultation has been inadequate and lacks in the essential detail to put forward reasoned points or potential solutions i.e. such as the location, size & design of underwater intake and outlet structures. These structures on a marine reserve could seriously affect small boat navigation, interfere with flora & fauna but their location has not been identified on nautical charts or how they would affect navigation. Small sailing/low powered craft from the Parrett use the general area in transit & when fishing. The construction of the sea defence, its dimensions, any safe public access points to the foreshore etc. These would also impact the Safety case so I cannot believe that detailed information is not available. If it is not available then I worry that the plant will be safe.	10091-1780-2223			/	
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	The site of the Station is immediately next to the marine reserve when it could be set back further inland using slightly longer tunnels. Setting the station back further away from the foreshore would help minimise disturbance & light pollution to the marine reserve.	10091-1780-3620		/		
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Some of the responses during consultation were contradictory such as claiming a building with a crane in it would be equivalent single story height...claiming that Hinkley traffic was currently the same or greater than ever when we know that it is not....no mention of wildfowling & beach casting activity on the foreshore when this was pointed out during first stage consultation...	10091-1780-11519			/	
Tractivity 62578	Public	Stage 2	You are building a 760 metre sea wall and a nuclear power station, for heaven's sake. An on-site wharf would surely be a walk in the park for your engineering masterminds!	10129-1780-15993		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62617	Public	Stage 2	(personal details removed) of Nether Stowey would like to know the height of the proposed C station, in relation to the height of the existing A/B station.	10164-1780-48		/		
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The buildings on this site will be very large and highly visible and we are keen to see them treated with honesty as powerful industrial objects. We urge the team to draw on the precedents of Battersea and Bankside power stations, which proudly imposed themselves on their industrial landscapes, and which are still celebrated as exciting landmark buildings today. Another useful precedent is the industrial heritage of the Landschaftspark in the Ruhr Valley of Germany, which now draws many tourists.	10185-1780-4638		/		
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The design of the turbine halls is very imposing and we suggest that a more modest architecture that defers to the reactors might be more appropriate. There is also a disconnect between the solidity of the turbine halls and the glassy skin of the operational service centre; the site-wide architectural strategy might develop the idea of one sort of architectural approach for the podium level structures and a different perhaps lighter treatment at higher level generally that does not compete with the primary quality of the reactor domes in views of the site.	10185-1780-5410		/		
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The large bulky structures in the north-east corner of the site will be particularly visible from the coastal path and will need to be very carefully handled.	10185-1780-5973		/		
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Material specification of robust, durable materials is vital to preserving the long-term appearance of the buildings. For example, the fair faced, in-situ concrete reactor buildings, which will be unclad, could suffer long term deterioration of their appearance as a result of weathering and we recommend careful specification of the concrete mix of the outer layer.	10185-1780-6397			/	
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We are aware that a large amount of work has been undertaken on the design of the reactors and main turbine buildings on the site. The scale of these is massive and we are surprised that they are, in comparison to the existing Hinkley A and B on the site, going to be so conspicuous in the landscape, given the amount of surface treatment and levelling that is anticipated. Clearly the amount and nature of mitigation proposed is going to be essential in helping to reduce this impact however we would raise the following points: - Need to understand and agree the types of materials and colours to be used on the complex - Importance of the treatment of the boundaries to the site and in particular on the eastern side close to the Scheduled Monument.	10190-1780-6411		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- We would put forward a suggestion that at least one of the 3 agricultural buildings that are proposed for demolition within the main site could be rebuilt and incorporated into the main site perhaps for use as part of the visitors facilities. This would not only be a very proactive form of mitigation but would also allow for a certain acknowledgement towards the vernacular architectural traditions of this part of Somerset.	10190-1780-10380		/		
Civil Aviation Authority	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Aviation Promulgation. There is a civil aviation requirement in the UK for all structures over 300 feet high to be charted on aviation maps. Given that the tallest structure is anticipated to be 80m (263ft) high, there would be no civil aviation charting requirement. That said, I understand that the MoD promulgate structures of heights less than 300fet.	10193-1780-3365			/	
Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	DPTAC has identified four overarching principles on which to base its advice to Government, other organisations and disabled people, which are that: - accessibility for disabled people is a condition of any investment; - accessibility for disabled people must be a mainstream activity; - users should be involved in determining accessibility; - achieving accessibility for disabled people is the responsibility of the provider.	10194-1780-709			/	
Friends of Quantocks	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	As the amenity society for the Quantock Hills, our principal concern is with the impact of the development viewed from the hills. We appreciate that the general scale of the structures is inescapable but wish to emphasise the importance of doing everything possible to mitigate their impact.	10261-1780-150a			/	
Friends of Quantocks	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We believe that there are two ways of doing this - by softening the shape and edges of structures and by careful use of colour in the external materials. Carefully handled, these can go a long way to soften the intrusion of buildings in the landscape and to help them to merge more into the background.	10261-1780-150b		/		
Friends of Quantocks	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We are pleased to see the rounded domes of the reactors but are concerned about the 'lumpish' character of the turbine halls which, although they are lower than the Hinkley Point B are considerably larger. The model makes them particularly square-edged and hard, whereas the photo-montage appears to indicate more modelling, which we would welcome, particularly of the outline and edges.	10261-1780-751		/		
Friends of Quantocks	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The model is all in monochrome white which is no doubt intended to lessen the apparent impact in the landscape, but the colour and reflectivity of the materials will play a major role in the impact of the structures and is of considerable importance.	10261-1780-1144	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Cooling Water Tunnels: Detailed design of the intake structure needs to be provided, along with information on how the proposed design and screening arrangements will minimise the entrainment and impingement of fish in the intake. Please note that we expect proposals related to this area to be based on the use of Best Available Technology (BAT) on water abstraction. It is noted that one of the assumptions in the assessment work on the impingement and entrainment of fish is that there will be no fish return system. The lack of a fish return system is a major concern. The provision of a fish return system would give some measure of mitigation to the issue of fish entrainment into the intake tunnels.	89069-1780-2012	/			
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Topic: Cooling water discharge Issue: Information not matching up / unclear Comment: The temperature effects associated with the cooling water discharge (Sections 17.7.59 to 17.7.82, pp31 to 39) are based on a cooling water discharge of 120 m3/s at a temperature of 12°C above ambient (Section 17.7.61). However in Section 17.7.59, it is stated that the current understanding is that the discharge temperature will be 12.5°C above ambient. Further to this the initial statement on compliance with WFD temperature standards (17.7.75) does not seem to match the information in Table 17.12on compliance with Water Framework Directive (WFD) High/Good Status. Action: Clarity and constancy is required on the temperature figures used.	89075-1780-308			/	
Countryside Council for Wales	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Cooling towers have been used extensively at nuclear generating stations in both the United States and France. As this is essentially a French reactor, we presume that the technical knowledge required should already be present with EDF? Certain U.S. plants are being required to retro fit closed circuit cooling by state Departments of Environmental Protection on environmental impact grounds under the Clean Water Act. We refer you to the U.S Supreme Court ruling on the "River keeper" case (2009), where it agreed with EPA that cost benefit analysis is not essential when determining reduced risk to the environment and that BAT for water use should be required. (http://www.riverkeeper.org/news-events/news/stop-polluters/power-plant-cases/u-s-supreme-court-decides-riverkeeper-case/).	89128-1780-2977		/		
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Most of the concerns relate to areas of the development peripheral to the main site, as SPC accept that the decision to build a new nuclear power station on this site has in principle been taken by the Government and the design of the facility is being assessed by others. There are however some landscaping, building and transport issues that affect the main site.	89288-1780-2024			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[7.3.1] 'Metallic clad enclosures would be silver coloured.' There is a serious concern about sun glint off these large buildings. Will EDF say how they will mitigate this?	89289-1780-9912		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[2.3.1] Table 2.1 provides sizes of site buildings, but not of the tallest structures on site which are the two chimneys and the EDF pylons. Will EDF supply sizes of these structures?	89291-1780-7198	/			
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	1.4 In consequence, the Estate requests that every effort is made by means of design and layout to reduce the significance of potential major/moderate adverse visual impacts wherever practicable. The Estate requires further information relating to the height of the proposed buildings and screening landform in relation to existing ground levels to understand that such an approach has been adopted.	89439-1780-2773	/			
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	1.6 The Estate requires confirmation from EDF that the proposed buildings are designed to be set as low as practical into the ground to minimise visual impacts arising from their overall height, scale and mass and, similarly, that consideration has been given to the selection of building materials and colours to assimilate the structures into the landscape. Where practical, new buildings should be set against existing buildings to provide visual cohesion and where they would not be prominent on the skyline. Given the high quality of the receiving landscape and seascape the Estate asks that consideration is given to sensitive integration of both the new and existing buildings and that reflective finishes and/or strong colours (such as at Hinkley Point B) will be avoided. The neutral concrete finish to the rectangular pylons on the Second Severn Crossing provides a cue to colour/materials that blend easily into the local landscape. Further information relating to the proposed building heights, appearance and duration is required to assess the potential impacts likely to arise from the temporary on-site accommodation which is likely to have an adverse effect on views from rural areas to the south and west of the site.	89439-1780-3557		/		
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	5.15 Although not an integral part of Traffic movements and Travel Plan concepts that have been identified, it is anticipated that given the somewhat removed location of the Hinkley Point site, a landing facility for helicopters may well be provided. It could reasonably be expected that use of this facility would be made by EDF, their contractors and the emergency services. 5.16 The Estate wishes to highlight and receive assurances that the use of such a facility on a routine basis should be minimal, with a limit placed on the number of helicopter movements allowed per day and which would be restricted to daylight flying hours only. In addition, the flight path approaches should be selected to minimise the environmental impact, with routes varied where possible. The Estate accepts that the use of such a facility for emergency situations will be required outside of these constraints.	89442-1780-6518	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	The whole list of changes to the associated development and main site layouts do not materially change our advice set out in our Stage 2 response. In some instances the new proposals have reduced our concerns regarding this area.	89711-1780-1309			/	
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	We note that your Notice refers to the construction of a sea wall. We understand that the sea wall is to be constructed, at least in part, on land owned by the Environment Agency. Again, as with the Consultation on the Stage 2 Preferred Proposals, the Environment Agency, as landowner welcomes the opening of negotiations in relation to the sea wall at the earliest opportunity so that compulsory purchase can be avoided.	89711-1780-10142			/	
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	5 The proposals remain silent as to the site levels of the proposed buildings on the main site. Without this information, it is impossible to assess accurately the visual impact of the proposals and/ or the efficacy of any proposed landscaping.	89767-1780-1261	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	The County Council has not seen the proposed details for the Bum Bridge crossing for the emergency access road. The potential flood risk at this location should be fully assessed to the Council's satisfaction. Details of the proposed bridge crossing and an assessment of the flood risk associated with the crossing should be presented to the Council.	89864-1780-3218	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We also question whether opportunities for workers to take a break outside for example to eat their sandwiches away from the formal cafe facilities have been adequately considered. However, overall the landscape design proposal has the potential to enhance the everyday working environment for more than 900 people, and the experience of visitors to the site. We welcome the recognition that the quality of the working landscape has a real value. If realised to the standard shown in the example indicative treatments, this will be a rich and attractive environment	10185-223-2175			/	Comments were received during consultation on the appropriateness of construction fencing including fencing running along the north side of Bum Brook. Following these comments a change to fencing arrangements during construction has been to relocate the southern fence from the boundary along the north bank of Bum Brook further north to OS northing line 144750. This effectively moves main construction activity out of the Shurton valley and in doing so has addressed concerns raised by local residents over the proximity of construction activities near to where they live.
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The treatment of the site edges is less well resolved. The reinstated coastal walk appears a potentially hostile experience within a narrow margin of left over space next to the secure perimeter fence. Acknowledging the technical constraints on the setting out of the nuclear island, we recommend that the team considers allowing the path to widen out locally where feasible to create a more generous, thoughtfully designed path from which views of the power station can be enjoyed by walkers.	10185-223-2745	/			With regard to specific details of construction fencing around the perimeter of the site, these details are provided as part of the site preparation works planning application.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Authorities position May 2010: Need further information on fencing proposed - of particular concern to local residents Update September 2010: No clear information is provided .	89327-223-6374	/			Comments were also received on the alignment of permanent site fencing in relation to the coastal path. In response to these comments, the location of the fence has been set back from the coastal path which will allow an improved experience for walkers. The issue of use of amenity space within the main site was also raised during consultation. The location of the Operational Service Centre (OSC) in the middle of the power station places restrictions on the amount of amenity space available for staff as operational land use requirements must take priority. There are also safety matters to consider. The Company's approach has been to create amenity space within the OSC building via the atrium where workers can take a break in amenable but safe surroundings.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The residents of Shurton and its surrounding hamlets have previously expressed great concern about the construction of a perimeter security fence.	89334-223-5916			/	
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	The whole list of changes to the associated development and main site layouts do not materially change our advice set out in our Stage 2 response. In some instances the new proposals have reduced our concerns regarding this area.	89711-223-1309			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	However, the design at the moment throws up many questions: it is not yet clear whether the bands are really meaningful, or whether the concept will be at all legible at ground level. The rationale for the orientation of the striations should be clarified; have they been designed to respond to existing features in the landscape or based on consideration of from where it might be desirable to view down the axes for example? The treatment of the edges of the masterplan is also ambiguous. Where it meets the coast, the relationship of the secure site boundary to the coastal path and the potential for retaining the new jetty should be considered. At all edges of the site, further work is needed to demonstrate how the strips will end and what relationship they will have to the site perimeter or existing landscape features.	8732-224-2256	/			<p>Visual screening of construction and Hinkley Point C (HPC) from villages to the south</p> <p>A combination of the existing rolling site topography, especially the retained Green Lane ridge running across the centre of the HPC development site, and the proposed use of construction spoil to build up the existing ridge south of Green Lane in a naturalistic shape to a maximum of +35M AOD would provide a high level of screening of HPC from villages to the south. The majority of the Green Lane hedgerow would be retained, with an additional line of hedgerow planted to the north of the track. In addition, the landscape restoration proposals include extensive woodland screen planting along this enhanced ridge.</p> <p>Many consultees, especially local residents, commented on the proximity of construction works and the on-site accommodation campus, and the adequacy of screening during construction. As a result, it was agreed that the land south of latitude 144750 N which was originally proposed to be used as part of the construction site was to be excluded from major construction works. Further comments recommended more effective use of this land as a buffer between the villages. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, it was further proposed that after the implementation of site preparation works, the restoration of land south of latitude 14750 N which had originally been proposed on completion of HPC, was brought forward to the start of construction phase. This change was welcomed by many consultees at the Stage 2 Update Consultation. The early restoration of this southern land enabled a much higher and more naturalistic screening landform to be implemented, and supported the early implementation of screen planting. This would have the effect of improving the screening of construction from villages to the south, and improving screening of HPC from villages to the south due to the earlier establishment of the screening landscape and planting.</p> <p>Restoration design to reflect local landscape character</p> <p>The landscape character of the HPC development site and its context in the wider landscape was assessed through reference to the National, County and District,</p>
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The form and colour of off-site planting will also be important in mitigating or framing particular views from closer view points. We suggest that the design team re-visits the principles of the planting schemes for the two existing reactor sites, which may still be relevant.	8732-224-4497	/			
Quantock Hills AONB Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The Permanent Development -3.2.4. 'The masterplan seeks to minimise so far as possible the visual impact of the development from the Quantock Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) ...'. This statement does not really hold any weight as it gives no indication as to how the masterplan proposes to do this.	8734-224-2062	/			
Homes & Communities Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	- Environmental enhancement. The site is in a rural area and has value for visual amenity and as a landscape resource. Due to the scale of the facilities, however, the scope for visual mitigation is quite limited. The Stage 1 consultation says that the impact on neighbouring properties during construction will be reduced by implementing a landscape buffer on the southern boundary, but it notes that there will be areas for spoil storage to the south of Green Lane. All measures should be sought to ensure that visual and noise intrusion are kept to a minimum.	8694-224-1550			/	
Natural England	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Fig 10.8 2.The concept design for site restoration does acknowledge the pattern of landscape features in the area and on site restoration should seek to reflect those characteristics, together with the pre-existing features. A landscape management plan for the area should be prepared to give guidance on how the landscape will be managed into the future.	8737-224-6031	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Natural England	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	3.The restoration options for the site cover a significant area contain a range of existing landscape features and wildlife habitats. Whilst these features can be recreated, any potential archaeology in the area cannot be reinstated once disturbed and therefore the operational areas during construction and the area of restoration of disturbed ground should take this into account. This also relates to para 3.14.13 - reference to the planting of woodland and manipulation of levels associated with screening. There may be some flexibility with the location and height of any earth bunding in order to accommodate landscape features. The benefit of any bunding and planting will be very localised and it may be more appropriate to create copses that reflect local character. The reference to enhancement of wildlife corridors and sensitive hedge management is welcomed, and this approach can be encouraged in any off-site mitigation measures (e.g. longer cycle of management for hedges allowed to grow taller).	8737-224-6391	/			and Local Landscape Character studies. Further field studies were carried out across the Quantock Vale area to define detailed local landscape character. An understanding of the landscape character was identified as a key component for both construction and restoration proposals that would successfully integrate the development into the surrounding landscape. The landscape restoration proposals were for naturalistic landform reflecting the existing rolling topography, structured with hedgerow field boundaries, coastal woodland brakes, and a larger area of naturalistic woodland on the inland ridge following the restoration contours. Several consultees including Natural England, commented on the importance of local landscape character informing all elements of the restoration landscape, and recommending that the inland woodland be broken up into smaller units, with angular outlines, in the style of 19 th Century planned agricultural landscape. The landscape restoration plan was changed to reflect these views. The inland woodland was broken into two smaller but overlapping woodlands, which maintained the screening from the southern villages. The smaller woodlands were designed with angular outlines, based on the 1841 Tithe map which showed the field patterns on site during the 19 th Century. Areas of non-angular scrub were omitted, and the habitat they would have provided compensated for with additional double hedgerows and hedgerow/scrub in the interiors edges of the woodland glades.
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	3. Mitigating the Impact of Developing the Main Site -It is recommended that further consultation is undertaken with WSC, Stogursey Parish Council and the West Hinkley Action Group regarding the proposed site layout and landscaping proposals for the main site. It will be particularly important to understand whether a buffer to be provided to the south of the main construction site will assist in mitigating the impacts of the project. This bund should be located as far north as possible to maximise the potential to mitigate the impacts of the development and to minimise impacts on properties in Shurton.	88780-224-4851	/			
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	3.4.9 The response also recommends that EDF considers all the comments and recommendations set out in the Technical Evaluation Report (Appendix 3) including comments on geology, soils and land use, land contamination and waste, hydrogeology, hydrology, drainage and flood risk, fresh water quality, marine water and sediment quality, hydrodynamic and coastal geomorphology, terrestrial, marine and coastal flora and fauna, noise and vibration, landscape and visual amenity, archaeology and cultural heritage and amenity and recreation.	88790-224-25558			/	Integration of HPC into landscape The landscape restoration was designed to integrate HPC development into the surrounding landscape. The restoration contours were designed to create naturalistic landform, building on the existing rolling landscape. This would provide screening of HPC particularly from the coastal footpath, Fairfield Estate and Quantock Hills AONB to the west, and local villages to the south, south-west and south-east. The majority of the Green Lane ridge, hedgerow and boundary hedgerows would be retained. Temporary bunds proposed during construction, such as the initial southern screening bund and the north-western bund were less naturalistic in form. Many consultees were keen to see not only the restoration landform but any temporary screening bunds naturalistic in shape, in keeping with the local
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	e) In terms of the landscape and visual impact, there will clearly be a significant impact as a result of the development of the site. Overall the appearance of the station as indicated in the document presents significant risk to the perception of the coast and its rural setting. Whilst a Masterplan has been developed it is not clear from the information presented what attempts can be made to mitigate against the inevitable impacts. More needs to be done to ensure a better "fit" into its landscape. Furthermore, the document makes reference to the development of a landscape buffer to reduce the impact of the construction phase to the local communities. It is suggested that EDF undertake specific consultation and engagement with the local community, and key stakeholders (such as the AONB Service) to ensure that the design of the 'environmental buffer' takes account of their views.	87910-224-5036	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Kilve Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The sound and light mitigation project to the north of Shurton should be started as soon as possible. A very high "bank" running east - west from the C182 to the proposed bridge over Bum Brook near Benhole lane should be created and then left, not removed following completion of the construction. This bank should be as far to the North of Shurton as is possible and practical, and planted with trees, shrubs and grassed, then left to establish. Not only would it reduce light and noise pollution, (providing that it was as far to the North of Shurton as possible) but it would also create a wildlife habitat for the future.	88930-224-22333	/			<p>landscape character. The early restoration of the southern area enabled the screening landform along this boundary to be more naturalistic as well as higher. The north-western bund would undulate with the adjacent local land levels, as further drawings have illustrated.</p> <p>Protecting views of construction and HPC from Quantock Hills AONB</p> <p>The high level long distance views of HPC from the Quantock Hills AONB together with the open rolling landscape do not support complete screening of HPC. The restoration landform and vegetation have been designed to wrap around HPC from the west and south, which will integrate the development into the landscape by screening lower level buildings and infrastructure.</p> <p>Several consultees have expressed concerns that views from the Quantocks AONB need to be protected. Views produced by the 3D model have demonstrated the effectiveness of the landscape restoration proposals in screening lower level views, leaving only the simpler uncluttered forms of the reactor domes which are more harmonious with the large scale sweeping coastal landscape.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	Figure 10.8 included within the Stage 1 Consultation document identifies that a visual and mitigation buffer is to be provided to the south of the construction site. In order to clarify whether or not this Buffer, in the view of the authorities, is appropriate it will be important to understand the scale of what is proposed and to assess the impacts that it will have on those residents living immediately adjacent to the site. Whilst the benefits of such a Buffer could be welcome, a more detailed understanding of the proposal and wider landscape plans are required. It is recommended that further consultation is undertaken with the authorities, Stogursey Parish Council and the West Hinkley Action Group (residents of Shurton, Burton and Knighton) regarding the proposed site layout and landscaping proposals.	88100-224-3023	/			<p>Several consultees have expressed concerns that views from the Quantocks AONB need to be protected. Views produced by the 3D model have demonstrated the effectiveness of the landscape restoration proposals in screening lower level views, leaving only the simpler uncluttered forms of the reactor domes which are more harmonious with the large scale sweeping coastal landscape.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	The form and expected visual effect of the landscape buffer has not been detailed within the Stage 1 Consultation document. There is limited information on any alternatives to the landscape buffer. There is limited information on future landscape treatment that might be made to the landscape buffer were it to be retained as a feature in the future. Further information / clarity on these issues is required in order to form a response to this question. In particular the following items are requested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirmation on final form of landscape buffer including plans and sections relative to existing topography; - Photomontages at key points through to the southern boundary and at varying distances to confirm on scale of the feature in the context of the surrounding area (particularly around Shurton); - Confirmation of mechanisms to avoid hydrological effects on Brooks (including any flood compensation) measures; - Commentary on terrestrial ecology effects of developing the landscape buffer is required. 	88600-224-628	/			<p>Protecting views of construction and HPC from coastal footpath</p> <p>Low level, short to medium views of HPC from the coastal footpath together with the open rolling landscape character do not support complete screening of HPC. The restoration landform and vegetation have been designed to wrap around HPC from the west and south, screening lower level development.</p> <p>A few consultees have identified the importance of views from the coastal footpath. The 3D model views have demonstrated the effectiveness of the landscape restoration in screening lower level buildings, integrating the large uncluttered reactor domes into the rolling coastal landscape.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	It is strongly recommended that any site restoration be conducted in full consultation with Natural England and with due reference to the Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) for the area. A range of site restoration / enhancement measures should be put forward indicating the relative opportunities that might be delivered in terms of securing long term habitat function. Although this question refers to a range of options, these are not adequately detailed within the Stage 1 Consultation document from which a preferred selection of measures can be made.	88600-224-1967	/			<p>Protection of Public Right of Way (PRoW) network during construction and at restoration</p> <p>For reasons of safety, the PRoW across HPC development site would be closed during construction, with alternative routes provided around the site boundary.</p> <p>Several consultees objected to the long term closure of the coastal footpath, and as a result the coastal</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
West Hinkley Action Group	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>- Bund or southern site boundary to be moved further north to lessen the adverse visual effects on nearby properties and leaving access for walkers to the south. Much more detail is necessary and required before further constructive comment can be made and the local community, especially those living immediately adjacent to the bund, should be fully informed and directly consulted throughout the process. The earth bank should be planted up without delay and be made environmentally friendly and visually appealing in ways that lay the groundwork for future use by the community. Money and effort should be vigorously directed towards this end as a form of partial mitigation of the effect of the development and the construction process. Further measures may be necessary. Consultation should be continuous.</p>	8755-224-851	/			<p>footpath closure has now been limited to 3 years. Several consultees identified the need for access to land south of latitude 144750 N for walking and recreation, especially for local residents. As a result of the change to exclude the area of southern land from major works (except for early restoration and the emergency access track and bridge), it was also agreed that the public could access this area during construction except during certain phases when the bridge or landform were being built. At landscape restoration, a network of PRoW is proposed across the whole restored landscape, connected to the existing surrounding network, with enhancements such as additional permissive paths and bridleway routes.</p> <p>Protecting biodiversity from short to long term</p> <p>The landscape restoration has been designed to provide extensive areas of a wide range of valuable wildlife habitats, delivering a significant biodiversity gain in the long term. Habitat creation during construction has been designed to protect biodiversity in the shorter term.</p> <p>The restoration habitat creation has been broadly welcomed by consultees. A few consultees have recommended specific features such as woodland and ponds, and these have been included in the restoration design. A few consultees have commented that construction measures were not adequate. As a result, during construction, biodiversity and habitat protection/creation has been increased by the identification of further areas for habitat retention during site preparation works, off-site planting of woodland and hedgerow on Fairfield Estate, extensive wildflower meadow creation on nearby off-site agricultural land, and the early restoration of land south of latitude 144750 N.</p> <p>Early restoration</p> <p>As described in the above discussion on visual screening of construction and HPC from villages to the south, the initial designs for land south of latitude 144750 N have been modified to change the use of this land from construction site to area of early</p>
West Hinkley Action Group	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>- Provision of alternative routes to closed public rights of way; direct consultation with local community groups and residents as well as the parish council over alternative routes at every closure.</p>	8755-224-4107	/			
West Hinkley Action Group	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Your experts identified the fact that the bund proposed by EDF will not mitigate noise or visual impact. We would therefore like a screen of trees to be planted along the ridge from Benhole Lane on the west to the C182 on the east to provide visual screening and to compensate for the destruction of habitat which will take place north of this line. This screen will also contribute to the provision of bio-diversity and new habitats to replace those which will be destroyed.</p>	8755-224-6283	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset Wildlife Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	we understand this information will come through the Stage 2 consultation on the Environmental Statement from the project EIA. In summary, our concerns at this stage relate to a lack of strong environmental commitment coming from EDF Energy. The Trust is not confident that the nuclear build and associated infrastructure developments will cause anything other than a wildlife deficit, as no firm statement has come from EDF Energy that they will adopt a comprehensive landscape-scale mitigation strategy to address all biodiversity impacts through the short to long term, and demonstrate that this proposed project will benefit both people and wildlife.	8769-224-1942	/			landscape restoration right from the start of construction. A temporary screening buffer was originally proposed along parts of the southern boundary, with temporary woodland screen planting. Many consultees commented that this temporary buffer and screen planting should be retained after construction of HPC, and that the earlier screen planting was implemented the better, so it had longer to establish and grow up. As a result of this feedback, the southern temporary bund was developed as a larger more naturalistic screening landform to be retained and incorporated into the whole construction site landscape restoration. The screen planting in the south, and in the majority of the site, has been designed to be retained as part of the scheme, both for early establishment and habitat continuity.
Tractivity 725	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? As long as you look after the wild life during construction. Lots of tree planting in the early stages so when it is complete the trees would be established.	9483-224-127	/			
Tractivity 735	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The landscaping, bund and planting should be sufficient on the southern side of the fence to obscure the visual impact of the fence. Planting will need to ensure that this effect is year-round, not just in the summer.	9493-224-125	/			Provision of greater details The landscape restoration was developed over the period of consultation. Initially planting species were shown with illustrated planting palettes and landform shown with cross-sections. Several consultees felt that the initial information provided was too sketchy. As the design developed further, planting schedules have been developed identifying species lists, planting sizes, percentages and layout. Landform has been illustrated with further drawings and visuals, including Visually Verified Images from key selected viewpoints, produced using the 3D model.
Tractivity 742	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Generally ok but pylon design should be addressed and match those eventually used by National Grid (a better design is required)	9500-224-127			/	
Tractivity 742	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Generally satisfactory but when you've "gone" don't leave a "footprint" all over the area!	9500-224-6428	/			Visual screening from villages' south-west of site At landscape restoration, screening of HPC from villages to the south-west would be provided by the retained Green Lane ridge, the enhanced inland ridge and woodland screen planting, and the retained boundary hedgerows along the western and southern HPC development site boundaries.
Tractivity 746	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The construction site is far too large an area, which will cause misery to local people's lives. WE appreciate the area of land that you have returned, but hate the idea of the destruction of such a huge area of lovely green land that has given local people pleasure for decades. Positive comments as follows: 1. Retain existing hedges and trees that are south of the boundary 2. Allow free access to the area south of your boundary 3. Minimise destruction of trees and hedges within site. No 'scorched Earth' 4. Provide warden/maintenance so that new planting does not dies. Make long term provision to ensure boundary planting and wildlife thrive. 5. The completed site looks good. However that is many years away.	9504-224-129			/	Visual screening from Fairfield Estate area of

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 746	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? You gave what we asked for some thank you for that. It was long time coming. Provide for wildlife south of boundary and also shield west of site from village of Burton/Knighton. Buuild a fence that enables wildlife to escape. Retain all trees and ledges in southern boundary area. Do not bulldoze trees and ledges beyond southern bounday i.e. Bishop?s Wood - until absolutely necessary. Leave bonhole lane alone!	9504-224-1101			/	<p>outstanding scenic interest</p> <p>The restoration landform wraps around HPC from the west and south. This naturalistic rolling landscape screens views of lower level buildings and infrastructure of HPC, leaving only views of the simpler shaped reactor domes, which are more harmonious with the massive uncluttered coastal slopes.</p> <p>A few consultee comments requested 3D modelling to prove the effectiveness of the proposed restoration screening landform on the southern and western site boundaries. Consultees also requested further screening measures during construction. As a result, modifications were made to the restoration screening landform in the north-west of the HPC development site, moving the ridge eastwards, and ensuring that the majority of the screen planting of Haysgrove Brake sits on the western face of the ridge, facing the Fairfield Estate area of outstanding scenic interest. 3D modelling has been undertaken which has demonstrated the effectiveness of the restoration screening landform in integrating the development into the landscape both in screening the lower level buildings of HPC and in providing a naturalistic shaped landform in keeping with the local landscape character of rolling hills. During construction, an undulating bund would run along the north-western site boundary, planted with native coastal shrub. This would provide screening from low level views from coastal footpaths and along the site boundary. In addition, screen planting on Fairfield Estate has been agreed, Phase 1 already implemented, with Phase 2 planned for winter 2011 planting.</p> <p>Landscape establishment management</p> <p>The landscape restoration planting strategy is divided into zonal planting typologies based on landscape character features and site conditions. A wide range of native plant species have been proposed to maintain and enhance local landscape character, to meet specific site conditions such as aspect, exposure, soil type and drainage, and to enhance biodiversity and wildlife habitat. Landscape establishment management would be provided by an integrated land management plan. This incorporates an outline habitat management plan, which identifies ecological management objectives for Hinkley Point</p>
Tractivity 750	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Even if the landscaping results do not produce a satisfactory screening outcome, this can always be increased or modified until it is satisfactory once the station is functioning.	9508-224-127			/	
Tractivity 767	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? In 20 years I am sure this will be both appreciated and effective. Unfortunately for me I will probably be part of the landscape myself by then.	9525-224-125			/	
Tractivity 784	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? This could be reduce even more by not building at all	9542-224-531			/	
Tractivity 784	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? no work permission should not be given therefore reinstate the land	9542-224-1071			/	
Tractivity 809	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Although further land could be gained from basing facilities off site while retaining housing on-site.	9567-224-547		/		
Tractivity 826	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? I think too much land is being enclosed and the whole construction area could be kept closer to the coast.	9584-224-129		/		
Tractivity 826	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? This is certainly better than the initial proposal, but as already stated on the previous page I fell too much land is being enclosed.	9584-224-493			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 830	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? From the scale model on show at the consultation meeting the proposed landscaping appears very thoughtfully deployed. It should effectively hide the reactors from view of the public roadways.	9588-224-127			/	Nature Reserve. In particular, agricultural land to be returned to Fairfield Estate would be subject to a Management Plan. The replacement of dead trees would also be carried out for the first 2 years of establishment.
Tractivity 833	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? The land should be reinstated at EDF's cost.	9591-224-890			/	Among the consultation responses, there was a suggestion that a 5 year dead tree replacement period would be more appropriate given the challenging coastal location, and that a 5 year Management Plan would be required to ensure agricultural land is brought back to full productivity. As a result, the dead tree replacement period was extended to 5 years and the Management Plan for the restoration of agricultural land was agreed at 5 years.
Tractivity 838	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? 2 Stations will be additional eyesore. Visible from A on B. Landscaping will not be adequate to hide 3-4 storey portacabins during construction period or to hide completed stations from Quantock viewpoints.	9596-224-129			/	Protecting the setting of Pixie's Mound Pixie's Mound is a circular Bronze Age burial mound, listed as a Scheduled Monument, located to the north-east of the HPC development site. Landscape mitigation proposals included a low level screening landform, woodland screen planting, and a hedgerow with hedgerow trees designed to screen views of HPC from Pixie's Mound and its setting.
Tractivity 838	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Re-instating terrain and ancient hedgerows as they were is, of course impossible. Suggest you wait for planning permission.	9596-224-1086			/	One consultee, English Heritage, commented that the height and extent of the landform should be reduced, and the extent of the woodland screen planting and hedgerow trees should be reduced. This was required in order to keep important views open of Pixie's Mound from Wick Moor Drove, and maintain the mound in an open grassland setting. As a result, the landscape mitigation proposals were modified to reduce the screening mound and planting, so maintaining these key views.
Tractivity 846	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? EDF should wait for full planning permission like everyone else before starting any work. The land could never be reinstated as it is now, as we like it. No preliminary works!	9604-224-1160			/	
Tractivity 860	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? As far as I'm concerned but I don't know about people living closer	9618-224-127			/	
Tractivity 864	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? They seem to be aware of making it as screened as possible, its never going to be pretty	9622-224-127			/	
Tractivity 867	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? But I doubt that you ever really needed or intended to use the land in the first place.	9625-224-395			/	
Tractivity 869	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Does it need to be so large will you reduce the area after construction is complete.	9627-224-127			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 875	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Pleased to hear about the landscaping, treeplanting, etc. Will be less of an eyesore than Hinkley A + B	9633-224-127			/	
Tractivity 880	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? As long as it is not at the expense of any kind of security or safe operating parametres.	9638-224-393			/	
Tractivity 881	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? I think the proposals a reasonable and as good as we might expect.	9639-224-127			/	
Tractivity 889	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Moving the boundary further away from the houses is a good thing. Pity the trees (personal details removed) has been planting over the last twenty years are now going to be bulldozed out!	9647-224-127			/	
Tractivity 891	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? They need to have taken into account previous residents? comments	9649-224-127			/	
Tractivity 892	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Landscaping could be better . This looks too cheap.	9650-224-129			/	
Tractivity 905	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? As long as a ?return to green site? is agreed then this may be ok	9663-224-127			/	
Tractivity 908	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Looks fine and will be a visual indication of whether the environment around the powerstation is clean and sustains growth.	9666-224-127			/	
Tractivity 908	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Anything you can do to reduce concerns of local residents is a positive more.	9666-224-506			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 913	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? As a lifelong resident of Bridgwater (Durleigh 10 years of that) and both family generations being residents of Bridgwater and Somerset for 6-8 generations before - myself and ALL my family are very excited and welcome EDF application for the Hinkley Point C. As for the proposed arrangement and landscaping - this is quite well planned and as a regular visitor to ?Stear? and also Beach-Castor to catch cod off this coast all sounds very exciting/	9671-224-125			/	
Tractivity 913	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? This proposal seems a very good solution/compromise.	9671-224-832			/	
Tractivity 915	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? See comment 1	9673-224-486			/	
Tractivity 920	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? When hinkley Point A and B were built we were told that trees would be planted to screen the buildings! No amount of landscaping will hide what is going to be a blot on the landscape, an ugly building which will complete the ruination of what was a beautiful part of our country. Tidal power is a much better option.	9678-224-129			/	
Tractivity 925	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Landscaping of the site should be more important - the edges of the site should be landscaped to blend in more with the local environment - more tree planting of the periphery	9683-224-129	/			
Tractivity 926	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The proposed plans are completely inappropriate. there is vast space between hinkley point and roads which are not in the middle of residential areas like a development would be in North Petherton. It is disgusting the proposals have got to this stage largely without the knowledge of any residents!	9684-224-129			/	
Tractivity 927	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? I find the the landscaping arrangements of Hinkley C irrelevant. Hinkley A and B can be seen for miles around. They are considered a necessary eyesore. Could you advise the people of this area what Hinkley C would look like. After all we will have to look at it from say, along the beach between Burnham and Brean, from the Quantocks, from the Polden Hills and even from the Mendip Hills. No amount of landscaping will hide it from those distances.	9685-224-129			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 931	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Would need to see plans and planting schemes before being able to make rational judgement.	9689-224-125			/	
Tractivity 933	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Why build on greenfield site when you could develop the construction site at Hinkley Point itself? This would reduce transport/haulage costs, congestion on country roads, noise and disruption to existing residents. What assurances are there that you will return the construction site to open land once you have finished, and what is to stop you from later declaring it a brown-field site and making it available for further development for housing or industrial use? What about the mainly negative impact this will have on people already living here, who never wanted to live near industry, noise, etc?	9691-224-6038			/	
Tractivity 934	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? I think that more use should be made of the land that is already in use - e.g. Hinkley A and parts of Hinkley B	9692-224-129			/	
Tractivity 935	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? In this age of environmental awareness and recycling I think that the land used for Hinkley A should be used, rather than taking a whole new tract of coastline and encroaching on an unspoilt area west of the current powerstations.	9693-224-129			/	
Tractivity 936	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Any screening of the site is preferable to none at all. However I am totally opposed to the erection of an accomodation block for 700 on site workers whether screened or not!!	9694-224-125			/	
Tractivity 937	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Landscaping to hide the construction site is essential, however I am strongly opposed to the accomodation block on site - nothing will 'screen out' the impact of several hundred men in the site day and night.	9695-224-129			/	
Tractivity 940	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? It is difficult to imagine until it is in place - and then it will be too late to have any views!	9698-224-125			/	
Tractivity 940	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? We don't live quite as close but am sure people who live nearer will be relieved.	9698-224-476			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 942	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? This is for the local residents to decide	9700-224-639			/	
Tractivity 945	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Some reservations - maturity of plants being used? Deciduous or evergreens? Native or imported?	9703-224-127	/			
Tractivity 961	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Your response is nowhere near enough. Please listen to the locals.	9719-224-397			/	
Tractivity 973	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? 500 acres of land will be devastated by the building and development of Hinkley C. EDF do not appear to be trying to minimise the environmental impact - there will be huge car parks, 420 spaces for the hostel alone. The light pollution from the three storey high hostel so close to the village will be terrible. The hostel has been sited on high ground, close to the southern boundary and will tower over the village. Not only will local residents have to cope with unbearable traffic, light pollution and noise from the preliminary works. EDF have not given any clear indication or plans as to how they will minimise the noise. I feel that the planting that is planned needs to include mature trees - 30-40 years old, the cost would be insignificant to such a large, profitable company and small improvements could make a huge difference to local residents.	9731-224-129	/			
Tractivity 981	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? You have obviously considered all the important issues very carefully	9739-224-127			/	
Tractivity 983	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Only to be dumped on someone else's doorstep?	9741-224-395			/	
Tractivity 985	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The proposed arrangement is very much larger than expected - the new ?reactors? are much larger than the existing sites A and B. EDF have taken far more land from the countryside than is necessary. The locality - road system, local infrastructure would not cope with this proposal. I am not impressed with the landscaping proposal - the trees EDF intend to plant will not be big enough to make a significant cover and natural looking landscape. We do not want formal planting and layout here; we enjoy the countryside looking natural as it does at the moment. I am very concerned about the bulldozing of the habitat of many of our wild animals and insects, and the trees and wild plants. I am very disappointed in EDF's attitude to the local parishioners - they dont act upon our concerns. I am very worried indeed about the proposals.	9743-224-129			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 986	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Powerstation far bigger than I was led to believe, when first told about it by EDF. Worried and upset that so much (500 acres) of land being bulldozed away and the old barns to be demolished. Rare and precious wildlife killed and disrupted. Trees to be planted not big enough. I wont see them mature in my lifetime. Worried about EDF?s attitude to this and to the local people. Very worried indeed about this proposal.	9744-224-129			/	
Tractivity 991	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? It remains to be seen how an area of land which has been taken down to bedrock, terraced and infilled with soil and rock debris could possibly be reinstated to it?s previous condition.The whole topography would be changed forever, natural features and watercourses will have been totally eradicated.	9749-224-1713			/	
Tractivity 993	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? How can you hide a nuclear power station?	9751-224-129			/	
Tractivity 1005	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Not able to view information	9763-224-672			/	
Tractivity 1014	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? not enough has been done	9772-224-422			/	
Tractivity 1016	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Any screen planting will be totally inadequate until long after the construction work is over and the on site hostel is removed.	9774-224-129			/	
Tractivity 1016	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Any ?good neighbour? wouldn?t have considered using this land so close to residential properties.	9774-224-513			/	
Tractivity 1016	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? The land cannot be reinstated the same as what is now. It may not be wonderful but the local residents like it.	9774-224-1097			/	
Tractivity 1017	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Totally inadequate.	9775-224-129			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1017	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? EDF could manage with even less land if they had to.	9775-224-404			/	
Tractivity 1022	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Area used during construction should be restored to either its state before, or to an improved state.	9780-224-127	/			
Tractivity 1031	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Good that it's been moved but I would like to see a more compact site. I do understand is a lot of earth movement required and have concerns regarding flooding when valleys are filled in.	9789-224-485			/	
Tractivity 1059	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? We feel such premature action would be a unnecessary before obtaining full planning permission. You say you could reinstat land but this is never possible for the flora and fauna thst have already been displaced.	9817-224-888			/	
Tractivity 1062	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? I would like to see tree planting to start now as Sizewell B trees are only just producing the screening they were designed to do.	9820-224-127	/			
Tractivity 1063	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Satisfactory, on the small amount of information given.	9821-224-127			/	
Tractivity 1067	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Mature woodland and hedgerows cannot be simply reinstated. A planning application for the complete works should be submitted and at least given interim approval before the initiation of any works.I do not agree in the submission of part planning applications giving the impression that final approval is a done deal.	9825-224-1968			/	
Tractivity 1069	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? This power station cannot be landscaped.It is misleading to suggest that it can.	9827-224-129			/	
Tractivity 1070	Public	Stage 2	Although the objectives proposed by EDF are generally along the right lines there is a lack of detail that enables anyone to fully understand what will actually be provided and the timescale.	9828-224-164	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1076	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? The way in which EDF handled this is appalling. Many, many people have been fighting for this for a long time - this should have been recognized right from the beginning. More still needs to be done.	9834-224-573			/	
Tractivity 1078	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The destruction of existing young trees is unacceptable. They should be reused.	9836-224-129		/		
Tractivity 1083	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? I think it is great you have listened to local residents concerns but it only makes me think you did not need to buy so much land in the first place	9841-224-494			/	
Tractivity 1087	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The landscaping near the village could be done now. Especially the planting of trees to enable growth.	9845-224-129	/			
Tractivity 1087	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Reinstatement would be impossible as regards any trees and hedges.	9845-224-982			/	
Tractivity 1091	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? As far as I can tell the landscaping design is very vague. Beside from a raised soil level to ?disguise? the development, no further detailed information is available regarding planting of trees, size or type, distance apart, policies if any die, care of planted landscaping. There are limited viewing point ?mock ups? of when the HPC site is complete, those that have been shown, are on such a far distance that it is almost indistinguishable. As local residents know HP A&B are blot on the landscape from a vast majority of tourist destinations eg local beaches, the Quantock hills, Minehead. There appears to be no other landscaping in place to mask the two reactors proposed. A raised bund will not shield the site alone. What else is offered?	9849-224-129	/			
Tractivity 1092	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? There is no doubt that this will affect tourism in the area, since the station will be clearly visible from the A39 and the coast from Burnham northwards. We have been given no details of any proposed landscaping of other sites, elsewhere, (e.g. where we live and work), related to the construction phase.	9850-224-129	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1099	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Site boundary is too close to Shurton and construction works will make life intolerable to residents for many years to come. Little in concrete terms has yet been offered in way of mitigation. Tree planting proposed is too little and too late with none shown on the Western boundary as a visual/noise buffer for Burton and Knighton residents.	9857-224-129	/			
Tractivity 1099	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? This relatively small concession will still not mitigate for loss of amenity and planning blight which will inevitably be inflicted on local residents.	9857-224-724			/	
Tractivity 1104	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? As walkers we are pleased that the boundary was pushed back but have always felt that the amount of land acquired by EDF was excessive.	9862-224-482			/	
Tractivity 1105	Public	Stage 2	1. What are your views on the proposed arrangement and landscaping of the Hinkley Point C site? Box ticked: Unsatisfactory 1. Any other ideas or comments? It is insulting to ordinary people's intelligence to be asking	9863-224-0			/	
Tractivity 1105	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? How big of you! Is this question an exercise in P.R.? Aren't we good at listening? It seems to be the only thing you've listened to so far! Probably no coincidence either given that the majority of the Shurton/Burton Stogursey community are pro-nuclear by virtue of being dependant on British Energy for employment or have close family members who are employed by British Energy!	9863-224-1321			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1105	Public	Stage 2	<p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>No Consent No preliminary works! The idea that building new nuclear power stations will significantly reduce carbon emissions is fundamentally flawed and therefore to go ahead with these works in the absence of any Major consents from Central government is inappropriate. You know yourselves that there are numerous trees that are of a significant age, such that they are impossible to reinstate (In terms of the role they currently play in this ecosystem). You have already had a big impact on the ecosystem at the site by removing Badgers from the land, whose role as top predators may lead to knock on effects throughout the ecosystem. This sort of work is not just at your risk but at the risk of the whole community and ecosystems given the scale and scope of your plans. It is not you that will be left to pick up any pieces or live with the damage such work will do. Awaiting the appropriate consents so that the building of new nuclear power</p>	9863-224-2192			/	
Tractivity 1119	Public	Stage 2	<p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>You can not ?reinstate? land to the ecologu it had before.</p>	9877-224-951			/	
Tractivity 1120	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The site boundary is too close to Shurton and the construction noise and visual impact will have a detrimental effect on the lives of residents. Planning blight will also affect their ability to move away should they wish to do so. Traffic on the C182 generated by the construction will also adversely affect residents.</p>	9878-224-129			/	
Tractivity 1120	Public	Stage 2	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Good as far as it goes. However, the site is still too close to Shurton and should be confined as planned originally to land lying to the North of the green lane.</p> <p>Tree planting designed to act as a visual and noise barrier is taking place at toolate a stage to provide any effective mitigation.</p>	9878-224-704			/	
Tractivity 1120	Public	Stage 2	<p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Deeply worrying for local residents who are already suffering from stress-related conditions due to this proposal.</p> <p>It is unclear how EDF can possibly return this land to it?s previous condition should Hinkley C application be refused. The topography is due to be totally altered by terracing, the infilling of the Holford Brook valley with tonnes of spoil/rock debris, after all topsoil and vegetation has been totally removed.</p>	9878-224-1485	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1124	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? I understand that even with this reduction the villagers are still concerned and rightly so.	9882-224-469			/	
Tractivity 1130	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Lipstick on a pig doesn't work.	9888-224-129			/	
Tractivity 1137	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Wrong place to close to foreshore marine reserve no public access plans	9895-224-129		/		
Tractivity 1140	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Still too much	9898-224-419			/	
Tractivity 1140	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? too big an impact	9898-224-920			/	
Tractivity 1142	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? As long as it does return to as was status	9900-224-1029			/	
Tractivity 1143	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Shurton too small	9901-224-129			/	
Tractivity 1143	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? The land cannot be reinstated to current usage	9901-224-922			/	
Tractivity 1145	Public	Stage 2	I firmly believe that there is no requirement for nuclear power in order to "keep our lights on" therefore I am obviously opposed to the needless destruction of ancient hedgerows and woodland.	9903-224-164			/	
Tractivity 1145	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? It is impossible to reinstate the land as after your preliminary works it will no longer exist, it will just be an enormous hole.	9903-224-1243			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1153	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The proposed landscaping seems completely inadequate as the power station will be seen and heard for miles around which I believe is totally unacceptable in a developed country in this day and age.	9911-224-129			/	
Tractivity 1156	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The information presented is insubstantial and insufficient.	9914-224-129	/			
Tractivity 1159	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? an inappropriate site for such a large project.	9917-224-129			/	
Tractivity 1167	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? If the land is returned to original state following completion of the work - (this must be guaranteed) then the land should be used as required.	9925-224-510			/	
Tractivity 1171	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? As long as you stick to your promises	9929-224-395			/	
Tractivity 1172	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Get the whole project done as quickly as possible! Keep local people FULLY informed.	9930-224-125			/	
Tractivity 1173	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The overseeing of the landscaping of the site seem to have taken on board some of the concerns of local residents by proposing to move the workers accomodation a little further away from properties in Shurton but I was dismayed to hear the new proposed site is on top of the ridge nearby, therefore it will be much more visible to Shurton, Burton and all surrounding areas. You are planning to put a band of trees to the south of the site to minimise the eyesore of the boundary fence but I fear there will only be a small line of trees on the outside of the west boundary fence therefore the view from Burton, other hamlets and some public footpaths will have adequate screening.	9931-224-125	/			
Tractivity 1174	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The site appears to be much larger than is strictly necessary to carry out the proposed project. It is imperative that the landscaping is carried out asap.	9932-224-129	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1175	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Will have an unacceptable bearing on the local (adjacent) community who have to live there! It matters little whether the landscaping is carried out to a high standard or not. A blot on the coast line of Somerset is unavailable, if the project goes ahead.	9933-224-129			/	
Tractivity 1179	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Initial plan was completely inappropriate and unsympatheitc	9937-224-393			/	
Tractivity 1181	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? On completion of building power station reinstate to local peoples wishes	9939-224-391			/	
Tractivity 1182	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? This site WILL need landscaping. All works should take into account views from local people from Burton, Shurton, Stogursey and the hamlets. Local dialogue WILL BE worth the effort.	9940-224-125			/	
Tractivity 1182	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? It is good that you listen to local concerns. You should be guided by local view, effort here will bring long term benefits.	9940-224-560			/	
Tractivity 1183	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Of course it is satisfactory to reduce the amount of land used nearest to residents. of course the vast majority of people filling in this form will have no interest in this question at all. I presume it is included to highlight the fact you have listed to local residents - will please listen some more. You will be using some of this land for the emergency road - it doesn't seem very clear exactly where this is going.	9941-224-391	/			
Tractivity 1186	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? It is up to the people of Shurton, Burton and the locality to judge this	9944-224-125			/	
Tractivity 1186	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Again it is up to the local people of Burton, Shurton and area.	9944-224-451			/	
Tractivity 1187	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? As long as it?s not at the expense of any kind of security or safe operating parameters	9945-224-393			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1190	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? No amount of tree planting, bund building or other fancy features will hide or even soften the stark ugliness of a nuclear power station. If it is built it will be another blight on this beautiful stretch of unspoilt coastline.	9948-224-129			/	
Tractivity 1192	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Cutting out a large portion of countryside and removing access for workers, destroying the natural coastline. Is this landscaping?	9950-224-127			/	
Tractivity 1194	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The arrangements seem satisfactory for the power station and its functions, but they cannot be seen as satisfactory for the residents here. We cannot easily adjust to a blot on the landscape? The people in the villages nearest to Hinkley Point have many concerns which are not answered.	9952-224-129	/			
Tractivity 1195	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The site is not suitable with the current infrastructure, The road system is not adequate. The C182 is the only main route to the existing and proposal sites. EDF have stated that no improvements are to be made. The landscaping is not substantial and will not be effective for many years due to the small young trees being used. The size of the new build will be an eyesore to the area from both land sea and air.	9953-224-129			/	
Tractivity 1198	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Not viewed	9956-224-125			/	
Tractivity 1202	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Plans are vague, but may be ok!	9960-224-125			/	
Tractivity 1203	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? I am unsure of what your proposals are at this time. We want tree and shrubs to be used as screening along Benhole Lane and your southern boundary. We want the screening to be outside any security fence that you erect.	9961-224-125	/			
Tractivity 1210	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Tree and hedge planting should be done now	9968-224-129	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1216	Public	Stage 2	1. What are your views on the proposed arrangement and landscaping of the Hinkley Point C site? Box ticked: Satisfactory 1. Any other ideas or comments? Needs to be a lot more successful than the a and b stations	9974-224-0			/	
Tractivity 1217	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Why is so much land being taken up? Why is proposed hostel in such a prominent place? It would be visible for miles around.	9975-224-129			/	
Tractivity 1218	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Your plans for landscaping sound promising, provided the woodland planting uses good sized trees so that it doesn't take years before anything shows.	9976-224-127			/	
Tractivity 1221	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? LATE. Built next to an AONB and SSSI the site needs to be as hidden as possible from view. Can the colour be looked into to lessen its visual impact from the Quantock Hills.	9979-224-125	/			
Tractivity 1244	Public	Stage 2 Update	Hinkley C will be a massive construction site. I would assurances that EDF will do their utmost to reinstate lost hedgerows, woodland and trees removed from site as soon as possible to not impact on any flora and fauna in the area. We have a unique bird population with the West Somerset area and do not want to lose that. Other companies come in and say they will replace hedgerows and dont.	89510-224-2371			/	
Tractivity 1257	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? Screening measures do not seem adequate.	89523-224-496	/			
Tractivity 1277	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? I'll be amazed if C182 does get hidden from view as well as you depict! Our view from Stockland Bristol will be largely unaffected but that is not a problem to me. By then the EA will have changed the views far more dramatically.	89543-224-1899			/	
Tractivity 1310	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	The landscaping proposals seem quite good. The southern bank looks well planned to screen views.	89576-224-2307			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1346	Public	Stage 2 Update	WE ARE PLEASED WITH THE PROPOSED PLANTING SCHEME	89612-224-968			/	
Tractivity 1373	Public	Stage 2 Update	The land on the southern boundary should be returned for local use at the earliest opportunity.	89639-224-1757			/	
Tractivity 191	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Do you agree that EDF Energy's proposal to provide a landscape buffer on the southern boundary of the site is the best way of minimising the potential impact of the construction site for nearby local residents?</p> <p>Box ticked: Yes</p> <p>1. If yes, should this be retained as a permanent feature once construction is completed?</p> <p>Box ticked: Yes</p> <p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The hill closest to bishop wood should be raised to minimise visual impact.</p> <p>Great care is required due to risk to watercourses increasing the risk of flooding.</p> <p>2. Return to land to its previous use</p> <p>Box ticked: Not Important</p> <p>2. Creation of wildlife habitats</p> <p>Box ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Grassland</p> <p>Box ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Woodland</p>	8906-224-0			/	
Tractivity 204	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>this should be conducted with the maximum of input from the local residents, whose views and opinions on the ecological and amenity value of the residual landscaping, including any traffic flows resulting from the construction and operation of the proposed plant must be paramount.</p>	9335-224-348			/	
Tractivity 204	Public	Stage 1	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>the creation of wildlife habitats is unnecessary - this has been an agricultural landscape for many centuries and the wildlife in the area has adapted to this environment. The wildlife is a consideration, but not to the extent of actually engineering the environment to suit it.</p>	9335-224-895			/	
Tractivity 228	Public	Stage 1	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The site is already taking away a large area of open land. The natural beauty should be restored and improved for residents, visitors and wildlife.</p>	9338-224-854			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 266	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? I am concerned that a high security fence should be set back from the perimeter of the land owned by EDF, with natural planting of native trees between it and the roads or properties adjacent to the area so that its visual impact is reduced as much as possible.	8955-224-4465	/			
Tractivity 270	Public	Stage 1	3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction? The suggestion that there might be a footpath following the hedge line across the middle of the site sounds a good idea. Many people will be interested in seeing construction progressing and if the coast path is to be closed, temporarily, a diversion will be required.	8959-224-659			/	
Tractivity 270	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? My particular concern is the provision of good alternative footpaths which will fit in with existing rights of way outside the development area especially the coast path.	8959-224-3778			/	
Tractivity 273	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? It would be a marvellous gesture if as part of your preliminary works you could include some decommissioning of redundant structures to show that you not only build but also restore.	8962-224-5697		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 305	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Do you agree that EDF Energy's proposal to provide a landscape buffer on the southern boundary of the site is the best way of minimising the potential impact of the construction site for nearby local residents?</p> <p>Box ticked: Yes</p> <p>1. If yes, should this be retained as a permanent feature once construction is completed?</p> <p>Box ticked: Don't Know</p> <p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Need a clearer idea of what it will look like. Maybe if it is attractive and in keeping. It is very close to the boundary of my house and at the moment we look out at trees and open land. How high will it be? Will we feel blocked in? Will it affect the light? Will building it effect our bats and other wildlife?</p> <p>2. Return to land to its previous use</p> <p>Box ticked: Not Important</p> <p>2. Creation of wildlife habitats</p> <p>Box ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Grassland</p> <p>Box ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Woodland</p> <p>Box ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p>	8993-224-0			/	
Tractivity 307	Public	Stage 1	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Spoil from the site could be initially placed at the southern edge (but a distance away from existing dwellings to be agreed). This soil could become a permanent landscape etc fairly soon during the construction period, because later backfill would then be taken from the northern (more recent) spoil. This would allow an east to west right of way footpath to be installed earlier rather than waiting for the whole project to be finished</p>	8995-224-619	/			
Tractivity 340	Public	Stage 1	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Unless the previous owners need it returned to ensure their business is viable.</p>	9028-224-612			/	
Tractivity 365	Public	Stage 1	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Creation of wildlife habitats, Grassland and Woodland are already there and thriving. All you will be doing is removing what is already at the the site. So this question is a contradiction,</p>	9345-224-1588		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 367	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? as long as if permission is not granted for this build all preliminary works are reverted and the landscape is restored to it previous state	9054-224-4189			/	
Tractivity 377	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? This should be completed and fully landscaped before ANY construction work begins to attempt to negate the noise levels from such a massive construction project	9064-224-348	/			
Tractivity 377	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? All areas should be returned to its natural beauty as soon as work on that part of the site is completed not wait years until the whole project is complete	9064-224-776	/			
Tractivity 381	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? If any work is undertaken at own risk there should be a committment to reinstate existing if the bid is unsuccessful.	9067-224-4969			/	
Tractivity 389	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? i dont rate any of the options as i dont want it in the village in the first place	9074-224-613			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 397	Public	Stage 1	<p>11. Any other comments? See comments at end.</p> <p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? BUND Bund to be sited further north of Shurton, this will allow land south of the bund to be used as alternative to closed PROW's. If the bund is sited further north it will be on higher ground and therefore have more of a buffer effect to noise and visual intrusions. The bund should be planted with native species of hedgerow, trees etc to compensate for the removal of wildlife habitats on the construction site. Keep the destruction of hedgerows, trees and barns to a minimum. Recycle and re-use materials to form new wildlife habitats in, on and around the bund. More information is needed on the construction, appearance, location and shape of the bund. WESTERN AND EASTERN BOUNDARIES Screening (tree planting) to the western and eastern site boundaries to be put in place before construction work commences to buffer noise and visual impact. PROW's Public rights of way need to be kept open for as long as possi</p>	9348-224-3888	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 400	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Do you agree that EDF Energy's proposal to provide a landscape buffer on the southern boundary of the site is the best way of minimising the potential impact of the construction site for nearby local residents?</p> <p>Box ticked: Don't Know</p> <p>1. If yes, should this be retained as a permanent feature once construction is completed?</p> <p>Box ticked: no data</p> <p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Other ideas or comments</p> <p>2. Return to land to its previous use</p> <p>Box ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Creation of wildlife habitats</p> <p>Box ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Grassland</p> <p>Box ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Woodland</p> <p>Box ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>no data</p>	9083-224-0			/	
Tractivity 433	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>I don't live near the actual site, but I'm sure that if I did I would want this.</p>	9353-224-348			/	
Tractivity 433	Public	Stage 1	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>not living o the perimeter of the site I think that this is best left to the choice of those that do.</p>	9353-224-679			/	
Tractivity 435	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>It should be a lot bigger and go to the west as well</p>	9114-224-348			/	
Tractivity 441	Public	Stage 1	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>It would be unrealistic to expect land use to continue as before alongside a major power station - and potential terrorist target. However, it would be useful to both EDF and the local community to plan for appropriate agriculture with public access.</p>	9120-224-953			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 452	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? EDF must be proactive in consulting and listening to the concerns of local residents at every stage and provide experts in noise minimisation. Hours of work must be daytime only. Light pollution must be minimised. The proposed carpark for outages following the hostel demolition is in a ridiculous position as it is so far from the Hinkley C Station. It is open to abuse at other times. This area should be restored to a greenfield site.	9130-224-6573	/			
Tractivity 452	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? a) The proposed emergency exit/access road into the middle of a small village where the lanes flood in both directions is a major concern. b) Could this road not be combined with the existing one from Hinkley B? N.B If a) has to happen, this 'road' must be gated at the entrance to the site (not at the lane) and no access should be allowed to contractors at any time.	9130-224-7040a		/		
Tractivity 452	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? a) Any woodland or hedgerows removed must be replaced by new planting as soon as possible. b) Material from the 3 demolished barns should be re-used, e.g. at the new visitor's centre.	9130-224-7040b			/	
Tractivity 457	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? As much as possible should be returned to former condition if plans are refused.	9134-224-5041			/	
Tractivity 457	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Will any land be recovered for use as woodland/farmland etc by decommissioning of A + B. How long would this take?	9134-224-5152			/	
Tractivity 464	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? The restoration of the land will depend very much on the agricultural outlook at the time, i.e. is the previous use a viable proposition? Over the years agricultural usage has changed, with the reduction in dairy production on small farms, and therefore something like woodland should be a locally decided decision.	9141-224-815	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 466	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? If there is little justification for the land to return to former use then I would suggest priority to varied wildlife by varied vegetation together with new public rights of way to replace the mileage lost within the HPC site	9356-224-881	/			
Tractivity 488	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? I would rather not have to see any restoration of the site occurring, as I do not wish to see the construction in the first place.	9358-224-973			/	
Tractivity 510	Public	Stage 1	A) All facilities required during construction, must be temporary and removed as soon as construction is complete, returning the land to its original state, with the exception of the landscape buffer on the southern boundary.	9182-224-7479			/	
Tractivity 525	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? We need more info, we don't want a wall! Will it minimise sound? Proof? Have you done this else where, does it work? We live in SHurton, the land rises up behind us, we are level with the top of your drilling platform? Does the south end of shurton not matter? You propose to start the buffer further along past the bridge. We need a site visit, communication and more info. Benhole Lanr residents private consultation we have views to preserve! And daylight.	9196-224-362	/			
Tractivity 534	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? Do not touch it in the first place.	9204-224-771			/	
Tractivity 542	Public	Stage 1	We need the land to produce food as much as we need the power station to produce power. The land should be put back to its former use as soon as possible. 3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction?	9211-224-635		/		
Tractivity 546	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? Landscape buffer is required. Should be planted as a permanent feature e.g woodland. Concerned boundaries in too close proximity to existing houses. If level raised significantly for example noise abatement this may have adverse affect on near houses, visual blockage of Northern views. Essential full consultation with nearby residents with view to changing boundary or accommodating their wishes.	9215-224-348	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 546	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? Opportunity should be taken to implement full programme to establish wildlife habitat including open grassland and woodland copses. Local residents to be consulted essential viewpoint. To be managed in perpetuity as a wildlife reserve with funding for management of reserve.	9215-224-987	/			
Tractivity 549	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? Importantly, the landscape buffer should remain thereafter - after the construction phases are completed. Adequately maintained.	9218-224-348	/			
Tractivity 550	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? The suggested position of the buffer is too close to residential areas, it will tower over the houses that back onto it. If the buffer was to be situated on the natural ridge it would merge with the natural line of the landscape and minimise the impact for local residents but also for miles around. Also some tree planting should take place sooner rather than later at the end of construction as trees take years to mature.	9219-224-348	/			
Tractivity 550	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? Local residents are losing valuable dog walking areas. Alternative areas/paths need to be established. A nature trail, cycle track, running or outdoor area. I would really just want the area to be restored back to its former state.	9219-224-1039	/			
Tractivity 565	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? Agricultural development of the whole of this part of the West Somerset coast has resulted in the removal of much natural woodland. this woodland should be replaced wherever possible and it would provide screening for the new site.	9234-224-691	/			
Tractivity 581	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? Any other ideas or comments? This should not be a cheap artificial looking bank but a more gradual gradient, looking more like a natural feature.	9250-224-348	/			
Tractivity 585	Public	Stage 1	9. What are your views on EDF Energy's general approach to community benefits and do you have any specific suggestions about what should be included in the package? The most lasting legacy that EDF can leave for local residents and the tourists that visit the area or pass through it, would be to return all the land (apart from the power station compound and the small accommodation facility for Cannington College) to its former landuse.	9364-224-4126		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 585	Public	Stage 1	<p>2. Power station design should be sympathetic to the local landscape, take the minimum amount of land and blend into the landscape rather than stand out from it. Colour is a major factor; The blue Hinkley A site is much less intrusive than Hinkley B. There is scope for innovative design to achieve this.</p> <p>3. Light pollution. It is essential that the dark skies of the area are not affected by the development. What plans are EDF developing to ensure that</p>	9364-224-5793			/	
Tractivity 596	Public	Stage 1	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Any land that can be returned to the idigenous wildlife must be for the good. Organisations such as the Somerset Wildlife Trust and the Woodland Trust would be only too happy to advise on this as they would have knowledge of the local flora and fauna.</p>	9262-224-607	/			
Tractivity 604	Public	Stage 1	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>If the site is used as a semi-industrial site it will become a brownfield site when the construction is completed. This ill mean it can be used for many non-agricultural proposes in future. The rual buffer to the south of Canning will be lost.</p>	9270-224-762			/	
Tractivity 605	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Return to 'as was' on completion?</p>	9271-224-348	/			
Tractivity 605	Public	Stage 1	<p>9. What are your views on EDF Energy's general approach to community benefits and do you have any specific suggestions about what should be included in the package?</p> <p>Generally good but people concerned about negative impact of what should be a temporary effect.</p> <p>1. Please return sites to 'as was' on completion. No one wants cheap, second rate housing on unnecessary village extensions to be dumped on them.</p>	9271-224-3786	/			
Tractivity 608	Public	Stage 1	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Possibly some water features.</p>	9367-224-635	/			
Tractivity 611	Public	Stage 1	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Return land to as natural a state as possible in keeping with local physical and biotoc environment and landscape.</p>	9275-224-618	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 611	Public	Stage 1	3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction? As many/much right of way as possible should be maintained throughout construction phase and then afterwards. Any footpaths that have to be diverted should be compensated for elsewhere, and access to the beach to the west of Hinkley should be maintained at all times- and left as unmarked and as natural as possible. Appropriate/sympathetic and natural screening should be considered to hide the new reactors from sight from as many angles as possible, including the beach.	9275-224-771			/	
Tractivity 611	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Ensure the building/reactors are coloured so as to blend into the landscape as much as possible ie not red as it shows on your website! Build all buildings, fences etc as small as possible and as close to existing reactors as possible. Keep any structures eg sea wall to a minimum and ensure the beach to the west of Hinkley is left as natural as possible. Ensure temporary jetty is as small as can be, is as close as possible to existing reactors and definatley removed as soon as it can be ie once all materials have been delievered and it is no longer needed. Ensure lighting is kept to a minimum and downlight things where possible. Visually the power station is going to have massive impact both at day and night and this should be considered carefully.	9275-224-5066	/			
Tractivity 616	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? If it is possible could the build be sunken down into the ground in order to screen the visual impact of the build?	9280-224-348		/		
Tractivity 668	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? Retaining and returning to a natural landscape is essential to west Somerset which relies heavily on its natural beauty for its primary industry.	9331-224-348	/			
Tractivity 671	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? Again as living in Williton, I do not know the area well. Priority should be giving to retaining rural areas. There may be scope to actually improve the existing area vis-a-vis wildlife habitat and visual impact. This again be discussed at length with 'local' and relative experts.	9334-224-990			/	
Tractivity 600	Public	Stage 1	- All fencing should be shielded by vegetation.	9378-224-1583		/		
Tractivity 50878	Public	Stage 1	Question 2 Restoration of the site This is also for local residents.	9393-224-960			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62317	Public	Stage 2	4- What age will the trees be, which are to be used for landscaping around the accommodation campus proposed on site at Hinkley?	10004-224-552	/			
Tractivity 62572	Public	Stage 2	The proposed landscaping of the site works and on site campus are wholly inadequate. The screening plants will hardly have grown enough by the time construction is complete and the campus (if built) is removed.	10123-224-3916	/			
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	1. Comment Disappointed you need to chop down mature trees. There's no way you can reinstate those when you are gone.	10124-224-121			/	
Tractivity 62577	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	1. What are your views on the proposed arrangement and landscaping of the Hinkley C site? Unsatisfactory	10128-224-54			/	
Tractivity 62582	Public	Stage 2	I have attached my responses to these separate sheets as there is not enough room on the questionnaire. The Main Site and Construction Phase - Q1: Firstly, you are asking my views on the proposed arrangement and landscaping of the Hinkley C site; what do you mean by the word arrangement and in what context? I am therefore unable to answer this first part of the question by surmising what you might mean. A new Stage 3 questionnaire is therefore needed in order to answer this question.	10133-224-53		/		
Tractivity 62582	Public	Stage 2	Re. the landscaping: you mention early planting but I don't think you understand how long deciduous trees take to grow and mature. I have spoken to (personal details removed) re. your 'landscape strategy' and she tells me that the planting will be 75% deciduous, to include willow and poplar, 25% coniferous, and hedgerow plants and scrub. The highest tree you intend to plant is only 6 feet, all the others being 'tiny saplings'. This means that it will be at least twenty years before the deciduous trees reach any reasonable size and maturity, therefore much taller trees that 6 feet need to be planted early. Many of us human residents of Shurton will probably have died by then. I am sure that the Hinkley C budget of billions of pounds can stretch to a better early planting of larger trees.	10133-224-547	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62604	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	30/7/10 -1 am writing to voice my concern about the fact that EDF does not have any clear plans about Die redirecting of footpaths around the Southern Boundary. As a resident of Shurton when EDF start their Preliminary Works I will be losing a number of facilities that I treasure greatly: Darkness, peace and pleasant walks. Within EDF's proposals there does not appear to be any indication of where the footpaths are to be diverted- if at all. I have been told by various people who have previous experience of these developments that the campus will be akin to the 'Wild West'. I feel that living and walking close to such an area will be frightening and intimidating when exercising my dogs, especially when it is dark. Worse still living in such close proximity to such a development will make me a virtual prisoner within my home, unable to walk the paths or along the Shurton Lane as it will be too dangerous due to the increase in traffic. EDF hai/e not addressed the concern of the residents of Shurton with reference to the Campus and the influx of 700 migrant workers living in such close proximity. There seems to be little point in the meetings with the residents when EDF show an inflexible approach with regards to changing any of their proposals following our responses to their "proposals".I look forward to voicing my opinion and fears to my MP this weekend	10151-224-0			/	
Tractivity 62610	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	called into the office today to enquiring about landscaping and security	10157-224-58			/	
Tractivity 62629	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6/10/10 - He has been speaking to some people measuring for the fencing around the boundary of their house.He just wanted to speak to you to clarify a few details and also to ask about the landscaping that was due to take place early October	10173-224-48			/	
Tractivity 62631	Public	Stage 2	The siting of the new power station and its landscaping is totally UNSATISFACTORY. The siting of this large industrial power station complex on the beautiful rural Somerset coastline will be a damaging visual blot on the rural landscape especially from the Quantocks .	10175-224-62			/	
Tractivity 62938	Public	Stage 2	- How can mature woodland, agricultural land, ancient hedgerows, precious wildlife and nature important sites be replaced by a bund and saplings??	10177-224-164			/	
Tractivity 62938	Public	Stage 2	- Will landscaping hide the plant from terrorists?	10177-224-312			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62938	Public	Stage 2	- To be able to block out such an eyesore, visible from the Quantocks and Bickenham/Weston Coast an amazing forest would have to grow immediately.	10177-224-364			/	
Tractivity 62938	Public	Stage 2	How can mature trees be re-instate?	10177-224-1488			/	
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The landscape design proposed for the permanent development site and the restored landscape of the wider construction site are both promising	10185-224-964			/	
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The strategy for remediation of the restored landscape and the approach to ecology to the north of the permanent site has been well considered but we are less convinced by the impact on the wider area.	10185-224-7175	/			
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	One of the main landscape features and a positive element in the landscaping strategy on the site is the Green Lane that is to be retained and will continue to serve as a convenient form of visual screen to the main site. However, it is unclear whether the hedgerows that run parallel to the lane and have been noted as historically significant within the "Terrestrial Historic Environment Section" will also be retained.	10190-224-5986	/			
West Hinkley Action Group	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- The wholesale destruction of the local landscape is most bitterly deplored. Every effort should be made to preserve and protect landscape and vegetation features as they are, to remove only what is necessary when it is necessary and to replant metre for metre and like for like from the commencement of any works.	10253-224-1565			/	
Exmoor Tourist Association	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	What are the proposals for the areas affected when this EDF work is finished? - to ensure we are not left with several blots on the landscape, and sub-standard facilities - and no tourism, would it not be far preferable to leave a beautiful rural area with an admirable legacy.	10256-224-2167			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stogursey and District Parish Plan Steering Committee	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>1) What are your views on the proposed arrangement and landscaping of the Hinkley Point C site</p> <p>Unsatisfactory</p> <p>It is clear from the consultations which preceded the draft Stogursey Parish Plan that the community at large values and cherishes the rural amenities of the main village, the hamlets and the surrounding countryside. Until the proposed landscaping completely obscures the proposed reactor - that is to say in 15-25 years' time - the arrangement and landscaping will be unsatisfactory. Furthermore, there will need to be extensive off-site planting, established without delay, to conceal the views of the reactor from the main village. EdF has not made any proposals on this score, which is additionally unsatisfactory. Evergreens and specific tree species have not been shown, nor have replacement hedgerows been shown. EdF has missed an opportunity to engage the local community as resident partner in the consultation process with regard to landscaping.</p>	10259-224-238	/			
Somerset Wildlife Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>On-site: During pre-application discussions, the Trust has consistently requested EDF reconsider the timing of ecological mitigation for on-site impacts. The current timeline sees a lag of at least 7 years between site clearance and the commencement of habitat re-creation, as EDF proposes to deliver habitat restoration only when HPC is operational. This concerns the Trust greatly because given the unpredictability and lag times inherent in establishing good quality habitat, there is a strong possibility that downward population trends for the threatened and rare wildlife species currently present on site will be exacerbated due to the unmitigated loss of breeding habitat.</p>	10263-224-4326		/		
Somerset Wildlife Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>The Trust is particularly dissatisfied with EDF's plans to delay deliver of the majority of ecological restoration/recreation works until HPC is operational. The mosaic of habitats and networks across the HPC site supports interesting assemblages of birds and bats, including priority conservation species, which are not typical of lowland farmland in Somerset. Under EDF's current proposals a period of at least 7 years will elapse between habitat destruction and reinstatement/re-creation. This represents a significant threat to the survival of local populations of species which are already classed as being of conservation concern. Re-creation of good quality wildlife habitats can be an uncertain process. Establishment of new habitats takes a good period of time, and replacement of failed areas is an inevitable requirement. This is time that local species of conservation concern may simply not have.</p>	10263-224-7372		/		
Somerset Wildlife Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>The Trust is pleased that one north-south and one east-west linear feature is being retained on site, albeit fragmented in places.</p>	10263-224-15326			/	
Quantock Hills AONB Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>- The AONB Service has concerns that the EDF pylons are of a very different shape to the National Grid proposed towers. We would expect every effort to be made to minimise the amount of different forms on the skyline.</p>	89122-224-1467		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	3.4 The Agency expects that the proposed application will provide details on restoration of the site and also details of any transport impact associated with this.	89168-224-3225	/			
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The Agency requires further clarification on how the restoration of the land will be secured post-construction. Should EDFE have any information regarding this matter we would welcome the sharing of this intelligence.	89168-224-5679	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The following missing data has been identified in the Stage 2 documentation: - Freight Management Plan - Waste Management Plan - Operational Management Plans - Landscape planting details	89200-224-3652	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Include soft landscaping within the development, or a justification of why this is not proposed.	89244-224-5723	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- While there is reference to the local character of the landscape in various parts of the reports, it is not well reflected in the landscape design of the proposals.	89244-224-8004	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Within the development itself, there is no soft landscaping indicated on the plans. This would create a very harsh local environment with no softening of hard surface treatments and no shading or shelter provided. There is scope to include some soft landscaping, particularly on the southern and western sides of the site.	89244-224-10651	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[Figure 7.3.6] Tree selection. Little thought seems to have been given to the high winds and salt-laden atmosphere of the site. Many of these tree species seem unsuitable. Will EDF reconsider their tree choices?	89289-224-10576	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[7.12.7] Hard landscaping. Will EDF commit to using only local stone in this treatment, to reflect the area and put some value into the local economy?	89289-224-10791		/		
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[Figure 20] Proposed sections. This shows screening trees that are at least 10 metres high. This is not achievable in practice as it is not feasible to transplant trees that big. What does EDF propose for the landscaping and screening that is actually achievable?	89290-224-4118			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[1.6.62] How long will it be before the restored hedgerows, wetlands and woodlands are mature enough to support wildlife?	89291-224-5741			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[13.3.6] States that EDF have undertaken extensive consultation with regard to landscape impacts and potential receptors, which has influenced the layout and design of the off-site associated developments. Why have EDF not applied the same criteria to on-site developments e.g. the site campus which by virtue of scale and proximity will impact the receptors in the hamlet of Shurton?	89293-224-9008			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[8.5] Land restoration will only commence following 'Completion of Construction Works.' As this is defined as the second unit in full power operation, this could be some considerable time after the completion of the physical construction. Will EDF reconsider phasing this, to ensure that land restoration starts as soon as the land is no longer needed?	89294-224-394		/		
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	1.8 Further information is required by the Estate to demonstrate how effective the proposed screening landform/bunds will be from vantage points accessible by the public in greater proximity to the site. This part of the coastline is readily accessible to the public by virtue of footpaths and bridleways as well as along country lanes. These considerations further increase the importance of ensuring that the built form of the proposed development is minimised. Given the complex landform of low ridges adjacent to the site and the more distant steeply undulating Quantock Hills which afford views over the development site, 3D modelling would be welcomed to prove the effectiveness of the proposed screening landform on the southern and western boundaries of the site.	89439-224-5165	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	1.11 The ability to 'restore' the landscape post the construction phase will require considerable further refinement and explanation. The development requires extensive earthworks including excavations, resulting in the obliteration of existing land form. The present proposals contain insufficient detail to demonstrate how ultimate site restoration and the return of land to its former agricultural use can occur effectively or over what time period this might happen. Site restoration work will itself require major earthworks and the proposals do not explain how the physical and visual impacts of these works will be mitigated against as and when they occur.	89439-224-7220	/			
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	3.2 Chapter 13, Section 13.2.25 (Volume 2) of the appraisal, refers to contaminated land and suggests that, given the historical land use covering the southern area, no site investigation of that area has been carried out to date but that these are reportedly planned for late 2010. In the context that that there is currently no quantified baseline measure of the present day ground conditions and that the term "good condition" has yet to be defined, it is unclear to the Estate how quantified land quality will be potentially assessed, validated and monitored by EDF going forward towards their eventual restoration and reinstatement of the area.	89440-224-9293	/			
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	15.6 The suggested planning requirement at paragraph 8.3 requires the replacement of any trees comprised in the approved landscaping scheme which die within two years of planting. As previously noted in the landscape section of this response, the site is in a coastal location where tree planting will be difficult to establish and it is recommended that this is extended to include trees, shrubs and hedgerows that die or fail to thrive within five years of planting.	89446-224-2138	/			
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	15.7 It is recommended that a further requirement is made in respect of all land restored for agriculture to ensure that a five year programme of aftercare works is undertaken to ensure land is gradually brought back to full productivity.	89446-224-2610	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>Authorities position May 2010:</p> <p>Landscaping bund needs to mitigate against noise and light pollution, and need to show how landscaping will integrate with wider green infrastructure</p> <p>Update September 2010:</p> <p>At Hinkley Point C it is proposed to provide native planting along the southern boundary to provide visual screening and to create additional habitat for breeding birds and a habitat corridor for bats. It is noted that this will also protect Bum Brook. It is unclear from the Stage 2 Consultation how effective the bund will be in mitigating noise and light pollution impacts on residents of Shurton and Burton.</p>	89327-224-5349	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The provision and retention of the landscaping bund (or alternative landscape treatment) is supported and the Council will wish to consult the local community on appropriate legacy uses of the campus site that are appropriate to the rural setting. These might include the establishment of Community woodland due to the initial planting of semi-mature trees being as a part of the campus landscape proposals.	89333-224-11029	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>- It is essential that the landscape proposals are viewed in the wider context. The red line site boundary (as currently shown) is not considered to be the appropriate extent of a landscape scheme for Hinkley Point C.</p> <p>- The provision of landscaping between the construction campus and nearby settlements is welcomed and viewed by the councils as an essential mitigation measure. It should also be noted that landscaping in this location is considered to be mitigation, and not a compensation or legacy benefit.</p> <p>- EDF Energy should demonstrate how landscape proposals for the construction phase and operation phase integrate with the wider green infrastructure of the area in terms of movement (rights of way), habitat, agricultural use, flood risk management and landscape character. This should include consideration of how linkages can be made with the proposals for managed realignment of flood defences and habitat creation at Steart, which will create a visitor attraction and destination for walkers and cyclists. Particular attention should be paid to maintaining and where possible enhancing the type and quality of the environment for 'users - local and tourists' and the experience they will have in using the local footpaths and green spaces.</p> <p>- A legacy plan should be provided to demonstrate how proposed tree planting and habitat creation measures can be retained and maintained in the long term.</p>	89334-224-3378	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The summary (Ref. 21.3.24) states that 'The Landscape Strategy for the proposed development will aim to meet all the associated landscape designation policy objectives.' It could be argued that it is not possible for this to happen and is an unrealistic aspiration of the present proposals. For instance the Strategy for the Severn Estuary (ref. 21.3.15) Policy D2: Encourage development and land uses which conserve and enhance the cultural, natural and built heritage. And also the Quantock Hills AONB Management Plan (ref. 21.3.16) Policy D3: To protect views out from the AONB through involvement in the planning process. EDF Energy should demonstrate how landscape proposals for the construction phase and operation phase integrate with the wider green infrastructure of the area in terms of movement (rights of way), habitat, agricultural use, flood risk management and landscape character. This should include consideration of how linkages can be made with the proposals for managed realignment of flood defences and habitat creation at Steart, which will create a visitor attraction and destination for walkers and cyclists. 	89354-224-18543	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At present the scheme does not seem to contribute anything to (ref. 21.3.17) policy on developing good walking and cycling networks across the region. This is considered an important aspect of developing a fully integrated, comprehensive Landscape Strategy and one that works with a rethink of the localised and wider landscape and visual resource mitigation package. 	89354-224-19681	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Further to this and applicable to all the developments but especially for Hinkley Point C and On-site Associated Development it is suggested that mitigation measures beyond the redline site boundary are considered to more realistically inform EDF Energy's concept to 'embrace' the development in the wider landscape. This would allow clarity around the impacts on the Landscape and Visual resource especially in the operational and decommissioning phases where greater reassurances are needed around realistic times for plant growth establishment and the capacity or not for Landscape character to be restored (in respect of the ancillary developments) to baseline conditions.	89423-224-8930	/			
Tractivity 62940	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	- If EDF really did want to look after the local community they should seriously consider improving local lanes and public footpaths and landscape the road verges with spring bulbs and specimen tree planting to beautify the local environment and main approach to the power station. I know you are going to plant landscape screening, but the main approach road also needs to be considered.	89675-224-1894	/			
Tractivity 63003	Public	Stage 2 Update	The southern boundary should be rolled back northwards and the land reinstated as soon as possible. It would make a great difference if EDF works could be seen to be retreating towards Green Lane.	89693-224-1913	/			
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	The whole list of changes to the associated development and main site layouts do not materially change our advice set out in our Stage 2 response. In some instances the new proposals have reduced our concerns regarding this area.	89711-224-1309			/	
English Heritage	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Following the meeting on site on the 22/3/11, it was agreed that the principle of a gentle bank and planting scheme to the north and west of the monument would be acceptable subject to a reduction in the bank's height, width and length. Much of this landscaping scheme will be formed on land already damaged by modern development such as the site of the current access road. However, we also understand that further Geophysics work is to be undertaken that should help to finalise the location of landscaping for this area.	89718-224-3347	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	6 Despite the lack of information in this regard, the Estate remains of the view that the landscaping proposed is inadequate. This is particularly the case given the sensitivity of the adjacent landscape particularly to the west and south west which is subject to a number of designations and which is host to an extensive network of public rights of way and access land.	89767-224-1510	/			
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	1. What are your views on the proposed arrangement and landscaping of the Hinkley C site? Satisfactory Unsatisfactory No Opinion Don't know - There is inadequate detail given about the landscaping. No species detail is given, no evergreens are shown, no winter views are indicated, no amenity use of the land such as coppicing is suggested. There are some appallingly intrusive landscape views which are not mitigated by any planting plans at all (e.g. from Knighton Lane). Even if such planting would be on land not owned by EdF the company should by now have made the effort to obtain consent in principle to vastly more extensive planting further afield.	89806-224-54	/			
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	- It Will be years before the suggested planting takes effect Meanwhile the host communities must endure the relentless ugliness of the construction and contemplate the permanent loss of the beauty and amenity of the local countryside.	89806-224-726	/			
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	2. We have reduced the amount of land to be used during the construction in the southern part of the site in response to concerns from residents. What are your views on this proposal? Satisfactory Unsatisfactory No Opinion Don't know - That the encroachment of the southern boundary upon a small settlement was ever contemplated at all and considered potentially acceptable is indicative of the barbarity of EdF's approach. That it took over a year of protest for the company to move the boundary slightly back, to a point that was already a generous compromise proposal on the part of the residents and that this should have been done only when the company realised that without this agreement, secured at ever more desperate and angry meetings with residents, they would not be able to proceed to Stage 2 is further indication of the absence of local consideration and responsiveness on EdF's part. That, having moved the boundary back at the very last minute, the company should then make the conscious effort to bring this action to repeated prominence in their Stage 2 publications and that they should use this to display their skilled local negotiating skills while overlooking many other omissions and errors of fact in the rest of their documents seems profoundly opportunistic and cynical.	89806-224-1515			/	
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	- Moving the boundary back is no more than the very least the company should have done. At that, it is reserving the right to fence the land reprieved, to run a road along it and to pile mountains of spoil on it.	89806-224-2827			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	- So yes, it is satisfactory that the boundary has been slightly re-drawn but it is no more than the minimum the company could do, and that grudgingly, so in terms of the 'social and environmental responsibility' of which the company boasts, it altogether fails to make a case.	89806-224-3043			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	There is also a lack of landscaping detail for the associated development sites to demonstrate how the impacts will be mitigated against. However, although mitigation and remediation are important, we are concerned principally about the absence of a strategic approach to landscaping. As a consequence, no creative or imaginative proposals have been forthcoming that will help to enrich the landscape and ensure the best possible contribution to the legacy for the area.	89853-224-2682	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1.2. [2.2.3] It is not clear why the removal of the jetty and the post construction landscaping will take three years. This should be achievable within one year.	89872-224-2603	/			
Natural England	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	3.The restoration options for the site cover a significant area contain a range of existing landscape features and wildlife habitats. Whilst these features can be recreated, any potential archaeology in the area cannot be reinstated once disturbed and therefore the operational areas during construction and the area of restoration of disturbed ground should take this into account. This also relates to para 3.14.13 - reference to the planting of woodland and manipulation of levels associated with screening. There may be some flexibility with the location and height of any earth bunding in order to accommodate landscape features. The benefit of any bunding and planting will be very localised and it may be more appropriate to create copses that reflect local character. The reference to enhancement of wildlife corridors and sensitive hedge management is welcomed, and this approach can be encouraged in any off-site mitigation measures (e.g. longer cycle of management for hedges allowed to grow taller).	8737-224-6391	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Quantock Hills AONB Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	-3.2.7 'Appropriate levels of security fencing and lighting'. The AONB Service would wish to see detailed assessment of what is meant by 'appropriate' Appropriate to what ? Given the increase in light pollution anticipated for the site, there should be a lighting assessment undertaken to ensure light emission from the site is kept to a minimum.	8734-227-2627	/			Following the Stage 2 consultation, Hinkley Point C (HPC) construction and operational lighting strategies and lighting strategies for off-site associated development have been informed by the Environmental Impact Assessment study and prepared in accordance with the relevant guidelines.
Civil Aviation Authority	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	-Aviation Warning Lighting. The documentation provided to date gives no indication of the maximum height of any associated structure(s); there is a mandated requirement for structures of a height of 150m or more to be equipped with aviation warning lighting in accordance with Article 133 of the UK Air Navigation Order. Structures of height of less than 150m might also need aviation obstruction lighting if, by virtue of their location and nature, they are considered a significant navigational hazard. Given the anticipated potential for helicopter operations associated with the proposed power station, even if the maximum height of any associated structure was less than 150m, aviation warning lighting of some scale would be recommended.	8699-227-2103			/	The strategies have involved the assessment of the lighting baseline conditions, the identification of key lighting impacts on the surroundings to the HPC development site and the proposal of objectives to minimise the impact of lighting. The proposed lighting schemes now comply with planning requirements, meet key standards and statutory requirements and provide a safe working environment. They incorporate lighting mitigation measures aimed to minimise light pollution during the construction and operation of the HPC development, avoid the over-lighting of the HPC development site and comply with the dark sky policy.
Natural England	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	4.The site is situated on the coast in a relatively tranquil, remote area of farmed landscape with dark skies at night. Any impacts associated with lighting for the development, including the outer car parks should be minimised through use of appropriate techniques including directional lighting and shielding to reduce glare at night.	8737-227-7406	/			In relation to the HPC main site, images of the HPC operational lighting were prepared to illustrate the lighting impacts from selected viewpoints included in the landscape and visual impact assessment. The viewpoints selected for dusk views were agreed with the statutory and non statutory consultees.
West Hinkley Action Group	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	- Effective measures to prevent light pollution from all parts of the site and from boundary lights.	8755-227-3511	/			
Tractivity 987	Public	Stage 2	11. Any other ideas or comments? As before- no need to transfer people into the town - we all go to Taunton or elsewhere to shop. If this goes ahead we need very adequate noise reduction to our houses from noise/light. A large bund and trees not jsut trees and shrubs. A definite no-no for people on this estate as we have been informed the value of our houses have gone down considerably already.	9745-227-5781			/	
Tractivity 1239	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	light pollution from very early in the morning until very late at night.	89505-227-862			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1239	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	There is no way of telling from the plans what the lighting will be like.	89505-227-1641	/			
Tractivity 1297	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	I do not feel enough is being proposed to mitigate against light pollution, as I can see the site from my house and already there appears to be increased activity with extra lighting that can be seen from several miles away.	89563-227-4251	/			
Tractivity 585	Public	Stage 1	3. Light pollution. It is essential that the dark skies of the area are not affected by the development. What plans are EDF developing to ensure that	9364-227-6100			/	
Tractivity 611	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Ensure the building/reactors are coloured so as to blend into the landscape as much as possible ie not red as it shows on your website! Build all buildings, fences etc as small as possible and as close to existing reactors as possible. Keep any structures eg sea wall to a minimum and ensure the beach to the west of Hinkley is left as natural as possible. Ensure temporary jetty is as small as can be, is as close as possible to existing reactors and definatley removed as soon as it can be ie once all materials have been delievered and it is no longer needed. Ensure lighting is kept to a minimum and downlight things where possible. Visually the power station is going to have massive impact both at day and night and this should be considered carefully.	9275-227-5066		/		
Tractivity 618	Public	Stage 1	Light pollution during construction and 24 hour shifts	9282-227-5050			/	
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Lighting is an important element of the architectural approach and needs to be carefully considered in relation to its wider impact on night time, distant views, working hours and energy use. Picking out just the reactor domes might be an effective approach.	10185-227-6135	/			
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Lighting and highway proposals will also need to be clearly set out for a fuller assessment of the impact of them upon the setting to Pixies Mound.	10190-227-7170	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Civil Aviation Authority	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- Aviation Warning Lighting. The summary of Stage 1 Consultation acknowledges the CAA recommendation regarding aviation lighting. In line with our earlier input, given that it would appear that the tallest structure associated with the new development would be perhaps 80m high, the need for lighting would be a recommendation as opposed to a legal requirement.	10193-227-2684			/	
Exmoor National Park Authority	Local Authority	Stage 2	2. There is a need to demonstrate that lighting at the Williton Park and Ride site and the Hinkley Point C site itself are the minimum necessary for the safe operation of the sites and that the lighting is designed to prevent spillage from those sites in the interests of ensuring that dark skies of the Exmoor National Park, one of its special qualities, is not affected.	10209-227-4149	/			
Exmoor National Park Authority	Local Authority	Stage 2	4.2 The new buildings will be extensive, and during construction, an accommodation campus will extend over a very large site. Once constructed, an extensive landscaping scheme is proposed on the western and southern sides of the site; however, it is unlikely that the planting will grow to such an extent to obscure distant views of the site. While the buildings themselves might not dominate the National Park, Exmoor is renowned for its dark night skies and any light source outside the National Park that causes a glow in the night sky could affect that special quality. Lighting will be needed on the site to ensure health and safety but that lighting both during construction including the accommodation campus, and with the subsequent operation of the nuclear reactor, should be designed so that glow and spillage from the sight is minimised.	10209-227-13218	/			
Exmoor National Park Authority	Local Authority	Stage 2	5.3 It is recommended that EDF Energy be informed that the National Park raises no objections to the proposals as a matter of principle but highlights concerns to ensure that any lighting is the minimum necessary and designed to prevent spillage from the sites, as well as concerns about the potential impact of traffic on the local environment.	10209-227-15377	/			
Quantock Hills AONB Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Residual Landscape Impact - The AONB Service has concerns over a number of the judgments made in tables 21.8.1 and 21.8.2 e.g. majority of hedgerows to be removed but the magnitude of change is deemed to be medium. Of key concern to the Quantock Hills AONB is the reference to light pollution under 'Changes to aesthetic and perceptual aspects' as having a medium (construction) and low (permanent) impact. There is a complete lack of any detailed assessment of light pollution impact (although issues of light pollution are mentioned under Mitigation 21.7.8) and impacts described as adverse (21.8.8 and 21.8.14) but without any detailed information on magnitude of impact and it is difficult to understand how this judgement has been reached.	89121-227-2579	/			
Quantock Hills AONB Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- The Quantock Hills AONB is very concerned that there is no detailed assessment of the impact of lighting on viewpoints.	89121-227-5181	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Lighting impact of the sites upon dark skies and residential amenity.	89200-227-4339			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	It is noted that the site security plan will dictate the lighting for the site, and the need to balance environmental/landscape impact and site security should be noted.	89201-227-6861	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[2.7.3] Will EDF provide details of the proposed security lighting, and confirm that this will not provide any form of disturbance to local residents?	89291-227-7385	/			
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	1.7 The Estate wishes to receive further information in relation to the proposed increase in lighting at both the temporary and operational stages. As this will be visible from the surrounding 'dark' rural areas, including the Quantocks AONB, and will adversely affect views and tranquillity, further information is required to understand how this will be mitigated.	89439-227-4795	/			
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	The whole list of changes to the associated development and main site layouts do not materially change our advice set out in our Stage 2 response. In some instances the new proposals have reduced our concerns regarding this area.	89711-227-1309			/	
Bridgwater Town Council	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	It will be essential to ensure lighting during nighttime is governed both on site and this will equally apply to associated sites for park and ride and freight movements where any residential properties might be affected.	89746-227-5593			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	12 No detail is given regarding proposals for the use of external lighting. The impact of such lighting must be carefully assessed.	89767-227-4120	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	Lighting strategies for each of the sites, including the main site, have not been provided and should be provided to stakeholders. Illumination of the main site could have a significant visual impact, especially upon the nearest nationally designated protected landscape the Quantock Hills AONB. The need for the site to be lit at night in order to allow operation of the night shift will have a significant effect for any area or dwelling that has a view of the main site, although the effect may technically be classed as temporary, it could last for a number of years.	89853-227-1928	/			
RSPB	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	There is recognition at 18.7.55 that construction and operational activities would cause disturbance within the SPA in the absence of effective mitigation. We agree that noise, lighting and human activity are likely to provide the main sources of disturbance to the SPA foreshore and functionally linked offshore areas. The jetty, sea wall extension and possibly onshore cooling water intake and outfall activity, are identified as major sources of disturbance, although future operational activities at the plant itself should be included.	89457-235-6691			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	We are very encouraged that a masterplan is being developed for this site, and welcome the early collaborative working between the masterplanner and landscape architect that it demonstrates. The design shows promise, however, it now needs to be developed much further to establish whether the powerful concept of using parallel bands as an organising device works in three-dimensions to generate a legible working landscape, that it responds to the issues raised by the analysis of key views from the surrounding landscape, and to convince us that it is not merely an abstract graphic intervention.	8732-225-1191	/			Comments have been received from various consultees including the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE), the Local Authorities, Natural England and English Heritage. There have also been numerous comments from landowners and the public. A number of comments have focused on how best to present the power station in terms of its relationship with the surrounding countryside. A number of public responses questioned the size of the development and whether it could be made smaller and more compact. Other comments have focused on the design of structures.
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Masterplan We welcome the approach of producing a masterplan for the Hinkley C site and, in principle, the idea of introducing overall coherence to the layout of the site. The concept of reflecting the coastal striations to generate organisational strips is potentially interesting and is graphically elegant.	8732-225-1945			/	EDF Energy's approach to master planning is explained in the Design and Access Statement (DAS) . A leading firm of architects were appointed at an early stage with experience of power station planning and design. The architect was commissioned to consider how best to order the development taking account of the basic size and configuration of plant (this largely being determined by functional inter-relationships between uses required to generate electricity safely and efficiently). The basic components of the masterplan were set out in the stage 1 consultation. Explanation was given on constraints and opportunities which influenced the masterplan. Whilst it was explained that the shape of key structures and basic layout of the nuclear island could not be altered, plans were presented demonstrating how the architect had been able to bring some design innovation to the development. In particular, a series of parallel bands were set out as an organizing device for the positioning of buildings across the site. The architect took inspiration from the ordered appearance of the rock formations on the foreshore which are highly visible, especially at low tide.
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	However, the design at the moment throws up many questions: it is not yet clear whether the bands are really meaningful, or whether the concept will be at all legible at ground level. The rationale for the orientation of the striations should be clarified; have they been designed to respond to existing features in the landscape or based on consideration of from where it might be desirable to view down the axes for example? The treatment of the edges of the masterplan is also ambiguous. Where it meets the coast, the relationship of the secure site boundary to the coastal path and the potential for retaining the new jetty should be considered. At all edges of the site, further work is needed to demonstrate how the strips will end and what relationship they will have to the site perimeter or existing landscape features.	8732-225-2256	/			This approach was supported in the consultations but comments were made with regard to the treatment of the edges of the development where it was felt that the masterplan was ambiguous. It was also felt that the approach towards order should extend to the design of the key structures in the sense that these should be treated as powerful industrial objects not to be fettered. Later in the consultation process, at stage 2, more detailed comments emerged. The treatment of buildings along the southern boundary was questioned as was the position of the public information centre which didn't appear to make the most of the vistas of the power station that a more central location would offer.
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The result of the design should be a working landscape, which is organised by the masterplan, just as if it were the masterplan for a village. There needs to be logic in the placement of buildings and the interrelationships of the buildings, and a third dimension of building massing, which are, at the moment, missing. It is vital that the striations do not function as an abstract tidying device but that the masterplan is directly related to the operation of the site. The masterplan should inform the legibility of the routes through the complex, reinforce the activities that will be taking place and enhance the experience of working on or visiting the site.	8732-225-3088	/			
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Architecture The masterplan should begin to direct the architecture and we are disappointed that we are not yet seeing any architectural principles emerge. The buildings on this site will be very large and highly visible and we are keen to see them treated with honesty as powerful industrial objects. We urge the team to draw on the precedents of Battersea and Bankside power stations, which proudly imposed themselves on their industrial landscapes, and which are still celebrated as exciting landmark buildings today. Another useful precedent is the industrial heritage of the Landschaftspark in the Ruhr Valley of Germany, which now draws many tourists.	8732-225-4777	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Conclusion</p> <p>While we think there is promise in the early masterplan ideas, the scheme is still abstract and we are unable to judge yet how the development will impact on views or what the employee or visitor experience of the site at closer range will be. At the next stage the masterplan must be tested to ensure that the concept of striations is an appropriate one. We urge the design team to question the technical constraints as thoroughly as possible: this masterplan needs to be a meaningful organising device that is able to lead and coordinate the layout of the site including its technical aspects - otherwise it will not function as a masterplan.</p> <p>The cost of masterplanning, landscape design and architecture is a tiny fraction of the overall budget for a nuclear installation. We, therefore, urge the client to invest heavily in design to ensure that an opportunity for exemplary high quality architecture and landscape that will reinforce the complex's value as an efficient workplace and as a local landmark, both in terms of its importance as a visitor attraction and its impact on views, is not missed.</p>	8732-225-5439	/			<p>In response to comments, masterplan and design iterations were made including through a series of presentations to CABE commissioners in 2009, 2010 and 2011. The 2011 presentation demonstrated that EDF Energy had responded to the comments and concerns raised. The southern layout of the site was made more coherent and the design of the key structures extended the sense of order to the elevations of the development to correspond with the layout. The Public Information Centre was also relocated to a more central location which offers visitors improved views across the power station.</p>
Natural England	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	<p>The development</p> <p>Para 3.7.4</p> <p>1. We welcome the master plan aim to minimise the visual impact of the development as the superstructure of the proposed buildings as shown in Figs 10.9 - 12 does increase the magnitude of change in the views, in addition to the existing buildings (taking into account that the size of the decommissioned Hinkley A structure is likely to be reduced). Other design considerations should include use of appropriate materials and finishes to reduce visual impact and reflection, and reinforce simplicity.</p>	8737-225-5496	/			
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>We have yet to have sight of the Master plan that was presented to CABE last year. Until we have copies, we are unable to provide any guidance on the design principles of the on-site project. We would however suggest that sensitivity should be given to where new infrastructure, especially the new roundabout, car park and buildings are located in respect of the impact upon the setting to Pixies Mound. We would also question the amount of land take up for this development and ask that any new build is kept to the minimum necessary in this green field location.</p>	88840-225-8255	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	<p>e) In terms of the landscape and visual impact, there will clearly be a significant impact as a result of the development of the site. Overall the appearance of the station as indicated in the document presents significant risk to the perception of the coast and its rural setting. Whilst a Masterplan has been developed it is not clear from the information presented what attempts can be made to mitigate against the inevitable impacts. More needs to be done to ensure a better "fit" into its landscape. Furthermore, the document makes reference to the development of a landscape buffer to reduce the impact of the construction phase to the local communities. It is suggested that EDF undertake specific consultation and engagement with the local community, and key stakeholders (such as the AONB Service) to ensure that the design of the 'environmental buffer' takes account of their views.</p>	87910-225-5036	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	Initial discussions between EDF, the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) and the authorities have highlighted that the impression and desire lines of the current design will only be effective from a very limited view point and that from all other areas the design will not have any positive impact within the wider landscape setting. Whilst the strict regulations regarding the location of key elements of the proposed Power Station will be the subject of consideration by other bodies, the overall design and its impact on the landscape of West Somerset is of concern to the authorities.	88100-225-2402			/	
Tractivity 737	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? There was no clearly justified reason for needing it in the first place, unless of course you propose to build Hinkley D there as well but haven't got around to telling us yet.	9495-225-438			/	
Tractivity 784	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? This could be reduce even more by not building at all	9542-225-531			/	
Tractivity 881	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? I think the proposals are reasonable and as good as we might expect.	9639-225-127			/	
Tractivity 898	Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments? As this plan has been revised to be much smaller than the original plan it appears a better plan altogether. Could you look at traffic calming strategies placed on the village road to prevent HGV's and heavy traffic speeding through.	9656-225-2398			/	
Tractivity 908	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below A nuclear powerstation is a necessity if the ever expanding population is to have electricity which we cannot do without. Whatever system is used there is going to be a need for Pylons to distribute the electricity to the grid. Hinkley Point must be constructed using the highest available technology and best quality materials and there must be a safe storage of waste.	9666-225-6876			/	
Tractivity 1140	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Too big an impact on countryside	9898-225-129		/		
Tractivity 1185	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? The smaller the overall footprint the better.	9943-225-513			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1187	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? See 5 above. The nature of the development is expensive & cutting costs on infrastructure is false economy	9945-225-3111			/	
Tractivity 1190	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below You seem determined to irrevocably scar and bury vast tracts of this beautiful unspoilt area of Somerset under tarmac and concrete. I strongly oppose the building of Hinkley C, new roads and all the associated disruption. I can see no advantages and having viewed the scale model at the exhibition, I am appalled at the vast scale of it.	9948-225-8443		/		
Tractivity 1238	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? Intrusive - over too large an area	89504-225-792		/		
Tractivity 1243	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? Your site - up to you	89509-225-678			/	
Tractivity 1260	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? Concerned about the loss of countryside, ssi and walks. Will change the rural character of Shurton/Knighton area.	89526-225-1039			/	
Tractivity 1262	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? I note that site plans are reduced in density and are therefore a little improvement	89528-225-1131			/	
Tractivity 1273	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? A waste of Council Tax payers money	89539-225-642			/	
Tractivity 1334	Public	Stage 2 Update	The boundary is still far too invasive for local residents and the illustrative photomontage seems to have shrunk the original A and B sites which is very impressive!	89600-225-4112		/		
Tractivity 1367	Public	Stage 2 Update	A step in the right direction, but more needs to be done to shield local residents from the workings of the power station.	89633-225-939			/	
Tractivity 243	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? Best way to lessen the impact is not to build the place in the first instance.	8939-225-351		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 291	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Make it as attractive as you can! GOOD LUCK!	8979-225-4060			/	
Tractivity 585	Public	Stage 1	. Power station design should be sympathetic to the local landscape, take the minimum amount of land and blend into the landscape rather than stand out from it. Colour is a major factor; The blue Hinkley A site is much less intrusive than Hinkley B. There is scope for innovative design to achieve this.	9364-225-5795	/			
Tractivity 611	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Ensure the building/reactors are coloured so as to blend into the landscape as much as possible ie not red as it shows on your website! Build all buildings, fences etc as small as possible and as close to existing reactors as possible. Keep any structures eg sea wall to a minimum and ensure the beach to the west of Hinkley is left as natural as possible. Ensure temporary jetty is as small as can be, is as close as possible to existing reactors and definatley removed as soon as it can be ie once all materials have been delievered and it is no longer needed. Ensure lighting is kept to a minimum and downlight things where possible. Visually the power station is going to have massive impact both at day and night and this should be considered carefully.	9275-225-5066	/			
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We are very encouraged that a masterplan is being developed for this site, and welcome the collaborative working between the masterplanner and landscape architect that it demonstrates.	10185-225-612			/	
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The concept of using parallel stripes as an organising device to generate an ordered working landscape is interesting and we think that it is on the whole successful.	10185-225-797			/	
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	However we recommend that more work is done to look at how the generosity of the coastal path can be increased, the definition of the northern edge of the permanent site, the location of the visitors' centre and measures to reduce the energy demand of the buildings.	10185-225-1107	/			
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We welcome the approach of producing a masterplan for the Hinkley C site that introduces coherence to the layout of the site. The concept of reflecting the coastal striations to generate organisational strips is graphically elegant. This appears a well ordered site with the principal large buildings arranged in a purposeful, pleasing way so that it has become more than a series of pragmatic engineering decisions. The correlation of the buildings to the stripes would benefit from further refinement. The relationships vary between exactly following an edge to straddling two stripes and we recommend that the relationship of stripe to building should either be more rigid or more flexible.	10185-225-1481	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The ordered urban design of the main plant buildings breaks down at the northern edge of the site. The widely spaced ancillary buildings with expanses of car parking between them lack the tautness and consideration of the main site. We suggest that the team explores alternative approaches to the definition of the northern edge. These might include use of the land between Hinkley C and the existing Hinkley A compound to limit the spread north and tighten up the northern edge or allowing the landscaped strips and buildings to drift further north into the restored landscape as a more deliberately dissipated edge. We would recommend that a masterplan drawing showing more clearly the strategy for use of the land between Hinkley C and A, and the relationship between the two compounds, is produced.	10185-225-3243	/			
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We question the location of the visitors centre on the site and suggest that a more integrated position that affords better views of the key buildings is chosen, for example on axis between the two reactors. If the preferred construction sequence does not allow the visitors' centre to be in the right location from the outset then we suggest that a temporary viewing platform is provided for the construction phase. The route of the access road to the visitors' centre should also be carefully considered within the context of the overall masterplan.	10185-225-4069	/			
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We think that, in general, the architectural approach is promising and we welcome the use of a design guide in setting a palette of appropriate materials and design integrity across the site	10185-225-5142			/	
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We think that the masterplan and landscape and architectural strategies are promising. The design team are encouraged to question the technical constraints as thoroughly as possible: this masterplan needs to be a meaningful organising device that is able to lead and coordinate the layout and architecture of the site including its technical aspects - otherwise it will not function as a masterplan.	10185-225-7804	/			
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The cost of masterplanning, landscape design and architecture is a tiny fraction of the overall budget for a nuclear installation. We therefore urge the client to invest heavily in design to ensure that an opportunity for exemplary high quality architecture and landscape that will reinforce the complex's value as an efficient workplace and as a local landmark, both in terms of its importance as a visitor attraction and its impact on views, is not missed.	10185-225-8207	/			
Landowner - Department of Energy & Climate Change	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	We are aware that the Government has two separate options over the land referenced in your letter in relation to operation and decommissioning and that these place some limitations on what land can be the subject of a planning application for new build.	10252-225-424			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	b) The sheer scale of the proposed developments are so vast, they can only be detrimental	89469-225-5748			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	- Limited evidence that site layouts and the location and design of buildings are informed by an analysis of the character, function and long term vision for the area in which they are located.	89183-225-4648			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Building and site external appearance - Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) has considered the site's layout in a design review. The main impact of the strata approach will be visible from above or directly to the north or south. The nearest raised ground is to the south west - the Quantock Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) - and the effect will be lost from other commonly used viewpoints. The buildings themselves are functionally industrial in appearance and reflect a modern approach to large scale industrial buildings.	89201-225-5961			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	It is not clear that the Masterplan covers all buildings. An 'outage restaurant' is mentioned, but there appear to be no details. Will EDF provide this information?	89289-225-11802		/		
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	1.5 The proposed landscape mitigation measures (para 1.6.85) would partly screen views of ground level activities within the proposed development. However, they would not mitigate the adverse impact of linear, large-scale built development along the coastline arising from the three different architectural styles associated with the Hinkley Point A, B and C power stations.	89439-225-3179		/		
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	1.6 The Estate requires confirmation from EDF that the proposed buildings are designed to be set as low as practical into the ground to minimise visual impacts arising from their overall height, scale and mass and, similarly, that consideration has been given to the selection of building materials and colours to assimilate the structures into the landscape. Where practical, new buildings should be set against existing buildings to provide visual cohesion and where they would not be prominent on the skyline. Given the high quality of the receiving landscape and seascape the Estate asks that consideration is given to sensitive integration of both the new and existing buildings and that reflective finishes and/or strong colours (such as at Hinkley Point B) will be avoided. The neutral concrete finish to the rectangular pylons on the Second Severn Crossing provides a clue to colour/materials that blend easily into the local landscape. Further information relating to the proposed building heights, appearance and duration is required to assess the potential impacts likely to arise from the temporary on-site accommodation which is likely to have an adverse effect on views from rural areas to the south and west of the site.	89439-225-3557	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The Masterplan document provides a useful and reasonably comprehensive appraisal of the existing site character and context.	89334-225-73			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Response								
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	The whole list of changes to the associated development and main site layouts do not materially change our advice set out in our Stage 2 response. In some instances the new proposals have reduced our concerns regarding this area.	89711-225-1309			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	Well thought through urban design approaches to both temporary and permanent buildings and infrastructure must meet Council and CABA requirements, and it is disappointing that the District Councils' as planning authorities, are yet to see or be briefed on associated development siting and design matters.	89735-225-9575	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Nether Stowey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	3.6 The Parish Council notes the proposal to use the route from the site via Stogursey Lane as an alternative / emergency access and would wish to receive further details of how this road is to be improved / managed to ensure that adequate access is maintained at all times for the homes accessed off Stogursey Lane.	8717-221-9972	/			<p>EDF Energy has received comments during the Stage 1 and 2 consultation processes from both public and statutory consultees in relation to the provision of on-site transport and access.</p> <p>With regard to emergency access, the emergency access road would provide an alternative access to the site for use only in emergency situations. The impact on local residents will therefore be very infrequent. The road would provide a separate route which does not rely on the same roads as the main access. Further detail of the proposed road is provided in the Hinkley Point C Development Site Design and Access Statement. Suggested alternatives, such as the existing Hinkley Point B emergency access route via Stolford or a new Bridgwater bypass do not meet the requirements. The emergency access road would be gated at each end and the gates locked under normal operation, although pedestrian access will be maintained. As use will be very infrequent, the road is designed as a single track road with passing places. The bridge over Bum Brook is proposed as single track although it also incorporates a footpath within its design. The junction with the public road in Shurton would be repositioned approximately equidistant between nearby properties and is designed generally in accordance with highway standards. There is no lighting provided for the emergency access road and the land either side is integrated into the proposed landscape plan.</p> <p>The helipad provides emergency access to the whole Hinkley Point complex (A, B and C Stations) and would be located accordingly between the main entrances to the three stations.</p> <p>The bridge over Bum Brook has been designed to carry the road above the brook flood level and avoid exacerbating the impact of any such floods. The Flood Risk Assessment of the emergency access road and connecting public roads show that access will be possible under expected flood conditions. The limited capacity of the existing bridge means that construction of the new bridge will need to be carried out from both sides of the brook.</p> <p>The access road to the south car park and Public Information Centre will leave Wickmoor Drove at the site southern roundabout, to separate station operational traffic from public visitor traffic. However, in the event of flooding of the low point of Wickmoor Drove between the southern and northern roundabouts, this access road provides an alternative</p>
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The Agency seeks further clarification on the number of car parking spaces proposed as part of the development.	88860-221-3988	/			
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	It is also noted that an additional permanent outage car park is proposed further south on land that would be occupied in part by the workers' accommodation campus during construction. The Agency requests clarification on the use of the outage car park, for example, will access be restricted to the car park during regular operational phases but opened for outages, how will access be restricted, how many spaces will be provided and will there be allocated spaces for car sharers?	88860-221-4100	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	b) The level of on-site car parking provision during both construction and operational phases has not been determined; this should be provided at a level that does not encourage unnecessary car usage and that is linked with trip generation forecasts.	87910-221-4064	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	c) The suitability of the emergency access road is queried. Further design details are requested such as road widths and design standards.	87910-221-4322	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	1.4. The level of on-Site car parking provision has not be determined; this should be provided at a level that does not encourage car usage and linked with HPC trip generation forecasts. Internal site access arrangements and circulation routes need to be considered for all transport modes, including cars, shuttle buses, cyclists and pedestrians, to ensure staff and visitors are able to access their place of work conveniently and safely by non-car modes (3.2.8).	87990-221-2583		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	1.5. The suitability of the emergency access road is queried. Further design details are requested such as road widths and design standards (3.2.8).	87990-221-3056	/			route to the site above the flood level. The outage access adjacent to the south car park would also provide access onto the site. Site car parking has been rationalised since the stage 1 proposals with three car parks immediately outside the station perimeter fence as shown in the Hinkley Point C Development Site Design and Access Statement . Part of the parking capacity replaces existing HPB parking and is therefore not available for HPC users. During the main construction, the south car park would be used exclusively for park and ride buses. Approximately 300 car parking spaces will be available in the south-east car park as follows: 200 spaces for key construction workers, 30 spaces for VIP visitors, 30 spaces for business visitors and 40 car spaces for disabled visitors and visitor buses to the Public Information Centre. All parking spaces will be individually allocated and controlled. Anybody without an allocated space will be required to use park and ride or direct bus services.
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	1.6. The number of car parking space to be provided at the contractors' temporary car park should be specified and justified in terms of links with trip generation forecasts (3.3.9).	87990-221-3212	/			
Kilve Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	1.1.16 Other road improvements; It is accepted that an emergency exit/entrance be made available to the site via the route indicated on the map (fig 10.5) however, this must not be seen as an alternative to the main road access (C182) other than in extreme circumstances, i.e. RTA.	88930-221-1507	/			Car parking during station operation will be as follows: 430 spaces will be available for station operational staff with 505 spaces in the south car park for outage staff together with users of the PIC and the training and simulator building. Six coach spaces will also be provided for the Public Information Centre. Limited parking for National Grid staff will be provided within the substation. No parking for private vehicles will be provided within the power station security fence.
Kilve Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	How long before the "Emergency" Access at Shurton (between Benhole Lane, and Bishops Farm) becomes a dedicated route, accessing the workers accommodation? EDF have assured the residents of Shurton and Burton, that their local road system will not be used for either worker access, nor for delivery.	88930-221-2402	/			Internal site roads are shown indicatively in the Hinkley Point C Development Site Design and Access Statement along with a description of site logistics. The site roads, particularly those on the northern part of the site, will be subject to change during the construction to take account of the changing works. There will be two crossing points for Green Lane, which divides the northern and southern parts of the site. With the exception of Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs), which will use the northern roundabout to access the site, all freight will enter the site via the southern access. Site workers who are resident in the site campus will enter the site at the south. All other construction workers will enter the site via the northern roundabout and the worker entrance adjacent to the south car park, which will be used for worker buses. Shuttle buses will carry workers around the site. These buses will be restricted to 10mph for safety reasons and this will also limit the
Kilve Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	.2.5 Stringent parking measures to be adopted in and around the Hinkley "C" site. More clarity needed on this. Having seen the measures that were put in place at Flamanville, the park and ride initiative does not work. If the park and ride system is to work, strict regulation must be enforced, and although it is good to hear about it, there is very little mention of how this will be achieved.	88930-221-7738	/			
Kilve Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The concept of a new access point in Shurton to serve as an emergency exit/entrance needs more clarification. The presumption that this exit/entrance will be a metalled road, would suggest that in times of emergency, such as an RTA on the C182, this could be used as a secondary works access point, with the inherent dangers that would bring to other non EDF workers and other road users such as dog walkers and children. It would also mean that there would be a proliferation of heavy/er vehicles using the roads from Nether Stowey and Holford off the A39. *	88930-221-10064	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Kilve Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The emergency entrance / exit to the south of the site in Shurton must be just that, emergency. It would be wholly unacceptable to have an access point within the village of Shurton, for vehicles of any type. It would also encourage people wishing to visit the site, to use the narrower lanes from the A39. As previously mentioned, the Clayland corner junction on the C182 is at present, notoriously dangerous, and in the event of a fatality between Clayland corner and the main site entrance, no access to the site would be possible. Will this new road from Shurton be considered as an alternative "emergency" entrance / exit in the case of accident? Is this being considered as a contingency route? Isn't it more likely that we will be looking at the likelihood of another entrance to the site from the western edge of the boundary, running to the north of Burton, and linking up with the A39 somewhere between Kilve and Nether Stowey? Widening of the Stringston road, and/or Stogursey lane would result in them both becoming suitable for heavier traffic, and easy access to the proposed new entrance in Shurton. This would not be acceptable. During the winter months, there is regular flooding in Stringston, Shurton and Burton. If flooding were to coincide with a necessity to use the emergency access in Shurton the result would be mayhem. The issue of flooding in these areas must be addressed as a matter of urgency.	88930-221-18018	/			<p>noise from the buses.</p> <p>Freight logistics control points will be located at the freight logistics centres at M5 junctions 23 and 24 as well as at the site entrance, in order to manage the flow of HGV traffic on the local roads between these points.</p> <p>The southern site access roundabout will be constructed to highway standards. However, in order to facilitate the north/south passage of AILs, the existing Wickmoor Drove roadway alignment will be retained, but gated off in normal use. The northern roundabout is not on the public highway and is designed for the passage of AILs.</p> <p>With regard to the provision of public rights of way, during construction no public access will be available within the site perimeter for security and health and safety reasons. However alternative footpath routes around the perimeter will be provided. The coastal path will have to be closed during construction of the jetty and during construction of the sea wall for health and safety reasons. Similarly, parts of the foreshore will be closed to the public during jetty and sea wall construction works. However, following completion of the sea wall, the coastal path will be reopened along the sea wall and underneath the jetty and foreshore access will be restored. Coastal path and foreshore access will again be closed for the dismantling of the jetty. The Public Information Centre will be built early in the construction of the power station and will provide a point from which construction activities could be viewed.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	2.2.2 Site Access Initial concern is expressed on the appropriateness of the Alternative Site Emergency Access/Egress Road. The proposed road is off an extremely narrow lane which cannot accommodate anything other than minor traffic movements because of its width and alignment. Should traffic movements be impossible along the C182 for any period of time, the proposed road will be the only access and travel along other local, substandard roads will be required. Further discussions on the suitability of this access road will be required between EDF, West Somerset Council and the County Council as Highways Authority.	88100-221-3846	/			<p>The proposed jetty will enable delivery of containerised freight as well as bulk aggregate, sand and cement. Because of the need to limit the impact on the internationally designated areas off the coast of Hinkley Point to acceptable levels, it was not possible to incorporate the capability to import AILs via the jetty. Additionally, the weather and sea conditions will limit the availability of the jetty, such that at times of peak aggregate requirements, there could be</p>
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	We understand the vital need for an Emergency route to and from Hinkley but feel Shurton village would be a poor place to put this. The suggested alternative road from the M25 at Dunball put forward by hundreds of angry Cannington residents would be much more appropriate. We would support this by-pass in the least-best scenario that Hinkley C goes ahead. Cannington residents wishes should be completely respected in terms of their wish not to have their village traumatised by new infrastructure proposed by EDF.	88960-221-29769	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
West Hinkley Action Group	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	- Concerns were expressed about the emergency access road and its proximity to houses. It should be guaranteed that the road is for emergency use only and will not be used by vehicles for any other purposes not only following but during construction. The gate should be secured. The road and the gate should not be lit and the gate and the fencing should be in keeping with the rural nature of the village surroundings. There should be minimum nuisance to the surrounding dwellings.	8755-221-3616	/			relatively few spare windows for delivery of other goods.
Tractivity 844	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? I believe far more work and storage should be on site at Hinkley Point, if you can unload sand and bulk items there you should also be able to unload container barges there even if it means cutting a channel in the rock outcrops, using for example explosives, if this is done think of the amount of pollution and expense this would save using road transport for containers and fabricated items.	9602-221-129		/		
Tractivity 844	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? If you can deliver bulk materials onsite surely a large company as you could have or engage marine engineers that could extend this to also accommodate barges to unload containers onsite. I worked as a diver on Breaksea Point power station during its construction and the local Welsh population did not appear to have all the problems you propose for the local population near Hinkley Point.	9602-221-1408		/		
Tractivity 844	Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments? If all sea freight is landed at Hinkley Point much of the freight Logistics are solved cutting down light, air and noise pollution over a large area of surrounding area and villages. Park and Ride areas away from villages for the same reasons.	9602-221-3288		/		
Tractivity 980	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The Somerset coast is used by residents and tourists alike and the proposed site will damage the tourism industry in Somerset and cause far too many job losses. The site is inaccessible at present and traffic congestion will be enormous, this will cut villages along the route off emergency services such as fire engines and ambulances, plus noise from traffic will be unacceptable.	9738-221-129			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1091	Public	Stage 2	12. Any other ideas or comments? I do not understand why a wharf cannot be built at HPC site. This would mean no disruption for Comwich residents and building materials traveling direct to site, meaning fewer lorries needed, helping you with your low carbon emissions drive!	9849-221-13711		/		
Tractivity 1098	Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments? Need reassurance that roads through surrounding villages will not become short cuts - what measures will be taken to avoid this. I assume that parking on site will be restricted to essential staff only and all other staff will only access the site by using one of the park and ride schemes?	9856-221-2062	/			
Tractivity 1134	Public	Stage 2	12. Any other ideas or comments? a dedicated wharf should be built on site at hinkley point	9892-221-5878		/		
Tractivity 1151	Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments? Land at Comwich is unsuitable for a park and ride depot and a freight logistics facility. It should be sited at Hinkley.	9909-221-2045		/		
Tractivity 1177	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I appreciate the need for the powerstations, and consider the site to be a satisfactory one. However EDF must make every effort to minimise the impact on local communities. i am concerned that a helicopter pad is being planned, which implies that there will be movements by helicopter. This seems totally unnecessary and will cause great aggravation - we have enough nuisance at present from the MOD helicopters.	9935-221-6587			/	
Tractivity 1183	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Of course it is satisfactory to reduce the amount of land used nearest to residents. of course the vast majority of people filling in this form will have no interest in this question at all. I presume it is included to highlight the fact you have listed to local residents - will please listen some more. You will be using some of this land for the emergency road - it doesn't seem very clear exactly where this is going.	9941-221-391	/			
Tractivity 1198	Public	Stage 2	9c. Hinkley Point C site for up to 700 places? Box ticked: Satisfactory 9c. Any other ideas or comments? Transport to/from for recreation?	9956-221-4513			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 263	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? It is clear that the NPS will include Nuclear, that the Siting policy will include Hinkley Point, so now it is a question of ensuring the development minimises disruption to the locals and offers maximum opportunities for employment in the short and long term. The current plans have a lot of issues for the local population which need to be addressed. In particular the proximity of the southern boundary to existing populations is unacceptable, as is the route of the emergency entrance. It is also not clear what the visual impact will be.	8952-221-6671	/			
Tractivity 270	Public	Stage 1	3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction? The suggestion that there might be a footpath following the hedge line across the middle of the site sounds a good idea. Many people will be interested in seeing construction progressing and if the coast path is to be closed, temporarily, a diversion will be required.	8959-221-659	/			
Tractivity 291	Public	Stage 1	3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction? Sorry - no.	8979-221-689			/	
Tractivity 302	Public	Stage 1	Very concerned about the 'emergency' access road on to the Shurton Road - it needs to be ONLY for REAL emergencies, not for general site/workers traffic.	8990-221-5579	/			
Tractivity 323	Public	Stage 1	3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction? This strategy seems good. It is of course obvious to retain as many rights of way open and open new ones where possible and it is understood that safety and security is a major consideration.	9011-221-1260			/	
Tractivity 343	Public	Stage 1	3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction? None	9031-221-686			/	
Tractivity 457	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? Would the emergency exit road be retained? If so, could this be made into a footpath route/bridleway. Could this existing emergency exit route to Stolford be used instead - connected to the new site? Any barns removed - could the building materials be re-used - in visitor centre for example.	9134-221-958		/		
Tractivity 492	Public	Stage 1	3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction?	9165-221-704			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 509	Public	Stage 1	.In particular - the proposed permanent outage car park is too close to the southern edge - surely it could be move closer to the developed part of the final site.	9181-221-4671	/			
Tractivity 574	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Disruption to local people must be kept to a minimum. The narrow road from Hinkley via Shurton to Nether Stowey should only be used in an emergency and not as a 'rat run'. I have just learned from 2 people who were living in Stogursey while Hinkley A & B were built they said fights broke out most nights and there was much disturbance from workers. I hope you will police this area constantly.	9243-221-4824	/			
Tractivity 593	Public	Stage 1	3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction? rights of Way should be maintained as existing as much as possible.	9259-221-802			/	
Tractivity 597	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Workers do on the whole drive slowly on your site and I hope this will continue when full construction goes ahead. After all we live here. You are destroying our lovely countryside!!!	9263-221-5109			/	
Tractivity 612	Public	Stage 1	3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction? Rights of way should be diverted around the site	9276-221-672			/	
Tractivity 618	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Personal comments - We are concerned about the following in relation to our day to day lives: Emergency Access Road - we would like it confirmed that it will only be used in the case of an emergency and that the construction will be in keeping with the area. Noise pollution during construction period which will effect our quality of life. We have today discussed with (Personal details removed) the possibility of double glazing funded by EDF. We have restricted visibility in exiting our drive and we are concerned about the hazardous effect following the increase in volume of traffic. Light pollution during construction and 24 hour shifts. We have a holiday let which we feel will be adversely affected during the construction period. We renew our contract with the agents in July and we will have to consider whether to renew our contract for 2011 and beyond. We would appreciate some feedback on this.	9282-221-4329	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 600	Public	Stage 1	The emergency road is positioned as far away from residential properties as possible and is shielded by vegetation.	9378-221-423			/	
Tractivity 600	Public	Stage 1	- In the Stage 2 document we need to clearly state our definition of "emergency road", if it's going to be used during construction we need to explain how often.	9378-221-1632		/		
Tractivity 50717	Public	Stage 1	I am however, from a selfish point of view concerned about the direct impact the development would have on our family. We live on (Personal details removed), in a house approximately half a mile from Nether Stowey. I understand that this road may become the emergency route of preference if the Hinkley Point road is closed. Obviously this would only affect the amount of traffic dramatically on the road in emergencies. However, the amount of traffic on the road is likely to increase significantly despite this. For example, I would imagine the preferred route of any workers housed in Willton would involve this road.	9389-221-641			/	
Tractivity 62177	Public	Stage 1	What do we do with/how do we manager the land in Shurton either side of the emergency road? This needs to be covered in Stage two	9421-221-272	/			
Tractivity 62178	Public	Stage 1	(Personal details removed) explained that moving the footpath from Benhole lane simply moves the issue of people wandering past his property rather than (Personal details removed). (Personal details removed) breeds valuable birds of prey, he is worried that a new footpath on our land without fencing/planting to keep people on the path will attract people/dogs close to his property to look at his birds, they are often left on perches outside. At best this could disturb the birds and at worst a dog could jump the existing fence and attack his birds. (Personal details removed) is ok with the emergency road/ footpath as long as they are equidistance from existing properties backing onto the field and that there is some type of fencing/planting to stop people wandering all over the field. What do we do with/how do we manager the land in Shurton either side of the emergency road? This needs to be covered in Stage two - (Personal details removed) is keen to buy / manage the sections that backs onto his property.	9422-221-208	/			
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	A Twin EPWR power station alongside the two existing stations on last freely permissible wildfowling foreshore area in the southwest if not the whole of England, which will most likely completely exclude shooting (security issues) if not all public access and definitely make access to the foreshore far more difficult if not impossible especially for those older or less able. The plans should include a public road, parking and access to the foreshore that until recently was enjoy by many for years. If it is not safe to do this then the plant itself is not safe to build.	10091-221-3041		/		
Tractivity 62517	Public	Stage 2	e. The escape route needs to consider the privacy of local residents.	10099-221-1364	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62551	Public	Stage 2	Emergency Access route -1 consider the location and planned route for this to be entirely unacceptable because I feel that it will be used as an additional general access route and have no confidence in statements made that this will be retained exclusively as an access point for emergency vehicles only.	10112-221-169			/	
Tractivity 62572	Public	Stage 2	The proposed emergency road emerges onto a lane that is prone to flooding. This lane becomes impassable at both Shurton and Burton. The problem of flooding must be addressed if this emergency road is to be of any use.	10123-221-3345	/			
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The route of the access road to the visitors' centre should also be carefully considered within the context of the overall masterplan.	10185-221-4486	/			
National Grid	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	For operational and safety reasons National Grid requires unrestricted access to our substation sites. We would request that any proposed changes to roads/layouts in the vicinity of our site have regard to the need to maintain access. I have attached a location map from our mapping system to show the Hinkley Point Power Station, for your information.	10201-221-323	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	2.30 It is not possible to comment on the suitability of the emergency access road without receipt of a detailed plan and evidence regarding the likely type and volume of traffic proposed to use it.	89222-221-10600	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Flooding: The Flood Risk Study shows that there is a credible possibility of a sea flooding event which would leave the main access to the site flooded to a substantial depth. Experience from the 1981 inundation shows that many of the surrounding roads, including those that would provide access to the proposed emergency access, were also impassable. There appears to be no mention in the documentation about how this event will be mitigated, and this is a serious concern to SPC. Although flood mitigation schemes are planned for "on-site", there is no mention of local flooding that can severely hamper access to the site itself. Both Stogursey and Shurton can be cut off by flooded roads during the winter months. Stringston, Cole Pool, Burton, and Farringdon Lane flood to a depth that prevents normal vehicle movements. This could constitute not only problems of access, but also security. This must be addressed in further consultation before the application goes to the IPC.	89288-221-13735			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Construction Land Use: The route of the emergency access road is not clearly defined here or elsewhere. It seems that the proposed route may be through the planned trees, which brings it very close to the properties in Shurton. Will EDF provide a definitive route for this road?	89289-221-1271	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[Figure 5.3] This appears to show the emergency access route running along the southern area close to residents, before turning north to the site. Will EDF reconsider this route, to move it away from the residents?	89289-221-8741	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[8.7.2] Refers to poor sightlines between passing places. Is the emergency road therefore going to be single track?	89289-221-11685	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[Executive Summary] This states that, even after proposed mitigation measures, the C182 is at risk of flooding from both a sea overtopping or breach events and from fluvial flooding. This would lead to the site being isolated as either of these events will lead to flooding of other roads in the area which would also render the emergency access unusable. What is EDF intending to do to deal with this issue?	89293-221-1071			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[9.2] States that, as there are no designs currently for the emergency access road crossing Bum Brook, this is not considered further. Flooding in this area is routine. What does EDF plan to do to mitigate this problem, given that any flooding here will probably cause flooding on the C182 leading to the site being cut off?	89293-221-1635	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	No further information provided. Authorities position May 2010: Alternative Site Emergency Access/Egress road - further information required should the C182 become impassable. Also requested main site access roundabout design to be improved to meet highway standards Update September 2010: No transport mitigation measures are proposed for congestion or safety..	89327-221-3716	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>Authorities position May 2010: Car parking - is it allocated on a first come first serve basis?</p> <p>Update September 2010: Proposed parking provision lacks justification and no clarification on how spaces will be allocated is provided.</p>	89327-221-4097	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concern is expressed at the appropriateness of the Alternative Site Emergency Access/Egress Road. The proposed road is off an extremely narrow lane which cannot accommodate anything other than minor traffic movements because of its width and alignment. Should traffic movements be impossible along the C182 for any period of time, the proposed road will be the only access and travel along other local, substandard roads will be required. Further discussions on the suitability of this access road will be required between EDF Energy, West Somerset Council and the County Council as Highways Authority; - West Somerset Council would wish to ensure that the proposed roundabout and junction for the main site access complies with highway standards; - Clarification is requested over whether car parking will be allocated or on a first come first served basis. If the latter, it is considered that 'search paths' through the campus are poor; - It needs to be demonstrated through vehicle swept path analyses that servicing and refuse collection is feasible. 	89334-221-4828	/			
Tractivity 62940	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If EDF really did want to look after the local community they should seriously consider improving local lanes and public footpaths and landscape the road verges with spring bulbs and specimen tree planting to beautify the local environment and main approach to the power station. I know you are going to plant lanscape screening, but the main approach road also needs to be considered. 	89675-221-1894			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62949	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>4. Emergency access road</p> <p>I accept that an emergency access road is necessary. The chances of an incident on site at the same time as the C182 is out of use, which is the only situation requiring its use, are very low. Couple this with the fact that emergency vehicles are in general capable of negotiating water to a significant depth, I see no reason for the large structure shown in the photo-montage of the bridge over Bum brook - it shows a structure that would be more suitable for a fair sized river. All that is required is a stronger version of the existing concrete slab bridge, maybe 0.5m higher. While the raising of the ridge is to be applauded, the gain in visual shielding will be negated by the much nearer eyesore of the proposed bridge. The design must be re-considered to minimise its visual impact. At the very least, paint it green !</p> <p>Because of the nature of the proposed bridge, we are very suspicious that EdF are in fact intending to use this as another route to the site - this would be entirely unacceptable given the size of the Shurton/ Burton road.</p>	89680-221-2116		/		
Tractivity 62953	Public	Stage 2 Update	The emergency road proposal, including the eyesore of a bridge are much more intrusive in the centre of our rural community that we were led to believe. Why does this bridge need to be so large if this emergency road is only to be used on very rare occasions?	89682-221-2851			/	
Tractivity 62967	Public	Stage 2 Update	No mention is made of flood relief at Newnham Bridge and between Burton and Stogursey without which the Emergency Access would be rendered useless at times of high rainfall.	89686-221-1959			/	
Tractivity 62983	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	We can only comment on the Emergency Access Road - this will be useless if there is any problem on the A39 and surrounding roads, a new route direct from Dunball is the only solution to give peace of mind to residents and, hopefully, to the local and national authorities.	89689-221-4219		/		
Tractivity 63031	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>Emergency Road:</p> <p>Access for the construction of the emergency road and bridge must not be through Shurton or Burton, as the lanes are not suitable, access must be from the main construction site.</p>	89704-221-4890			/	
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	The whole list of changes to the associated development and main site layouts do not materially change our advice set out in our Stage 2 response. In some instances the new proposals have reduced our concerns regarding this area.	89711-221-1309			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Labour Group	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	- We believe that there remains insufficient detail regarding emergency procedures in terms of emergency vehicles accessing the main site in the event of an emergency, should there be severe congestion on the roads, and in terms of evacuation of local residents.	89779-221-7719			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	1.34 We understand the emergency access arrangement has changed since Stage 2 when it was proposed to use the existing highway. To comment meaningfully we need detailed designs for the emergency access junction and changes to the road itself which are not referred to in the report (p. 36). A detailed design and explanation of proposed use is requested.	89846-221-630	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	The County Council has not seen the proposed details for the Bum Bridge crossing for the emergency access road. The potential flood risk at this location should be fully assessed to the Council's satisfaction. Details of the proposed bridge crossing and an assessment of the flood risk associated with the crossing should be presented to the Council.	89864-221-3220			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	2.4.3 The County Council has not seen the proposed details for the Bum Bridge crossing for the emergency access road. The potential flood risk at this location should be fully assessed to the Council's satisfaction. Details of the proposed bridge crossing and an assessment of the flood risk associated with the crossing should be presented to the Council.	89865-221-12997			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	-provide details to the County Council (as Local Lead Flood Authority) of the proposed bridge crossing over Bum Brook, and an assessment of the flood risk associated with the crossing.	89865-221-16535			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.17 Page 36 Emergency access road and junction: It is entirely unacceptable for the works to construct the substantial bridge over Bum Brook and the junction with Shurton Road to be accessed from Shurton. The road is simply not suitable for the type and volume of traffic required. This work must be carried out by accessing the area from the main construction site.	89871-221-14926		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1.116 [4.3.25-28] It is not clear from these paragraphs how traffic will gain access for the construction of the Bum Brook crossing and junction with Shurton Road. Elsewhere in 2a, it is suggested that this access will be via Shurton Road. This is unacceptable as this road is entirely unsuitable for the type and volume of traffic proposed. All access must be via the main construction site using the proposed temporary access road.	89872-221-5570		/		
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1.18 [5.3.3] SPC wish to understand the extent of the noise and night time light pollution associated with these internal shuttle buses.	89872-221-6115			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	Emergency Access Road The provision of additional details on the emergency access junction is useful and the commitment that the route would only be used to respond to an incident at the station is important.	89875-221-13383			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	Emergency Access Road - The provision of additional details on the emergency access junction is useful and the commitment that the route would only be used to respond to an incident at the station is important. Given that hedgerow removal is proposed, details of replacement boundary treatments that would maintain visibility splays and be appropriate to the setting are required.	89897-221-3292	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Friends of Quantocks	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>a) Further enhancement of existing pylons/cables between Hinkley C and Bristol. Please may I have some more detail of this? Does this mean higher or bigger pylons and what form of enhancement to the existing cabling?</p> <p>b) A new route to convey the additional power would also be required. Exactly what form would this take - over ground/under ground? If over ground what would the anticipated exact route be?</p>	8767-226-350	/			<p>A number of issues were raised by consultees during the Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultation process in relation to overhead line infrastructure. Comments were made in relation to the EDF Energy related works, National Grid works and the relationship between these works.</p> <p>Issues raised by consultees included: the use of different designs of towers (pylons) by EDF Energy and National Grid which would result in different forms on the skyline; the possibility of undergrounding the cabling due to impact on countryside character; requests for further information on the infrastructure design including confirmation on the heights of the tallest structures in order to identify whether air navigation warning lighting is required and information on the design of the substation including consideration of external factors such as salt-laden winds and technologies chosen; and ensuring high quality design of towers.</p> <p>Comments were also received on the route options and corridors for the National Grid infrastructure. It was also questioned as to why the upgrades were required given the original optioneering exercise (which served as an aid to decision making) for the choice of the Hinkley Point C site based on the availability of existing infrastructure.</p>
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Hinkley Point C Main Power Station and Ancillary Buildings</p> <p>The site identified for the main buildings and associated land uses, as depicted in Figure10.2, does not occupy any MOD statutory safeguarding zones or neighbour any MOD property.</p> <p>Based upon the illustrative layout design for the main buildings provided at Figure 3.2, it is not anticipated that the development of the actual nuclear power station will in itself affect any defence interests. Subject to confirming the dimensions of the taller structures included in the development it is possible that the highest points of some of the structures may need to be fitted with air navigation warning lights to maintain the safety of military air traffic that operates in the area.</p> <p>Section 3.3.6 identified that fixed tower cranes will be used at the development site during the construction programme. The heights of the cranes are not identified at this stage. It is anticipated that air navigation warning lights may need to be attached to these structures to maintain air traffic safety.</p>	8775-226-2770		/		
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Overhead Transmission Network Development</p> <p>Defence Estates Safeguarding has been consulted separately by National Grid on the development of new overhead power lines to support Hinkley Point C. The proposed routes for overhead line development will not affect defence interests. However, Defence Estates Safeguarding will assess the precise location and dimensions of overhead line towers when these have been finalised to verify whether any air navigation warning lights will be needed and to update air navigation charts accordingly.</p>	8775-226-3828			/	
Tractivity 742	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Generally ok but pylon design should be addressed and match those eventually used by National Grid (a better design is required)</p>	9500-226-127		/		
Tractivity 811	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>I have not seen any plans for additional Electrical Pylons, are there any?</p>	9569-226-6746			/	<p>EDF Energy cabling (lines) and EDF Energy towers (pylons) carry the electricity from the generators in the turbine halls, stepped-up to high voltage (400 kilo Volts (kV)) via transformers, to the National Grid 400kV substation in the south-east corner of the HPC permanent development site. Connections are also provided from the National Grid substation back to the transformers via underground cables. These proposals, including the National Grid substation, are included in the Hinkley Point C Development Site Design and Access Statement.</p> <p>In addition to the on-site EDF Energy towers and lines, the Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultations proposed that EDF Energy's Development Consent Order (DCO) application would include the National Grid substation, three end (terminal) towers (pylons) to the south and east of the substation and connecting wires (downleads) from the terminal towers into the</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 908	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below A nuclear powerstation is a necessity if the evr expanding population is to have electricity which we cannot do without. Whatever system is used there is going to be a need for Pylons to distribute the electricity to the grid. Hinkley Point must be constructed using the highest available technology and best quality materials and there must be a safe storage of waste.	9666-226-6876			/	substation. In order to ensure that EDF Energy's consultation and DCO application would not prejudice National Grid's own DCO consultation and subsequent application, EDF Energy's proposals now only include the National Grid substation, as set out at Stage 2 Update in February 2011. All proposed National Grid overhead lines and towers including the terminal towers and substation connecting downleads will be subject to a separate DCO application by National Grid.
Tractivity 374	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Some concern about such a large generator adjacent to salt water. February 9th 1990 all circuits into Hinkley Point A and B were lost due to salt laden winds. The loss of 3200 MW(e) would cause huge disruption to the national Grid, a 10% loss of average national load. Please consider enclosing the 400 kV substation.	9061-226-4716		/		In relation to the choice of Hinkley Point C based on the proximity to existing power line infrastructure, the site does benefit from the existing power line infrastructure close to the site which is suitable for the power output from Hinkley Point C. The connection works in proximity to the site, proposed by National Grid in their consultation and any subsequent separate DCO application, is limited to line entry modifications (which includes proposed overhead line connections) to connect the proposed National Grid substation to the existing overhead line network.
Tractivity 62560	Public	Stage 2	An early thought looked at building the new road over concrete lined channels which could then be used as a conduit for high tension lines thus avoiding pylons.	10117-226-6071		/		Some wider reinforcement works comprising replacement and upgrades to the national grid high voltage transmission system and new transmission infrastructure are required further away from the HPC site between Bridgwater and Seabank (Avonmouth) to accommodate the additional power from Hinkley Point C and help to connect other power generation facilities planned in the area.
Cheddar Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The original option choice of the Hinkley site appears to be because of the proximity of the required infrastructure - cooling water, grid power lines, and geographic suitability. The fact that the grid power lines are not actually sufficient to cope with the output power, and will require replacing with new lines, appears to have been dismissed at the selection stage, along with the fact that 80% of the power is to be sent 'up country' again ignoring the resulting losses inherent in the overhead grid system.	10222-226-442			/	National Grid is undertaking pre-application consultation on their transmission infrastructure and route corridors for the wider connection project, which will be subject to a separate DCO application.
Shapwick Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	At a recent meeting the only point that members of Shapwick PC wished to raise was that underground cabling should be used not overhead cabling.	10230-226-0		/		As such, no further comment is made in this response in relation to National Grid's proposals, including on the various upgrades to lines in the immediate vicinity of Hinkley Point C and in the wider Somerset area.
Weston-super-Mare Town Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	To protect and enhance the quality and character of our countryside all power lines must be placed underground or under the sea. Overhead lines will drastically change and spoil the character of our countryside. All natural assets of our district must be conserved, if not enhanced.	10238-226-659		/		EDF Energy has considered the comments made in relation to the technology used, design and general layout of the lines and towers at each stage of consultation, however, the proposals have remained generally the same due to safety reasons and optimisation of the design.
Natural England	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	We consider the introduction of 'EDF Pylons' within the proposed development a major visual detractor, and one that is not fully explored or assessed. The pylon design is significantly different to the more easily recognisable 'National Grid' design and incongruous. We understand that at Hinkley Point A & B the cable connections are routed underground resulting in a simplicity of form and significantly less skyline clutter.	89110-226-4007		/		For safety reasons, the design should minimise the risk of a disconnection with the national grid high voltage transmission system. Therefore, each UK EPR reactor unit is connected separately to the

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Quantock Hills AONB Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- The AONB Service has concerns that the EDF pylons are of a very different shape to the National Grid proposed towers. We would expect every effort to be made to minimise the amount of different forms on the skyline.	89122-226-1467		/		national grid high voltage transmission system via a main connection and an auxiliary connection. These two external connections should be as independent as possible.
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[Figure 2.1] This montage does not show the on-site pylons or the National Grid pylon route. Will EDF re-issue this with all of the visual features included?	89289-226-7768			/	With an overhead line for the main connection and an underground cables for the auxiliary connection these connections are fully segregated. This design with two different technologies decreases significantly the risk of common mode failure due to external hazards.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	- Consideration is given to the design of the overhead lines and the supporting pylons to ensure minimal visual impact.	89424-226-13773	/			The main connection is designed to transmit the electricity produced by the generators to the national grid high voltage transmission system and to feed all the unit's auxiliaries in normal operating and accident situations. Another benefit of using overhead lines is that technology is very reliable in transmitting high levels of energy and for ease of maintenance.
Tractivity 1362	Public	Stage 2 Update	We understand that National Grid will be dealing with the transmission issues. How much power will be lost by transmission long distances which we understand is to be the fate of much of the power to be generated at Hinkley Point?	89628-374-0			/	The auxiliary connection is designed to use the national grid high voltage transmission system to supply the unit auxiliaries needed to shut the unit down in both normal operating and accident situations. This connection acts as a back-up to the auxiliary supply function of the main connection if the latter fails. The maximum demand for this auxiliary connection is below 100MW which can be easily transmitted by underground cable. The shape, size, height and location of the EDF Energy towers are determined by safety, topographical, operational and environmental considerations. EDF Energy's proposed overhead lines and towers at the Hinkley Point C site have fixed locations and are indicated on the Hinkley Point C Development Site Plan provided as part of the DCO application. Near contact with overhead lines is dangerous. Overhead electric conductors are not insulated and if an object approaches too closely it is possible that a flashover will occur and an electric current flow with the likelihood of fatal or severe shock and burns to any person nearby. In order to prevent such incidents minimum safety clearance for overhead lines are prescribed. As the lines are installed over buildings at Hinkley Point C, the height of the towers should be designed to respect these prescribed safety clearances. A horizontal arrangement for the conductors was selected to reduce the height of the towers and to be lower than the top of the reactor building domes, thus minimising, so far as possible, the visual impact. The height of the highest tower would be less than 65m (which would also therefore not require air

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
								<p>navigation warning lighting). In comparison, the National Grid towers connecting the substation to the national grid high voltage transmission system would be between 42 and 52m. EDF Energy towers are also located as close to the reactor building domes as possible to group pylons with the largest structures on site and minimise the visual impact.</p> <p>Therefore, due to the site specific and safety requirements for overhead line connections within the power station site, the EDF Energy tower design is different from the proposed National Grid towers, which lie outside of the power station site. The design and siting of the infrastructure has sought to reduce the visual impact against the backdrop of the HPC structures.</p> <p>For the construction of the overhead line infrastructure, EDF Energy plans to use the Best Available Technology and highest quality of materials.</p> <p>The design of the National Grid substation has considered all the external factors of its coastal location. The substation is designed to be enclosed from any salt-laden wind effects to ensure appropriate efficiency and safety of operation at all times.</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
OFWAT	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	We understand that EDF is already in communication with Wessex Water on water supply. We understand from Wessex Water that some upgrading of water service infrastructure is a likely requirement to meet the development and associated construction needs. We are not aware of particular constraints on source water availability, but this should be confirmed through Wessex Water and the Environment Agency.	8703-1781-815	/			<p>The majority of comments raised at stage 1 of the consultation centred around seeking clarification on utility capacity and supply arrangements, particularly potable water and the methods by which sewage would be dealt with during construction. Concerns were raised over the ability of service providers to cope with increased utility demand and the potential knock on effects regarding adequacy of provision locally. Further questions were raised over the potential for disruption caused by utility works necessary to make the supply connections, on the local road network and adjacent land. Detailed comments tended to focus on the lack of detail contained in stage 1 over methods of water supply and effluent treatment.</p> <p>Similar issues to Stage 1 were also raised at Stage 2. In response to these comments further work has been undertaken to provide greater clarification on water and sewage issues. In terms of potable water, this will be supplied via the existing Wessex Water mains connection to the Hinkley Point B station. A new pipe is proposed to be installed and operated by Wessex Water, which will run to the south of the Hinkley Point B station and the Hinkley Point A complex and under the existing station access road to the HPC site. Disruption will therefore be minimal to neighbouring residents.</p> <p>With regard to treatment of sewage during construction, mobile sewage treatment plant will be installed to treat effluent from the main site in the vicinity of the power station development and additional plant will serve the workers accommodation campus. The level of treatment will be to 'tertiary' standard and discharges will be subject to consent by the Environment Agency. Treated sewage discharges from the power station build area will be routed to sea via the foreshore and from the accommodation campus to Holford Stream. The standard of treatment will not pose a threat to water quality. During operation of the power station sewage will be treated by the permanent sewage works to be located in the north east area of the power station site. All treated discharges will be made via the main cooling water outfall infrastructure.</p>
OFWAT	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Note that construction of additional works by Wessex Water to service the developments are also subject to due process of planning legislation and should be factored into programming.	8703-1781-1604			/	
Wessex Water	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	It is important for Wessex Water to gain a full understanding of these requirements to ensure that we can plan and deliver any necessary capacity improvements at the appropriate time. We can advise that discussion with EDF has commenced and we are currently appraising the need for improvements to the water supply network to meet the increased demand. It is understood that private foul water drainage and treatment will be provided by EDF Energy through existing onsite arrangements. Similar arrangements for surface water disposal will apply.	8705-1781-1122	/			
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Inspection manholes shall be provided and clearly identified on foul and surface water drainage systems, in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority.	88820-1781-5025			/	
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	8.Sewage Capacity Sewerage infrastructure should be in place to cope with the maximum potential volume of sewage/grey water created by new living and recreational facilities before it is used. Please consult the local water company to check that there is adequate space on the mains sewerage network connection to deal with the development (Wessex Water's New Connections telephone number (01225) 526333). Evidence of this assurance will be required.	88820-1781-7382	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	There is relatively limited information on proposed utility connections and no commentary on expected wayleave implications nor a commitment to evaluate the environmental implications of works to secure these connections. Furthermore, there is no plan accompanying the utilities strategy (either for existing or proposed connections).	88580-1781-4924	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 767	Public	Stage 2	9c. Any other ideas or comments? Local infrastructure - drainage, sewerage etc. will not cope without considerable upgrading. Noise, light etc. will aterially affect local residents.	9525-1781-5152	/			
Tractivity 62316	Public	Stage 2	Thanks for providing these references and for your phone call. Having had time to trawl further through the Stage 2 Consultation documents, I have more worrying references to the water supply situation buried in the Sustainability Evaluation:	10003-1781-147a	/			
Tractivity 62316	Public	Stage 2	- 10. 3. 6. Service infrastructure not sufficient in water-most likely to place pressure on existing services.	10003-1781-147b	/			
Tractivity 62316	Public	Stage 2	- 10. 3. 8. Hinkley C will require more than double the water use of Sizewell B, currently 700m3 per day.	10003-1781-147c			/	
Tractivity 62316	Public	Stage 2	- 10. 3. 10. States that the water supply issue has the potential to impact on existing settlements both during construction and also on local transport networks and services.	10003-1781-147d	/			
Tractivity 62316	Public	Stage 2	The water situation is obviously likely to severely impact local residents, particularly if new mains have to be installed. Presumably new supplies will be needed for the preliminary site works which will I understand also need large amounts of water.. My query is therefore, at what stage are your "detailed utility surveys"?	10003-1781-147e	/			
Tractivity 62316	Public	Stage 2	RE: Hinkley C Water Supply (Personal details removed) I was under the impression that it was EDF's policy to answer specific questions related to stage 2. The issue of water supply is I believe a valid one and must surely be crucial to the construction site. Should the water companies become involved in new pipe-laying activities then this would have implications for the local community bearing in mind the recent water mains project in Bridgwater. If I have any further specific questions I will consider listing them if and when appropriate.	10003-1781-2676			/	
Tractivity 62316	Public	Stage 2	Subject: Hinkley C Water Supply Many thanks for confirming that there are currently no plans in place for sewage disposal from the proposed on-site campus . Stage 2 documentation also makes no reference to how water will be supplied to the construction site or the campus. What arrangements/plans do you have for this basic but very important utility supply? I am expecting a written answer to this question as opposed to a verbal reply!	10003-1781-3945	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Some of the responses during consultation were contradictory such as claiming a building with a crane in it would be equivalent single story height...claiming that Hinkley traffic was currently the same or greater than ever when we know that it is not....no mention of wildfowling & beach casting activity on the foreshore when this was pointed out during first stage consultation...	10091-1781-11519			/	
Tractivity 62671	Public	Stage 2	During the building period of these structures, EDF claim "it is likely that new power, drainage, potable water and possibly gas infrastructure services will need to be extended from existing networks to serve the site'. We can therefore look forward to frequent traffic jams and upheaval on Rodway whilst the road is being ripped to shreds by the utility companies. We can find no risk assessment for this work.	10180-1781-1522	/			
Parrett Internal Drainage Board	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Drainage of the Main Site The main construction site is outside of the Boards area. However surface water from the site currently enters the Boards area. Should the development proceed to the next stage we would wish for suitable surface water strategies to be developed to ensure that land in and adjacent to these areas can continue to drain to a standard at least as good as that which exists currently and that no additional burden is placed upon adjacent drainage systems from increased runoff and volumes from the sites. This will require surface water run off to be managed and for drainage features to be maintainable.	10189-1781-417			/	
Parrett Internal Drainage Board	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	This site is within the Boards boundary. Within this area the board have jurisdiction over matters relating to all Ordinary Watercourses. Should the development proceed to the next stage we would wish for suitable surface water strategies to be developed to ensure that land in and adjacent to these areas can continue to drain to a standard at least as good as that which exists currently. This will require surface water run off to be managed and for drainage features to be maintainable.	10189-1781-3519			/	
OFWAT	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Whilst the proposal is of national strategic importance to electricity supplies, this is essentially a local matter in respect of associated water and sewerage service provision. You are correct to identify Wessex Water and Environment Agency as your key Statutory Consultees. We expect that normal commercial arrangements will apply.	10197-1781-349	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Wessex Water	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>Hinkley Point C</p> <p>We understand that requirements for water supply and waste water services will occur during the temporary construction project and for operational activity once the station is complete.</p> <p>Wessex Water is liaising with EDF Energy and has scoped the works necessary to form a water supply pipeline connection Appraisal. The Appraisal is ongoing with terms of reference and timetable agreed between Wessex Water and EDF.</p> <p>It is understood that private foul water drainage and treatment at the site will be provided by EDF Energy through existing onsite arrangements. Similar arrangements for surface water disposal will apply.</p>	10199-1781-866			/	
British Telecommunications (BT)	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>Openreach apparatus will be affected within your areas of interest. Openreach records indicate that a substantial amount of our apparatus exists near to the areas of your proposed works, which will need to be diverted.</p> <p>Please note that no site survey's have yet been carried out at this stage and will be chargeable, and therefore can you please contact us directly so that we can provide you with the necessary estimate of costs to provide survey's and any subsequent alteration/diversion. Plans of at least 1:500 will be required.</p>	10200-1781-180			/	
Bristol Water	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>We do not anticipate that the construction activities and arrangements described in the consultation document will impact on our operations.</p>	10202-1781-386			/	
South West Water	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>Stage 2 consultation: Preferred proposals for Hinkley Point C nuclear development - S42 Planning Act 2008</p> <p>Thank you for your letter dated 13 July 2010. I can confirm this proposal is not within South West Waters region, therefore we have no comments.</p>	10203-1781-0			/	
E S Pipelines Ltd, ESP Networks Ltd, ESP Electricity Ltd, ESP Pipelines Ltd and ESP Connections Ltd	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>Further to your communication to E S Pipelines Ltd, ESP Networks Ltd, ESP Electricity Ltd, ESP Pipelines Ltd and ESP Connections Ltd dated 7 July and 13 July 2010 I can confirm that our businesses have no comments.</p>	10205-1781-0			/	
Easynet Telecom	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>Pleased be advised that Easynet Telecom will not be affected by these works.</p>	10208-1781-73			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Drainage Strategy: Drainage (including sewage disposal) must be clearly set out in your submission to the Infrastructure Planning Commission. Welfare facilities will need to be connected to the mains sewerage network. Alternatively the discharge from this facility may require an Environmental Permit for the discharge to controlled waters.	89069-1781-10646	/			
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Topic: Freshwater abstraction Issue: It is unknown at this time where freshwater will be abstracted from and the potential implications on the environment to this abstraction. Comment: The requirements for and assessment of freshwater abstraction needs to be clearly understood. (If it is greater than 20 cubic metres per day an abstraction licence would be required if taken from a source of supply requiring quantitative control). Action: Freshwater abstraction area will need to be defined and included within the EIA.	89075-1781-1052	/			
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- In addition to the impacts on the designated habitats we have general concern in relation to lack of information in your proposals on how you will to deal with site drainage, sewage etc. In developing these you will need to make particular reference to the management of any potential impacts on EU designated bathing beaches and the associated bathing water standards.	89097-1781-4319	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[7.9.12] One type of waste arising that has not been mentioned at all is human waste. With such large numbers of workers on site during construction, substantial volumes of sewage will be generated. How is EDF planning to deal with this waste stream?	89291-1781-8727	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>Water supply:</p> <p>SPC are very concerned that the adequacy of the existing water supply appears to be in question. This has not been mentioned anywhere else in the documentation or at the exhibitions. The potential need for a new main to be installed could lead to major disruption in the area. When will EDF know what needs to be done, and when will they discuss this with local residents?</p> <p>[10.3.6] Service infrastructure not sufficient in water-most likely to place pressure on existing services. How do EDF plan to address this issue?</p> <p>[10.3.8] States that Hinkley C will require more than double the water use than Sizewell B, currently 700m3 per day. No solutions are made as to how an extra 1400m3 plus of water will be made available. Desalination has been ruled out therefore huge local disruption is a real possibility.</p> <p>[10.3.10] States that the water supply issue has the potential to impact on existing settlements both during construction and also on local transport networks and services. EDF states that more detailed utility surveys are required but fails to state when these will occur and what format will be used.</p>	89293-1781-7642	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>Authorities position May 2010:</p> <p>Balancing ponds - need to demonstrate how water levels would be maintained at an appropriate level for the ponds to form an attractive landscape feature once construction campus removed</p> <p>Update September 2010:</p> <p>EDF Energy has not supplied any detail in relation to drainage using generic 'best practice' terminology with very little quantitative information to demonstrate how drainage solutions, which may include balancing ponds etc, will operate.</p>	89327-1781-4857	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>20.1.5 Surface Water</p> <p>On the whole the assessment of residual impacts is based on assuming that general site wide surface water management systems and construction site management practice can remove all impact from the construction phase of the project. This is an overestimation of the effectiveness of these systems.</p> <p>Operational phase impacts are reliant on an effective surface water management system. The level of detail provided on these is insufficient to gain confidence that these systems will be technically feasible.</p>	89423-1781-6808		/	/	
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	<p>The whole list of changes to the associated development and main site layouts do not materially change our advice set out in our Stage 2 response. In some instances the new proposals have reduced our concerns regarding this area.</p>	89711-1781-1309			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Wessex Water	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	As you are aware Wessex Water has a sewage treatment works identified as 'Pumping Station' and falling within the land highlighted in pink on plan. Although the treatment works does not form part of your client's proposed acquisition the associated pipe work and access do. Clearly it is necessary for the site to operate and be accessible at all times both during your client's construction activities and subsequent use of the surrounding land.	89727-1781-721			/	
27	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	2. Utilities During the building period of these structures, EDF claim it is likely that new power, drainage, potable water and possibly gas infrastructure services will need to be extended from existing networks to serve the site". We can therefore look forward to frequent traffic jams and upheaval on Rodway whilst the road is being ripped to shreds by the utility companies. We can find no risk assessment for this work.	89816-1781-1439	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Avon and Somerset Constabulary	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>The response below also incorporates discussions held by the Avon & Somerset Police Authority.</p> <p>The initial considerations we would like to raise at this time to form part of the consultation process include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact of the proposed construction at the actual site and associated works of the potential by-pass and temporary accommodation sites. This would also include a rise in the local population by the incoming workforce during the construction phase and the permanent workforce there after which could increase the demand on local policing services. - Recent history has shown that a development of this type and scale will undoubtedly lead to organised, prolonged and high profile protest activity by environmentalist and anti-nuclear protest groups. This potentially will create a huge demand for Avon and Somerset Constabulary to police outside of core business.- - Potential impact in the event of a critical incident at the new site. 	8730-241-204			/	<p>Consultee responses identified the significance of the REPIIR regulations and the already-established Local Resilience Forum and Emergency Planning Consultative Committee in development of emergency arrangements for HPC which were closely co-ordinated with those for HPA and HPB. Reassurance was sought on the aircraft crash resistance of spent fuel facilities. The importance of taking on the views of the ONR and EA was also noted. A number of responses identified potential evacuation and emergency service access difficulties arising from the constrained road network and frequent A39 blockages west of Bridgwater, especially during the construction phase, with some advocating a new road linking Cannington and Dunball.</p> <p>As regards other types of emergency, respondents noted the potential for significant protest activity, road accidents involving main site campus residents, business continuity in the event of widespread flooding, and the impact of a pandemic on key operating staff.</p> <p>The Emergency Arrangements at Hinkley Point C will be prepared in accordance with Government guidelines as defined by Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations (REPIIR) and the Emergency Planning Consultative Committee which includes the local services. These arrangements will be approved by the Office of Nuclear Regulation, as part of the nuclear site licensing process, specifically Licence Condition 11. These arrangements cover scenarios that include, but are not limited to: on site nuclear incident, off site nuclear incident, malicious action and non nuclear incident (e.g. chemical spill, flood). The plans will also be integrated with those of adjacent nuclear sites and communicated with local residents via a Local Liaison Committee (or equivalent) so that Hinkley Point C can take necessary actions for the protection of the public and staff as a result of an event on these adjacent</p>
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The Agency seeks further clarification on the number of car parking spaces proposed as part of the development.	88860-241-3988	/			
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	It is also noted that an additional permanent outage car park is proposed further south on land that would be occupied in part by the workers' accommodation campus during construction. The Agency requests clarification on the use of the outage car park, for example, will access be restricted to the car park during regular operational phases but opened for outages, how will access be restricted, how many spaces will be provided and will there be allocated spaces for car sharers?	88860-241-4100	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>In view of the serious questions posed by this report and the presentation that came with it, we strongly contend that no reactors should be constructed at Hinkley. Should a decision be made to go ahead with the project, then we feel that emergency arrangements must be enhanced to allow better public protection. For example the current practice of pre-distributing potassium iodate tablets just within the 3.4 kilometre radius around Hinkley should be enhanced to take account of the fast pace that weather patterns can deliver radiation to locations much further away. As the Isle of Wight is about eighty miles from Hinkley we suggest the iodate tablets should be pre-distributed to all homes, schools, offices and factories within 100 miles.</p> <p>We are concerned generally that emergency measures would break down. At Three Mile Island ninety percent of medical staff left their posts after the accident.</p> <p>A police report to the Nuclear Industry Association at Oldbury power station in 2002 said that protective breathing gear had a life limit of just twenty minutes in a contaminated environment. Police officers would in any case be advised to voluntarily abandon their kit as it would panic the local population. We were also told that police officers had a smaller maximum dose in such circumstances than ambulance men and even council officers.</p>	88960-241-23167		/		<p>sites. These arrangements are subject to review and update throughout the lifetime of the plant, including the construction phase, to take into account learning from events, be they in-house, national or international.</p> <p>These arrangements, once developed and agreed with the regulator, may include the pre-distribution of potassium iodate tablets at prescribed distances from the plant. While detailed arrangements will be developed following grant of Development Consent, the Detailed Emergency Planning Zone and the extent of pre-distribution are not expected to exceed those for HPA and HPB.</p> <p>Emergency arrangements are regularly exercised and updated to reflect operating experience both here in the UK and from worldwide events. The regulator routinely witnesses emergency exercises to ensure that the response of the station and the support organisations are adequate.</p> <p>Emergency arrangements for the increased number of workers for the construction site and inhabitants of the area have been recognised by EDF Energy, and special arrangements for the wellbeing of workers and local residents would be considered in both the arrangements in the Hinkley B Emergency Plan and also the Hinkley C Plan, both in the construction and operational phase. During the construction period, when there may be up to around 5600 workers on the site, the plans will be progressively developed and provisions made to protect and/or evacuate these workers from any hazard from the site or for adjacent nuclear sites. This includes evacuation plans and catering for the safety and well being of staff and visitors to the visitors centre.</p> <p>The emergency access road route will be designed to blend into the local environment and will resemble a "green lane". It will only be used for emergency purposes or for emergency exercises, not as a routine means of accessing site. It will be designed to accommodate the appropriate weight and axle loading of emergency services vehicles that are anticipated to be needed in an incident.</p> <p>The helicopter landing area is designed as only for emergency use, i.e. medical evacuations or transport of vital personnel and equipment or spares. It is not intended to use the helipad for normal visitors or company executives. There will be an aircraft exclusion zone around the plant as is common with other, similar facilities.</p> <p>In the event of a severe pandemic, contingency plans</p>
Tractivity 1069	Public	Stage 2	<p>It is nothing short of outrageous to impose the scale of this development on this rural area. If it must come much greater measures must be taken to contain it. You should consider the impossibility of evacuation in case of an accident. Do your emergency evacuation plans have any hint of reality, or do we just sacrifice the local population. I doubt that they can meet health and safety requirements even if they exist.</p>	9827-241-7592			/	
Tractivity 1081	Public	Stage 2	<p>4. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Workers lodged at Hinkley Point will gravitate towards Bridgwater and Taunton for entertainment. This could lead to traffic problems on the Hinkley Point road due to speeding and alcohol. I suggest that less people are stationed at the site and that those who are are provided with evening transport to Bridgwater and Taunton.</p> <p>The housing of workers at Hinkley Point will add significantly to the Detailed emergency planning zone (DEPZ) making evacuation more difficult in a nuclear emergency.</p>	9839-241-2323	/			
Tractivity 1081	Public	Stage 2	<p>9c. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Workers lodged at Hinkley Point will gravitate towards Bridgwater and Taunton for entertainment. This could lead to traffic problems on the Hinkley Point road due to speeding and alcohol. I suggest that less people are stationed at the site and that those who are are provided with evening transport to Bridgwater and Taunton.</p> <p>The housing of workers at Hinkley Point will add significantly to the Detailed emergency planning zone (DEPZ) making evacuation more difficult in a nuclear emergency.</p>	9839-241-6536				

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1296	Public	Stage 2 Update	2. failure to explain how emergency vehicles will gain lease obstructed access to HP in the event of an emergency	89562-241-2007			/	<p>will be developed by EDF Energy in accordance with recognised industry standards. Ultimately, should there not be sufficient suitably qualified and experienced staff available to meet the manning levels defined in the operating procedures and safety report, the plant would be shut down to a safe state until the situation was resolved. (There is a requirement under the Nuclear Site Licence, policed by the Office of Nuclear Regulation, to shut down the plant to a safe state should there not be sufficient qualified and experienced staff to operate it).</p> <p>The request for the combustion permit includes the scenario of all 12 station diesels operating at the same time at full load; albeit very unusual, this would be a bounding case. In an event, a single diesel on each reactor unit would be capable of maintaining the plant in a safe state.</p>
Tractivity 1296	Public	Stage 2 Update	SPENT FUEL STORES SHOULD NOT BE INCORPORATED WITHIN THIS SITE PLAN THIS ADDS YET ANOTHER GOOD CASE FOR A NORTHERN B/W BYPASS AS A MEANS OF REMOVING THIS FUEL FROM SITE AND FOR EMERGENCY USE	89562-241-2515		/		
Tractivity 1300	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Q3 Do you have any comments on our proposed community mitigation and benefits? This section does not deal with the waste legacy which will impact on local communities for generations. the impact on local communities for the next 100 plus years should be recognised and practical steps taken to reduce the impact of HP traffic. A permanent dedicated haul road from Dunball to HP should be constructed, reducing the impact of HP traffic on the existing inadequate road network and the necessity for it to go through Bridgwater and Cannington. It would improve access for safety/emergency traffic for the current and proposed developments at HP.	89566-241-1086		/		
Tractivity 1304	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? I remain of the view that the proper solution to transport proposals is a road from the M5 to Hinkley point, whilst I note the reasons it is not being pursued I think that in the long term the cost will be worthwhile (what happens when a further reactor is needed later in the century). It would also facilitate emergency access.	89570-241-691		/		
Tractivity 1342	Public	Stage 2 Update	I rang the police and was told by a panicked (Personal details removed) that he had no iodine tablets and had never heard of this before! So your emergency plans could be said to be null and void!	89608-241-1355		/		
Tractivity 1351	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? On safety grounds a new Dunball link road would reduce traffic through residential and school areas. it would also provide an alternative route for emergency services sghould the need ever arise.	89617-241-1918		/		
Tractivity 1360	Public	Stage 2 Update	What would happen if there was an accident on the A39 Sandford Cross Cannington/Combwich road, with all the increase in traffic, its busy in the summer now, without further increase with the HGVs etc. people in Combwich do work shifts and we do have to travel into Bridgwater ourselves.	89626-241-1107		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1362	Public	Stage 2 Update	You say that safety is your ?top priority? but we have not been able to find details of any costed plans for evacuation of the local community in the event of an emergency. Please publish accurate figures for the number of residents within 10, 15, 20, 25 and 30 etc km radii of the power station, together with a detailed explanation of how you will manage emergencies of all kinds and how you will keep people within these radii informed plus evacuation plans. This should be made public before the application is submitted to the IPC (or its replacement).	89628-241-238			/	
Tractivity 1376	Public	Stage 2 Update	Yes. in th light of recent events in Japan, will EDF indemnify residents, by menas of an insurance policy or whatever, against the cost, stress and disruption of an evacuation of their homes in the event of a site incident on C stn? You say it will be safe - prove that you mean it.	89642-241-1459			/	
Tractivity 323	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? I have lived with Hinkley Point as a close neighbour for over 20years and have been happy with the situation. I look forward to the response from the consultation and further discussion especially about the "Bund" - emergency access road and other points raised.	9011-241-5311			/	
Tractivity 477	Public	Stage 1	€ Risks of leaks, accidents, terror	9153-241-5264			/	
Tractivity 504	Public	Stage 1	I think that no start should be allowed until an evacuation plan for all local communities has been worked out. Please do not trot out the mantra of ' nothing can go wrong'. You should have a responsi bility of producing a plan a.s.a.p and certainly before a brick is laid.	9177-241-4647		/		
Tractivity 50717	Public	Stage 1	We live on (Personal details removed), in a house approximately half a mile from Nether Stowey. I understand that this road may become the emergency route of preference if the Hinkley Point road is closed. Obviously this would only affect the amount of traffic dramatically on the road in emergencies. However, the amount of traffic on the road is likely to increase significantly despite this.	9389-241-761			/	
Tractivity 50720	Public	Stage 1	2. Emergency Routes: Probably an awkward question but the suggestion of using Stogursey lane or a north only route in the event of a Hinkley emergency route in the event of a Hinkley emergency does not make sense. If it is a really bad situation then residents of the many local villages and independent houses (including the (Personal details removed) will use Stogursey lane as their escape route to the south. As I expect you already know that road already has difficulty with two way traffic, particularly heavy vehicles (including local buses) so positive road works to straighten and widen the lane would be required here also.	9390-241-1380			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62206	Public	Stage 1	2) Risks of leaks, accidents, terrorism	9428-241-170			/	
Tractivity 62239	Public	Stage 1	- Risks of leaks, accidents, terrorism	9438-241-169			/	
Tractivity 62240	Public	Stage 1	Risks of leaks, accidents, terrorism	9439-241-169			/	
Tractivity 62366	Public	Stage 2	Air transport I understand that there will be a helipad for evacuation of medical emergencies. This is all that it should be used for and it should not be turned into a heliport for executive arrivals and departures by helicopter so close to residential areas. I understand that there is an exclusion zone for aircraft around nuclear power stations since 9/11. This should not be relaxed for EdF convenience.	10040-241-4002	/			
Tractivity 62442	Public	Stage 2	4. In regard to all the additional 5000 people and traffic, where can I find your risk assessment in relation to the safe evacuation of both employees and neighbours in the event of an accident at the power station? What provision have you made for emergency services getting through and what will be the impact on local hospitals, police and fire services in an emergency?	10070-241-4489			/	
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	The C182 road to Hinkley was apparently built for 'A' site construction in 12 weeks to the then 'A' road standard which was the 'motorway standard' of the day. It was improved for 'B' site construction and for many years maintained to 'A' road standards. Population increase, change in farming practise and other facilities such as Stockland Lovell have increased traffic use. The road is no longer suitable for modern traffic let alone the large loads and massively increased traffic. A blockage of this road would lead to major disruption and preclude prompt response from the emergency services in the event of a site emergency or an emergency to the local public.	10091-241-8372			/	
Tractivity 62578	Public	Stage 2	And what about when (not if) there's an accident at the power station? Where is your evacuation programme for these 5000 workers and neighbouring residents?	10129-241-4925			/	
Tractivity 62586	Public	Stage 2	Further, even now (let alone during the build) and subsequently once the station is operational I worry that emergency services access to the site is severely hampered just due to the increase in traffic volumes that have occurred since the site was first built, even before the strain the additional traffic this development will place on existing infrastructure.	10137-241-3119			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62631	Public	Stage 2	The siting of the two most powerful nuclear reactors in the world next to a working reactor and one being decommissioned presents serious hazards and problems with safety and emergency planning if there is a fire or an accidental release of radioactivity. The combined numbers of workers from all the sites and the limited access routes for such a large number of workers to be evacuated from the area will cause serious problems for the emergency services in dealing with emergencies in a satisfactory way.	10175-241-691			/	
South West Strategic Health Authority	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- In relation to the emergency response aspects, I would ask that consideration is given to any submissions made by and on behalf of the Local Resilience Forum as the planning forum for the development of emergency response plans in the event of a major incident or emergency occurring at the Hinkley Point C Nuclear Plant, when and if constructed. As members of the local resilience forum, NHS South West will continue to contribute to the development of multi-agency plans and response arrangements as appropriate.	10182-241-3112			/	
Marine Management Organisation	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	In relation to non-routine releases, there is only a very small section on emergency preparedness. With any major development of this sort the risk of incidents should be considered for planning purposes; that failure scenarios would be identified and consequences assessed, and that mitigation measures would be explained.	10188-241-16213			/	
Burnham-on-Sea & Highbridge Town Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- Hospital capacity (major incident plans - from small injury incident to a major accident on the A39 (the major route to the Hinkley C), minor injuries facilities for workers' dependants, maternity services and other general hospital services)	10220-241-2476			/	
Cheddar Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	a bypass would be the only feasible option although this also is rejected by EDF as too expensive, and taking too long to construct. How any emergency situation could be handled either during the construction phase, or when 'on line' is too horrible to imagine, if no bypass is present.	10222-241-3324			/	
Federation of Bridgwater Practices	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	There is much discussion on potential outcomes of CBRN accidents, which are outside the scope and expertise of this paper, but will have far wider implications in both England and Wales should there be a major incident. However, it should be noted that even a minor incident may have major consequences for the local area, causing disruption and devastation to residents in the immediate and downwind areas. The Local Incident plan must be updated during the consultation phase, so as to ensure it is not found wanting once building work commences.	10271-241-6145			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	<p>The picture we are being given is a sanitised, glossy picture that completely skims over what it will all mean, for example, what an EPR is. Are we supposed to assume the design for the UK EPR is finalised and approved? Questions surrounding the EPR are of relevance to this consultation and it should not be just brushed aside as only relevant to the Generic Design Assessment, which is what I feel is happening. Would I not consider the proposals in a different light if I was told that, for example, the fallout zone for these reactors is twice that of existing UK nuclear reactors? (John Large Associates reports). Definitely. I don't see this information in the Summary documents or even on the CD... is it there? It should be. It should also let the public know clearly, right up front and highlighted, that an EPR's operation involves the fuel being burnt differently resulting in increased amounts of hazardous radioactivity and dangerous isotopes being emitted to the existing reactors. It should also include what this would mean in the event of a serious accident:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) How much greater an area would be affected? ii) How many people would have to be evacuated, from where? iii) Where is the analysis of how our existing emergency contingency plans need to be adapted considering a far larger area would be affected? iv) Would you fund an increased number of emergency beds in hospitals after an accident? v) How many? vi) Within what greater radius around the site of Hinkley C would residents receive potassium iodate? vii) Where are the reports on all these things? viii) Where's the radiological survey? <p>The parameters of understanding and acceptance in the local population do not automatically transfer to two new reactors when the operation, maintenance and decommissioning are so different to what they are used to.</p>	89472-241-2278		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	f) I understand the reactor is contained within a structure designed to withstand the crash of a commercial airliner. Is the fuel pond and long-term store for spent fuel also reinforced to that level? My understanding is that they aren't. If so, isn't the protection strategy then flawed? What about the store for intermediate level waste? If that were breached, what would be the result? It is worrying that the levels of protection are increased reactively (as a result of 9/11) and weren't anticipated. It is doubly worrying, that it would be impossible to intercept aircraft before they reach Hinkley considering its proximity to Bristol Airport as there would be insufficient time to accurately assess the risk. It is further worrying, that increased protection is not being applied to our existing nuclear power stations. Was this measure for the EPR meant to reassure us? What other vulnerabilities are there? Perhaps, by wishing to capture the 'flavour of the month' issue of CO2 reduction, the use of natural ventilation renders the operational workforce open to air-borne chemical and biological attack. Never mind... at least EDF saves energy. Is there a conflict in design objectives between low carbon operation and safety?	89472-241-4149			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	It is likely key specialised staff that are required to operate the power stations will be vulnerable to falling prey to a deadly pandemic that the World Health Organisation says is well overdue and we have been lucky so far that no more died as a result of bird flu', SARS and swine flu. So when this pandemic does eventually hit in whatever form it takes, who will replace staff if everyone else has fallen sick or died? When an industry relies on a limited number of key senior qualified staff, unlike actors, there may be no understudy available. What are the consequences of nuclear power stations running with no manpower to operate them?	89472-241-8465			/	
Tractivity 62486	Public	Stage 2	"Any radiological effects would be confined to the operational and decommissioning stages at the HPC [Hinkley C] site" (para 4.4.32 - page 31) This statement is incorrect for two main reasons: i) It does not consider the possibility of radiological impact due to a reactor emergency. ii) It does not consider the radiological impact of the radionuclides that would be synthesised by Hinkley C over the long term - in particular the lack of a robust disposal route.	89475-241-152			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>Issue: Scope of operational scenarios appears unnecessarily pessimistic</p> <p>Comments: Whilst operational scenarios should be pessimistic, they should not be unreasonable so. The frequency of operations and the number of units running assumed for the modelling needs further consideration.</p> <p>The Station Blackout Units (SBU) are a second line of defence. It is not normal for such units to be run at the same time as the primary line of defence due to vulnerability to common mode failure. Unless there is some reason specific to Hinkley Point C why all 12 units will run together, we would expect the 8 Emergency Diesel Generators (EDG) running together would be the worst case scenario.</p> <p>However a grid fault could lead to the simultaneous running of all 8 EDG and also the Gas Turbines on Hinkley Point B. Such a fault sequence was seen at the Heysham Power Stations on two consecutive years in the late 1990s.</p>	89071-241-2252		/		
Health Protection Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>Within the application the HPA would expect to see information about how the applicant would respond to accidents with potential off-site emissions e.g. flooding or fires, spills, leaks or releases off- site. Assessment of accidents should: identify all potential hazards in relation to construction, operation and decommissioning; include an assessment of the risks posed; identify risk management measures and contingency actions that will be employed in the event of an accident in order to mitigate off-site effects.</p>	89165-241-3231			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>45. With regard to the temporary accommodation proposed in Bridgwater, the proposals do not identify the business continuity arrangements in the event of flooding or other emergency causing a loss of temporary accommodation for workers. Moreover, there are no proposals identified to mitigate the effects of such an emergency, which would lead to the loss of use of the accommodation. Similarly, business continuity arrangements are not specified for other off-site developments.</p>	89193-241-4006			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>Resilience: There is a lack of clarity on how resilience will be delivered, including for transport infrastructure and highway safety (eg the A39); the economy beyond a "boom and bust" scenario; flooding in terms of future proofing against climate change; emergency planning and community/ third sector capacity building. Resilience needs to be built into mitigation and compensation, and there should be access to funding to respond to both future unknowns and to where EDF's offer does not effectively deal with the impacts and harms.</p>	89196-241-6596			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>Hinkley Point C Site - Construction Phase</p> <p>EDF is required to put in place measures to protect the workforce and visitors to the site in the event of an "off-site nuclear emergency" being declared at either Hinkley A or Hinkley B sites. These emergency arrangements are required by the provisions of Radiation (Emergency Preparedness & Public Information) Regulations (REPPiR) to cover the following procedures in the event of the declaration of an "off-site nuclear emergency":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How workers and visitors will be briefed on the emergency action to be taken. - How workers and visitors will be alerted to such an event. - How workers and visitors will be sheltered in appropriate accommodation. - How workers and visitors will be provided with potassium iodate tablets. - How workers and visitors will be evacuated from the site and the arrangements made for their longer-term care and accommodation. - How vehicle movement to the site will be prevented and site traffic cleared from emergency services routes and evacuation routes. <p>All measures to take account of the changing demographic make up of the workforce.</p>	89243-241-953	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>REPPIR requires emergency plans to be in place for the protection of both the workers and the public in the event of a release of radioactive material from a licensed nuclear site. All construction areas are within the Hinkley Point A & B Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ). Construction workers at the power station complex are on a REPPIR "Licensed site" with other construction site personnel as well as visitors to the site (including the Visitors Centre) are deemed to be "members of the public". In the event of a declaration of an off-site nuclear emergency at either Hinkley Point A or B then immediate countermeasures are required to protect the public:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sheltering. All members of the public within the DEPZ are advised to shelter. Within the DEPZ this amounts to 1400 local residents and "visitors" to the area being advised to shelter in their homes. "Visitors" unable to shelter are encouraged to leave the immediate area. - Take Potassium Iodate Tablets. In the event off an off-site nuclear emergency at Hinkley Point B only, all members of the public are advised to take these tablets. <p>In the event that evacuation is advised, only downwind sectors within the DEPZ will be evacuated requiring some 1140 local residents to evacuate the area, primarily using their own transport. We have assessed that, in this event, evacuation transport for a maximum of 200 residents will be required. The Off-Site Nuclear Emergency planning arrangements provide the necessary measures to achieve these requirements. The Hinkley Point Off-Site Plan does not consider the protection or evacuation of subsequent workers at either Hinkley A or B sites. Under REPPIR the site operators remain responsible for the safety and protection of their site personnel.</p> <p>Issue: The proposal does not identify the arrangements to be taken to protect the construction site workforce and site visitors in the event of an off-site nuclear emergency.</p>	89243-241-4024	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>Concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alerting of Workforce and Visitors. There will be an immediate requirement to alert the workforce and Visitors Centre and advise them to take shelter. The following measures are required: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Robust procedures to ensure that workers throughout the various sites are alerted and know what actions to take to shelter. - Adequate procedures to ensure that the general public at the visitors centre are briefed and cared for. Arrangements should be made to move them from the DEPZ as soon as possible, using their own transport if appropriate. 2. Sheltering. Shelter facilities are required at the construction sites with adequate facilities for a stay of up to 6hrs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the early stages of construction there will not be sufficient or appropriate infrastructure on site to provide adequate sheltering facilities at the construction sites. - If appropriate shelter facilities are not available then the work force should be evacuated as soon as possible from the construction sites and from the DEPZ. 3. Potassium Iodate Tablets. Sufficient stocks of tablets should be held on 	89243-241-5976	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			<p>site for the workforce and visitors in the Visitors Centre:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stocks should be effectively stored and maintained to allow their rapid distribution. - The workforce and visitors should be briefed on reasons and dose requirements. <p>4. Evacuation from the DEPZ. Arrangements are required to evacuate the workforce should immediate and appropriate shelter facilities not be available. In addition, if full evacuation from the area is required, procedures should be put in place to evacuate the workforce. The large number of the workforce involved (up to 5,000) poses a number of concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A full evacuee transport plan is required; transport resources available to the local authority are not sufficient for this task. It is assessed that 100 coach movements would be required for this task. The resilience of the existing transport network, together with additional transport impacts associated with the development and its associated developments and, in addition cumulative impacts of other significant developments, will need to be taken into consideration and mitigated against as part of this. - A traffic plan is required to model the traffic density and flow rates on the proposed evacuation route along the C182 to Cannington. - An appropriate strategy and plan for the care and provision of emergency accommodation for the evacuated workforce is provided. <p>5. Control of Construction Traffic in to the DEPZ. Site traffic, including workforce commuter traffic, heading towards Hinkley C could adversely affect the deployment of emergency vehicles and the outflow of traffic required in an evacuation scenario. While the civil police would seek to control and prevent further egress in to the DEPZ towards Hinkley C there should be robust procedures in place to halt this site and workforce commuter traffic from entering the DEPZ.</p> <p>6. Training. Measures should be put in place to ensure that the workforce and visitors to the site or Visitors Centre know their individual response in the event of an off-site nuclear emergency including the sheltering and evacuation plan.</p> <p>Moreover, that visitors and the workforce are briefed on the reason for taking potassium iodate tablets and the correct dosage.</p> <p>7. Equalities and Diversity Requirements. The workforce may consist of a high proportion of migrant workers who may or may not have a good command of English. Appropriate arrangements should be put in place to ensure that training and briefing material for what they should do in an emergency is provided.</p>					

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	3. Potassium Iodate Tablets. Sufficient stocks of tablets should be held in the facility for staff and residents in the accommodation facility: - Stocks should be effectively stored and maintained to allow their rapid distribution. - The workforce and visitors should be briefed on reasons and dose requirements.	89243-241-11463	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[2.10.3] Whilst the design of the emergency access road will avoid flooding, the public road it accesses is subject to regular fluvial flooding. What is EDF planning to do about this flooding to ensure access can be gained to the site in emergency?	89291-241-7539			/	
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	Adverse Weather Planning 5.13 The intention of EDF is to transport staff, contractors and visitors to the construction site each day. It is therefore conceivable that in the event of severe weather, such as snow, a significant number of people could find themselves held at the site without provision for accommodation or ease of transport away from site. This may be of particular concern for those who will use the Williton Park & Ride facility which is more significant in terms of distance away from Hinkley. 5.14 The Estate therefore requests clarification as to what contingency planning EDF will be preparing in respect of accommodation, transport and general arrangements for such circumstances. The Estate also wishes to understand and have clarified what might form part of such plan(s) and what relevant stakeholders will be engaged in formulating them.	89442-241-5635			/	
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	14.3 Given that a significant number of people could be on site (particularly during the construction phase) and that there will be limitations on the capacity of roads in the local community, the Estate wishes to understand clearly what emergency planning will be prepared by EDF during each phase of the programme in terms of major incidents for the safety and environmental aspects. The Estate also wishes to understand how frequently desk-top and active testing of such plans will be carried out for possible scenario style incidents and what impact these would have on the Estate and the local community. For major incidents, particular concern relates to the possible propagation of an event at any one of the three Hinkley installations which could then involve one or more of the other stations.	89445-241-987			/	
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	14.4 The Estate also wishes to have clarified which stakeholders will be engaged in formulating the plans that could affect nearby communities and the Estate itself. We also wish to appreciate where active participation of the community in planned exercises might be needed, if at all.	89445-241-1794			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>In this respect, if consent is eventually given for the power station, we would like to see the implementation of a wide-scale programme of pre-distribution of potassium iodate tablets. We consider the existing radius of 3.4 kilometres to be inadequate in the event of a serious accident. Fifty miles would be more appropriate, especially given the intense radioactivity of the high-burn fuel. One report suggests that seven times more radioactive iodine, and eleven times more caesium, would be blown out of the reactor in a serious accident than from a standard PWR.(15)</p> <p>As the Guardian newspaper reported in 2008: "The problems inside France's nuclear industry could not come at a worse time for Britain. They may be officially 'anomalies', as some say, but they raise questions about the safety and efficiency of the two giants Electricite de France (EDF) and Areva, entirely or largely state-owned."(16)</p>	89448-241-9336			/	
NHS Somerset Primary Care Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>1.5 A further consideration from the public health perspective will be the appropriate level of emergency preparedness for both the construction and operational phases. Due consideration should given to the views of the South Western Ambulance Service Trust (SWAST) with regard to the strategic and tactical management of emergency service support. With regard to the greater question of major incident management, the views of the Emergency Planning Consultative Committee for Hinkley Point should be incorporated in the planning process and should take account of any formal response to the Stage 2 consultation by the Avon and Somerset Local Resilience Forum.</p>	89459-241-2476	/			
NHS Somerset Primary Care Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>7.1 REPIR(1) requires that emergency plans be in place for the protection of the public in the event of a release of radioactive material from a licensed nuclear site. To this purpose a Multi Agency Off-site plan has been developed so in the event of a declaration of an off-site nuclear emergency at either Hinkley Point A or B then immediate counter measures will be implemented to protect the public. These counter measures will include:</p>	89463-241-28			/	
NHS Somerset Primary Care Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>7.3 The proposal has not considered the arrangements that will need to be taken to protect the construction site workforce, visitors, on-site campus residents or administrative staff housed in temporary accommodation in the event of an off-site incident.</p>	89463-241-1248			/	
NHS Somerset Primary Care Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>7.4 During the peak phase of construction there will be around 5000 people working at the Hinkley Point C site, this will result in a new off-site plan having to be developed to ensure all immediate counter measures are able to offer appropriate protection to all 5000 workers.</p>	89463-241-1506			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>The timeframe for EDF Energy's plans relate to the timescale over which the various operational and decommissioning stages will take place, and suggested timescales are given in the proposals. For higher activity wastes (spent fuel and ILW), plans are dependent on national policy initiatives to provide ILW and spent fuel disposal, both of which are being taken forward by the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely programme (MRWS). The MRWS programme is based on volunteerism of a locality willing to consider hosting a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF), and by its nature cannot be driven to predetermined timescales. The currently projected dates for the GDF are 2040 for acceptance of ILW, and 2075 for acceptance of spent fuel. These dates remain indicative however, and both the dates and also the order in which the various elements of the waste inventory will be emplaced are expected to be subject to variation.</p> <p>Section 6 of the EnvApp describes that an Integrated Waste Strategy (IWS) will be prepared for LLW, which will be treated in accordance with the Waste Hierarchy. The IWS will include a number of management practises including treating and recycling of metals, off-site incineration of combustible waste, off-site supercompaction of compressible waste, authorised burial for very low level waste (VLLW), and with consignment to the Low Level Waste Repository (LLWR) as the last resort.</p>	89335-241-1385			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>Project and Area Resilience - identifying measures to compensate and mitigate for abnormal, irregular and emergency events and incidents. For instance accidents or closures for maintenance on the main transport routes or local flooding on roads. Plans of action, mitigation and compensation will need to be identified for each contingency item.</p>	89418-241-10155			/	
Tractivity 62913	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>How will workers get back to their cars in an event of an emergency during their shift hours? How will emergency vehicles get to Hinkley Point in the event of a major incident on site when time will be the overriding factor?</p>	89665-241-5919			/	
Tractivity 62967	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>No mention is made of flood relief at Newnham Bridge and between Burton and Stogursey without which the Emergency Access would be rendered useless at times of high rainfall.</p>	89686-241-1959			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62983	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>We can only comment on the Emergency Access Road - this will be useless if there is any problem on the A39 and surrounding roads, a new route direct from Dunball is the only solution to give peace of mind to residents and, hopefully, to the local and national authorities.</p> <p>Can we ask how EDF think a major incident at the power station site would be handled should local people have to be evacuated from the area and emergency vehicles require immediate access to the site?</p> <p>Heaven forbid that such an incident occurred, but should such a disaster happen as currently in Japan (and even in the UK, the volatile nature of nuclear generation could result in serious danger to life), the roads would be totally inadequate to cope and EDF would be to blame by not providing sufficient means of escape/access.</p>	89689-241-4219			/	
Tractivity 63013	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>New Year's Day 2000 saw a huge leak of radioactive elements from "B" station which blew this way. I know because a friend rang me at the time and said "listen to this (Personal details removed)!". Her Geiger counter had gone into a single scream! And, yes it had been recently balanced! I rang Hinkley and was told this could not be possible and the Geiger counter was at fault. It most certainly was not. I rang the police and asked if they had in place a contingency plan for a nuclear leak or accident. They didn't and the constable who answered the phone was panic stricken and asked what he should do. I told him he should know where there were iodine tablets for immediate use. He had never heard of them. I told him what a good exercise this all was and he should contact his superior as soon as possible. So where were the emergency plans?</p>	89697-241-647			/	
South West Strategic Health Authority	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>- I would ask that full consideration is given to the views of the Health and Safety Executive and the Environment Agency as regulators for the safe operation of the site and guidance for planning against appropriate and proportionate nuclear incident scenarios, particularly in light of any new findings following the potential to learn lessons from recent events in Japan and the Fukushima Nuclear Power Plant.</p>	89707-241-2463	/			
Wembdon Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>Recent evidence in Japan has also highlighted to everybody that in the event of an unexpected catastrophe there is the need for the emergency services to access the Nuclear stations directly from a National Freight Route.</p>	89758-241-3459			/	
Sedgemoor District Labour Group	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>- Obviously any such development is going to have serious impacts on the surrounding communities in Sedgemoor and West Somerset. We need to ensure that there are adequate safety precautions built into the system: Chernobyl and Fujiyama, over the last two weeks, come to mind. It is no good saying that the situation is very different and we don't have earthquakes or tsunami in the Severn estuary.</p>	89779-241-7318			/	
Sedgemoor District Labour Group	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>- We believe that there remains insufficient detail regarding emergency procedures in terms of emergency vehicles accessing the main site in the event of an emergency, should there be severe congestion on the roads, and in terms of evacuation of local residents.</p>	89779-241-7719			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
1	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	Emergency vehicles attending the present installations at Hinkley Point need to negotiate through Bridgwater/holiday traffic/commuter traffic along the A39 to Cannington, This is far from being an expedient service and would be used even more often in the future should this or any further Power Stations be built.	89790-241-1777			/	
16	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	By introducing the proposed Western bypass I can see nothing other than gridlock from the north of Bridgwater to Cannington. This could be an absolute-disaster-as-far-as-access for any - emergency vehicles are concerned. Our Fire Station, Police Station, Ambulance Station and Taunton Hospital would be totally cut off.	89805-241-3352		/		
18	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	Air transport I understand that there will be a helipad for evacuation of medical emergencies. This is all that it should be used for and it should not be turned into a heliport for executive arrivals and departures by helicopter so close to residential areas. I understand that there is an exclusion zone for aircraft around nuclear power stations since 9/11. This should not be relaxed for EdF convenience.	89807-241-4022	/			
27	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	- An accident at the power station would be impossible to deal with under the current plans and there seems to be no contingency for an emergency situation	89816-241-8461			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	Emergency Planning EDF is required to put in place measures to protect the workforce and visitors at the Hinkley Point C (HPC) site, and occupants and staff of temporary accommodation to be constructed within the main site, in the event of an "off- site nuclear emergency" being declared at either Hinkley A or Hinkley B sites. At the time of writing, negotiations are continuing for the agreement of these arrangements but there remain a number of outstanding matters. In particular, the Council requires details of the on-site arrangements for the Hinkley Point C Site, linked with the Hinkley Point B site arrangements, in order to assess the suitability of the arrangements for the C site and protect people working on site and those residents in temporary accommodation at HPC.	89861-241-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	In the event of a major incident or emergency, it is usual practice for the local authorities to lead on the humanitarian aspects of the emergency response. Such emergencies could involve the loss of residential accommodation through either damage / total loss of the facility or loss of use as the facility if in an evacuation area. While the local authorities may be able to assist, they do not have the resources to provide temporary accommodation for the numbers of displaced workers at the Bridgwater A and C accommodation campus sites, in particular if the emergency affects other members of the community in Somerset. The Council notes that these facilities are located on the Bridgwater Flood Zone 3 & Flood Zone 2 floodplain. In the event of a major flood incident there would be a requirement to evacuate / relocate the workers if the facility were flooded and EDF will need to make arrangements for this. These issues were raised by the Council in its Stage 2 response and remain to be addressed to the Council's satisfaction.	89861-241-789			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	Somerset County Council (SCC) will expect EDF to fully support and resource the agreed Outline Contingency Response Arrangements (OCRA) during the life-time of the project.	89861-241-1828			/	
Otterhampton Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Contingency plans must be developed and regularly revised for flooding events and for major incidents at Hinkley Point nuclear power stations. Contingency plans are also needed to ensure access for emergency services, including provisions for helicopter and hovercraft access in times when the road is impassable, and to ensure the supply of main utilities - water, electricity and telephone.	89870-241-9986			/	
37	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2 Update	Going back to one of my original points about having an alternative route we have just been witness to a major emergency in Japan, now I know people will say we can't have that sort of thing happen over here but we could have some form of emergency and we must have the confidence in our emergency services being able to get out to Hinkley Point without any form of hold up whether it be an accident or a deliberate blockage!	89906-241-2186			/	
Tractivity 1362	Public	Stage 2 Update	You say that safety is your ?top priority? but we have not been able to find details of any costed plans for evacuation of the local community in the event of an emergency. Please publish accurate figures for the number of residents within 10, 15, 20, 25 and 30 etc km radii of the power station, together with a detailed explanation of how you will manage emergencies of all kinds and how you will keep people within these radii informed plus evacuation plans. This should be made public before the application is submitted to the IPC (or its replacement).	89628-374-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1400	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	<p>Reliance on a single access route (as EDF's proposals) presents a serious safety issue (as well as one of convenience) for their own staff as well as all residents of Bridgwater and the villages.</p> <p>There have been 3 major accidents on A39 west of Bridgwater In the last 4 years, leading to total road closure of between 4 and 6 hours. On this past experience, the nuclear power station could well have to run with people working for 14 hours or more without a break. This is when minor slips leading to major catastrophes occur.</p> <p>A 2nd access road is essential.</p>	89975-241-296		/		
Tractivity 1449	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	<p>A blockage of the existing roads would be disastrous in the event of an emergency.</p>	90023-241-429		/		
Wembdon Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	<p>Recent evidence in Japan has tragically highlighted worldwide that in the event of an unexpected catastrophe there is the need for the emergency services to access the Nuclear stations directly from a National Freight Route. Whilst being assured of contingency plans for such an eventuality, we strongly advocate with the advantage of local knowledge and experience that the current transport strategy will be inadequate to deal cohesively with such events.</p>	89921-241-9813		/		
Tractivity 63102	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	<p>However, one thing that appears to have been overlooked is the concern about nuclear power following the disaster in Japan. What would happen if there was a catastrophic failure at Hinkley Point and what provision has been made for rapid evacuation not only of the local residents but also the workforce in such an event? Statics may show that such an event is highly unlikely as I am sure Japan, Three Mile Island and Chernobyl have demonstrated in the past. The problem is when they go wrong the people who assure everybody that things would not go wrong are no longer around to be accountable and it is the innocent who suffer.</p> <p>The roads in the immediate area are unable to cope with the traffic flow at the best of time. The A39 is nothing much better than a B road. Having a road that links direct to the M5 could be reached in less than 15 minutes. As EDF has always shown concern for the safety and welfare of its employees and local residents this is an opportunity to prove how much they really care and whether they are prepared to be a good neighbour and invest in safety and maintaining a healthy quality of life for local people.</p>	90063-241-888		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 63141	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	<p>I would therefore request some response and assurances from you regarding the following:</p> <p>A) Have the proposed access and egress routes been personally reviewed by yourself- together with the alternatives of a direct bypass from Junction 23 of the M5?</p> <p>B) If no, when will such a review take place? If yes (as I would expect) what increase in capacity and robustness did you see with the introduction of the Junction 23 bypass? What impact does the choice of road transport access route have on your egress plans from HP in the event of an emergency?</p> <p>C) What are the criteria you use in selecting the access routes to HP for the construction period? How important is safety?</p>	90074-241-950		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	It is also noted that an additional permanent outage car park is proposed further south on land that would be occupied in part by the workers' accommodation campus during construction. The Agency requests clarification on the use of the outage car park, for example, will access be restricted to the car park during regular operational phases but opened for outages, how will access be restricted, how many spaces will be provided and will there be allocated spaces for car sharers?	88860-239-4100	/			<p>. Responses to the consultations sought clarification on the transport modelling with respect to outages, and on their expected frequency and duration. Comments were also made on impacts of campus locations now no longer included in the proposals.</p> <p>There will be an outage on each reactor approximately every 18 months. These outages will last around 30 days, with a longer outage of around 40 days every 10 years. This will involve additional staff numbers of around 1000 for these periods as specialist workers and labour are brought in. It is unlikely that these outages would be planned to coincide with those at Hinkley Point B as some staff are required to work on both plants – for example turbine contractors.</p> <p>Car parking is now located to the east and south east of the site, minimising impact on the southern area (where in any case the southern limit of the main construction are had already been moved north in response to the Stage 1 consultation). As these car parks are limited in size, car sharing will be encouraged by the operating station management. For periods where there are many more workers on site, particularly during outages, then it is likely that there will be dedicated coach services from the local area to serve the station, thus reducing the burden on local roads and parking.</p> <p>Planning for the accommodation of the workers is a prudent and necessary process for construction of major infrastructure projects, and this process addresses all of the environmental impacts. The planning for accommodation will recognise the influx of workers required for the outages at Hinkley B station which will occur during the construction interval of the Hinkley C site.</p>
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The Agency seeks further information on how the planned outages for Hinkley C will be managed and how potential trip generation, distribution and assignment will impact upon the SRN.	88860-239-19625			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Outage at Hinkley B - significant increase of staff on site (1,500). This has been achieved without significant alterations to existing network. Additional workers on C site would increase this impact.	88900-239-10494			/	
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	- Outages for Hinkley 'B' - It is noted that no account of the increasing outages for Hinkley 'B' are taken account of within the accommodation strategy which is considered a significant flaw.	88310-239-0			/	
Tractivity 1377	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q5 What are your views on the proposed changes to our transport proposals? The road structure is not suitable. EDF are not showing how they will stop rat runs through the local roads. it is already dangerous when outages occur.	89643-239-654			/	
Tractivity 314	Public	Stage 1	6. Please give comments on your preferences and any suggestions about the future use of these facilities. The thought of 200 workers mixing with students in Cannington is horrendous. The impact on Williton would also be disproportionate. I think Bridgwater could absorb the influx better. As for privately-rented accommodation, this would be required for B Station outages.	9002-239-2582	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 461	Public	Stage 1	6. Please give comments on your preferences and any suggestions about the future use of these facilities. Williton based workers will result in more traffic using the minor roads to the west of the Station - this should be avoided. Use of rented accommodation will probably happen by default, probably local supply will increase. Need to be aware that this could impact local tourism and also outage periods on the B Station when there can be large short-term influxes of contractors.	9138-239-2472	/			
Tractivity 509	Public	Stage 1	.In particular - the proposed permanent outage car park is too close to the southern edge - surely it could be move closer to the developed part of the final site.	9181-239-4671	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[4.5.4] It is noted that outages will be phased, but it is not clear how long each outage will take and how often they will occur. Will EDF provide this information?	89289-239-8572	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
26	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	<p>5. In your Masterplan you make the following statements with regard to the time when Hinkley Point C is built and operational:</p> <p>"It is expected that the majority of personnel will arrive by car"</p> <p>"The workforce would access the site by private car and bicycle"</p> <p>"The access road into the existing Hinkley Point Power Station Complex, the C182, would also be the main access for the proposed development".</p> <p>"Park and ride strategies during the construction period wilt not be continued during the operational period of HPC"</p> <p>"There is an existing bus network. Generally speaking the shift times of the HPC operational workforce will not correlate with the bus service times."</p> <p>"There is no dedicated cycle infrastructure within 5km and the existing road network within the catchment area is not amenable for cycling"</p> <p>"Approx 1000 additional staff would be employed on each UK EPR reactor unit during planned refuelling and maintenance outages. Therefore, there would be approx 500 additional staff on site at any one time"</p> <p>You state that "Additional facilities would be required and provided to support this temporary increase of the workforce on site including parking, office and welfare facilities". However there is no mention of how you will ship all these extra people in. By car presumably, given that the park and ride buses will no longer be in use and people will be unable to cycle there?</p> <p>With up to 1000 cars, plus visitors and additional staff, plus 120 HGV's and an unknown number of park and ride buses travelling along the single-carriage C182, past the entrance to Combwich, with some travelling through country lanes from Williton and others through Bridgwater from Junctions 23 and 24, how then, do you quantify your attempt, as quoted in your Masterplan, to "reduce the car traffic generated by the operation of the HPC site" and "encourage alternative transport modes" What alternatives will there be other than by car?</p> <p>Exactly how will you reduce the traffic along this road? How can this single track country "C" road possibly sustain all this extra traffic?</p>	89815-239-4760			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Civil Aviation Authority	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Notwithstanding the apparent lack of any aviation related comment within the documentation provided I believe that the following issues are worthy of note and should be addressed within future consultation process and associated environmental documentation:</p> <p>-Protective Airspace. In accordance with Statutory Instrument 2007 No 1929 (The Air Navigation (Restriction of Flying) (Nuclear Installations) Regulation 2007) nuclear power stations in the UK are afforded an element of protection from aviation activity through the establishment a Restricted Areas (RA) encompassing each individual site. Aviation activity within any RA is limited to that specifically permitted by the Statutory Instrument (SI). Typically, such RAs have a 2nm radius and extend vertically to 2000ft above the surface.</p> <p>The existing Hinkley Point nuclear installation has an associated RA. Through the Department of Transport's amendment of the aforementioned SI, a similar Restricted Area around the proposed facility (or an amendment to the existing RA) would provide a similar level of protection from civil aircraft movements.</p> <p>Clearly a new or amended RA would have a potential impact upon airspace availability to aviation. The scale of any such impact needs to be assessed and detailed within associated environmental documentation, which should also describe the mitigation of any related concerns. As a starting point, related studies will need to consider any aerodrome related operations, aviation activity associated with the power station itself and current usage of airspace (both civil and military, including Ministry of Defence-sponsored activity in Danger Area119 (Bridgewater Bay)).</p> <p>-Aviation Warning Lighting. The documentation provided to date gives no indication of the maximum height of any associated structure(s); there is a mandated requirement for structures of a height of 150m or more to be equipped with aviation warning lighting in accordance with Article 133 of the UK Air Navigation Order. Structures of height of less than 150m might also need aviation obstruction lighting if, by virtue of their location and nature, they are considered a significant navigational hazard. Given the anticipated potential for helicopter operations associated with the proposed power station, even if the maximum height of any associated structure was less than 150m, aviation warning lighting of some scale would be recommended.</p> <p>-Gas Venting and/or Flaring. Any venting or flaring of gas either routinely or as an emergency procedure such that might cause a danger to overlying aircraft would need to be appropriately promulgated throughout the aviation community.</p> <p>-Aviation Promulgation. There is a civil aviation requirement in the UK for all structures over 300 feet high to be charted on aviation maps. Should this development progress and the 300 feet height be breached, to achieve this charting requirement, developers will need to provide details of the development to the Defence Geographic Centre.</p>	8699-240-416	/			<p>A substantial proportion of the consultation responses focused on the safety and security of HPC once operating. While some consultees opposed any nuclear development, other specific concerns included safety against flood, tsunami and aircraft crash of the reactors and spent fuel store, the resilience of on-site and off-site sources of back-up power, the vulnerability of marine works to deliberate collision, the degree of geological faulting on the HPC site, the status of issues (such as instrumentation and control systems) raised in Generic Design Assessment, and whether the safety and security regulators are sufficiently rigorous. Military and civil aviation consultees identified the potential need to deploy air navigation warning lights, extend the existing restricted area for aircraft movements, and revise arrangements for the Lilstock Range. A smaller number of responses addressed construction concerns, including the impact on local crime and traffic and the ability to evacuate the construction workforce</p> <p>The UK EPR system proposed for HPC is a development of the existing pressurised water reactor system that is employed in over 400 reactors worldwide and is related strongly to the "N4" series of plants in France and the "Konvoi" series of reactors in Germany. These reactor types have proven output and safety records. They require periodic shutdowns (known as "outages") approximately every 18 months for refuelling and maintenance. The grid substation at HPC will be of a modern gas insulated enclosed design, protected where necessary from the elements.</p> <p>The nature of the Generic Design Assessment (GDA) process is that a robust questioning attitude is presented by the regulator, in order to determine that the design of the reactor system is safe. This has resulted in a number of design queries, all of which will necessitate satisfactory resolution by EDF Energy prior to permission to construct being granted by the Office of Nuclear Regulation (ONR). For example, ONR challenged the design of the instrumentation and control systems during the GDA process and as a result, modifications were made to satisfy their rigorous review.</p> <p>EDF Energy considers nuclear and industrial safety, alongside environmental protection, above all other imperatives in the construction and operation of a nuclear power plant. Robust quality assurance and quality control processes will be established and subject to internal audit by EDF Energy with routine monitoring and audit by the regulators to ensure</p>
South West Strategic Health Authority	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>We understand that the Health and Safety Executive continues to work with EDF Energy to ensure satisfactory progress is made in addressing concerns with regard to the proposed safety systems for the UKEPR reactor as part of the generic design assessment process. We look forward to receiving details regarding the Stage 2 consultation in March 2010.</p>	8711-240-881	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1091	Public	Stage 2	it is concerning from a safety aspect that 2 nuclear reactors are being built in such close succession, having not been done in Britain before. With rising tides, threats of terrorism and unclear waste management - what a terrible legacy for our children's future.	9849-41-13993			/	compliance. In the analysis of reactor design, reactor accidents and their effects are assessed as part of the design of the plant, so as to ensure that mitigating features can be designed into the facilities. The effects of such accidents, based on these scenarios, considered with the design features built into the plant, can then be assessed so as to ensure the public are not subjected to harm. Also as part of the detailed design process, human factors analysis is being carried out on systems and on the "human-machine" interfaces.
Burnham-On-Sea & Highbridge Town Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Members would therefore like an assurance about the safety of storing the fuel on site and the measures that would be in place to guard against possible terrorist attacks.	8715-240-1997	/			HPC is designed to be "self sufficient" in terms of being able to store the entire lifetime of arisings of intermediate level waste (ILW) and spent fuel within the site. The ILW will be rendered "immobile" by encapsulation or other means. In accord with Government policy, it is transportable and can be moved from the interim store on site to the eventual final disposal facility, expected to be the Geological Disposal Facility, as soon as this is available. Also in accord with Government policy EDF Energy proposes to construct an Interim Spent Fuel Store on the site to safely store the spent fuel from the sixty years operation of the two reactors, until the final UK storage solution for spent fuel becomes available. Discharges from site, including those generated during construction and commissioning, are covered by the environmental permits that are required to be obtained from the Environment Agency.
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	EDF will need to assess the community safety implications of their proposal	88890-240-32463	/			The locations of the reactors are chosen to meet many criteria, one of which is the stability of the geology of the site. In particular, the locations of the reactors are on sound geological features, with no fault lines. The possibility of a ship striking or blocking an intake or outfall structure (either by deliberate act or by accident) has been assessed in the design of the cooling systems. The site will have both a construction security plan and an operational security plan, agreed and approved by the Office of Nuclear Regulation, Civil Nuclear Security Division. This plan covers the power plant, Intermediate Level Waste store and the Interim Spent Fuel Storage facility on site. These plans reflect
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	- To fully explain and clarify the safety of the new development at Hinkley Point, more information regarding the Generic Design Assessment should be included during the stage 2 consultation stage.	87910-240-624	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	The Conservative administration of Somerset County Council has stated that they support nuclear power, and the expansion of new nuclear development at Hinkley Point. This support is, however, only forthcoming on the basis that the operation at the site is demonstrated to be safe and the associated benefits of the development will outweigh environmental impacts.	87910-240-1858	/			
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	- health risk to a much wider population in the event of a serious accident or act of terrorism;	88940-240-275			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>We believe that there are real safety risks associated with operating a European Pressurised Reactor (EPR). We note the recent misgivings of the Nuclear Installations Inspectorate Generic Design Assessment team with regard to the Control and Instrumentation systems in the EPR design. Nuclear Consultant (Personal details removed) has written in some detail about the risks to an EPR from an aircraft attack as well as the consequences in terms of fallout in the event of a containment by-pass accident.</p> <p>On the grounds that effective landscaping can reduce the accuracy of an aircraft attack on the plants, we contend that the spoil from excavations should be built up not just on the south side of the station but in each compass direction. However we feel the residents of the village most affected should be given a choice in an official referendum.</p>	88960-240-62		/		<p>activities that must be undertaken by the site in the event of changes in security levels and risk. It includes features such as vehicle search facilities and “drop off” points, for deliveries to minimise vehicular access to site, and provisions to enhance information security.</p> <p>The UK EPR design caters for the potential of aircraft crash, either accidental or deliberate. The layout of the buildings and design features built in to certain of these buildings provides protection against such an event.</p> <p>An application will be made for a restricted area for the overflying of Hinkley Point C. This will make provision for the occasional use of the helipad. The highest building or chimney on site is 70m, thus falling below the 91.44m (300 ft) limit for aircraft warning beacons, although beacons may be fitted to the highest permanent features after detailed consultation with the CAA and MOD. As the construction programme is fully developed with the successful contractors, tower crane heights will be assessed on a case by case basis and aircraft anti-collision lights may be fitted as agreed with the CAA and MOD.</p> <p>Public Rights of Way will be diverted during the construction period, when there will be heavy vehicular traffic moving around the construction site. Once construction has completed then only the area enclosed by the site itself will have permanent footpath diversions. The coastal path will be reinstated as part of the sea defences.</p> <p>Car parking is located to the east and south east of the site, minimising impact on the southern area. As these car parks are limited in size, car sharing will be encouraged by the operating station management. For periods where there are many more workers on site, for example during outages, then it is likely that there will be dedicated coach services from the local area to serve the station, thus reducing the burden on local roads and parking.</p> <p>Planning for the accommodation of the workers is a prudent and necessary process for construction of major infrastructure projects.</p>
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>The Nuclear Installations Inspectorate (NII) today announced they have major concerns over key aspects of the safety systems in the EPR reactor proposed for Hinkley Point. They state they would not issue a license for the reactor unless the Control and Instrumentation system is fixed. A top nuclear consultant suggests the error could hold up the UK nuclear project by up to three years. (1)</p> <p>In their Part 3 Report of the Generic Design Assessment, the safety regulators claimed that in the Control and Instrumentation system the computerised shut-down systems were not sufficiently separated from the normal operating systems. Consequently they aired their concern that a fault could affect the performance of crucial safety systems. They raised a 'Regulatory Issue' or red flag over the issue, the highest warning they can give to a nuclear operator.</p> <p>The Control and Instrumentation system, if not acceptable, could be replaced with a version from an older reactor the 'N4' but the N4's control system was itself found to be faulty and so it used an even older version from an earlier reactor, the '1300 MWe' built in the 1980's. EdF have suggested using a hard-wired system to replace the computerised control of the safety systems but this is an early proposal with no detail attached.</p>	88960-240-1099			/	<p>Public Rights of Way will be diverted during the construction period, when there will be heavy vehicular traffic moving around the construction site. Once construction has completed then only the area enclosed by the site itself will have permanent footpath diversions. The coastal path will be reinstated as part of the sea defences.</p> <p>Car parking is located to the east and south east of the site, minimising impact on the southern area. As these car parks are limited in size, car sharing will be encouraged by the operating station management. For periods where there are many more workers on site, for example during outages, then it is likely that there will be dedicated coach services from the local area to serve the station, thus reducing the burden on local roads and parking.</p> <p>Planning for the accommodation of the workers is a prudent and necessary process for construction of major infrastructure projects.</p>
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>More work was required on the prevention of cracks in the fuel cladding due to thermal stress. This is very important as the 'high burn up fuel' which will be deployed in the EPR is hotter and more radioactive than fuel used in previous Pressurised Water Designs. It is crucial that the fuel is effectively contained within its cladding.</p> <p>- Analysis of the human factor in the safety of the reactor was seen as being unclear in the design proposals. This section deals with how workers or others might deliberately or for other reasons sabotage the reactor. EdF were told to put more effort into their arguments to back up their safety claims.</p>	88960-240-2473			/	<p>Public Rights of Way will be diverted during the construction period, when there will be heavy vehicular traffic moving around the construction site. Once construction has completed then only the area enclosed by the site itself will have permanent footpath diversions. The coastal path will be reinstated as part of the sea defences.</p> <p>Car parking is located to the east and south east of the site, minimising impact on the southern area. As these car parks are limited in size, car sharing will be encouraged by the operating station management. For periods where there are many more workers on site, for example during outages, then it is likely that there will be dedicated coach services from the local area to serve the station, thus reducing the burden on local roads and parking.</p> <p>Planning for the accommodation of the workers is a prudent and necessary process for construction of major infrastructure projects.</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>A comparison has been made regarding the C & I system that it is like having a fault in your car steering that means the brakes also stop working. It does not inspire confidence that the EPR has got so far without this potentially dangerous fault being rectified. We were very surprised that the normally restrained French nuclear authority ASN were equally critical of the system as well as the Finnish regulators, STUK.</p> <p>On the issue of human factors, I worked as a (Personal details removed) at (Personal details removed), Bridgwater in the 1980's. One of my clients for counselling was a (Personal details removed) at Hinkley Point B. Although he did not have a 'mental illness' as such he was very preoccupied with family problems. One session he reported having made an important mistake in operating the reactor which had led to a discharge of radioactive gasses. The accident was reported in The Guardian at the time in which Dr John Large suggested it was the worst UK accident since Windscale.</p> <p>Colleagues reliably informed me at the time that another Hinkley worker with safety responsibilities had Alzheimer's Disease and was effectively being 'carried' by co-workers.</p> <p>I discussed this event at the Hinkley C public inquiry. I raise the question now as I still am concerned that human factors could contribute to a serious accident at a reactor. The fact that the NII have pointed out the inadequacies of EDF's analysis in this area is of great concern.</p>	88960-240-5575	/			
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>1. Vulnerability of the EPR to terrorism:</p> <p>In 2006 a letter from EDF to the French Government was leaked to a French campaigner and consequently published. The letter was on the question of the EPR's vulnerability to a deliberate aircraft attack. John Large was asked to write a report on the contents of the letter. Here is the summary of his report. The full report is available on:</p> <p>http://www.largeassociates.com/3150%20Flamanville/R3150-aircraft%20impact%20-%20FINAL.pdf</p> <p>The EDF letter referred to is below.</p> <p>OPERATIONAL RISKS AND HAZARDS OF THE EPR WHEN SUBJECT TO AIRCRAFT CRASH</p> <p>SUMMARY</p> <p>This is a brief review of a confidential EDF document that has been leaked to the public domain in France.</p>	88960-240-7059			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>In your letter, you ask me to e/amine the EPR reactor capacity of resistance to/to withstand a potential commercial plane crash, and then to make any necessary suggestions. Very quickly after the September 11th attacks in the USA, the EDF made a point of analysing the problem and in particular with regards to the conception/design of the EPR.</p> <p>As you note in your letter, the new project takes into account resistance to a military plane crash, which is already a heavy charge. For this, the designers have chosen functional and geographical building plans taking account of such accidents. The project has 4 trains which are completely separate, and a part of the construction is "bunkerised ": in particular the buildings containing the reactor and used nuclear fuel, and one building containing 2 of the 4 safeguards trains (electrical and mechanical parts).</p> <p>The "bunkerised" part, designed to resist to the impact of a military plane, presents a high resistance and especially with regards to perforation: a military plane is considered to be the equivalent of a perforating missile.</p> <p>All this gives to the EPR an important capacity to resist to the impact of a commercial plane, so no change has been made in the construction plans.</p> <p>Despite this capacity for resistance to plane accidents, it is nevertheless necessary to note that EDF is not in a position to ensure resistance to eventual war or terrorist action. Prevention or limitation of such action and its possible results involve State responsibility In this case</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The controls concerning resistance to such accidents and any necessary supplementary measures are to be considered as outside the (normal)design basis of the building, and I am obliged to place this situation amongst the "Risk Reduction Categories" - The study of different possibilities concerning an impact should induce a reasonable response to the risk incurred and will not be able to take into consideration/cover each and every possibility. Furthermore, the measures should, in my opinion, be in complete coherence with the measures adopted internationally, and should not be too different from the measures adopted for other industrial risks. I also consider that the different scenarios studied, the rules and analysis used to do so should not appear in the security reports immediately available or which could become available to the public. <p>Precisions concerning this general logic are to be found in the joined anne/. And, added to this, in order to decide or control the design basis of the protective construction/shear wall of the "bunkerised" part of the building, it will be necessary to define a reference impact load. This reference, whilst generally covering the case of the sort of planes which could crash in the event of an intentional action, should not be associated directly to a particular plane nor to a particular speed of impact. It should correspond to a general hypothesis based on criteria and calculation of a general and conventional nature.</p> <p>For this reason I propose to retain as the reference the impact charge given in the anne/ which represents the risks reasonably considered possible by the sorts of planes in European skies.</p>	88960-240-12177			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Our concerns here are obvious. It is not at all clear that the EPR could withstand a terrorist attack. EDF have claimed that in this short time-span they have reinforced the reactor designs to the level that it could withstand such an attack but this seems difficult to believe. In his fuller report John Large goes on to say:</p> <p>"Obviously, to safeguard against intentional aircraft crash the only effective measure (other than security at the departure airports) is to physically enhance the structure of the building enclosures although, since the fundamentals of the building design are committed to at an early stage of the design process, other than a radical change of the building structures and/or layout (for example, building underground), little can be done to improve the resilience of the existing EPR containment design. There are no apparent signs that the post 9-11 EPR designs have undergone such a radical enhancement."</p>	88960-240-15452			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>For the EPR the designer, AREVA, reckon that the nuclear plant is entirely protected from accidents and malicious acts that could result in significant release of radioactivity. In making this claim AREVA place extraordinary reliance on its failsafe engineered systems and containment, so much so that, in the very worst and most severe incident, the release would be limited to just 0.03% of the reactor fuel radioactive inventory. Put another way, over the six days following the explosion at the Chernobyl Unit N 4 reactor, it is reliably estimated that at least 30% of the total reactor fission product radioactivity released uncontrolled into the atmosphere. The equivalent worst case reactor incident release from an operational EPR at Hinkley Point would, according to AREVA, result in no more than (6 / 0.03%) 0.18% of the radioactive inventory. (Personal details removed) will give an illustrated presentation that provides an up to date prediction of the radiological consequences of a severely damaging incident at Hinkley Point, this being the first time since 1982 that a revised radiological impact assessment for PWR has been publicly aired.</p> <p>Based on EDF's undertaking that two EPRs, will be commissioned at Hinkley Point, the radiological health consequences of these larger nuclear plants will be analysed taking into account upwards revisions to the causal factors linking radiation dose to health detriment, the larger core mass of nuclear fuel, the increased irradiation or burn-up of uranium fuel rendering it more radioactive, and the impact of MOX (plutonium) fuelling, all in account of the lessons learnt from Chernobyl.</p> <p>The modelling and analysis will draw upon the outcome of highly confidential terrorist attack exercises carried out on nuclear plants in the United States, it will assume the same capabilities of the terrorist to penetrate the security at Hinkley Point, seek out the vulnerabilities of the nuclear plant, and to contrive effective means by which a radioactive release will take place; and for the radioactive dispersion and consequences the European standard COSYMA software has been deployed, together with NOAA satellite data to provide real time imaging of the dispersion and radioactive fall-out in the aftermath of the release.</p> <p>The analysis and projections for Hinkley Point will be expressed in terms of the risk of any one individual sustaining health harm in the aftermath of a radioactive release and, related to the increased health risk from the larger EPR plant operating with a greater extent of irradiation (burn-up) and/or with a plutonium based fuel core, the need to extend both the range and resources allocated to the local authority off-site plan (under the Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations 2000)</p>	88960-240-20196			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>In view of the serious questions posed by this report and the presentation that came with it, we strongly contend that no reactors should be constructed at Hinkley. Should a decision be made to go ahead with the project, then we feel that emergency arrangements must be enhanced to allow better public protection. For example the current practice of pre-distributing potassium iodate tablets just within the 3.4 kilometre radius around Hinkley should be enhanced to take account of the fast pace that weather patterns can deliver radiation to locations much further away. As the Isle of Wight is about eighty miles from Hinkley we suggest the iodate tablets should be pre-distributed to all homes, schools, offices and factories within 100 miles.</p> <p>We are concerned generally that emergency measures would break down. At Three Mile Island ninety percent of medical staff left their posts after the accident.</p> <p>A police report to the Nuclear Industry Association at Oldbury power station in 2002 said that protective breathing gear had a life limit of just twenty minutes in a contaminated environment. Police officers would in any case be advised to voluntarily abandon their kit as it would panic the local population. We were also told that police officers had a smaller maximum dose in such circumstances than ambulance men and even council officers.</p>	88960-240-23167			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>At the same time we understand the OCNs security concerns of having thousands of workers accommodated on site during construction. The risk of sabotage is a real threat especially given the high expected turn-over of workers in the Olkiluoto model. The scale of the project should therefore be cut right back to one reactor built over a much longer time-scale, thus reducing the weight on local communities of so many outside workers. During the construction of Hinkley B many fights and brawls were reported in local villages and Bridgwater.</p>	88960-240-30288			/	
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>1.4. We note that the Health and Safety Executive's (HSE) ongoing Generic Design Assessment (GDA) of the EPR (2) has already raised significant issues with the safety of the proposed EPR design for Hinkley Point C (3). The HSE recently concluded that "we have identified a significant number of issues with the safety features of the design." This followed the HSE taking the unprecedented step of releasing a Joint Regulatory Position Statement on the EPR with their Finnish and French counterparts. It is very worrying that EdF apparently do not agree with the HSE's assessment. The (Personal details removed) recently said that EdF "is 'confident we will qualify' the Siemens SPPA-T2000 control I&C system for use without modifications." (4). However, the NII has reiterated that design changes will still need to be made.</p> <p>1.5. As the GDA findings show, new reactor designs proposed for Hinkley Point C do not by any stretch of the imagination represent a "proven" technology as claimed by EdF. The fact remains that any new reactor will be first-of-a-kind and very much UK specific. At present EdF cannot prove that their designs meet basic reactor safety standards.</p>	8766-240-1152	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Hinkley Point C Main Power Station and Ancillary Buildings</p> <p>The site identified for the main buildings and associated land uses, as depicted in Figure10.2, does not occupy any MOD statutory safeguarding zones or neighbour any MOD property.</p> <p>Based upon the illustrative layout design for the main buildings provided at Figure 3.2, it is not anticipated that the development of the actual nuclear power station will in itself affect any defence interests. Subject to confirming the dimensions of the taller structures included in the development it is possible that the highest points of some of the structures may need to be fitted with air navigation warning lights to maintain the safety of military air traffic that operates in the area.</p> <p>Section 3.3.6 identified that fi/ed tower cranes will be used at the development site during the construction programme. The heights of the cranes are not identified at this stage. It is anticipated that air navigation warning lights may need to be attached to these structures to maintain air traffic safety.</p>	8775-240-2770			/	
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Overhead Transmission Network Development</p> <p>Defence Estates Safeguarding has been consulted separately by National Grid on the development of new overhead power lines to support Hinkley Point C. The proposed routes for overhead line development will not affect defence interests. However, Defence Estates Safeguarding will assess the precise location and dimensions of overhead line towers when these have been finalised to verify whether any air navigation warning lights will be needed and to update air navigation charts accordingly.</p>	8775-240-3828	/			
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>The surface area of D119 is defined in Practise and E/ercise Chart Q.6402 published by UK Hydrographic Office. It is an important defence training asset used primarily to conduct helicopter gunnery training. It is currently used to provide pre-deployment training to crews going to Afghanistan. It is important that the use of the range is not impeded or compromised.</p> <p>The consultation document does not recognise the presence of Lilstock Range. Section 2.3.8 incorrectly identifies that the development site is not in pro/imity to military activity. Consequently no assessment has been made of the likely impacts of the proposed marine developments associated with the new power station upon military activities carried out in Bridgewater Bay. Likewise the potential impacts of military activities upon the operation of the proposed marine developments have not been assessed.</p>	8775-240-7233	/			
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>The MOD is investigating the possibility of moving the actual firing target area within the e/isting Danger Area - moving the firing impact zone away from the area of the proposed developments to achieve an appropriate separation distance between the two activities. Relocating firing activities to a different area of the marine environment will necessitate that the MOD completes a Sustainability Appraisal and a Statutory Habitats Regulations Assessment of the proposed changes. In addition the removal and relocation of buoys and associated anchoring points would also be required.</p>	8775-240-8961	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Alternatively, to achieve an appropriate separation distance to safely accommodate the proposed jetty and the associated maritime activities, it may be necessary to e/pand or relocate the entire range Danger Area. This would entail obtaining a modification to regulated UK air space. This in itself can be the subject of an e/tensive consultation and impact assessment process administered by the Civil Aviation Authority. A Sustainability Appraisal and a Statutory Habitats Regulations Assessment Sustainability to assess the environmental impacts of relocating a military firing activity would also need to be undertaken. It is possible that these procedures may determine that relocation of the Danger Area is not permissible.	8775-240-9550	/			
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	In considering such mitigation options a full assessment of the routes that maritime traffic using the jetty will take and e/pected volumes of traffic will need to be completed. The MOD may seek to recover reasonable costs associated with undertaking any works associated with implementing these mitigation options from the applicant. In addition the MOD may ask EDF to undertake environmental surveys and data gathering needed to complete impact assessments necessary to relocate the range area.	8775-240-10284			/	
Civil Aviation Authority	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	As previously advised, a new or amended RA would have a potential impact upon airspace availability to aviation. The scale of any such impact needs to be assessed and detailed within associated environmental documentation, which should also describe the mitigation of any related concerns. As a starting point, related studies will need to consider any aerodrome related operations, aviation activity associated with the power station itself and current usage of airspace (both civil and military, including Ministry of Defence (MoD)-sponsored activity in Danger Area (DA) 119 (Bridgewater Bay)).	10193-182-1432	/			
Tractivity 784	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? What ever you do will be an impact. Don?t build a powere station no need for a new accident zone. THIS IS NOT A GGOD IDEA	9542-240-3209			/	
Tractivity 874	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the bo/ below The general theme throughout these proposals appears to be one of cost and urgency which are interlinked. The sooner the project is up and running, the sooner EDF will se a return on their investment. If these are the primary concerns, what ranking does safety have? A rushed job is quite often a botched job!	9632-240-8061			/	
Tractivity 880	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? As long as it is not at the e/pense of any kind of security or safe operating parametres.	9638-240-393	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1002	Public	Stage 2	7. Any other ideas or comments? What security checks will be in place for all vehicles.	9760-240-3677			/	
Tractivity 1002	Public	Stage 2	8. Any other ideas or comments? as above	9760-240-4139			/	
Tractivity 1011	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? It is insulting to ordinary people?s intelligence to be asking what we think about your landscaping ideas when you?re not actively engaging people in discussion about far more pressing issues such as the health & safety issues brought up by your proposal, such as the issue of ionising radiation, or the fact that the reactors that you are proposing are far bigger, dirtier and more dangerous than the current 2nd generation reactors that we are currently saddled with. Or the fact that you intend to turn one of the most beautiful places in the UK into a long term to/ic dump by storing radioactive waste so hot that it cant be moved for at least 160 years. All of the research that has been published so far regarding nuclear waste only refers to what is known as legacy waste and doesn?t consider new nuclear waste. This is not a legacy I wish to leave for my children and I am not so arrogant or blindly faithful in human ingenuity to assume th	9769-240-129			/	
Tractivity 1036	Public	Stage 2	Nuclear energy is e/tremely dangerous, when you consider there is no safe way to dispose of the unspent radiation,	9794-240-7373			/	
Tractivity 1057	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the bo/ below not very wide ranging over the impact over Burnham-on-Sea and other communities in the Bridgwater Bay, if this development does happen I hope that a substantial contribution is given to the flood defences of the coast line in the whole area and the company/government have an active policy to listen and be pro active for the areas safety,benefit and beauty over the long term.	9815-240-5842			/	
Tractivity 1060	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? A bridgwater Bypass should be built, from Dunball to hinkley. This will free up the roads in and around the town. It would also provide another access route if there were ever a nuclear accident.	9818-240-3716			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1105	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>It is insulting to ordinary people?s intelligence to be asking what we think about your landscaping ideas when you?re not actively engaging people in discussion about far more pressing issues such as the health & safety issues brought up by your proposal, such as the issue of ionising radiation, or the fact that the reactors that you are proposing are far bigger, dirtier and more dangerous than the current 2nd generation reactors that we are currently saddled with. Or the fact that you intend to turn one of the most beautiful places in the UK into a long term to/ic dump by storing radioactive waste so hot that it cant be moved for at least 160 years. All of the research that has been published so far regarding nuclear waste only refers to what is known as legacy waste and doesn?t consider new nuclear waste. This is not a legacy I wish to leave for my children and I am not so arrogant or blindly faithful in human ingenuit</p>	9863-240-129			/	
Tractivity 1119	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the bo/ below</p> <p>Your proposed EPR reactor is already e/periencing serious problems and long delays in France and Finland. According to (Personal details removed), University of Greenwich, "the UK government is in danger of backing a design that could prove unlicensable, unaffordable and unbuildable". If building begins and is stopped, damage will already have been done to this rural area. There are also safety problems to be addressed. As for waste, no answer has yet been found to storing it safely elsewhere yet.</p> <p>How will you pay for all this when your credit rating has been reduced to A and your debts far outweigh your profits?</p> <p>Add the safety problems, the huge costs of building the reactor(s), and the doubt whether the carbon floor price will be adequate. And by the time this white elephant is built, it will be too late to keep our carbon footprint low enough to avoid drastic climate change. Nuclear is a distraction not a solution.</p>	9877-240-6238			/	
Tractivity 1187	Public	Stage 2	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>As long as it?s not at the e/pense of any kind of security or safe operating parameters</p>	9945-240-393	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1228	Public	Stage 2 Update	Do you know that the Hinkley site should be ruled out for any new nuclear build as it is all limestone geology and there is a faultline running parallel to the coast?	89494-240-841	/			
Tractivity 1228	Public	Stage 2 Update	You really must act in the interests of the community and resist pressure from EDF etc who are trying to persuade you that building new EPR reactors at Hinkley would bring any benefits at all to Somerset. These reactors are intrinsically unsafe as they are designed to release poisonous gases from the reactor cores every 18 months.	89494-240-1061			/	
Tractivity 1270	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? After the latest incident of the nuclear power station explosion in Japan as a result of the failure of the fail-safe cooling system, how EDF will ensure this will not happen? Can EDF explain what safety design and measures will be incorporated into the design and operation? Any robust risk assessments have been undertaken in the technical studies and design to deal with possible risk of radiation leaks caused by earthquake and tsunami?	89536-240-1014	/			
Tractivity 1272	Public	Stage 2 Update	What if sea levels were to rise? What if a tsunami hit the site as in 1600 AD? You are operating in the short term, for short term profits and should be ashamed of yourselves.	89538-240-317			/	
Tractivity 1274	Public	Stage 2 Update	The recent events at Fukushima demonstrates that power stations are well built and accommodate all eventualities. Japan has experienced the worst earthquake on record, need I say any more. Just build it, this country has to many whiners and moaners, if they don't like it move!	89540-240-146			/	
Tractivity 1297	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? After the incident at Fukushima, Japan I am very concerned about the safety aspect of the two proposed reactors. Natural disasters do happen as we have recently seen and the site will be on a natural flood plain. Also what will the affect be when the natural valley is filled with spoil on an area that already is prone to flooding. How can we be reassured that these newly designed, extremely powerful reactors are safe? We, the locals will be living in such close proximity to such a high risk installation without any benefits and only constant uncertainty. I do not feel reassured by EDF's proposals.	89563-240-4481	/			
Tractivity 1329	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q1 Do you have any comments on our proposals for the workforce and for employment, skills and business engagement? Irrelevant in view of the safety concerns about nuclear energy as demonstrated by the current crisis in Japan.	89595-240-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1329	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? We are e/tremely concerned that any new reactors are currently being considered in the UK given the events in Japan - much more detailed research is surely now urgently needed into more appropriate and safe alternative sources of energy, which are still "value for money". There is no evidence that there could never be a "surge" or tsunami up the Bristol Channel, endangering future generations of people both locally and throughout the UK.	89595-240-1166			/	
Tractivity 1332	Public	Stage 2 Update	After the Japanese disaster not sure that we want the power station at all.	89598-240-1665			/	
Tractivity 1337	Public	Stage 2 Update	There is also grave concerns following the ongoing problems in Japan. As a community living very closely to this development more needs to be done to reassure people of the safety of the plan and to compensate them for the situation that they will find themselves in if the development goes ahead	89603-240-857			/	
Tractivity 1342	Public	Stage 2 Update	I live in Glastonbury and we get the prevailing South West winds! No one here wants another Nuclear power plant. In 2000 a friend of mine rang me in great panic and told me her Geiger counter was screaming beyond limits. She brought it down to me and demonstrated the fact.. She had had it recently balanced! There are 10,000 people who live downwind of your power station and I don?t know anyone who wants another one near them. Why can?t the energy industry use wave and wind energy? They only seem to ignore the people who don?t want nuclear power. We are at a time when working in harmony with the earth is what is required not blatantly flying in the face of that requirement for greed!! And by the way this is the first time I?ve heard about this new plant! Yours sincerely, (Personal details removed)	89608-240-133			/	
Tractivity 1342	Public	Stage 2 Update	I should have written my comments in this slot. I live in Glastonbury and 10,000 of us here and 9,000 in Street get the prevailing winds from your direction, i.e. south west, and we want no more plants billowing out potential hazards. In 2000 my friend?s geiger counter went beyond into a scream and we were all very worried. It had been balanced! I rang the police and was told by a panicked constable that he had no iodine tablets and had never heard of this before! So your emergency plans could be said to be null and void!	89608-240-1002			/	
Tractivity 1354	Public	Stage 2 Update	In the light of the Fukushima nuclear accident, are you aware that Hinkley Point is in the area that was deluged by a natural event in 1604? Either a Tsunami or a storm surge. With the very strong tides of the Bristol Channel, how do you think this would be a safe place for further development?	89620-240-36			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1356	Public	Stage 2 Update	Usual indifference to local opinion makes me wonder why I am filling in another form, such indecent haste may lead to a Japan incident here! No confidence in your openness.	89622-240-1003			/	
Tractivity 1358	Public	Stage 2 Update	Please take on board what is happening in Japan.	89624-240-662			/	
Tractivity 1361	Public	Stage 2 Update	I am also e/tremely concerned about safety issues. It is not good enough to say the nuclear industries safety record is good in this country. Accidents happen because some events cannot be forseen.	89627-240-1451			/	
Tractivity 1377	Public	Stage 2 Update	You are not taking the chance of e/treme circumstances seriously. i suspect you cannot guard against the abnormal.	89643-240-963			/	
Tractivity 1377	Public	Stage 2 Update	Do not chance a major disaster. DO NOT BUILD HPC	89643-240-1119			/	
Tractivity 217	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? No, have always been aware of the need for future stations to be built. Just build them safely.	8920-240-7361			/	
Tractivity 273	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? I would ask you to consider the implications for the decommissioning of Hinkley A and B stations of the new plan. Previous e/perience suggests a 'cinderella effect' is likely in which the decommissioning project finds it almost impossible to recruit and retain good quality staff to progress the work because they are all attracted by the new project. The risk is that by the time the new build period is over the plant knowledge and decommissioning capability to complete the decommissioning of the A and B stations will have been largely lost and the hazard and cost of decommissioning will increase substantially. This effect was seen at the Dounreay Fast Reactor (DFR) in Scotland when its larger and newer replacement was built on the same site. DFR is now one of the most dangerous nuclear liabilities in the UK.	8962-240-5910			/	
Tractivity 289	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? I have heard recent remarks commenting rather unfavourably on pressurised water reactors, and hope all safety concerns have been fully investigated.	8977-240-4385			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 302	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>Very concerned about the 'emergency' access road on to the Shurton Road - it needs to be ONLY for REAL emergencies, not for general site/workers traffic.</p> <p>Very concerned that Policing hasn't been mentioned, with so many 'strangers' we villagers/hamlet dwellers are vulnerable.</p> <p>Very concerned about the increased traffic and that the park and rides will be under used and lots of workers will use their cars.</p> <p>Very concerned about Clayland Corner where the Stogursey Road meets the C182 it is already a death trap.</p> <p>Very concerned about the building safety standards - I saw a film report of the Finnish nuclear power station being built - masses of problems, especially from non specialist building contractors.</p>	8990-240-5435	/			
Tractivity 310	Public	Stage 1	<p>3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction?</p> <p>Need to be kept open if possible and not a danger to workforce to walkers.</p>	8998-240-663	/			
Tractivity 323	Public	Stage 1	<p>3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction?</p> <p>This strategy seems good. It is of course obvious to retain as many rights of way open and open new ones where possible and it is understood that safety and security is a major consideration.</p>	9011-240-1260	/			
Tractivity 341	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>I am not convinced of the need for a third NPS at Hinkley Point. I am not happy about the safety record of the present station and remain to be convinced of the safety and reliability of the proposed station.</p> <p>I also feel strongly about the proposal to store nuclear waste on site, for safety and security reasons.</p>	9029-240-4617			/	
Tractivity 342	Public	Stage 1	<p>11. Any other comments?</p> <p>I am reasonably satisfied so far. However the worst is yet to come.</p> <p>The population is sceptical about any proposal that the nuclear industry make and I am more sceptical than most. I am old enough and wise enough to remember the words (Personal details removed) in the 1950s when he said "Believe nothing that the nuclear industry say"</p> <p>Have you changed? I wonder!!</p>	9030-240-5684			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 342	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>The Finnish nuclear build is running late because of design and safety problems.</p> <p>Lets hope EDF put the right mi/ of concrete in! Paramount, must be the safety and well being of the surrounding population in the villages and hamlets.</p> <p>I have read NOTHING which reassures me. EG will the second road access used as an emergency route be used to route site traffic through Shurton adn Burton?</p>	9030-240-6098			/	
Tractivity 343	Public	Stage 1	<p>11. Any other comments?</p> <p>Construction of sea wall, if its for protection of the Power Station OK.</p>	9031-240-4358			/	
Tractivity 365	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Do not build another "Atomkraftwerk" on this site.</p> <p>I was part of the team that e/cavated the Plesiosaur remains from the slate rock a few years ago. Constructing this will destroy the surrounding environment and further discoveries of english history and heritage.</p> <p>Back in the '80's, a chap called (Personal details removed) worked at Hinkley point site B and told me the horror stories of the events that took place at his place of work. The leaks, fires and the ruptures that occurred at this site and equipment. He also informed me how close Somerset and surrounding areas were almost devastated by the same scenario that occurred at Sellafield and on more than one occasion. Also the contamination of the surrounding Bristol channel was a key factor and will be once again e/tremely polluted from the pipeline. Sadly (Personal details removed) is no longer with us as he died from Cancer.</p> <p>So placing a "Landscape Buffer" up on this site will make difference to anyone, as the</p>	9345-240-351			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 365	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>Do not build another "Atomkraftwerk" on this site.</p> <p>I was part of the team that e/cavated the Plesiosaur remains from the slate rock a few years ago. Constructing this will destroy the surrounding environment and further discoveries of english history and heritage.</p> <p>Back in the '80's, a chap called (Personal details removed) worked at Hinkley point site B and told me the horror stories of the events that took place at his place of work. The leaks, fires and the ruptures that occurred at this site and equipment. He also informed me how close Somerset and surrounding areas were almost devastated by the same scenario that occurred at Sellafield and on more than one occasion. Also the contamination of the surrounding Bristol channel was a key factor and will be once again e/tremely polluted from the pipeline. Sadly (Personal details removed) is no longer with us as he died from Cancer.</p> <p>So placing a "Landscape Buffer" up on this site will make difference to anyone, as the</p>	9345-240-4678			/	
Tractivity 393	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>A landscape bugger will be ineffective against radiation leaks or losses should there be any accident or attack</p>	9078-240-351			/	
Tractivity 400	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>It's not worth the upheaval, the damage to the local environment ,the pollution of air and sea, the massive carbon footprint involved in the construction, the radioactive emissions, the risk of accidents for just 6 percent electricity supply. 25 years decommissioning the site is a very long time - but what about the spent fuel? What are you going to do about that? And where will it go in the long term?....</p>	9083-240-3467			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 401	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Do you agree that EDF Energy's proposal to provide a landscape buffer on the southern boundary of the site is the best way of minimising the potential impact of the construction site for nearby local residents?</p> <p>Bo/ ticked: Yes</p> <p>1. If yes, should this be retained as a permanent feature once construction is completed?</p> <p>Bo/ ticked: Yes</p> <p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Permanent feature if construction is completed: Should be high enough to block the view of any and all construction from the properties affected in Shurton.</p> <p>2. Return to land to its previous use</p> <p>Bo/ ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Creation of wildlife habitats</p> <p>Bo/ ticked: Not Important</p> <p>2. Grassland</p> <p>Bo/ ticked: Not at all Important</p> <p>2. Woodland</p>	9084-240-0			/	
Tractivity 401	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1. We are not in favour of a new nuclear power station being built at all. Especially if it can be seen from our property in Shurton. This construction will blight the area completely.</p> <p>2. The construction is far too large, with two nuclear reactors.</p> <p>3. Health and Safety issues concerns us deeply. i.e target for a terrorist attack. Reactors are a new french design- have these been tried and tested sufficiently?</p>	9084-240-4648			/	
Tractivity 440	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>Provided that the new station comes up to the HSE standards required I suppose it is something that we have to live with in this power hungry world!</p>	9119-240-4008			/	
Tractivity 446	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>New Nuclear power stations are unnecessary, will damage the marine ecosystem of the estuary, become permanent high level radioactive waste dumps virtually for ever, will make the local area a major terrorist target, will cause a health hazard to the local population from the regular radioactive discharges to the environment, are a potential risk to a major release of radioactivity and will do very little to benefit local employment and be too late and too little to do anything to help climate change.</p>	9125-240-5093			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 450	Public	Stage 1	9. What are your views on EDF Energy's general approach to community benefits and do you have any specific suggestions about what should be included in the package? E/tra facilities for education i.e. more school places may be needed/toddler groups. E/tra security both near power station and close residential areas. If more houses are built some form of local shop may be needed.	9128-240-3601			/	
Tractivity 477	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? I object to proposals for the largest UK nuclear power station due to my concerns over: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> â€¢ Health risks from radioactive emissions â€¢ Risks of leaks, accidents, terrorism â€¢ Highly radioactive spent fuel remaining on site for 160 years plus â€¢ No planned repository for onward disposal of this spent fuel â€¢ Disruption of local life due to an influ/ of 5,000 male workers â€¢ Nuclearâ€™s tiny contribution to combating climate chang 	9153-240-4987			/	
Tractivity 499	Public	Stage 1	3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction? As Q1 However, I believe that the ever present terrorism threat must be taken into account.	9172-240-1613			/	
Tractivity 514	Public	Stage 1	3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction? Due to health and safety and security issues it would be difficult to provide rights of way across the site during construction, but every effort must be made to put alternative foot paths in place to go around the site.	9186-240-647			/	
Tractivity 539	Public	Stage 1	3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction? Obviously Health and Safety are major concerns during construction. I hope that rights of way will be restored asap, especially the coastal path along the new sea wall.	9208-240-1093			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 544	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? I think the 2 / UKEPR's pressurised water reactors are too big a project for the local Somerset community infrastructure. I am not in favour of nuclear power. I see it as potentially dangerous, remembering Chernobyl in 1986 - fallout from Chernobyl fell on sheep pasture in Wales - where sheep are still restricted from selling as meets. It is also dangerous to our health (evidence of increased cancers in Burnham-on-Sea). However, if the IPC does give permission I think one reactor would be more suitable to our local rural community.	9213-240-5874			/	
Tractivity 581	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? We are concerned about the safety of nuclear power stations.	9250-240-6415			/	
Tractivity 669	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? As long as the suitability of the site meets with assurance that the 'fault line' discovered when building B will not fail. (For attached see enquiry)	9332-240-3580			/	
Tractivity 50899	Public	Stage 1	2. I am concerned about the risks of leaks, accidents and terrorism. The Health and Safety Executive have reported their concern about the safety system in the French EPR reactor design. Nuclear regulators in France, the UK and Finland have condemned the computerised system. They also say more work needs to be done on ensuring cracks don't develop in the nuclear fuel cladding.	9396-240-675			/	
Tractivity 62128	Public	Stage 1	(c) it brings proven health risks from radioactive discharges in the hinterland of nuclear installations; (d) it has risks of big accidents through big leaks and terrorism;	9415-240-553		/		
Tractivity 62151	Public	Stage 1	1. Your safety system is not independent of the regular control system and will not be passed by NII.	9419-240-0		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	<p>Even the process of mining the uranium is dangerous. (Personal details removed) who was the Inspector for the Hinkley (C) Inquiry at the end of the eighties concluded:</p> <p>"I recommend that if future proposals are put forward for further nuclear facilities which would involve the importing of uranium the applicants should use their best endeavours to present information to any future inquiry on conditions for workers and the public in the countries concerned who might be affected by the mining and processing of uranium for the project."</p> <p>(Personal details removed)- of 'Nuclear Waste Advisory Associates' (NWAA) has written a paper on Uranium mining looking at the issues of risk and despoliation - and also at the issue of 'environmental racism'. The paper can be found on the NWAA web-site.(37)</p> <p>Further information can be also be found on the 'WISE' web-site on uranium issues:</p> <p>http://www.wise-uranium.org/inde/.html</p>	89481-240-2822			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	<p>Nuclear Reactors are intrinsically linked with nuclear weapons. (Personal details removed) commented in March 2009:</p> <p>"For the eight years that I spent in the White House every nuclear weapons proliferation problem we dealt with was connected to a reactor programme. People have said for years that there are now completely different [nuclear] technologies. OK, but if you have a team of scientists that can build a reactor, and you're a dictator, you can make them work at night to build a nuclear weapon. That's what's happened in North Korea and Iran. And in Libya before they gave it up." (43)</p> <p>On 24th March, (Personal details removed) at the Home Office warned of the risk of terrorists using nuclear weapons,(44) and the Home Office referred to a strategy of 'prevent, pursue, protect and prepare' .(45)</p> <p>Nuclear power stations create plutonium (46) thus the fact that the Government is actively seeking the synthesis additional plutonium when the Home Office have raised nuclear concerns is incongruous.</p> <p>On 17th March 2009 (Personal details removed) gave a speech on nuclear proliferation,(47) in which he spoke of 'capping the production of weapons useable fissile material'. However, there is no question of the fact that the plutonium from nuclear power stations could be used to make nuclear weapons. (48)</p> <p>Release due to Terrorism</p> <p>Bombs can also be made out of Uranium-235, and a 'dirty bomb' (that disperses radionuclides - but isn't made out of a nuclear explosive) could be made out of something that simply contained radionuclides. Euratom (the nuclear part of the European Union) has a research programme (49,50) which is currently looking at:</p> <p>'Malevolent uses of radiation or radioactive material' (51) The web-site states:</p> <p>"With new security challenges facing society, there is a need to develop robust and practical approaches in response to the malevolent use of radiation or radioactive materials, in particular to minimise the impact of nuclear and radiological terrorism."</p> <p>In October 2009 a nuclear scientist working on the Large Hadron atom collider in Switzerland was arrested as it was suspected that he was helping al-Qaeda.. He had worked in the UK at the Rutherford, Appleton laboratory in Didcot, Oxfordshire.(52)</p> <p>Serious Reactor Accidents</p> <p>The first serious reactor accident in the world took place in the UK, when one of the Windscale (53) 'Piles'(54) caught fire.(55) There was also a very serious accident in Chernobyl in the Ukraine in 1986.</p> <p>In March 1978, an accident happened in a PWR at Three Mile Island, Pennsylvania 240 kilometres from New York. This accident is of particular concern as the 'PWR' reactor type is of the type proposed by EdF</p>	89481-240-6595			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	<p>It is the contention of this part of my response that the confidence that EdF place in the institutional and legislative framework to protect people and the environment from radionuclide harm is misplaced.</p> <p>At Section Three, (87) Part 3.6 ' The Nuclear Regulatory Regime' EdF set out (pp 2930) an outline of the legal and organisational frameworks that purportedly ensure public and environmental protection from harm caused by radionuclides.</p> <p>The following te/t demonstrates that these bureaucratic instruments would not in fact be able to deliver the tangible controls necessary.</p> <p>i) The specific e/amples considered are:</p> <p>ii) The lack of regulatory competence of the NII</p> <p>iii) The NII' slack of Veracity</p> <p>iv) The lack of Credibility of the NII Evidence Base</p> <p>v) The Failure of the EA to Adequately Assess the Difficulites of Radiological Risk Assessment</p> <p>NII - Lack of Regulatory Competence</p>	89484-240-73		/		
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	<p>In Summer 2001 a report for the European Parliament concluded that an accident / attack at Sellafield could kill two million people (88). The following Autumn in September 2001 the 9/11 attacks happened. As a result of this event, the American Nuclear Security e/pert Gordon Thompson submitted to the House of Commons Defence Select Committee in January 2002.</p> <p>His evidence was entitled: (89)</p> <p>'Civilian Nuclear Facilities as Weapons for an Enemy'</p> <p>Despite these warnings the NII did not ensure that work was undertaken at Sellafield to prevent a catastrophic release from the site. Instead the NII let the state of disrepair at Sellafield reach e/treme levels - to the e/tent that, in July 2008, they commented in their Newsletter that a programme to replace storage tanks for the most intensely radioactive wastes '</p> <p>"should be progressed with the utmost urgency." (90)</p> <p>In addition the NII (also in 2008) wrote a letter to the nuclear industry. (91)</p> <p>During the following year, in 2009, there were two site emergencies at the Sellafield site (92), (93), (94), (95) - and the NII stated in a public forum that the risks at Sellafield were 'far too high' (96) In the face of these serious safety problems, the response of the NII was to:</p> <p>- to write another letter. (97)</p> <p>Although this Case Study is concerned with the Sellafield site - rather than the Aldermaston site - it does point to the Nil's lack of regulatory competence</p> <p>i.e. in the face of ongoing risk of a site-emergency that could result in two million people contracting fatal cancer, the response of the NI has simply been to write a letter – and failing that – to write another letter.</p>	89484-240-988			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62206	Public	Stage 1	I object to proposals for the largest UK nuclear power station due to my concerns over: 1) Health risks from radioactive emissions 2) Risks of leaks, accidents, terrorism	9428-240-37			/	
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	The construction of the sea defence, its dimensions, any safe public access points to the foreshore etc. These would also impact the Safety case so I cannot believe that detailed information is not available. If it is not available then I worry that the plant will be safe.	10091-240-2764			/	
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	In summary the proposals worry because they seem to be incomplete and at minimal cost to EDF with maximum cost locally. If the budget is so restricted I do not think it is safe to go ahead.	10091-240-12517			/	
Tractivity 62531	Public	Stage 2	My fundamental objections to EdF's revived Hinkley C are: 1. It carries safety risks, from the health effects of radiation through to the possibility of a catastrophic accident, unlike any other means of generating electricity. The storage of radioactive waste at Hinkley for 100 years after electricity generation has ceased is an example of these risks.	10104-240-637			/	
Tractivity 62554	Public	Stage 2	We live in uncertain times, threatened by such things as rising sea levels and international terrorism. We should be setting an example to the world by phasing out our nuclear industry and investing in other, smaller scale, perhaps more local technologies - if possible led and directed locally rather than by big corporations.	10114-240-1663			/	
Tractivity 62578	Public	Stage 2	I understand Hinkley C is going to be 7 times the size of the original Hinkley A, something you fail to mention in your Summary and which I find extremely worrying, especially when your project at Flamanville in France has been a series of disasters and the EPR system that you're planning to build at C is virtually untested,	10129-240-586			/	
Tractivity 62610	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	20/8/10 - called into the office today to enquiring about landscaping and security, discussed with them when someone called (Personal details removed) from EDF came to visit them. They have heard nothing since. Taking a "stab in the dark" (Personal details removed), but is this you? If not- can you advise of another (Personal details removed) to whom it might be (Personal details removed)	10157-240-48			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62631	Public	Stage 2	The siting of the two most powerful nuclear reactors in the world ne/t to a working reactor and one being decommissioned presents serious hazards and problems with safety and emergency planning if there is a fire or an accidental release of radioactivity. The combined numbers of workers from all the sites and the limited access routes for such a large number of workers to be evacuated from the area will cause serious problems for the emergency services in dealing with emergencies in a satisfactory way.	10175-240-691			/	
Tractivity 62631	Public	Stage 2	Some General Comments as a local Bridgwater resident. 1. I worry about the safety of these EPR reactors, there is much information leaking out about the problems of these reactors and the possibility of a Chernobyl type accident. I do not wish Bridgwater to become a ghost town like Pripriat near Chernobyf in the Ukraine. 2. I worry about this station becoming a target for world terrorists. The damage that could be done in sabotaging the safety systems of these reactors, the two most powerful in the world, or preventing the cooling of the spent fuel (high level active waste) for the hundreds of years it must be kept safe could cause untold damage to large parts of this country.	10175-240-8250			/	
Tractivity 62938	Public	Stage 2	- Will landscaping hide the plant from terrorists?	10177-240-312			/	
Tractivity 62938	Public	Stage 2	a power surge would create a 'Chernobyl' and EDF would have to cover compensation and medical costs (like BP in USA).	10177-240-8736			/	
South West Strategic Health Authority	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- I would ask that full consideration is given to the views of the Health and Safety E/ecutive and the Environment Agency as regulators for the safe operation of the site and guidance for planning against appropriate and proportionate nuclear incident scenarios.	10182-240-3632			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Health and Safety Executive	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>However, we have reviewed those parts of the consultation package which:</p> <p>i) describe or make reference to the nuclear safety/security regimes which HSE/ND enforces; or</p> <p>ii) make statements on matters relating to safety and security of the intended nuclear licensed site.</p> <p>We have reviewed these aspects of the documentation for factual accuracy and consistency with knowledge gained from our work both on GDA and on the proposed development on the Hinkley Point C site. I should emphasise that where we have reviewed technical information in the consultation package, this review was not necessarily comprehensive or detailed, and our comments below (or lack of them) are without prejudice to any regulatory findings and decisions which may ensue from our detailed assessments of a nuclear site licence application for Hinkley Point C.</p> <p>On the basis of that review, on (i) above we do not consider that there are significant inaccuracies in those parts of the consultation documents that describe the nuclear safety/security regime and HSE/ND's role in its enforcement. On (ii), based on our work on the generic EPR design and on preliminary discussions with NNB Genco relating to a future Site Licence application, we are broadly satisfied with the accuracy of the statements in the documents that relate to the assurance of nuclear safety and security within the proposed Hinkley Point C nuclear licensed site.</p>	10183-240-2379			/	
Civil Aviation Authority	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>Airspace Issues. You are reference to our earlier comment. It should be clear however that the establishment of a new or revised portion of protective airspace (a Restricted Area (RA)) is not a requirement of the CAA; the summary of Stage 1 Consultation intimates that the CAA has stated that the CAA has said that "a similar or amended RA around the new facility is needed". The call for a RA area around a nuclear power station (to afford the facility an element of protection from aviation activity) is one for the Government to require and enact through amendment of legislation (Statutory Instrument 2007 No 1929 (The Air Navigation (Restriction of Flying) (Nuclear Installations) Regulation 2007)).</p>	10193-240-724	/			
Civil Aviation Authority	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>The summary of Stage 1 Consultation details that the MoD has indicated that associated new structures may impact upon the operation of 'Lilstock Range' such that there might be a need to relocate the DA. Following te/t suggests a perception that the CAA would undertake the associated consultation and impact assessment; this is categorically incorrect. Whilst the consultation and impact assessment associated with moving an e/isting DA or creating a new one would be subject to CAA oversight, scrutiny and final approval, such work would need to be undertaken by the sponsor of the proposed airspace change. Civil Aviation Publication 724 refers.</p>	10193-240-2032			/	
Civil Aviation Authority	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>aviation Warning Lighting. The summary of Stage 1 Consultation acknowledges the CAA recommendation regarding aviation lighting. In line with our earlier input, given that it would appear that the tallest structure associated with the new development would be perhaps 80m high, the need for lighting would be a recommendation as opposed to a legal requirement.</p>	10193-240-2687			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Civil Aviation Authority	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Gas Venting and/or Flaring. Any venting or flaring of gas either routinely or as an emergency procedure such that might cause a danger to overlying aircraft would need to be appropriately promulgated throughout the aviation community. This seems to be acknowledged within the summary of Stage 1 Consultation.	10193-240-3051			/	
Civil Aviation Authority	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Aviation Promulgation. There is a civil aviation requirement in the UK for all structures over 300 feet high to be charted on aviation maps. Given that the tallest structure is anticipated to be 80m (263ft) high, there would be no civil aviation charting requirement. That said, I understand that the MoD promulgate structures of heights less than 300fet.	10193-240-3365			/	
Bristol Water	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We do not anticipate that the construction activities and arrangements described in the consultation document will impact on our operations. Bristol Water is aware of the risks associated with having nuclear power generation sites within its area of operation and already co-operates with local, regional and national resilience organisations to mitigate identified risks. Bristol Water will re-assess its risk e/posure in view of the proposed development, but it is anticipated that this will not change significantly given the presence of nuclear installations in the south west of England.	10202-240-386			/	
The Bristol Port Company	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- Any potential impacts on the safety of navigation in the Severn Estuary during marine construction and operations.	10204-240-1035			/	
Burnham-on-Sea & Highbridge Town Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The Town Council's policy on energy production is to support in principle all means of renewable energy and the Town Council is therefore broadly in support of a nuclear build at Hinkley Point. Such support is of course subject to due consideration of any application through the planning procedure, which we understand is likely to be via the Infrastructure Planning Commission, or its successor body	10220-240-1527			/	
Burnham-on-Sea & Highbridge Town Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	One of the key issues will be an assurance regarding the safety of the type of nuclear build proposed	10220-240-1930			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	The Health & Safety Executive's concept of 'tolerability' to describe "a willingness to live with a risk so as to secure certain benefits and in the confidence that it is being properly controlled" cannot be met. The risks are too great, there are no benefits and the public could never say now that they had confidence that the nuclear industry was being properly run, controlled (or supervised by government bodies charged with the oversight of that industry) when all around serious accidents happen. Ministers have publicly said government departments aren't 'fit for purpose'; the Rural Payments Agency bungle everything to the point that even my own MP described it recently as a "shambles" and that an improvement from "appalling to merely disastrous" would be welcome (Western Daily Press 28 July 2010); Defra comes in for constant criticism, the Inland Revenue have unrepentantly cocked-up the taxes of millions of people and the Financial Services Authority completely failed to understand what the banks were up to prior to the credit crunch let alone prevent it. The list of incompetencies is endless, so, if Justification is affirmed allowing nuclear build to go ahead, it would be a travesty. When one moves from government departments and public agencies in general to those specifically involved in the nuclear industry, the picture is alarming:	89471-240-6813			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	"If it had been real life, it would have been the most audacious act of terrorism since September 11. When Exercise Lindisfarne got under way on Wednesday, March 17, at the Torness power station in East Lothian, it was to test the defences of Scotland's nuclear industry. And it revealed just how slipshod safety procedures are in what should be one of the country's most secure facilities. During the role-playing exercise a "terrorist" with a stolen security pass penetrated the Torness nuclear power station. He damaged the reactor, caused casualties and took several staff hostage. The emergency response launched by the plant's operators was so riddled with flaws that it failed to deal safely and promptly with the crisis. The exercise was ridiculed yesterday by the nuclear industry's critics. "In the anniversary week of the 7/7 atrocities in London, when we know that a terrorist attack on a nuclear facility could cause major casualties across Scotland and northern England, this Keystone Cops approach is simply not acceptable," said (Personal details removed), an Edinburgh-based nuclear consultant. "If British Energy can't get its counter-terrorism arrangements right, then its nuclear facilities should be closed before we end up with a terrible contamination problem." (Sunday Herald 11th July 2010). I doubt EDF could do much better. I could have cited endless more examples of safety exercises going disastrously wrong. There is nothing in your proposals regarding your own record of emergency planning and response. Am I to believe no weakness has ever been found at all at EDF's nuclear power stations in France? I question your abilities to keep me safe.	89471-240-9074			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	I don't expect you to reveal your interior security arrangements, but I do expect some kind of recognition of the current threats today (e.g. the Stuxnet computer virus suspected of targeting Iran's nuclear power station and Al-Qaeda kidnapping Areva personnel from uranium mines in Niger indicating they are targeting links in the nuclear chain too) and an indication that you have the mechanisms to prepare for the potential threats of tomorrow or are you just waiting for some boffin working in a research/regulatory body to come and tell you what to do? How proactive in this area are you? I have visions of you all looking like Homer Simpson, saying 'Doh! What's happening?' when someone with a bit of imagination sends large quantities of a specially developed, water-resistant superglue up Hinkley C's water intake pipes. You don't appear to have back-up pipes in your plans. Is that wise?	89471-240-10742			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	<p>I'm in my 50s now and I have heard it over and over again that 'lessons will be learned' whenever something has gone wrong. A major nuclear accident is not something you can afford to let happen and then come out with that platitude. Complacency is demonstrably endemic in the industry as illustrated by the complete absence of any documentation in your proposals that show your credentials in this area. .Anything I should know about your record in France, for e/ample? Unblemished, is it?</p> <p>At Hinkley, on our own doorstep, we have had:</p> <p>1994 An 'unauthorised release of radiation' (Environment Agency)</p> <p>2006 '.An increase in air pressure' in the decommissioning and de-fuelled Hinkley A Magno/ reactors led to about nine vents being installed in the rooves of each reactor leading to discharges of radiation into the atmosphere when reactors should be kept sealed for 80 years to allow for radiation decay. Also, Magno/ South claimed that some of the vents had not been fitted with the correct filters.</p> <p>July 2009 An accident at one of the operational AGR reactors (Hinkley B) resulted in 8 employees being referred for medical treatment.</p> <p>A major nuclear accident is a low probability /high consequence event. So was the recent BP oil spill and that happened. However, the nuclear consequences are far greater. We should have learnt from Chernobyl. We've since had major nuclear accidents at Hamm- Uentrop in Germany (1986), Delta, Pennsylvania and Lycoming, New York (1987), Lusby, Maryland and Griefswald, East Germany (1989), Waterford, Connecticut and Crystal River, Florida (1996), Ibaraki Prefecture, Japan (1999), Oak Harbor, Ohio (2002), Fukui Prefecture, Japan (2004) and Montpelier, Vermont earlier this year.</p> <p>Russia's nuclear town and Chernobyl's fall-out area has just been under serious threat from forest fires.</p> <p>How many more lessons do we need?</p> <p>The pro-nuclear lobby dismiss concerns about safety because they don't see us all glowing in the dark that is, from what I can gather, their criteria for determining whether or not nuclear power is safe.</p> <p>With this track record, the prospect of new nuclear build is not only intolerable but horrific. Who needs terrorists when we've got energy companies such as yourselves and people in our government departments seriously considering a new generation of nuclear power.</p>	89471-240-13989			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	f) I understand the reactor is contained within a structure designed to withstand the crash of a commercial airliner. Is the fuel pond and long-term store for spent fuel also reinforced to that level? My understanding is that they aren't. If so, isn't the protection strategy then flawed? What about the store for intermediate level waste? If that were breached, what would be the result? It is worrying that the levels of protection are increased reactively (as a result of 9/11) and weren't anticipated. It is doubly worrying, that it would be impossible to intercept aircraft before they reach Hinkley considering its proximity to Bristol Airport as there would be insufficient time to accurately assess the risk. It is further worrying, that increased protection is not being applied to our existing nuclear power stations. Was this measure for the EPR meant to reassure us? What other vulnerabilities are there? Perhaps, by wishing to capture the 'flavour of the month' issue of CO2 reduction, the use of natural ventilation renders the operational workforce open to airborne chemical and biological attack. Never mind... at least EDF saves energy. Is there a conflict in design objectives between low carbon operation and safety?	89472-240-4149			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	How will this development ensure a better quality of life precisely and the needs of future generations when we are all being endangered? As for delivering sustainable communities and personal well being, in ways that protect and enhance the physical environment - none of these are deliverable. The nuclear mantra of 'The Solution to Pollution is Dilution' is demonstrably wrong as the concentration of radioactive pollution in the environment increases overtime. It doesn't disappear. The hazard increases.	89472-240-9113			/	
Tractivity 62486	Public	Stage 2	- the possibility of a catastrophic accident, although elsewhere in the Stage Two text EdF concede that such an accident is possible;	89473-240-4033			/	
Tractivity 62486	Public	Stage 2	"Any radiological effects would be confined to the operational and decommissioning stages at the HPC [Hinkley C] site" (para 4.4.32 - page 31) This statement is incorrect for two main reasons: i) It does not consider the possibility of radiological impact due to a reactor emergency. ii) It does not consider the radiological impact of the radionuclides that would be synthesised by Hinkley C over the long term - in particular the lack of a robust disposal route.	89475-240-152			/	
Tractivity 62486	Public	Stage 2	"Analysis is undertaken which considers initiating faults and fault sequences that have the potential to lead to a person receiving a radiation dose." (para 4.5.13 - page 12) It is therefore quite clear that EDF consider a reactor accident at the proposed Hinkley C station to be a realistic possibility. This means that the possibility of a radiological dose arising from such an accident should be included in the cumulative environmental impact assessment.	89475-240-715			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62486	Public	Stage 2	<p>(a) London</p> <p>On 30th September 2010, the French campaign group 'Sortir du Nucleaire' (44) released EdF documents (45) that demonstrate that a design flaw in the 'EPR' could lead to a Chernobyl type accident. The EPR is the reactor type that EdF plan to construct at Hinkley.</p> <p>Similarly, the Stage Two documentation prepared for this Consultation process indicates quite clearly that EdF believe that a severe nuclear accident is a realistic possibility. (46)</p> <p>The fall-out from the Chernobyl accident in April 1986 affected areas over fifteen hundred miles away. (47) This means that were there to be such an accident at Hinkley, people living in London would certainly be affected.</p>	89478-240-1051			/	
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>Issue: Scope of operational scenarios appears unnecessarily pessimistic</p> <p>Comments: Whilst operational scenarios should be pessimistic, they should not be unreasonable so. The frequency of operations and the number of units running assumed for the modelling needs further consideration.</p> <p>The Station Blackout Units (SBU) are a second line of defence. It is not normal for such units to be run at the same time as the primary line of defence due to vulnerability to common mode failure. Unless there is some reason specific to Hinkley Point C why all 12 units will run together, we would expect the 8 Emergency Diesel Generators (EDG) running together would be the worst case scenario.</p> <p>However a grid fault could lead to the simultaneous running of all 8 EDG and also the Gas Turbines on Hinkley Point B. Such a fault sequence was seen at the Heysham Power Stations on two consecutive years in the late 1990s.</p>	89071-240-2252			/	
Bridgwater Town Council	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>There will need to be assurance of the safety of the type of new nuclear build and this will be sought primarily through Government National Policy Statements for Energy (EN-1) and for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6) and e/amination through the Infrastructure Planning Commission.</p>	89263-240-582			/	
Bridgwater Town Council	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>- The community and council will need assurance of the safety of the type of new nuclear build.</p>	89264-240-323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	There are unanswered questions relating to flooding. It appears that there are substantial unmitigated risks of the site being cut off by sea inundation or fluvial flooding. This raises serious operational and security concerns and must be addressed.	89288-240-4433	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[6.4.3] Table 6.1 states that the site is not in proximity to MoD assets. This is not true - the Lilstock helicopter firing range is adjacent. Can EDF confirm that MoD view has been sought about the development?	89291-240-6785	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[10.2] This recommends that EDF discuss with NII whether the flood risk to the site is manageable once operation starts. Has EDF discussed this with NII? If so what is the outcome? If not, then how can EDF be sure that their proposed design will obtain a licence for operation?	89293-240-1963	/			
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	5. EdF's safety record In EdF's summary document, "Preferred Proposals: E/planation and Assessment, July 2010", the company says that the operation of the power station will be "undertaken in a manner consistent with the highest standard of safety, reliability and sustainability" (para 1.1.7). However, EdF's track record on these measures is poor. (Personal details removed) from Greenwich University, for e/ample, has said that the company's reliability is worse than comparative operators in the rest of Europe and the United States (9). Last year France was in the humiliating position of having to import electricity from other countries as 30 per cent of its nuclear plant was under repair or closed because of industrial disputes.(10)	89448-240-7290			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The safety of EdF's nuclear activities has been under considerable media scrutiny, especially during 2008, when 100 workers were contaminated by a leak at the Tricastin power station.(11) The incident was taken so seriously by the local vineyard that it decided to change its "appellation" to avoid association with radioactivity. The operation of other EdF plants has also resulted in radioactive leaks. Under the newly acquired ownership of EdF, Hinkley Point B was the focus when eight workers were sufficiently contaminated for them to be sent to the scientific laboratory at Harwell for further investigation.(12) No doubt the worker and environmental safety at EdF plants contributed to the industrial unrest last year, which forced the management to raise salaries by 4.4 per cent.(13)	89448-240-8037			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	EdF internal documents submitted to the French campaign group Sortir du Nucleaire appear to show that safety has been compromised in the ongoing construction of an EPR at Flamanville. A combination of design problems and engineering methods are said to potentially lead to a Chernobyl type e/plosion.(14)	89448-240-8832			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	In short, we are not convinced by the safety claims made by EdF. Although the risks from an accident at a future Hinkley C power station might be remote, the consequences would be unthinkable.	89448-240-9140			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	6. Security of the power station Although Stop Hinkley raised the issue of the security risks associated with a new EPR power station in its response to the Stage 1 consultation, including details of a letter written by Bruno Lescouer from EDF to the French government, there appears to be no reference to this in the Stage 2 consultation. The most important point made by Lescouer was that an EPR could not be guaranteed to withstand the impact of a large airliner but only that of a small fighter plane. In the current period of international terrorist activity and in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, we therefore view the current application as remarkable.	89449-240-0			/	
NHS Somerset Primary Care Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The technical assessment of suitability of the local environment to host an EPR should be subject to rigorous evaluation by a suitably qualified authority. As a statutory consultee the views and evidence provided by the Health Protection Agency (HPA) should be considered paramount.	89459-240-2190			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Given the indicated consequence of blocking the intake / outfall by a ship running aground on one or the other and the nature of the site there is no consideration given to deliberate ship collision. i.e. hijacking of a vessel and deliberately running it into one or other of these structures.	89357-240-17915	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	- That the project is undertaken to the highest standards of safety, reliability and sustainability.	89418-240-8368			/	
Tractivity 62900	Public	Stage 2 Update	Documents submitted to West Somerset Council relating to the preliminary site preparation works make reference to "uncertainties" and "possible fault movement across the site". Have these uncertainties been resolved and has the possibility of any future fault movement taken into account, bearing in mind that for many decades after Hinkley C is decommissioned, nuclear waste will remain on site.	89659-240-0	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62912	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>In light of the failures of the emergency generators at the Japanese nuclear plants due to flooding what precautions will be taken in the design of the new Hinkley point C power plant to prevent the possibility of this happening? The cutaway drawing of a UK EPR on your website shows the emergency diesel generator building bellow ground level will this be the case at Hinkley C.</p> <p>The Bristol Channel floods, which occurred on 30 January 1607, resulted in the drowning of a large number of people and the destruction of a large amount of farmland and livestock. Recent research has suggested that the cause may have been a tsunami. If this or a similar event were to happen again what would the affects be on the new power station and is it being designed with this in mind. I live close to the power station so naturally I am concerned that it is built with the safety of local residents in mind.</p>	89664-240-0	/			
Tractivity 62915	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>Further to the Pre-Application Consultation 2A meeting at Cannington on Friday 4 March 2011, to discuss the EDF's update on the proposed changes to "Preferred Proposals" February 2011 plus Draft Freight Management Strategy dated February 2011 our views are as follows:</p> <p>Accommodation</p> <p>We had previously been assured by EDF in Stage 2 that there was to be no accommodation proposed for Cannington. At no stage in the meeting on Friday 4 March 2011 or within the "Preferred Proposals" document was any accommodation for construction workers mentioned by EDF staff for Cannington or Cannington Court. We have since ascertained that a proposal has been put forward to use Cannington Court for single worker accommodation. We do not agree with accommodation at Cannington Court or indeed in Cannington village for Hinkley C construction workers. It would put a severe strain on policing/medical facilities/car parking etc notwithstanding the obvious implications involved with so many vulnerable young students from B/W College/Brymore School within our midst. THERE IS NO LEGACY FOR THE VILLAGE FROM THIS ACCOMMODATION, Bridgwater College only would benefit</p> <p>Park & Ride</p> <p>In the Consultation Document it states that the Park & Ride at Cannington will be removed after the construction of Hinkley Point C and that the land will be restored to a Greenfield site. At the above meeting, when questioned about this, it became obvious that this is not the intention of EDF in fact it was admitted by EDF staff that the Park & Ride facility will remain after construction of HPC to continue to be used by EDF for their transport etc.</p> <p>There are a number of key issues relating to this proposed park & ride facility i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) close pro/imity to residential accommodation b) flooding issues not addressed within this document c) noise/disturbance between 5am - midnight plus / 7 days per week d) light pollution e) possibility of future nightshifts 	89666-240-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62916	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	I write separately concerning the recent catastrophe in Japan where four Nuclear Power Stations have been engulfed by the sea. Given the prospect of a repeat of the 1607 Bristol Channel Tsunami (Great Flood), we herewith object to the construction of any further Nuclear Power Stations on the Hinkley Point site. Our submission/objection (10) dated 29th. September 2010 refers.	89667-240-2430			/	
Tractivity 62945	Public	Stage 2 Update	US Japanese engineer has miscalculated, as always, innocent people will suffer! EDF record in France is not good and the whole European nuclear safety provisions are being reviewed. So Hinkley, which have already naturally flooded to the height of 6mt in 1600, could also impede the cooling system.	89677-240-217			/	
Tractivity 62956	Public	Stage 2 Update	Forgive me if I am being tedious and correct me if I am wrong but isn't the nature of probability that it is only probable, whereas it is perfectly possible for two 10,000 year events to occur within days of one another? You understand that it is only the logical basis of the argument that I seek, not reassurance that the plant is (probably) as safe as any other piece of lethal equipment subject the operation of human error. Will you be answering the original other questions too? I gather that a tsunami is far more likely than an earthquake and perfectly possible, if not probable.	89684-240-333			/	
Tractivity 62956	Public	Stage 2 Update	Would you be so very kind, since you answer for him, as to ask (Personal details removed) how EdF knows that the ten-thousand year event which opens up the Behole Fault isn't scheduled for 2018? Or even ne/t week? Or even both, since nobody other perhaps than EdF knows that it doesn't go dot and carry one? And how EdF can guarantee that were it to do so that there would be no question of human error or corners cut for the sake of profit which might compound the damage? And no possibility whatsoever that the waste storage might leak? And no repetition of the tsunami of 1607? Future generations might be very glad to have a record of his response.	89684-240-2062			/	
Tractivity 63013	Public	Stage 2 Update	In a time where we have to consider our planet and its delicate balance it is not e/pedient to be shoving more nuclear power plants into it's or our faces. This question should not even be being asked. Why not use wind and wave energy both of which we have in plenty? The west side of our country also has many earth tremors all the time so do not even consider it.	89697-240-1833			/	
Tractivity 63034	Public	Stage 2 Update	The risks of radiation leaks from nucleur power stations are enormous. Those leaks travel huge distances. The week after the Fukushima disaster, I smelt "burnt dust" for days, here in my hometown, and could not breathe normally. We live on a small planet!	89706-240-479			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
South West Strategic Health Authority	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	- I would ask that full consideration is given to the views of the Health and Safety Executive and the Environment Agency as regulators for the safe operation of the site and guidance for planning against appropriate and proportionate nuclear incident scenarios, particularly in light of any new findings following the potential to learn lessons from recent events in Japan and the Fukushima Nuclear Power Plant.	89707-240-2463			/	
Maritime & Coastguard Agency	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	At this stage, the MCA would have no objection on safety of navigation grounds to the submission being consented, subject to the standard conditions. 1. A collision risk management plan should be developed for the pipe laying operation to record the pre planning measures taken to minimize the risk of ship collision and to define the guarding role of the ERRV whilst on location. 2. Please note that a charge will be levied on the applicant, by The Maritime and Coastguard Agency for the transmission of maritime safety information, via Navte/ or Coastguard VHF radio network, in respect of the proposal. Agreement by the applicant to pay any such charges should be a condition of the consent. 3. Unless an agreement has been made with the Fisherman's Federations, details of the deployment should be passed, by email, to kingfisher@seafish.co.uk, for inclusion in the Kingfisher Information Services fortnightly bulletin, at least two weeks before the start date. : 4. The consent holder should notify the UK Hydrographic Office to permit the promulgation of maritime safety information and updating of nautical publications. 5. The works should be lighted in accordance with the requirements of the General Lighthouse Authority. 6. No radio beacons or radar beacon operating in the Marine frequency bands shall be installed without prior written approval by the Secretary of State.	89715-240-732			/	
South Gloucestershire Council	Local authority	Stage 2 Update	We understand that health and safety of nuclear installations is governed under separate consents and regulatory regimes. However, given the unfolding events in Japan and the relative proximity of Hinkley, these issues are of heightened concern to this Council and its communities. We question how we and local communities can access information on the safety and resilience of the proposed new build at Hinkley?	89742-240-8266	/			
Selworthy & Minehead Without Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	The Parish Council still maintains its objections, particularly now after the problems with power stations in Japan.	89753-240-241			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	This hazard has been starkly emphasised by the events at the Fukushima power station in Japan, where thousands of people have had to be evacuated (see attached graphic) (Editor's note: pdf does not include this graphic) and both workers and the public e/posed to dangerous levels of radiation. Even if Britain is not in an earthquake zone, Somerset has e/perperienced a tsunami (in 1607) and the risks of future coastal flooding resulting from climate change are well documented. As importantly, the operators of Fukushima said that their power station could withstand seismic events in just the same way as EDF is predicting that Hinkley C will withstand a range of other hazards. We do not accept the assurances from EDF that nuclear power is safe. The events in Japan have shown that when it does go wrong, the results can be disastrous. There is therefore no justification for adding to the hazards that already e/ist from the operating power stations on the Somerset coast.	89770-240-2668			/	
Sedgemoor District Labour Group	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	- Obviously any such development is going to have serious impacts on the surrounding communities in Sedgemoor and West Somerset. We need to ensure that there are adequate safety precautions built into the system: Chernobyl and Fujiyama, over the last two weeks, come to mind. It is no good saying that the situation is very different and we don't have earthquakes or tsunami in the Severn estuary.	89779-240-7318			/	
11	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	Objection (10). We question the sustainability of Hinkley Point as a site for a further Nuclear Power Station, given the historic details of the 1607 Bristol Channel Tsunami and the possibility or probability of a recurrence - see details on the internet under Bristol Channel Tsunami.	89800-240-677		/		
26	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	4. In regard to all the additional 5000 people and traffic, where can I find your, risk assessment in relation to the safe evacuation of both employees and neighbours in the event of an accident at the power station? What provision have you made for emergency services getting through and what will be the impact on local hospitals, police and fire services in an emergency?	89815-240-4384			/	
33	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	There is plenty of room out-on the coast for the Fabrication Buildings and for storage. It makes more sense security wise to keep things in a more confined space as opposed to spreading it all across the countryside.	89822-240-2202			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	6. The impact of the disaster in Japan has shaken everyone. These are terrible, e/treme events and it is our role to reassure the public that we understand their concerns and are able to investigate and learn lessons. Prompt Government action to commission a report into the recent failure of the nuclear power stations in Japan is welcomed. Through its membership of the New Nuclear Local Authorities Group, the Council will do all it can to support the production of the report due to be carried out by the Chief Nuclear Inspector. With a number of new nuclear development proposals about to be considered across the country, we need to be able to answer challenges from the public and pressure groups about what has happened in Japan. It is crucial that any lessons or recommendations within the Chief Nuclear Inspector's report are quickly endorsed by Government so that these can be factored into the new nuclear development proposed at Hinkley Point and other sites around the Country.	89843-240-3812			/	
39	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2 Update	I write separately concerning the recent catastrophe in Japan where four Nuclear Power Stations have been engulfed by the sea. Given the prospect of a repeat of the 1607 Bristol Channel Tsunami (Great Flood), ,we herewith object to the construction of any further nuclear power stations on the Hinkley Point site. Our submission / objection (10) dated 29th September 2010 refers.	89908-240-0			/	
42	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2 Update	We submit that the site in question is left undisturbed on the grounds of public safety	89911-240-480			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[10.2] This recommends that EDF discuss with NII whether the flood risk to the site is manageable once operation starts. Has EDF discussed this with NII? If so what is the outcome? If not, then how can EDF be sure that their proposed design will obtain a licence for operation?	89293-420-1963		/		
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Issue: Scope of operational scenarios appears unnecessarily pessimistic Comments: Whilst operational scenarios should be pessimistic, they should not be unreasonable so. The frequency of operations and the number of units running assumed for the modelling needs further consideration. The Station Blackout Units (SBU) are a second line of defence. It is not normal for such units to be run at the same time as the primary line of defence due to vulnerability to common mode failure. Unless there is some reason specific to Hinkley Point C why all 12 units will run together, we would expect the 8 Emergency Diesel Generators (EDG) running together would be the worst case scenario. However a grid fault could lead to the simultaneous running of all 8 EDG and also the Gas Turbines on Hinkley Point B. Such a fault sequence was seen at the Heysham Power Stations on two consecutive years in the late 1990s.	89071-421-2252			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	This hazard has been starkly emphasised by the events at the Fukushima power station in Japan, where thousands of people have had to be evacuated (see attached graphic) (Editor's note: pdf does not include this graphic) and both workers and the public exposed to dangerous levels of radiation. Even if Britain is not in an earthquake zone, Somerset has experienced a tsunami (in 1607) and the risks of future coastal flooding resulting from climate change are well documented. As importantly, the operators of Fukushima said that their power station could withstand seismic events in just the same way as EDF is predicting that Hinkley C will withstand a range of other hazards. We do not accept the assurances from EDF that nuclear power is safe. The events in Japan have shown that when it does go wrong, the results can be disastrous. There is therefore no justification for adding to the hazards that already exist from the operating power stations on the Somerset coast.	89770-420-2668			/	
Tractivity 1386	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	In the light of the Japanese disaster can we be assured that in the new plant. 1 The back up power facilities (standby generators etc) are off site say 10Km from the site so that in the event of a major disaster, tidal wave, aircraft, meteorite etc and loss of national grid power can be restored to cooling etc.	89963-240-24	/			
Tractivity 63146	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	Having taken note of the relevant sections of your application to the IPC in regard to the New Nuclear Power Station, I am writing to lodge this objection, chiefly on the grounds of safety.	90075-240-0		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	In relation to the safety of any new nuclear development at Hinkley Point, we will continue to keep appraised of the Generic Design Assessment process to ensure that the UK EPR design, that EDF have selected to construct at Hinkley Point, meets the requirements of the regulators. The Stage 1 consultation would have benefited from the inclusion of more information related to the Generic Design Assessment process. Safety and security of any future operation at Hinkley Point is of paramount concern to the community of Somerset and as such this should be more clearly explained during the Stage 2 consultation.	87910-238-2229	/			Consultation comments at Stage 2 highlighted the paramount importance of safety and security to the local authorities and community. Some public consultees questioned the safety attributes of the UK EPR, and also of the Hinkley Point site in terms of geology and vulnerability to tsunamis. Others sought explanation and reassurance. A response from the HSE noted its role in assessing the UK EPR design through Generic Design Assessment in advance of the Nuclear Site Licence application for HPC.
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	- Categorisation & classification: The EPR design has been found to be not entirely in alignment with international good practice eg on mechanical systems where there is no classification system for delivery of a safe function.	88960-238-3971			/	Other responses noted the experience of construction difficulties and delays on the EPR projects at Olkiluoto and Flamanville. One Stage 1 consultee sought further information on decommissioning and disposal of spent fuel, and on the difference between reactor and turbine power output.
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	"This reactor has had an unlucky history. It was based on the earlier 'N4' reactor of which only four were ever built due to thermal fatigue flaws in the important heat removal system. They took between 16 and 19 years to reach operational output." "Its construction in Finland is nearly four years late with 3,000 recorded building errors (2). The French version is currently two years behind schedule and now the UK regulators are as critical as they can be over the risks with its computerised safety system. EDF may need to apply a thirty year old system to replace it or simply hard-wire it. This is hardly 'state-of-the-art' that EDF boasts of their new reactor design. It makes you wonder how it got approval to get as far as it has in Finland and France." "We could avoid a great waste of time and money by a change of direction and fully backing renewables before that's too late to help stop climate change."	88960-238-4608			/	The Generic Design Assessment (GDA) process will provide the HSE and the Environment Agency with assurance that the design of the proposed UK EPR can meet the regulatory safety, security and environmental requirements within the UK. Provisions within the GDA allow for regulatory queries and concerns to be raised and for the monitoring and completion of regulatory issues (such as system classification and design of the control systems) in a planned and monitored manner. The UK EPR is taking on board the lessons learned from the construction of the reactors at Olkiluoto, Flamanville and Taishan in order to optimise the design, procurement, construction, commissioning and operational aspects of the proposed plant.
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	since the fundamentals of the building design are committed to at an early stage of the design process, other than a radical change of the building structures and/or layout (for example, building underground), little can be done to improve the resilience of the existing EPR containment design. There are no apparent signs that the post 9-11 EPR designs have undergone such a radical enhancement.	88960-238-15992			/	The UK EPR embodies design features that mitigate the effects of an aircraft impact type event, and also is being subject to a design review to take account of the lessons learned from the Fukushima event, as reported on by Dr Weightman, the Chief Nuclear Inspector in the Office of Nuclear Regulation. The outcome of the review will be reported to the HSE. Any changes to the design will be discussed and agreed with the regulators.
Tractivity 1119	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Your proposed EPR reactor is already experiencing serious problems and long delays in France and Finland. According to (Personal details removed), University of Greenwich, "the UK government is in danger of backing a design that could prove unlicensable, unaffordable and unbuildable". If building begins and is stopped, damage will already have been done to this rural area. There are also safety problems to be addressed.	9877-238-6238			/	The geology of the site has been thoroughly investigated and the reactors sited so as to be in a stable geological position. Likewise, the main platform level of 14.0m AOD and the sea wall provided to protect against its erosion have been designed in the light of all factors impacting on sea level, including storm surge and tsunamis.

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1228	Public	Stage 2 Update	The EPRs are also designed to burn MOX fuel which is yet one more reason not to allow it. Do you know that the Hinkley site should be ruled out for any new nuclear build as it is all limestone geology and there is a faultline running parallel to the coast?	89494-238-751		/		<p>In accord with the conditions of its Nuclear Site Licence, HPC will require emergency arrangements which can be implemented in case of an off-site nuclear emergency. As with the existing arrangements for HPA and HPB, these will provide for off-site countermeasures including sheltering and evacuation, and for pre-distribution of potassium iodate tablets within a Detailed Emergency Planning Zone (DEPZ) around the power station. While detailed arrangements will not be finalised until Development Consent has been obtained, the safety attributes of the UK EPR are not expected to require a larger DEPZ than is already in place at Hinkley Point.</p> <p>All gases released from the reactor systems are filtered and treated and short-lived radionuclides allowed to decay prior to release to the atmosphere. All radioactive emissions from the station will comply with the environmental permits issued by the Environment Agency. Spent fuel will be stored in a purpose built storage facility until such time the Government's policy intent of a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) has been implemented and becomes available.</p> <p>The reactor type can be decommissioned to a green field site and there have been examples of this being done in the US, at Maine Yankee and at Connecticut Yankee.</p> <p>In common with all power station designs, the laws of thermodynamics place a limit on the efficiency with which heat produced in the reactor can be converted into electrical power. The residual heat is passed to the sea as a small increase in temperature between the intake and outfall of the sea water coolant. No practicable and economic use has been found for this low grade heat.</p>
Tractivity 1228	Public	Stage 2 Update	You really must act in the interests of the community and resist pressure from EDF etc who are trying to persuade you that building new EPR reactors at Hinkley would bring any benefits at all to Somerset. These reactors are intrinsically unsafe as they are designed to release poisonous gases from the reactor cores every 18 months. The spent fuel would not be sent off site as it is now but stored on site for 160 years. You need to study all the reports on the ?health detriment? these reactors would bring and understand that if the EPRs are ever built it will be a disaster for the local community, not least because the tourism industry on which Somerset depends would be totally destroyed.	89494-238-1061			/	
Tractivity 1270	Public	Stage 2 Update	Can EDF explain what safety design and measures will be incorporated into the design and operation?	89536-238-1234	/			
Tractivity 1297	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	How can we be reassured that these newly designed, extremely powerful reactors are safe?	89563-238-4853			/	
Tractivity 1317	Public	Stage 2 Update	What assurances have we that the nuclear reactor will be able to withstand a tsunami wave which could reach 25ft at this point in the Bristol Channel? It has happened before, the last tsunami was on the 30th Jan 1607 when many thousands of people were killed. Has the design taken into account the very likely effects of a 30ft tsunami wave?	89583-238-38	/			
Tractivity 391	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>I am neither for or against nuclear power due to its low carbon footprint but highly toxic waste. However, I have lived locally to the previous plants and providing all works on the ground are undertaken with the same care that the reactors must be built with then I will welcome the building of this plant and the extra security of energy supply.</p> <p>There are two issues that I am still rather concerned with and they are the disposal of spent fuel and plant decommissioning and secondly the loss of generating potential between the reactor and the turbine output.</p> <p>Though these issues are not a part of the initial works to prepare for building the plant they are a consequence of it to which I would welcome some further information.</p>	9076-238-5835	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62938	Public	Stage 2	It is a reactor with no operating track record	10177-238-8688			/	
Health and Safety Executive	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	In connection with the proposed development at Hinkley Point, you will be aware that we have been engaged in discussions with NNB Genco on matters preparatory to a nuclear site licence application for the construction of a twin-EPR power station. Once we receive a site licence application our technical specialists will begin a detailed examination of that application. A key factor in that licensing assessment will be the degree of commonality between the proposed design and the generic design that we assessed in GDA. We do not anticipate that we will repeat any assessment work already undertaken on the generic design unless there are substantial differences between the generic and site specific design and its safety/security case.	10183-238-1378			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	<p>The picture we are being given is a sanitised, glossy picture that completely skims over what it will all mean, for example, what an EPR is. Are we supposed to assume the design for the UK EPR is finalised and approved? Questions surrounding the EPR are of relevance to this consultation and it should not be just brushed aside as only relevant to the Generic Design Assessment, which is what I feel is happening. Would I not consider the proposals in a different light if I was told that, for example, the fallout zone for these reactors is twice that of existing UK nuclear reactors? (John Large Associates reports). Definitely. I don't see this information in the Summary documents or even on the CD... is it there? It should be. It should also let the public know clearly, right up front and highlighted, that an EPR's operation involves the fuel being burnt differently resulting in increased amounts of hazardous radioactivity and dangerous isotopes being emitted to the existing reactors. It should also include what this would mean in the event of a serious accident:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) How much greater an area would be affected? ii) How many people would have to be evacuated, from where? iii) Where is the analysis of how our existing emergency contingency plans need to be adapted considering a far larger area would be affected? iv) Would you fund an increased number of emergency beds in hospitals after an accident? v) How many? vi) Within what greater radius around the site of Hinkley C would residents receive potassium iodate? vii) Where are the reports on all these things? viii) Where's the radiological survey? <p>The parameters of understanding and acceptance in the local population do not automatically transfer to two new reactors when the operation, maintenance and decommissioning are so different to what they are used to.</p>	89472-238-2278		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>The French Government was so worried by these delays and cost overruns, characteristic of all nuclear build, that it commissioned a report by a former CEO of EdF. The Roussely Report slammed the EPR as too complicated, giving the example that the Dubai government had turned down the so-called Generation 3 reactor design in favour of an older model on offer from a Korean company.</p> <p>In fact the Control and Instrumentation system of the EPR has been criticised in an unusual joint communique by all three UK, French and Finish nuclear safety regulators. The US nuclear regulator has also recently added its weight to the concern that a malfunction in the normal control system could dangerously override the shut-down system. The Nuclear Installations Inspectorate has said this may be part of a list of 'exceptions' to any licence they provide to operate the reactors. So EdF would have to resolve this entrenched problem before the eventual start-up. There are considerable uncertainties here, as the only other available 'hard-wire' alternative is from the 40-year-old N4 design.(4)</p>	89448-238-3138			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>Economic meltdown</p> <p>Energy economist (Personal details removed) has produced an authoritative analysis of the risks and uncertainties resulting from EdF's current plight, for example in his response to Vermont Law School's review of the risks of importing the French nuclear project to the US. Commenting on the study, (Personal details removed) , University of Greenwich (and a member of the editorial boards of Energy Policy, Utility Policy, Energy & Environment and the International Journal of Regulation and Governance) said:</p> <p>"The French nuclear power industry is in crisis on three counts: its new reactor technology, the Evolutionary Power Reactor (EPR), is proving expensive and difficult to build and gaining safety approval is proving slow and problematic; the existing 58 reactors are far less reliable than its European and US peers; and its flagship nuclear companies, the utility Electricite de France (EDF) and the reactor vendor, Areva, are struggling to control their levels of debt... This experience suggests that, far from being a model to emulate, the French experience is a cautionary tale of overdependence on nuclear power and on the state becoming too embroiled in commercial decisions."(6)</p> <p>The original Vermont Law School report, entitled "Policy Challenges of Nuclear Reactor Construction: Cost Escalation and Crowding Out Alternatives. Lessons from the US and France for the Effort to Revive the US Industry with Loan Guarantees and Tax Subsidies", was written by (Personal details removed).(7)</p> <p>(Personal details removed) was even more forthright about EdF's disintegrating policy of exporting the EPR to Britain in a recent parliamentary briefing to Parliament, in which he said: "The issue that Roussey fails to address, and the one the British government needs to face up to, is whether the EPR design is salvageable... Unless things start to go right for the EPR soon, the UK is in danger of backing a design that could prove unlicensable, unaffordable and unbuildable."(8)</p> <p>In summary, there is an undeniable risk that the massive £10 to £12 billion Hinkley C project could collapse at several stages from investment snags to regulators' objections. The supply chain under the EdF project would be affected with dire consequences to construction and other small and medium size firms in the area with a ripple effect to local communities and families. And West Somerset could have a huge monument to nuclear folly sitting half-built on its beautiful coastline.</p>	89448-238-4769		/		
NHS Somerset Primary Care Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>1.4 Further impacts are identified linked to the operational phase of the development. It is considered outwith the scope of this response to comment on the technical aspects of the European Pressurised Reactor (EPR) generic design, as safety and environmental concerns will rest with the Environment Agency and the Health and Safety Executive (HSE). We would expect the assessment to cover the safe management of potential emissions to air and water and safe storage of waste and that best available techniques would be used to ensure the risk posed to the public was negligible. The technical assessment of suitability of the local environment to host an EPR should be subject to rigorous evaluation by a suitably qualified authority. As a statutory consultee the views and evidence provided by the Health Protection Agency (HPA) should be considered paramount.</p>	89459-238-1609			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62912	Public	Stage 2 Update	In light of the failures of the emergency generators at the Japanese nuclear plants due to flooding what precautions will be taken in the design of the new Hinkley point C power plant to prevent the possibility of this happening? The cutaway drawing of a UK EPR on your website shows the emergency diesel generator building bellow ground level will this be the case at Hinkley C.	89664-238-0	/			
Tractivity 62924	Public	Stage 2 Update	'Is EPR operating anywhere in the world?'	89670-238-0			/	
Tractivity 62946	Public	Stage 2 Update	(Personal details removed) wanted technical answers about the proposed EPR - and ostensibly wanted to know if the reactor design is being revisited in light of what's happening in Japan 17/3 -(Personal details removed) phoned and spoken to him and directed him to GDA website	89678-238-0			/	
8	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	4) As Finland has rejected the proposed EDF reactor design as unsafe, we are e/pecting the IPC to follow suit.	89797-238-1863			/	
Tractivity 62578	Public	Stage 2	I understand Hinkley C is going to be 7 times the size of the original Hinkley A, something you fail to mention in your Summary and which I find extremely worrying, especially when your project at Flamanville in France has been a series of disasters and the EPR system that you're planning to build at C is virtually untested,	10129-225-586		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Health and Safety Executive	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Thank you for your letter of 13th November 2009 to (Personal details removed) Nuclear New Build</p> <p>GDA, enclosing a copy of EdF Energy's Stage 1 consultation on its proposed nuclear development at Hinkley Point (Hinkley Point C). As you are aware, the Health & Safety Executive is a statutory consultee for such consultations as set out in the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. My unit in HSE's Nuclear Directorate leads on the Hinkley Point C development project and your letter has been passed on to me to respond.</p> <p>Having considered the contents of the Stage 1 Consultation documentation, I am satisfied that there is nothing in that documentation on which HSE's Nuclear Directorate would wish to comment.</p>	8722-261-120			/	<p>Specific consultation has been undertaken on the proposals for Hinkley Point C with the nearby local community throughout the overall consultation period.</p> <p>At Stages 1, 2 and 2 Update, held in November 2009 to January 2010, July to October 2010 and February to March 2011 respectively, information was provided on the most up-to-date proposals for the main site. The Junction 24 and Highway Improvements consultation did not involve any proposals in respect of the main site but some comments were still received from consultees on main site issues. Issues raised during these stages were focussed around the importance of consulting with local residents and the relationship between them and EDF Energy, the preliminary works applications, and the changing nature of the proposals including the landscaping and on-site accommodation.</p> <p>Several comments were received at all stages where it was felt that those people who lived in the vicinity of the main site should be the ones to decide what happens there. EDF Energy has taken into account all responses it has received during the overall consultation period, and has analysed quantitative responses by geographical location (see Chapter 3 of the Consultation Report). Through work undertaken both during formal consultation (Chapter 2) and informal engagement (Chapter 4) with the local community around the main site, EDF Energy is very aware of the various issues of concern and has amended the proposals in some key areas, such as the construction area, landscaping proposals including the Stage 1 bund, and the on-site accommodation campus. A separate consultation on a Main Site Neighbourhood Support Scheme that is not a part of the DCO application, has also been undertaken with residents within a defined area near the site to ascertain their views on future mitigation proposals.</p>
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>We are pleased to see the proposal at an early stage and hope that the comments in this letter will provide a helpful direction for design development.</p>	8732-261-1790			/	
Crown Estate	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	<p>We are already in contact with the Hinkley Point C Marine Water Liaison Group and thus aware of most of the proposals in the marine environment and will continue to liaise and engage with the Group, especially insofar as we are affected and highlighted above.</p>	8735-261-3017			/	
Trinity House	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>With reference to your letter dated 12 November, 2009, concerning the above, in the interests of the safety of navigation, taking into account any environmental matters, Trinity House have no objections to make on the initial proposals and options for the construction of Hinkley Point C Nuclear Power station.</p>	8692-261-62			/	<p>Where amendments have been made to the proposals, some consultees questioned whether EDF Energy had always intended to make these changes and whether the consultation was just an exercise in public relations. All changes have been made as a result of a mixture of consultation feedback and investigative works feeding into the revisions being made to the proposals after each stage of consultation. As a part of this iterative process, some proposals have come about in later consultation stages than others, but at whatever stage they have been produced EDF Energy has fully taken into</p>
OFWAT	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Whilst the proposal is of national strategic importance to electricity supplies, this is essentially a local matter in respect of associated water and sewerage service provision. You are correct to identify Wessex Water and Environment Agency (Table) as your key Statutory Consultees. We expect that normal commercial arrangements will apply.</p>	8703-261-340			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Wessex Water	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	It is important for Wessex Water to gain a full understanding of these requirements to ensure that we can plan and deliver any necessary capacity improvements at the appropriate time. We can advise that discussion with EDF has commenced and we are currently appraising the need for improvements to the water supply network to meet the increased demand. It is understood that private foul water drainage and treatment will be provided by EDF Energy through existing onsite arrangements. Similar arrangements for surface water disposal will apply.	8705-261-1122			/	account all feedback. Consultation has also been undertaken with statutory consultees and the local community on the preliminary works applications of the Site Preparation Works and Temporary Jetty). One issue raised following the publication of the Stage 1 Consultation Report appended to this report questioned the summaries of feedback, particularly on the preliminary works. Any summaries of feedback at this stage were based on the feedback received at that time. It was not conclusive and further consultation was planned to take place before proposals were finalised.
Countryside Council for Wales	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	With respect to nature conservation, the following comments relate to the welsh and 'cross border' internationally and nationally important sites for nature conservation that could be affected by these proposals: the Severn Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) Wetland of international importance (Ramsar Site), Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI); River Usk SAC, SSSI; River Wye SAC, SSSI. We look to Natural England to comment on possible impacts on English nature conservation interests. We also look to Natural England to comment on matters relating to potential impacts from radioactivity, in line with the agreed protocol between our two organizations.	87810-261-1122			/	Information on the proposals at every stage was provided to consultees, as described in Chapter 2 . Some consultees said they had not had enough information at certain stages. This is partly due to the iterative nature of the proposals and consultation stages. Additional requests for information were made by consultees throughout the formal stages of consultation. Specific requests regarding the main site, such as potential use of land at Hinkley Point A and B, site visits, and investigative work were discussed via the informal engagement route described in Chapter 4 .
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The TER is focused on Hinkley Point C as a whole and the significance of individual project elements, including the preliminary work, appears to have been underestimated. If the temporary aggregates jetty and other preliminary works are to be treated as elements of the project in their own right, we will require more details of these aspects of the proposals including the construction of the jetty, new sea wall, cooling water intakes and outfalls, and the refurbishment of Combwich Wharf. This information should be provided and discussed with us prior to submission of any preliminary work applications.	88840-261-5409	/			Other consultees commented upon Stogursey not being mentioned in consultation maps at Stage 2 Update. Any area names were intended only to make consultation maps understandable and were no reflection on EDF Energy's knowledge of the area or on the desire to receive feedback from consultees from particular areas.
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	We have yet to have sight of the Master plan that was presented to CABE last year. Until we have copies, we are unable to provide any guidance on the design principles of the on-site project. We would however suggest that sensitivity should be given to where new infrastructure, especially the new roundabout, car park and buildings are located in respect of the impact upon the setting to Pixies Mound. We would also question the amount of land take up for this development and ask that any new build is kept to the minimum necessary in this green field location.	88840-261-8255			/	Some consultees commented on a wish for more information on the Generic Design Assessment process. EDF Energy is not responsible for this process. However, it is part of what needs to be completed in order to build and operate Hinkley Point C under the current proposals, and therefore it was made clear to consultees where they could find more information
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	We would ask that the possibility of reusing some of the existing Hinkley A & B site should be investigated in order to reduce the area of land take. If this has already been discounted then we would ask that this is clearly indicated in future consultation information so that a more comprehensive understanding of the reasons for not reusing components of this site including the existing electric Sub-station can be established.	88840-261-10498		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	<p>Summary of Observations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Lack of detail on Preliminary Works -Lack of justification of Associated Development sites -Proposals put together with the absence of a traffic model to assess impact -Lack of supporting detail and evidence to underpin and inform strategy -Limited evidence of consultation and true engagement e.g. visual effects and impact on perception (what effect might there be on Tourism?) -Associated Development - fundamental questions on workforce estimates / local labour capacity - 50% high -Unclear as to how the development and investment will benefit communities and places in the long term -Questions on the extent of EDF influence on the supply chain and how any benefit might be secured - unclear on what activity will underpin labour force development -Little information on how EDF proposals integrate with wider regeneration and economic objectives -Limited definition of planning mitigation and community benefit -Concern about impact on Tourist Accommodation and impact of increased demand for private rented accommodation <p>(Editor's note: see pdf page 35. Map not entered into database)</p> <p>Summary of Observations - the Site</p> <p>Para 2.2 of App 3 - Pages 139 - 141</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Master-planning and Visual Impact -Impact of the bund -Additional Site Access -Transmission Infrastructure -Spoil / Soil Storage -Workers Accommodation Campus -Public Rights of Way 	88800-261-5273			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	<p>4.9 A concern is registered that little detail is provided within the Stage 1 document on the preliminary works and the consent processes for these works. Further details are requested from EDF on the preliminary works aspects of the proposals as well as other elements of the project, including the construction of the jetty, new sea wall, cooling water intakes and outfalls, and refurbishment of Combwich Wharf.</p>	88890-261-27512	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	4.10 The response also recommends that EDF considers all the comments and recommendations set out in the Technical Evaluation Report (Appendix 3) including comments on geology, soils and land use, land contamination and waste, hydrogeology, hydrology, drainage and flood risk, fresh water quality, marine water and sediment quality, hydrodynamic and coastal geomorphology, terrestrial, marine and coastal flora and fauna, noise and vibration, landscape and visual amenity, archaeology and cultural heritage and amenity and recreation.	88890-261-27931			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	In relation to the safety of any new nuclear development at Hinkley Point, we will continue to keep apprised of the Generic Design Assessment process to ensure that the UK EPR design, that EDF have selected to construct at Hinkley Point, meets the requirements of the regulators. The Stage 1 consultation would have benefited from the inclusion of more information related to the Generic Design Assessment process. Safety and security of any future operation at Hinkley Point is of paramount concern to the community of Somerset and as such this should be more clearly explained during the Stage 2 consultation.	87910-261-2229			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	e) In terms of the landscape and visual impact, there will clearly be a significant impact as a result of the development of the site. Overall the appearance of the station as indicated in the document presents significant risk to the perception of the coast and its rural setting. Whilst a Masterplan has been developed it is not clear from the information presented what attempts can be made to mitigate against the inevitable impacts. More needs to be done to ensure a better "fit" into its landscape. Furthermore, the document makes reference to the development of a landscape buffer to reduce the impact of the construction phase to the local communities. It is suggested that EDF undertake specific consultation and engagement with the local community, and key stakeholders (such as the AONB Service) to ensure that the design of the 'environmental buffer' takes account of their views.	87910-261-5036	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	c) It is important that there is continued and effective dialogue on all aspects of the proposal on the main site and the associated development so that all potential impacts are taken into account prior to the submission of an application.	87920-261-4069	/			
Kilve Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	1.1.10 The village of Shurton lies to the south of the development, in some cases, less than 100 yards from the boundary of the development. That should be made abundantly clear.	88930-261-224			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	The authorities are concerned that the information made available on the preliminary works has not allowed the public to influence the development of these elements of the overall project. No options have been presented and little information on the details of the proposals was made available. There is significant local concern about these elements of the project and to date no proper justification has been offered regarding the need for these elements of the project other than notional commentary on EDF's programme.	88070-261-0			/	
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	The authorities therefore require that more details are provided on preliminary works aspects of the proposals as well as other elements of the project, including the construction of the jetty, new sea wall, cooling water intakes and outfalls, and refurbishment of Combwich Wharf. This information should be provided and discussed with the local authorities and the relevant statutory bodies prior to submission of any preliminary work applications.	88070-261-896	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	In addition, the authorities require further information on the planning strategy for these applications, including the consultation activities programmed for all elements; the relationship of technical information and the mechanisms to evaluate cumulative effects of the development in its entirety.	88070-261-1347	/			
Tractivity 737	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? There was no clearly justified reason for needing it in the first place, unless of course you propose to build Hinkley D there as well but haven't got around to telling us yet.	9495-261-438			/	
Tractivity 784	Public	Stage 2	4. Any other ideas or comments? definatly NO to all of the above. bridgwater is to far from the hinkley site think of the carbon footprint save a lot of money by not building the power station	9542-261-1732			/	
Tractivity 789	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I would like more information on the temporary jetty planned for the delivery of bulk materials, as unclear why such a jetty could not be permanent thus reducing the need to expand the facilities at Combwich	9547-261-882	/			
Tractivity 800	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? not a local resident but would hope that their views are listened to and acted on.	9558-261-389			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 809	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? More information required on the impact this will have on Cannington and Bridgwater. Preliminary works will require an increase in traffic to the site; how will this be mitigated?	9567-261-1134				
Tractivity 864	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Glad to see the local residents knew what was happening before it did.	9622-261-471			/	
Tractivity 919	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Local opinion ignored	9677-261-129			/	
Tractivity 920	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I think it is very important to get all these things right before you start any building. Of course it is not possible to please everyone but it is vital to please everyone but it is vital to please the majority to keep your public image favourable. To have said you respect Cannington and completely ignore Stogursey - the whole parish - was a big mistake	9678-261-7223			/	
Tractivity 936	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? EDF must think that we are all fools! The probability is that EDF originally extended the southern portion of the site up to a few feet of the residents' homes to create a furor, then move northwards to give the impression that EDF were good guys and listening to the people's concerns. Get real EDF no one believes anything anymore!	9694-261-558			/	
Tractivity 937	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? The further away from dwellings the better but it is regrettable that EDF chose to put the boundary near houses in the first place. It was probably a concession you were planning to give to appease the locals if needs be.	9695-261-595			/	
Tractivity 940	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? We don't live quite as close but am sure people who live nearer will be relieved.	9698-261-476			/	
Tractivity 942	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? This is for the local residents to decide	9700-261-639			/	
Tractivity 942	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? See question 2	9700-261-1163			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 981	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Very pleasing that you have listened and taken positive action	9739-261-452			/	
Tractivity 985	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The proposed arrangement is very much larger than expected - the new reactors are much larger than the existing sites A and B. EDF have taken far more land from the countryside than is necessary. The locality - road system, local infrastructure would not cope with this proposal. I am not impressed with the landscaping proposal - the trees EDF intend to plant will not be big enough to make a significant cover and natural looking landscape. We do not want formal planting and layout here; we enjoy the countryside looking natural as it does at the moment. I am very concerned about the bulldozing of the habitat of many of our wild animals and insects, and the trees and wild plants. I am very disappointed in EDF's attitude to the local parishioners - they don't act upon our concerns. I am very worried indeed about the proposals.	9743-261-129			/	
Tractivity 985	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? My concern is that you are taking far too much land from the local people. When EDF moved the Southern boundary it was only after much arguing and I feel that this was a tactical approach by EDF to give the impression that they had actually listened to local views. If the logistics of the movement of materials and machinery were thought about more thoroughly there would be no need to take so much land away from us.	9743-261-1222			/	
Tractivity 986	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Powerstation far bigger than I was led to believe, when first told about it by EDF. Worried and upset that so much (500 acres) of land being bulldozed away and the old barns to be demolished. Rare and precious wildlife killed and disrupted. Trees to be planted not big enough. I won't see them mature in my lifetime. Worried about EDF's attitude to this and to the local people. Very worried indeed about this proposal.	9744-261-129			/	
Tractivity 1011	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? How big of you! Is this question an exercise in P.R.? Aren't we good at listening? It seems to be the only thing you've listened to so far! Probably no coincidence either given that the majority of the Shurton/Burton Stogursey community are pro-nuclear by virtue of being dependant on British Energy for employment or have close family members who are employed by British Energy!	9769-261-1337			/	
Tractivity 1034	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below WE AGREE WITH ALL OBJECTIONS RAISED BY STOGURSEY PARISH COUNCIL	9792-261-5749			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1044	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? I can appreciate concerns of local residents	9802-261-424			/	
Tractivity 1048	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below My views are the same as Stogursey Parish Council.	9806-261-5719			/	
Tractivity 1049	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I agree with the views expressed by the Stogursey Parish Council	9807-261-5719			/	
Tractivity 1062	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? I think the response is the correct one. It probably caused more grievance than was necessary if good communications channels and the ability to make decisions and act had been in place.	9820-261-513			/	
Tractivity 1083	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? I think it is great you have listened to local residents concerns but it only makes me think you did not need to buy so much land in the first place	9841-261-494			/	
Tractivity 1103	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? The local residents need to be satisfied with your proposals.	9861-261-389			/	
Tractivity 1111	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? construction of the jetty should be delayed until the load requirements are finalised, otherwise this prejudices and prejudices the consultation re combwich i.e. "we have to have combwich wharf because our temporary jetty is too small"	9869-261-886			/	
Tractivity 1114	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I fully endorse the Stogursey Parish Council Response and would like this e-mail to be included as my response to the Stage 2 Consultation. I am using my neighbours? computer to communicate my respon	9872-261-5739			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1115	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I fully agree with the responses of the local parish council (Stogursey) Please accept this e-mail as my response to the stage 2 proposals. I am submitting this on my neighbour?s computer.	9873-261-5731			/	
Tractivity 1116	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I would like this e-mail, which is sent from a neighbour?s computer, to stand as my response I fully agree with all the comments made in the Stogursey Parish Council?s response	9874-261-5759			/	
Tractivity 1137	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Not detailed enough to make informed comment. Cheapest option for EDF & most expensive for the local population pursuit shakes confidence in EDF capability, Betrayal of Nuclear industry covenant of trust to the public.	9895-261-6234			/	
Tractivity 1147	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Because of the risk of pollution.	9905-261-129				
Tractivity 1149	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below We need to build this and other nuclear power stations to meet the energy needs of the country. Being a Somerset resident I also welcome the opportunity to comment on EDF?s proposals.	9907-261-5889			/	
Tractivity 1169	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Site not near my residence too many people have views on what does not really concern them.	9927-261-391			/	
Tractivity 1172	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Get the whole project done as quickly as possible! Keep local people FULLY informed.	9930-261-125			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1173	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The overseeing of the landscaping of the site seem to have taken on board some of the concerns of local residents by proposing to move the workers accomodation a little further away from properties in Shurton but I was dismayed to hear the new proposed site is on top of the ridge nearby, therefore it will be much more visible to Shurton, Burton and all surrounding areas. You are planning to put a band of trees to the south of the site to minimise the eyesore of the boundary fence but I fear there will only be a small line of trees on the outside of the west boundary fence therefore the view from Burton, other hamlets and some public footpaths will have adequate screening.	9931-261-125			/	
Tractivity 1175	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? EDF at last, responded to the grave concerns and presure from the local residents.	9933-261-640			/	
Tractivity 1182	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? This site WILL need landscaping. All works should take into account views from local people from Burton, Shurton, Stogursey and the hamlets. Local dialogue WILL BE worth the effort.	9940-261-125			/	
Tractivity 1186	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? It is up to the people of Shurton, Burton and the locality to judge this	9944-261-125			/	
Tractivity 1186	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Again it is up to the local people of Burton, Shurton and area.	9944-261-451			/	
Tractivity 1194	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The arrangements seem satisfactory for the power station and its functions, but they cannot be seen as satisfactory for the residents here. We cannot easily adjust to a ?blot on the landscape? The people in the villages nearest to Hinkley Point have many concerns which are not answered.	9952-261-129			/	
Tractivity 1195	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? This move of boundary I believe was planned well in advance to give the impression of compliance to the wishes of the local community. The totla area of land being destroyed would reduce the area required. Also the 700 bed campus is not needed on site feeing up more land.	9953-261-801			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1213	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? (Continued from1) That youve thought about climate change and sea level rises? Ask me questions about that, lets have an open, active dialogue about options and choices. Don?t insult me with landscaping. (Question2) For more information ask the people of Shurton, Burton + Stogursey. They dont get the luxury of NIMBY.	9971-261-1321			/	
Tractivity 1235	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? Awful. Please keep hinckley in hinckley.	89501-261-805			/	
Tractivity 1244	Public	Stage 2 Update	It is amazing EDF have even thought of the FRR system. It seems you are considering all aspects - you must however keep consulting throughout the consultations, plans and build of this structure. "LEt it be a pride thing, not a thorn in our sides".	89510-261-2083			/	
Tractivity 1255	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? What changes	89521-261-756			/	
Tractivity 1283	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? No real change.	89549-261-926			/	
Tractivity 1284	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? Very little change. Window dressing.	89550-261-912			/	
Tractivity 1288	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? Listen to those it actually affects	89554-261-576			/	
Tractivity 1308	Public	Stage 2 Update	I cannot believe one thing coming from EDF now as being truthful. I will resist all EDF plans until they listen to the Cannington Community wishes.	89574-261-571			/	
Tractivity 1356	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? Lack of detail again.	89622-261-846			/	
Tractivity 1374	Public	Stage 2 Update	Night shift working is a low blow to instigate at this advanced stage in the consultation. it is also unacceptable.	89640-261-274			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 433	Public	Stage 1	3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction? Not using these rights of way I think that this should be answered by those who do	9353-261-819			/	
Tractivity 526	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? Consult with the local people as to what they want done.	9197-261-622			/	
Tractivity 597	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? We all know we need a new power station to keep the lights burning - Why Hinkley I ask myself!!! Why did you buy/rent 250 acres first of all, then move the goal posts and acquire another 200 acres - Both existing Hinkley sites don't sit on any where near that amount. Worry about selling my house during construction of your site.	9263-261-5323			/	
Tractivity 662	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? I realise that the country needs extra power, be it by nuclear or any other sources and having two stations constructed in this area in the past with minimal disruption as opposed to the development of Hinkley	9326-261-4196			/	
Tractivity 671	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Again, for local residents to discuss	9334-261-5348			/	
Tractivity 50878	Public	Stage 1	Question 2 Restoration of the site This is also for local residents.	9393-261-960			/	
Tractivity 62307	Public	Stage 2	This note is written in the spirit of trying to help. I said at one of the many meetings that it was astonishing that EDF had managed to alienate a local population who were essentially pro-nuclear. Despite the concession on the Southern Boundary the local population, who WHAG try to represent, remain very anti EDF. The main reason is the huge area of land that you have taken and the damaging effect this will have on our lives, it is not accepted that you need it. In the last few days the Stop Hinkley Campaign have been active locally and are gaining support. People are signing their various forms which at present do not seem to be anti-nuclear, but as a person with experience of Stop Hinkley. I do not trust them. You will understand that the Stop Hinkley will cause you more trouble than WHAG, who are not anti-nuclear. There is evidence that local people are turning to Stop Hinkley because they think that they are getting nowhere with WHAG. WHAG are going to campaign against the Campus, and for positive steps on your behalf to tackle the increase in traffic that is bound to occur on our local roads. We would ask that you listen sympathetically to our requests to enable us to better compete with Stop Hinkley.	9996-261-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62385	Public	Stage 2	- We assume that Hinkley Point C will not be the last of the nuclear power stations and that future plans will be made to build an Hinkley Point D - so it is extremely important that the current proposals and developments are the correct ones for now and 100 years ahead.	10048-261-6654			/	
Tractivity 62430	Public	Stage 2	I fully endorse the views of the Parish Council, District Council and WHAG as stated in their responses. This letter has been copied to WSDC SDC, our MP and the IPC	10064-261-3092			/	
Tractivity 62434	Public	Stage 2	I hereby object to the entire planning application submitted by EDF as its a chapter of lies and false statements made in public meetings and in so called consultations. I do not object to the provision of Hinkley 'C' station as there is a real need for more power sources. However, the prospect of Hinkley 'D' and all these problems starting all over again causes some concern. I note with interest that EDF has been very careful not to mention the proposed 'D' station.	10067-261-2535			/	
Tractivity 62449	Public	Stage 2	However, these much needed new nuclear stations should not be built with apparent disregard to the feelings of local communities with companies putting forward fabricated timescales to try and push ahead with planning issues.	10075-261-334			/	
Tractivity 62559	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	We just do not have any faith/trust in EDF and their proposals to eliminate all of the above. We feel they are just not listening to or accepting what the local (Shurton) residents really want. It is Shurton that will mostly suffer from the proposed build. We are not impressed with EDF at all, and we will not be holding our breath waiting for EDF to prove us wrong.	10116-261-250			/	
Tractivity 62574	Public	Stage 2	At the moment, the level of "anti-power station" movement appears to be quite low. Jeopardies the future continued enjoyment and the very existence of the area we chose to live our lives, and EDF could find itself involved in a completely different situation!	10125-261-4137			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62577	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>2 We have reduced the amount of land to be used during the construction in the southern part of the site in response to concerns from local residents. What are your views on this proposal?</p> <p>Unsatisfactory</p> <p>- That the encroachment of the southern boundary upon a small settlement was ever contemplated at all and considered potentially acceptable is indicative of the barbarity of EdF's approach. That it took over a year of protest for the company to move the boundary slightly back, to a point that was already a generous compromise proposal on the part of the residents and that this should have been done only when the company realized that without this agreement, secured at ever more desperate and angry meetings with residents, they would not be able to proceed to Stage 2 is further indication of the absence of local consideration and responsiveness on EdFs part. That having moved the boundary back at the very last minute the company should then make the conscious effort to bring this action to repeated prominence in their Stage 2 publications and that they should use this to display their skilled local negotiating skills while overlooking many other omissions and errors of fact in the rest of their documents seems profoundly opportunistic and cynical.</p>	10128-261-1467			/	
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Please keep CABE in touch with the progress of this scheme. If there is any point that requires clarification, please telephone me.	10185-261-8993			/	
Ministry of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	I note that the notice issued under section 4 of the Planning Act 2008 confirming EDF's intention to apply for a development consent order for the new nuclear power station includes the temporary jetty and cooling water tunnels as associated elements. Taking into account the timescales identified for the implementation of the development programme, it is therefore strongly recommended that EDF engage with this office as soon as possible to identify mitigation and management arrangements to facilitate the marine works identified in the submission.	10266-261-958			/	
Natural England	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	1) There are limited maps of some of the proposals, we need to make sure we all have a simple map showing locations of main areas of concern to us, linked to the locations and their names in the project proposals. (Personal details removed) asked me to look at 'coombwich wharf' but it's not easy to find these easily. Overall I don't think many of the maps are clear enough in what they are trying to present.	89114-261-3592				

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There are several conclusions reached which are questionable, for example, paragraph 4.2.2 that there is "general support for the proposed preliminary works". The authorities question (i) how reliable this statement is, and (ii) the reliability of support which was found given that the nature of the preliminary works and the impacts on local communities was not sufficiently described and explained at Stage 1. Furthermore, paragraph 4.2.2 that there is "general support for the park and ride at Junction 24". The authorities question how this conclusion was reached given the significant concerns raised by the local community of Stockmoor, North Petherton during the Stage 2 consultation process.	89295-261-4339			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Initially, fortnightly pre-application meetings were held between EDF Energy and West Somerset Council to discuss preliminary works applications in spring 2010. This process commenced on the 24th March and lasted approximately 6 weeks (3 meetings). However these meetings were then cancelled at the request of EDF Energy and did not recommence. It is stated in the revised SOCC that EDF Energy will consult with the affected local communities and take their views into account before finalising preliminary works applications. However, based on consultations with local residents, in particular in the Shurton and Burton areas, it would appear that there continues to be uncertainty about when works might commence, what they will ultimately comprise and a great deal of concern regarding the principle of the preliminary works, in particular in relation to impacts from noise, dust and traffic and impacts on quality of life and access.	89296-261-4910			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The authorities require further information and pre-application discussions on the preliminary works and any other non IPC applications to be submitted to the local authorities, including discussions on a draft heads of terms, prior to the submissions of planning applications to the local authorities.	89296-261-6536	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	It is stated in the revised SOCC that EDF Energy will consult with the affected local communities and take their views into account before finalising preliminary works applications. A statement on their consultation webpage notes that consultation on the preliminary works with local residents took place on the 19th April 2010. Reference is also made to further meetings with local residents in May and June to provide updates on works taking place. However, based on consultations with local residents, in particular in the Shurton and Burton areas, it would appear that there continues to be uncertainty about when works might commence and concern regarding the preliminary works, in particular in relation to impacts from noise, dust and traffic and impacts on quality of life and access.	89319-261-1896			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Conclusion reached in paragraph 4.2.2 that there is “general support for the proposed preliminary works”. The authorities question how reliable this support is given that the nature of the preliminary works and the impacts on local communities was not sufficiently described and explained at Stage 1.	89319-261-5431			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>The principle of development for a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point C is driven fundamentally by national policy, as set out in draft National Planning Statement EN-6. This policy document lists Hinkley Point C as a site, following the Strategic Siting Assessment, as being potentially suitable for the deployment of a new nuclear power station by the end of 2025 (para. 5.1.1).</p> <p>The development of new nuclear capacity at Hinkley Point C does benefit from the precedent of a previous Inspector’s recommendation that consent should be granted. In 1990, the Public Inquiry summary report by Michael Barnes QC examined four main issues relating to: (i) the need for major new generating capacity; (ii) economic and associated matters and government policy; (iii) safety and the effect on health of the proposed Pressurised Water Reactor (PWR); and (iv) the local and environmental effects of the proposed PWR. The report concluded that the Secretary of State for Energy should grant conditional consent under s36 of the Electricity Act 1989 for the extension of the Hinkley Point nuclear power stations by the construction of an additional PWR generating station.</p> <p>It should be recognised that the proposals of the CEGB in the late 1980s differed in many respects to the proposals that are currently the subject of consultation by EDF Energy. The main differences are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One reactor was proposed by CEGB with different technologies (PWR) compared to two reactors by EDF Energy with UK EPR nuclear reactor technology. The scale and visual impact of the current proposals are therefore greater than the proposals of the 1980s. • The current proposals require the high level radioactive waste to be stored on site for at least 160 years. The storage of this type of waste on site for this length of time was not a feature of the 1980s proposals. • Any proposals for supporting infrastructure, training, skills development and procurement were backed up through funding from government. This included a commitment to provide a Bridgwater bypass which was considered necessary to mitigate the traffic impacts within Bridgwater. The current proposals are being taken forward by the private sector with no guarantee of funding for essential supporting infrastructure and for training and skill development initiatives. 	89333-261-5384				
Tractivity 62883	Public	Stage 2 Update	Stogursey seems to have vanished from your map and detail. As a Stogursey resident, please advise how and to what extent our lives are going to be blighted by this ill advised project.	89655-261-53			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62907	Public	Stage 2 Update	4. The village of Stolford and its scattered farms need to be included in your planning and benefits to the local community. We are far closer to you than Stogursey and about the same distance as Wick. We are exactly downwind due west of you and would thus receive the brunt of your building dust and fumes as well as noise. (When Hinkleys A & B were built, Stolford was of course included, with tree gifts to screen out the view of the building site, and regular radioactivity checks on water, garden produce etc. We are only just over a mile from the Power Station site so why are we being excluded? We are indignant!	89662-261-1313				
Tractivity 62940	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	We live at (Personal details removed), which is probably the closest dwelling to the proposed new reactor site and arguably we will be one of the most dramatically affected properties in the local vicinity. I would like some answers to the following questions please;	89675-261-0			/	
Tractivity 62940	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	We would appreciate some feedback on our concerns above please. We shall look forward to hearing from you.	89675-261-2286			/	
Tractivity 62955	Public	Stage 2 Update	When we were first consulted about the proposed building of Hinkley C we were assured that the only time there would be 24 hour working would be during concrete pours. We were assured that the maximum general hours of working would be from 7am to 7pm Monday to Friday and Saturday mornings only unless something exceptional was happening. We accepted this as fair. You now tell us we will have 24/7 working for the next seven years at least. Do you seriously think this is fair? I and most other people living in Shurton want an answer to this question.	89683-261-1070			/	
Tractivity 62992	Public	Stage 2 Update	Question 71 heard at the last Hinkley A + B Site Stakeholder Group Meeting in February that agreement had been reached to receive spoil from earthworks on HPC site to fill in the old Turbine Hall basement and to use the Turbine Hall itself as a workshop and storage area. I applaud this and consider you should maximise use of the HPA Turbine Hall plus any other part of the HPA site which may become available. Can you say more on this point in your next documents?	89691-261-824	/			
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	The whole list of changes to the associated development and main site layouts do not materially change our advice set out in our Stage 2 response. In some instances the new proposals have reduced our concerns regarding this area.	89711-261-1309			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Royal Mail	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Notwithstanding (Personal details removed) letter dated 10 March 2011, for which I am are grateful, on behalf of Royal Mail Group, I wish to re-affirm our client's objection to the Hinkley Point C proposal as expressed in the submission made to the Stage 2 consultation exercise, as attached below for ease.	89726-261-223			/	
6	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	Question 12 Other comments about the initial proposals None. I should add that my wife has read this letter and, having considered the documentation herself, fully endorses what I have said.	89795-261-3274			/	
16	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	now that EDF's 2nd stage preferred options have been released, I wish to raise further strenuous objections to their proposed application.	89805-261-99			/	
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	2. We have reduced the amount of land to be used during the construction in the southern part of the site in response to concerns from residents. What are your views on this proposal? Satisfactory Unsatisfactory No Opinion Don't know - That the encroachment of the southern boundary upon a small settlement was ever contemplated at all and considered potentially acceptable is indicative of the barbarity of EdF's approach. That it took over a year of protest for the company to move the boundary slightly back, to a point that was already a generous compromise proposal on the part of the residents and that this should have been done only when the company realised that without this agreement, secured at ever more desperate and angry meetings with residents, they would not be able to proceed to Stage 2 is further indication of the absence of local consideration and responsiveness on EdF's part. That, having moved the boundary back at the very last minute, the company should then make the conscious effort to bring this action to repeated prominence in their Stage 2 publications and that they should use this to display their skilled local negotiating skills while overlooking many other omissions and errors of fact in the rest of their documents seems profoundly opportunistic and cynical.	89806-261-1515			/	
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	3. In order to speed up the process of building the new power station and enable us to finish work earlier we intend to apply this summer to undertake preliminary works to prepare the main site and build a temporary jetty for the delivery of bulk materials. If permission is not obtained we will reinstate this land. Satisfactory Unsatisfactory No Opinion Don't know - The land cannot be reinstated. The preliminary works are too devastating. These facts do not need elaboration. - No detail is given for the preliminary works themselves. By what process of double-think can EdF call this question a 'consultation'?	89806-261-3324			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	<p>12. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>- It is disturbing that EdF's 2nd Stage proposals so consistently discount or ignore the feedback that was given during the 1st Stage proposals. Whatever the real cause the impression it gives is of incompetence, inertia, lack of imagination, or arrogance and duplicity. The absence of detail in the documentation. On the basis of which a constructive response could be made, is also disquieting and for the same reasons. The vague general observations and promises made in the paperwork when issues of impact to local communities arise contribute to the widely-held perception that the company is untrustworthy.</p> <p>- The excuses of energy gap and global warming are not enough to justify a scheme devised apparently in haste for a site which is too small and vulnerable to cope with the scale of the development. "If it were done when 'tis done, then t'were well it were done"...not quickly, but properly, with circumspection and careful contingent development, in such a way that the inevitable trauma to landscape and communities is mitigated not only after but during construction.</p>	89806-261-11704			/	
26	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	The fact that your engineers, to quote at a recent meeting, "hadn't thought about fabrication and where it should be located until very late in the consultation period" is laughable - in a somewhat frightening way. You are building a nuclear power station - WHAT ELSE HAVE YOU FORGOTTEN?	89815-261-2513			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1.17 [5.2.1] The Stage 2a information states that 5.8M tonnes, not 5.1, are required to be imported.	89872-261-6007		/		
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	We do not consider that the material presented in this consultation addresses all of the Councils' previous comments and we are frustrated by the lack of detailed direct engagement with local planning authorities on associated development proposals.	89873-261-980			/	
Tractivity 1105	Public	Stage 2	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>How big of you! Is this question an exercise in P.R? â??Aren't we good at listening?â?ø It seems to be the only thing you've listened to so far! Probably no coincidence either given that the majority of the ShurtonyBurton Stogursey community are pro-nuclear by virtue of being dependant on British Energy for employment or have close family members who are employed by British Energy!</p>	9863-1577-1321			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 63141	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	At a public exhibition on the 11th July, I asked (Personal information removed) for details of the Hinkley evacuation plan in the event of a nuclear disaster on site. He said he was sure there was one but he did not have the details. I particularly wanted to know how EDF would plan to handle an emergency evacuation should there be an incident at Hinkley B while Hinkley C was under construction. There will be thousands more people on site then. He promised to obtain these and let me have them. Again, I am still waiting.	90074-261-3126			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Countryside Council for Wales	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Climate Change</p> <p>5.21: We acknowledge that the proposals clearly have the potential to have both negative and significant positive environmental effects with respect to Climate change.</p> <p>5.22 - 5.24: We welcome the consideration of a wide range of measures that could help to address the potential increase in greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the proposals. Some of these options should not only address some of the emission issues but also minimise the potential significant effects on the environment, particularly related to transport, of the proposed development.</p>	87890-262-3677	/			<p>EDF Energy received a number of consultation responses relating to sustainability. This has included comments in relation to the sustainability measures proposed at specific sites, however comments regarding the sustainability of these sites in general were also received.</p> <p>This section provides a response to the site specific consultation comments received for the Main Site. Many of these points are explained more broadly within the consultation responses relating to the 'Sustainability Strategy' and 'Sustainability Evaluation'. The reader is referred to these sections where relevant.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	<p>It is anticipated that per capita CO2 emissions will increase substantially once the construction of Hinkley Point C commences and therefore mitigatory measures will be required. These could include financial support for the retrofitting of existing residential developments with energy efficiency measures and the establishment of local-scale heating and energy networks.</p>	88480-262-2603			/	<p>The site specific comments received for the main site included those relating to emissions, energy efficiency, and various comments in relation to sustainable design measures proposed. EDF Energy has considered a number of sustainability opportunities for the project. The Sustainability Statement explains these, and provides a description of the process EDF Energy has undertaken to consider and integrate these into the project.</p>
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>There is much more opportunity to design the auxiliary buildings to minimise energy use in passive ways. For example, the operational service centre will require comfort cooling. The design could however be developed to minimise energy use by using a shallower plan to maximise the use of natural light and incorporating shading measures in the treatment of the facades.</p>	10185-262-6785			/	<p>Comments were received in relation to emissions from the project. Due to the scale of works at the Main Site, it is anticipated that these emissions are likely to be greatest by comparison to other parts of the project. EDF Energy is promoting a number of controls and</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>Topic: NNB GenCos sustainability aspirations</p> <p>Issue: We encourage NNB GenCo to set high standards of sustainable development.</p> <p>Comment: We commend NNB GenCo in its intentions to build according to sustainable objectives which are stated in the stage 2 documentation "as more advanced than the objectives within the planning system" With statements such as these we would be looking for high quality design providing exemplar developments in BREEAM standards (excellent) and Code for Sustainable Homes (Level 6). This includes Hinkley Point C and the associated developments.</p> <p>The Environment Agency and the nuclear industry have worked together to develop a nuclear sector plan. The aim of sector plans is to build a shared understanding with industry of priority issues. They work to improve the environment beyond the minimum standards of regulation, and provide a basis on which to set performance targets. We would expect NNB GenCo's new power stations to become part of this sector plan in due course and it should be noted that resource usage is an important component of this plan. We would expect suitable equipment to be build into a new power station to enable resources usage to be measured in various manageable parts of the site</p> <p>http://publications.environment-agency.gov.uk/pdf/GEH00709BQGI-e-e.pdf</p> <p>Action: NNB GenCo should adopt high sustainability standards -identified in the Nuclear Sector Plan/ Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards.</p>	89087-262-5489			/	<p>sustainability opportunities, which will take effect during construction to limit emissions. A description of these can be found in the Sustainability Statement.</p> <p>Linked to comments on minimising CO2 emissions, comments were received in relation to buildings' energy efficiency. A number of measures have been incorporated into the design of Hinkley Point C (HPC) to ensure that energy efficiency is maximised. A relatively limited level of detail was provided at Stage 2 to demonstrate how this is achieved, as many of these principles were still in development, and remain under development as detailed design progresses. The Tier 2 Design Access Statement (DAS) for the main site includes specific information in relation to energy efficiency measures applied to buildings at the main site. This includes a description of the standards and regulations that each building needs to meet, in some cases this includes Part L2a of the Building Regulations, however many buildings do not need to meet this standard, as they are governed by the Nuclear Installations Act 1965.</p> <p>For a more general overview, the Sustainability Statement summarises some of the proposals being considered to promote energy efficiency, including EDF Energy's proposals that all buildings will draw power from HPC via a Private Wire arrangement, which means that electrical energy is taken from the power generation process before it enters the National Grid Transmission Network. This electricity will be very low carbon and avoids losses, which are typically associated with grid distribution. Specific comments were received which refer to the design of the Operational Service Centre (OSC). It has very specific design requirements. However, it will be achieving Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) day lighting credits through the use of natural light.</p> <p>Various consultation comments related to the</p>
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>[6.4.2] For occupied non-industrial buildings, EDF aspires to achieve a BREEAM (This acronym is not defined) 'Excellent' rating. This must be an absolute requirement. Will EDF guarantee that these buildings will be constructed to 'Excellent' standard? There is no reason why the occupied industrial buildings should also not be specified to 'Excellent'.</p> <p>[6.4.4] 'For safety reasons it is EDF's policy not to harvest and recycle rainwater.'? There will be a massive area of roofing for rainwater collection which could supply a large amount of the non-potable water requirements on site. Will EDF explain what can possibly be unsafe about collecting and re-using rainwater, and will they reconsider this green initiative?</p>	89289-262-9185			/	<p>Various consultation comments related to the</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>[7.10.5] 'The roof of the office block will be aluminium.' This roof could and should be a green roof. This will help with controlling rainwater run off and improve insulation. It will also assist in achieving BREEAM 'Excellent'. Will EDF reconsider this design parameter?</p> <p>[7.11.10] 'EDF aspires to BREEAM 'Excellent' for the PIC'. This building, of all buildings as the public face of the company, should be 'Excellent'. Will EDF commit to this, rather than simply aspiring to it?</p>	89289-262-10088	/			<p>application of BREEAM at the Main Site. EDF Energy has continued to explore opportunities for achieving BREEAM 'Excellent' for applicable Main Site buildings. The ability to achieve BREEAM is restricted by EDF Energy's need to address very specific regulatory requirements set out in the Nuclear Installations Act 1965. However, BREEAM will be applied to three major Main Site buildings: the public information centre (PIC), operational service centre (OSC) and simulator building / training centre (STC). BREEAM is not proposed for other industrial type buildings on the site, which are typically specialist buildings, have infrequent occupation, are excluded from Part L of the building regulations and do not lend themselves to specific design measures required by BREEAM. Further explanation into the approach taken is provided in Part 2 of the Sustainability Statement.</p> <p>Details relating to the BREEAM strategies, including the measures, which have been identified to achieve the BREEAM targets, are available within the Tier 2 Main Site DAS.</p> <p>EDF Energy received comments relating to the use of rainwater harvesting for on-site buildings. In general, rainwater harvesting is not the most appropriate solution for the main site, due to maintenance issues. EDF Energy intends to apply rainwater harvesting for certain buildings around the main site, including the PIC. It was also suggested that green roofs should be employed. Green roofs will be provided on a number of Main Site buildings. Further information is available in the Tier 2 Design and Access Statement and an explanation for the approach to green roofs is available within the Sustainability Statement.</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Marine and Fisheries Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	INITIAL COMMENTS FOR STAGE 1 CONSULTATION: PROPOSALS AND OPTIONS FOR HINKLEY POINT C NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENT, WEST SOMERSET I refer to your letter of 12 November requesting comments on of the Stage 1 Pre- Application Consultation (November 2009) document you submitted for the above proposal. I set out below the views of the Marine Development Control Team of the Marine and Fisheries Agency (MFA), in consultation with Cefas, on the information provided.	8691-214-0			/	Preliminary works applications for a temporary jetty and site preparation works have been submitted to the relevant authorities for consideration in advance of submission of the Development Consent Order (DCO). The site preparation works include clearing and levelling the site and providing the necessary infrastructure for the main construction activities proposed at Hinkley Point C. A planning application to complete these works has been submitted to West Somerset Council (WSC) and on 28 th July 2011 WSC resolved to grant permission, subject to completion of an S106 agreement and finalisation of the planning conditions.
Marine and Fisheries Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Both the Sea Wall and Temporary Aggregates Jetty are deemed by EDF as preliminary works and may be subject to applications for licences under the Food and Environment Protection Act 1985, as amended (FEPA) in advance of the main application to the IPC.	8691-214-2686	/			The temporary jetty development includes the construction of 'bridge like' structure, extending approximately 500m into Bridgwater Bay and associated onshore infrastructure. The temporary jetty would allow for construction material, mainly aggregates and cement, to be imported to the Hinkley Point C site by sea, thereby minimising the volume of traffic associated with the construction of the new nuclear power station. Applications for the jetty development were submitted in December 2010 and include a Harbour Empowerment Order (HEO) to construct and operate the jetty and two Food and Environment Protection Act (FEPA) Licences which were submitted to the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) and an application for a Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO), submitted to the Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) [hereinafter referred to collectively as the 'jetty applications'].
Trinity House	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	It is noted from the pre-application consultation that Combwich Wharf is to be refurbished, temporary jetties to be constructed and a cooling water infrastructure proposed (horizontal tunnels and vertical wells), in such cases Trinity House will consider any requirements for marking once details have been provided or at the time the application for consent to the Marine and Fisheries Agency is made.	8692-214-376			/	It should be noted that the above described works also form part of the proposals submitted under the DCO application for Hinkley Point C and have also been fully assessed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment accompanying the application.
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	3.4.8 A concern is registered that little detail is provided within the Stage 1 document on the preliminary works and the consent processes for these works. Further details are requested from EDF on the preliminary works aspects of the proposals as well as other elements of the project, including the construction of the jetty, new sea wall, cooling water intakes and outfalls, and refurbishment of Combwich Wharf.	88790-214-25139	/			Need for Preliminary Works Preliminary works applications were submitted in advance of the DCO for Hinkley Point C to expedite the construction programme so the new power station can be operational as soon as possible. The benefits of early deployment are that Hinkley Point C would contribute earlier to replacing the UK's ageing electricity generating infrastructure, to enhancing energy security and diversity of supply and, crucially, to decarbonising our electricity supply. In the event that the planning permission and consent
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	- Preliminary Works. EDF intend to submit applications for preliminary works in advance of the submission of an application for the main project and associated development to the IPC. A planning application will be submitted to the local authorities (principally West Somerset District Council) for some of the preliminary works and a Harbour Empowerment Order Application will be submitted to the Department for Transport for the construction of a temporary aggregates jetty.	88890-214-21551			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	4.9 A concern is registered that little detail is provided within the Stage 1 document on the preliminary works and the consent processes for these works. Further details are requested from EDF on the preliminary works aspects of the proposals as well as other elements of the project, including the construction of the jetty, new sea wall, cooling water intakes and outfalls, and refurbishment of Combwich Wharf.	88890-214-27512	/			
Kilve Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Given that it is the intention to create a new harbour, will permission be sought from the local authority in the form of a Town and Country Planning Application (TCPA) or is it more likely that this will be decided by the Ministry for Transport (MFT)?	88930-214-20402	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	Given that the design of these preliminary works should be at a relatively advanced stage, with applications likely to be submitted in March 2010 (according to EDF's programme), the authorities are concerned that further details of these works and consent processes have not been made available as part of the Stage 1 consultation material.	88060-214-5044	/			for the preliminary works is granted, but the DCO for Hinkley Point is not made within five years of the date of grant of the preliminary works, EDF Energy will remove the infrastructure constructed under the site preparation works planning permission and jetty applications and reinstate the land. A number of queries raised within the consultation responses queried whether it is feasible to reinstate the land. Outline reinstatement plans have been provided and submitted as part of both the site preparation works and jetty applications and whilst it may take a while for new habitats to mature, EDF Energy is confident that, over time, the landscape of the area will develop and enhance.
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	The authorities are concerned that the information made available on the preliminary works has not allowed the public to influence the development of these elements of the overall project. No options have been presented and little information on the details of the proposals was made available. There is significant local concern about these elements of the project and to date no proper justification has been offered regarding the need for these elements of the project other than notional commentary on EDF's programme.	88070-214-0	/			As a guarantee that the site will be reinstated, in the event that DCO consent is not granted, EDF Energy has entered into a bond to secure finances to cover the cost of reinstatement of the site preparation works.
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	The authorities therefore require that more details are provided on preliminary works aspects of the proposals as well as other elements of the project, including the construction of the jetty, new sea wall, cooling water intakes and outfalls, and refurbishment of Combwich Wharf. This information should be provided and discussed with the local authorities and the relevant statutory bodies prior to submission of any preliminary work applications.	88070-214-896	/			Environmental Impact Assessment Both the site preparation works and jetty applications were subject to a full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) which assessed the impact of the proposed developments on the environment, including transport and visual and landscape impact. The developments were assessed as individual, standalone projects and also in combination with other relevant ongoing and anticipated developments in the area such as Hinkley Point C.
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	It is recognised that there are three distinct elements to the proposals, and that the Hinkley Point C and Associated Development elements will be ultimately addressed within an application to the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC); whilst aspects of the Preliminary Works are to be addressed within Town and Country Planning Act Applications and a Harbour Empowerment Order (for the proposed aggregates jetty). Further information on the management of these applications is contained within this Stage 1 evaluation.	88090-214-2704	/			Where relevant, mitigation measures are proposed to avoid and minimise impacts. For example, in response to various consultation responses, early landscape works have been completed in the area to the south of the Hinkley Point C site, which will act as a buffer, providing visual screening to the construction site.

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	<p>Observations on Preliminary Works</p> <p>It is understood that EDF intend to submit applications for preliminary works in advance of the submission of an application for the main project and associated development to the IPC. It is also understood that a planning applications will be submitted to the local authorities (principally West Somerset Council) for some of the preliminary works and a Harbour Empowerment Order Application will be submitted to the Department for Transport for the construction of a temporary aggregates jetty. Given that the design of these preliminary works should be at a relatively advanced stage, with applications likely to be submitted in March 2010 (according to EDF's programme), it would be expected that further details of these works and consent processes would have been made available as part of the Stage 1 consultation material.</p> <p>The authorities are concerned that the information made available on the preliminary works has not allowed the public to influence the development of these elements of the overall project. No options have been presented and little information on the details of the proposals was made available. There is significant local concern about these elements of the project and to date no proper justification has been offered regarding the need for these elements of the project other than notional commentary on EDF's programme.</p> <p>The Stage 1 Consultation document is focused on Hinkley Point C as a whole and the significance of individual project elements, including the preliminary work, appears to be overlooked. The temporary aggregates jetty and other preliminary works are treated almost as a necessary step in the construction process rather than elements of the 'project' in their own right. Further details would thus be expected to be provided on preliminary works aspects of the proposals as well as other elements of the project, including the construction of the jetty, new sea wall, cooling water intakes and outfalls, and refurbishment of Combwich Wharf. This information should be provided and discussed with the local authorities and the relevant statutory bodies prior to submission of any preliminary work applications. In addition, the authorities require further information on the planning strategy for these applications, including the consultation activities programmed for all elements; the relationship of technical information and the mechanisms to evaluate cumulative effects of the development in its entirety.</p>	88580-214-417	/			<p>Various consultation responses have requested for transport mitigation measures to be in place prior to commencing any preliminary works. Full transport assessments have been completed and form part of the Environmental Impact Assessments for the site preparation works and temporary jetty development. Mitigation measures proposed relate in kind and scale to the works proposed and the assessment concludes that it is not necessary to construct any bypass through Cannington or Bridgwater to mitigate any of the construction traffic associated with the preliminary works.</p> <p>Consultation</p> <p>EDF Energy carried out consultation on the preliminary works applications as part of the Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultation on the Hinkley Point C development in November 2009-January 2010 and July-October 2010 respectively. In addition to this, the preliminary works were also subject to statutory consultation by the respective authorities to which the applications were submitted.</p> <p>It should be noted that a condition is proposed to be included within the site preparation works planning permission whereby no development cannot take place until an 'information dissemination and complaints handling system' is implemented i.e. a hotline which local residents can call if they have a query regarding works at the Hinkley Point C site.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	<p>The site preliminary works section includes a description of the anticipated initial works to make ready the site for construction. One aspect of these works is the site terracing. Whilst the broad approach to terracing is described, there is no information on the potential need for excavating rock by blasting. Furthermore, there is limited information on the mechanism for managing excavated material other than a reference to stockpiling. No information is provided on the site control to ensure effects associated with air quality and noise are managed, nor the potential requirement for removal of material from site (and associated traffic issues) where this is not of suitable quality for use as engineering fill. Reference is made to the need for suitable profiling of material and re-vegetation to minimise visual impact but details of this are absent. No commitment is made to generation of visualisation material (including photomontages) to demonstrate the expected effects upon nearby residential receptors.</p>	88580-214-2965	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	In considering such mitigation options a full assessment of the routes that maritime traffic using the jetty will take and expected volumes of traffic will need to be completed. The MOD may seek to recover reasonable costs associated with undertaking any works associated with implementing these mitigation options from the applicant. In addition the MOD may ask EDF to undertake environmental surveys and data gathering needed to complete impact assessments necessary to relocate the range area.	8775-214-10284	/			
Tractivity 701	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? NO preliminary works should start until permission to build the power station is granted. Once this permission is in place then a bypass whether from Bridgwater or from Cannington should be completed before attempting to commence with building Combwich Wharf as if both are built at the same time it would increase the danger on the A39 and especially through the centre of Cannington village.	9461-214-888			/	
Tractivity 706	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? What is the point in doing preparation work that you may have to reinstate if planning permission is refused? Or do you have information that isn't available to the public!?	9466-214-892		/		
Tractivity 716	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? No, you must build the jetty if/when planning for the power station is granted	9474-214-1132			/	
Tractivity 726	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Would say this would be a good thing. Hopefully permission will be granted sooner than later	9484-214-917			/	
Tractivity 735	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? No works should commence until and unless permission for the power station is granted.	9493-214-1149			/	
Tractivity 737	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? you have not provided anything concrete by way of a method statement, so this proposal is unclear and cannot be commented on.	9495-214-1101	/			
Tractivity 738	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Excellent idea. Why not something along the lines of the "Mulberry" Harbour utilised at the time of the Normandy Landings in WW2?!	9496-214-882			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 749	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Preliminary works should include the planning and construction of a Northern Bridgwater Bypass, Dunball to Cannington, as proposed at the Hinkley Point "C" enquiry.	9507-214-890			/	
Tractivity 750	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? It is always an advantage to keep well ahead of programming needs to allow for unforeseen delays cropping up	9508-214-1299			/	
Tractivity 755	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I feel that these should not be carried out until the plans have been passed	9513-214-1965			/	
Tractivity 763	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? It gives out the impression to local residents that you are ploughing on regardless. Although these preliminary works would enable work to finish earlier - this of no benefit to local residents as it simply means disruption starts soon and still continues for a set period (i.e. years). It gives the impression of a ?done deal?.	9521-214-888			/	
Tractivity 766	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? We would like to think that EDF would not pre-empt any works until planning permission is granted for the whole site	9524-214-886			/	
Tractivity 784	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? no work permission should not be given therefore reinstate the land	9542-214-1071			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 789	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. What are your views on the proposed arrangement and landscaping of the Hinkley Point C site?</p> <p>Box ticked: No opinion</p> <p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>2. We have reduced the amount of land to be used during construction in the southern part of the site in response to concerns from local residents. What are your views on this proposal?</p> <p>Box ticked: No opinion</p> <p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>No comment</p> <p>3. In order to speed up the process of building the new power station, and enable us to finish work earlier, we intend to apply this summer to undertake preliminary works to prepare the main site and build a temporary jetty for the delivery of bulk materials. If permission for the power station is not obtained, we will be required to reinstate this land.</p> <p>What are your views on our plans for Preliminary Works?</p> <p>Box ticked: No opinion</p> <p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>I would like more information on the temporary jetty planned for the delivery of bulk materials, as unclear why such a jetty could not be permanent thus reducing the need to expand the facilities at Combwich</p>	9547-214-0	/			
Tractivity 795	Public	Stage 2	<p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Are you not jumping the gun, and potentially wasting time and money.</p>	9553-214-1203			/	
Tractivity 807	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Nothing should go head at all, Iam totally opposed</p>	9565-214-1055			/	
Tractivity 808	Public	Stage 2	<p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>wait until you have permission for the power station why do you think that you are any different to everyone else in the country who has to wait until they have permission for their plans.</p> <p>Please do not treat us as stupid this is already a done deal.</p>	9566-214-886			/	
Tractivity 812	Public	Stage 2	<p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>get on and do the work somerset and sedgmoor would be idiots if they dont allow the development</p>	9570-214-1209			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 814	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? why why why dont you have enough land at the site	9572-214-894			/	
Tractivity 816	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Wait until you get written permission - you've known about this possibility for years. Why the sudden hurry?	9574-214-890			/	
Tractivity 821	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? You should not start any works until you have planning permission for the whole project. This will disrupt local communities for longer than would otherwise be the case.	9579-214-890			/	
Tractivity 824	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? For any other building work local authority would not allow any site clearance preparation of site until planning permission had been granted. I think this is a done deal as no one in their right mind would spend vast amounts on a project that might fail.	9582-214-894			/	
Tractivity 828	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? No preliminary works should be undertaken until the Cannington bypass has been constructed.	9586-214-886			/	
Tractivity 831	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Wait until planning permission is granted!	9589-214-894			/	
Tractivity 838	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Re-instating terrain and ancient hedgerows as they were is, of course impossible. Suggest you wait for planning permission.	9596-214-1086			/	
Tractivity 846	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? EDF should wait for full planning permission like everyone else before starting any work. The land could never be reinstated as it is now, as we like it. No preliminary works!	9604-214-1160			/	
Tractivity 848	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? You are going to spend ?? ££ on preliminary work. if permission is not granted you are going to spend ?? ££ to reinstate the land. Crap!!	9606-214-882			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 849	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Dont bother why go to all that trouble when hopefully you will not get planning permission to go ahead.	9607-214-899			/	
Tractivity 864	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Don?t mind. it has to happen	9622-214-1026			/	
Tractivity 874	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Without inside information this appears to display and arrogant confidence that the project will go ahead, ignoring the wishes of the local population and final government approval. The apparent aim of this proposal is to speed up the project.	9632-214-886			/	
Tractivity 875	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Need the power station working asap	9633-214-1074			/	
Tractivity 881	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I am extremely concerned and unhappy about many of your proposals. You are going to make life a misery for a small, very rural village for up to 10 years. There should be no industrialisation of Combwich. It should all be based at Hinkley where there are adequate facilities for storage and fabrication. The majority of incoming sea loads should be offloaded at Hinkley. You have the resources and finances to construct a wharf or jetty there.. Your proposals regarding traffic are not thought out. The Hinkley road is a single carriageway which cannot cope with the proposed volume. An accident on that road could cut off the local villages. If there was then an emergency, the necessary service vehicles would not get through. Overall I think your proposals are, in general, totally unacceptable and I trust that every effort will be made by the local communities and councils to ensure that they are curtailed and amended to acceptability.	9639-214-7476		/		
Tractivity 886	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? If I put up an extension on my house before I had planning I would be told to take it down.	9644-214-948			/	
Tractivity 892	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Not acceptable before full planning authority granted. Spent fuel store not acceptable.	9650-214-1178			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 901	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Impossible to truly "reinstate", and no way of negating disruption to local communities. get your planning permission first.	9659-214-890			/	
Tractivity 908	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Preliminary works sound to be a good plan. This will give construction a good start and can be done in preparation for the main build.	9666-214-1068			/	
Tractivity 912	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Very good	9670-214-919			/	
Tractivity 913	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? These preliminary works in our opinion are welcome - as a family of a 3year old daughter for our and her future the sooner the project gets going the sooner we and our future will have a pretty good security of energy to not only us but also all UK.	9671-214-1369			/	
Tractivity 920	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? 1) This would be a waste of money. 2) What price democracy? This would be an assumption of permission being granted and a lever towards that end	9678-214-1306			/	
Tractivity 920	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I think it is very important to get all these things right before you start any building. Of course it is not possible to please everyone but it is vital to please everyone but it is vital to please the majority to keep your public image favourable. To have said you respect Cannington and completely ignore Stogursey - the whole parish - was a big mistake	9678-214-7223			/	
Tractivity 923	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? The preliminary works SHOULD NOT be going ahead at all until a proper road has been constructed from Dunball wharf to site as it is not satisfactory that site traffic would have to travel through Bridgwater and Cannington, putting pressure on the A39 and affecting local residents.	9681-214-1094		/		
Tractivity 931	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I think you should wait until planning permission is given which will save money if planning permission is refused.	9689-214-1115			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 932	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Why not wait for permission to build; trying to speed up the process may be costly if permission is refused - although this appears unlikely. Also, is it legal?	9690-214-1558			/	
Tractivity 933	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Provison should be made for deliveries direct to the site, e.g. a new wharf at Hinkley Point itself.	9691-214-890		/		
Tractivity 934	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I believe that full planning permission should be granted before any ?preliminary works? are carried out.	9692-214-1170			/	
Tractivity 935	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I think you should wait until you have planning permission before any ?preliminary? works are done. I notice walking down there that the land is already resembling a building site. The loss of established flora and fauna cannot simply be .re-instated?.	9693-214-1168			/	
Tractivity 936	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Permission to build a new powerstation is a done deal. A sensible solution to all the problems is to build a house campus at Dunball for the workforce, use the M5, A38, railway, and use Dunball Wharf and build a bridge across the Parrett.	9694-214-1379			/	
Tractivity 937	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? The use of the sea to bring materials to the site is a sensible and obvious plan. The ?temporary? jetty could be used for the removal of materials following de-commissioning. Presumably this jetty is to be on-side where the existing gantry is.	9695-214-1299			/	
Tractivity 940	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I do not believe that the building of a temporary jetty is necessary just to enable work to finish earlier. Intil permission has been granted, impact on bird and wildlife in the area should be kept to a minimum.	9698-214-1044			/	
Tractivity 945	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? The logistics can be appreciated - but with the change of Government anything can happen.	9703-214-1065			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 972	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I do not believe that any site works should be allowed before the necessary road improvements have been made, particularly the construction of the new Cannington bypass. Under no circumstances should traffic be allowed to pass through Stogursey or the neighbouring hamlets. I would urge the local authority NOT to grant permission for these works.	9730-214-886			/	
Tractivity 981	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? It makes a lot of sense to us	9739-214-1000			/	
Tractivity 986	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Very concerned. it would be impossible to re-instate this land if permission is not granted, even if legal. Decimating trees, animals, plants entirely unnecessary I feel EDF want to ruin this countryside for the wildlife and the people. Very upset and worried about this proposal. This is wrong.	9744-214-1538			/	
Tractivity 991	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Proposed tree planting and screening alongside the Southern And Western boundaries will be totally ineffective as noise and visual mitigation measures due to the tardiness of planting. The trees and vegetation will not reach maturity for many years after construction so will not provide an effective visual screen for the site works close to residential homes. EDF's own experts also have admitted in public that they will also be poor barriers for noise mitigation.	9749-214-129			/	
Tractivity 993	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? You should wait until full planning permission is granted, then you should build a proper permanent quay to take the pressure off the local roads.	9751-214-992			/	
Tractivity 1001	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? As long as road traffic problems are addressed before work begins.	9759-214-884			/	
Tractivity 1005	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Preliminary work should NOT be undertaken until full permission of the powerstation is obtained. This means less disruption for people/area if permission not given and if not given all works/disruption will be in a more compressed time scale.	9763-214-1187			/	
Tractivity 1008	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Preplanning for construction and material supply essential for timely execution of the work. Well Done!!	9766-214-888			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1008	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Nuclear power is the environmental answer to our impending generation shortfall. Any necessary works to enable timely construction should be vigorously pursued. Good luck.	9766-214-6035			/	
Tractivity 1010	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? No work should be undertaken until the relevant permissions are obtained.	9768-214-892			/	
Tractivity 1011	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? No Consent No preliminary works! The idea that building new nuclear power stations will significantly reduce carbon emissions is fundamentally flawed and therefore to go ahead with these works in the absence of any Major consents from Central government is inappropriate. You know yourselves that there are numerous trees that are of a significant age, such that they are impossible to reinstate (In terms of the role they currently play in this ecosystem). You have already had a big impact on the ecosystem at the site by removing Badgers from the land, whose role as top predators may lead to knock on effects throughout the ecosystem. This sort of work is not just at your risk but at the risk of the whole community and ecosystems given the scale and scope of your plans. It is not you that will be left to pick up any pieces or live with the damage such work will do. Awaiting the appropriate consents so that the building of new nuclear power	9769-214-2208			/	
Tractivity 1014	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? please do not damage the local landscape on the off chance of approval.	9772-214-933			/	
Tractivity 1017	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? No preliminary works should commence before permission is given for the power station.	9775-214-943			/	
Tractivity 1024	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? No work should be undertaken until full consultation is finished and planning permission given	9782-214-974			/	
Tractivity 1030	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? You are trying to STEAMROLLR your way forward, we do not tolerate this.	9788-214-1633			/	
Tractivity 1031	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Should not do anything on site that cannot be returned to its original state or better within a very short time. ie no hedgerows should be interfered with.	9789-214-1160			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1033	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Unsatisfactory because the provision of traffic through Cannington during this period will be totally unacceptable. Acceptable traffic infrastructure must be completed first.	9791-214-1237			/	
Tractivity 1040	Public	Stage 2	. Any other ideas or comments? You should not start until permission has been given. You are assuming...or perhaps you already know you will have consent!	9798-214-941			/	
Tractivity 1050	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? The new power station should not be built until access for traffic is obtained. The Northern bypass is the only acceptable route. Do not touch Cannington. The bypass is too close to the village to be called a bypass.	9808-214-884			/	
Tractivity 1053	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? good idea	9811-214-1141			/	
Tractivity 1059	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? We feel such premature action would be a unnecessary before obtaining full planning permission. You say you could reinstat land but this is never possible for the flora and fauna thst have already been displaced.	9817-214-888			/	
Tractivity 1060	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Work should not be started until IF planning is granted. This question is pointless being in this questionnaire as by the time the consultation period has closed the summer is over and you have already done the work.	9818-214-1414			/	
Tractivity 1061	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? From enquiries to the environment agency it is not clear whether EDF actually have a mandate to build a power station at Hinkley Point and until permission is clearly obtained I don?t see any works should be commenced.	9819-214-886			/	
Tractivity 1063	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Plans for preliminary works would inevitably mean extra traffic through Cannington, some of which would be large lorries, etc. This is TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE!!	9821-214-1052			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1065	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Abuse of process even if legal. The volume of traffic associated with these works is such that the new link road from north of Bridgwater/ and any Cannington by pass should be completed prior to these proposed works	9823-214-886			/	
Tractivity 1073	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? No work should start until all necessary infrastructure is in place particularly traffic mitigation measures.	9831-214-888			/	
Tractivity 1076	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I cannot believe that EDF should be allowed to carry out preliminary works prior to planning permission being given. A huge amount of disruption both to residents and wildlife will take place, wildlife habitat will be lost and insufficient mitigation put in place.	9834-214-1261			/	
Tractivity 1076	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I do not believe that EDF have dealt with the consultation process properly. Many, many people have major concerns about the proposed construction of Hinkley C. I think it is fundamentally wrong to start preliminary works without planning permission being granted - or is it already a done deal? The consultation process I believe is more of a tick box exercise. Many communities and areas of important habitat will be changed forever without proper due regard. I have given my views here because I care but I feel that EDF has no regard for anyone. Your track record elsewhere is dubious, why should we believe that EDF will be any different here. I have also decided to change my electricity supplier from EDF to Southern Electric, I do not want to be associated in any way with EDF	9834-214-8457			/	
Tractivity 1080	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I think that any work should only be undertaken once permission for the power station is agreed as there will be unnecessary work undertaken that someone will have to foot the bill and the countryside will be unnecessarily damaged	9838-214-890			/	
Tractivity 1083	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? The trouble is that to undertake preliminary works I understand you will be removing ancient woodland and hedges that cannot be replaced. I don't think this should be done before planning permission is granted	9841-214-1129			/	
Tractivity 1087	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Reinstatement would be impossible as regards any trees and hedges.	9845-214-984			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1089	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I think you should get the plans settled first. There id much opposition to the whole concept.	9847-214-1183			/	
Tractivity 1091	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? This question seems totally pointless. ?This summer? being Julu/August 2010, consultation closes in Autumn October 4th 2010. It is likely consent will have been granted for a number of preliminary works by the time these forms are processed. However, it is unlikely that any preliminary works carried out will be able to be ?reinstated? if necessary. Wildlife, flora and fauna do not settle in weeks. It takes years to establish correct habitats and enviromental conditions for positive growth of ecology. No works should be carried out until full planning permission is granted.	9849-214-1913	/			
Tractivity 1093	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Preparation of the main site before permissions cannot be reinstated without impact - ancient hedgerows being an example of ecosystems that cannot be reinstated as they were. Work should not begin unless permissions are given	9851-214-1033			/	
Tractivity 1099	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Should DCO application be refused, it would be impossible to return this land to it?s previous condition-given that the overlaying soils will be stripped to bedrock, the land will be terraced and the Holford Stream Valley will be infilled with rock/excavation debris converting it to a plateau. The existing flora and fauna, established over centuries will be lost and could not possibly be replicated.	9857-214-1362			/	
Tractivity 1100	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? The democratic planning process should be completed before any preliminary work is carried out.	9858-214-1014			/	
Tractivity 1102	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Wait until permission is given	9860-214-1021			/	
Tractivity 1103	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I would rather you did not start the work until planning permission is granted. It could be a waste of money. People who are not following the process closely might be under the false impression that permission has already been granted if the works are started prematurely.	9861-214-933			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1104	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? We are concerned that preliminary works will take place prior to permission. We are very concerned about noise, dust etc and would required prior notice so that, in our case, we can warn our holiday visitors.	9862-214-1104			/	
Tractivity 1105	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? No Consent No preliminary works! The idea that building new nuclear power stations will significantly reduce carbon emissions is fundamentally flawed and therefore to go ahead with these works in the absence of any Major consents from Central government is inappropriate. You know yourselves that there are numerous trees that are of a significant age, such that they are impossible to reinstate (In terms of the role they currently play in this ecosystem). You have already had a big impact on the ecosystem at the site by removing Badgers from the land, whose role as top predators may lead to knock on effects throughout the ecosystem. This sort of work is not just at your risk but at the risk of the whole community and ecosystems given the scale and scope of your plans. It is not you that will be left to pick up any pieces or live with the damage such work will do. Awaiting the appropriate consents so that the building of new nuclear powe	9863-214-2192			/	
Tractivity 1118	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I AM OPPOSED TO PRELIMINARY WORKS STARTING & DISTURBING THE ENVIRONMENT BEFORE EDF HAVE PERMISSION TO GO AHEAD	9876-214-942			/	
Tractivity 1118	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I AM VERY CONCERNED ABOUT THE PROPOSALS i WOULD BE VERY AGAINST ANY COMMENCEMENT OF THESE PLANS PRIOR TO THE PROPER CHANNELS FOR PERMISSION HAVING BEEN OBTAINED	9876-214-6984			/	
Tractivity 1119	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? You can not ?reinstate? land to the ecologu it had before. You should not ?jump the gun? as permission may never be given to go ahead, in view of your unsatisfactory financial situation and for other reasons.	9877-214-953			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1120	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Deeply worrying for local residents who are already suffering from stress-related conditions due to this proposal. It is unclear how EDF can possibly return this land to its previous condition should Hinkley C application be refused. The topography is due to be totally altered by terracing, the infilling of the Holford Brook valley with tonnes of spoil/rock debris, after all topsoil and vegetation has been totally removed.	9878-214-1485	/			
Tractivity 1124	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? What a joke! This is all about EDF and what is best for the company, no thought for the local community and the resulting traffic chaos.	9882-214-1048			/	
Tractivity 1130	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Whats the rush. Starting earlier with such an ill conceived plan is of no advantage of EDF or residents.	9888-214-992			/	
Tractivity 1140	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? too big an impact	9898-214-920			/	
Tractivity 1142	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? As long as it does return to as was status	9900-214-1029			/	
Tractivity 1143	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? The land cannot be reinstated to current usage	9901-214-922			/	
Tractivity 1145	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? It is impossible to reinstate the land as after your preliminary works it will no longer exist, it will just be an enormous hole.	9903-214-1243			/	
Tractivity 1146	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Works should not begin until the IPC have given their consent to the development of the new reactors.	9904-214-1394			/	
Tractivity 1148	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Does this mean that EDF are assured the build will go ahead as I feel EDF would not put in prelim work with a possibility of wasting their money.	9906-214-1174			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1151	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Why carry out work that may have to be reversed.	9909-214-966			/	
Tractivity 1158	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? If preliminary works are undertaken but the main application does not receive approval, this will amount to criminal environmental damage. The flora, fauna, wildlife & biodiversity has taken 100's of years to evolve. For edf to say they will reinstate the area if the main planning application is refused is totally ludicrous. It would take 100's of years to evolve back to its current state. Preliminary works should not take place.	9916-214-894			/	
Tractivity 1158	Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments? All works proposed within the overall strategy should be in place BEFORE any construction works take place.	9916-214-2360			/	
Tractivity 1158	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Noise, visual and environmental mitigation for the Cannington by-pass is totally inadequate. All transport strategy works, accommodation work and the Cannington by-pass MUST be in place before any construction works take place.	9916-214-6610			/	
Tractivity 1159	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? there should be no preliminary works.	9917-214-1004			/	
Tractivity 1163	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? No preliminary building works should be started until full planning permission is granted. If plans have to be changed to accommodate or obtain permission, building preparations may need to change also. This would result in further cost and a waste of resources.	9921-214-888			/	
Tractivity 1167	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? If the money is spent on this work there will be a great pressure to resist the re-instatement of the land. Slao, if planning is refused for certain areas - requiring part re-instatement it will not happen	9925-214-1141			/	
Tractivity 1169	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Job has to be done get on with it	9927-214-965			/	
Tractivity 1172	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Get the whole project done as quickly as possible!	9930-214-125			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1174	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The site appears to be much larger than is strictly necessary to carry out the proposed project. It is imperative that the landscaping is carried out asap.	9932-214-129			/	
Tractivity 1175	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? But jumping the gun somewhat! Should not be carried out until full planning permission is obtained.	9933-214-1207			/	
Tractivity 1176	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I am keen to see preliminary works start as soon as possible	9934-214-989			/	
Tractivity 1180	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? You may only be throwing your money away.	9938-214-997			/	
Tractivity 1182	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? NO works to start if any plant or materials are to be brought through Cannington	9940-214-1171			/	
Tractivity 1183	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? We are not fully aware of your plans for rudimentary works. We are of course regular letter from the planning dept advising of planning applications which are largely beyond my understanding.	9941-214-1295			/	
Tractivity 1185	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? For the well being of West Somerset this should be done in order that the construction phase can run smoothly.	9943-214-1043			/	
Tractivity 1186	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? They should not begin until an ADEQUATE bypass for Cannington has been completed.	9944-214-1001			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1190	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I strongly object to the destruction of mature woodland removal of badgers and associated disruption even though you have obtained permission to do so. You state if you fail to get planning permission you will reinstate the land its original condition. You cannot reinstate mature woodland - do not insult our intelligence with promises that are impossible to keep.	9948-214-1200			/	
Tractivity 1193	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Good	9951-214-914			/	
Tractivity 1194	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I dont doubt that permission to build will be obtained and you will proceed on that premise. The consultations you offer are vague; the decision to speed up building seems based on a foregone conclusion.	9952-214-1367			/	
Tractivity 1195	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? This is totally unacceptable. The flora and fauna of the area will be decimated. This includes mature trees, scrub, grassland and semi derelict barns. Ian from EDF planning has admitted that EDF will NOT be able to reinstate the land to its original condition. This should not be a separate application but should be considered as part of the application to the IPC.	9953-214-1560			/	
Tractivity 1196	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? One wonders if EDF are willing to commit money in preliminary construction work, whether they (EDF) already feel the project is going ahead no matter what local people say or do. No work should start until all objections have been fully investigated and the best solutions selected irrespective of cost. Not necessarily to the advantages of EDF	9954-214-1274			/	
Tractivity 1203	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? There is too much rush rush rush about this whole scheme: see any points later.	9961-214-1173			/	
Tractivity 1206	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? You are proceeding with preliminary works despite having not yet received permission for Hinkley C. You have ALREADY started tearing down woodland and cementing over badger sets. This would take decades to restore.	9964-214-1372			/	
Tractivity 1210	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Should wait for permission to build	9968-214-924			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1213	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Essentially, your conduct here has been, and is, disgraceful. Without consent, no preliminary works should be undertaken. Your definition of 'temporary' is flawed and misleading, and by using it you intend to willfully misinform and minimise the impact of your actions on the local community. How will you re-instate fully grown trees? How will you reinstate a coast line that has taken millions of years to form? I expect answers personally.	9971-214-2127			/	
Tractivity 1214	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I have walked around the proposed site and found you have begun preliminary works before the consultation has been completed. This is unfair. It makes me feel powerless and doubt your care for the community and wildlife, particularly the badgers.	9972-214-894		/		
Tractivity 1221	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? In the interest of cutting down on road transport could the jetty become permanent, allowing deliveries of rods from Sellafield per instance to be transported by sea?	9979-214-1094		/		
Tractivity 1296	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? NO WORK should be commenced on this site until Planning Permission has been agreed by the IPC/Government. SPENT FUEL STORES SHOULD NOT BE INCORPORATED WITHIN THIS SITE PLAN THIS ADDS YET ANOTHER GOOD CASE FOR A NORTHERN B/W BYPASS AS A MEANS OF REMOVING THIS FUEL FROM SITE AND FOR EMERGENCY USE	89562-214-2332			/	
Tractivity 1355	Public	Stage 2 Update	The preliminary works application in advance of the IPC application is completely unacceptable and renders logic and normal planning law meaningless.	89621-214-1616			/	
Tractivity 204	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? I would still like to know why you need so much land.	9335-214-8096	/			
Tractivity 230	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Once the damage has been done it cannot be undone. EDF should wait until they have full permission. Such impatience and naked greed does their public image no good whatsoever.	8931-214-5844			/	
Tractivity 243	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Should wait and save your/our money. It will be a waste of funds when the plans get turned down.	8939-214-4547			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 252	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Do what you need to get the Power Station built. Do it quickly and fast.	8945-214-5430			/	
Tractivity 328	Public	Stage 1	11. Site preparation and earthworks Box ticked: Satisfied 11. Any other comments? Best of luck.	9016-214-3841			/	
Tractivity 343	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Construction of sea wall, if its for protection of the Power Station OK.	9031-214-4358	/			
Tractivity 380	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Any member of the public could not and would not be allowed to carry out preliminary works without planning consent as EDF DO NOT HAVE.....yet. But as we all know this is preordained and just a matter of time at the expense of local peoples feelings	9066-214-5454			/	
Tractivity 397	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? See comments at end.	9348-214-3888			/	
Tractivity 403	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? This is a business decision which EDF alone can make.	9086-214-4207			/	
Tractivity 405	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Only work should be undertaken that will be permanent before go ahead re. finished plans.	9088-214-3834			/	
Tractivity 427	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? This work preempts the necessary planning process and feels like an attempt to undermine the IPC	9351-214-5944			/	
Tractivity 430	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? *any such works would add credence to the widely held view these consultations and the deliberations of the IPC are a sham *it is not in EDFs or the IPCs long term interests for such works to be processed separately.	9111-214-5625			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 432	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? No problem with any of this at edf risk. Espeically for the use of the sea to bring in materials rather than road.	9352-214-8590			/	
Tractivity 438	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? I think you are only starting work because you know it's a done deal and all this consultation will make no difference to the overall outcome. The IPC consultation will also be a farce and make no difference to decisions already made.	9117-214-4482			/	
Tractivity 451	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? I think that planning consent is an obvious 'welcome' inevitability and therefore well worth the gamble of starting preliminary construction work.	9129-214-5910			/	
Tractivity 453	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? The government has indicated the go ahead so where is the 'own risk'? It makes sense to make a start!	9131-214-4066			/	
Tractivity 464	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? I accept that it is not EDF's preferred way forward but the idea that DECC are consulting on their siting proposals at the same time as EDF is proposing and requiring acceptance of preliminary works makes the whole question of consultation a farce!	9141-214-6220			/	
Tractivity 466	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? I think it's vital to get HPC up and running asap so I support making a start at your risk.	9356-214-6815			/	
Tractivity 473	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? EDF must not do any works on land until planning consents have been given by the relevant authorities, and until after all 'consultation' has been completed and agreed.	9149-214-4641			/	
Tractivity 496	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Any other comments? You must be sure it will go ahead!	9169-214-4385			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 521	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? EDF should wait until it has permission to proceed with the project from the IPC.	9360-214-3517			/	
Tractivity 525	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? You should wait for planning approval like the rest of us. WSDC obviously make up the roles as they go, hedges, trees, woodland, wildlife all gone takes years to come back and establish, once ripped up!	9196-214-4831			/	
Tractivity 527	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? You should wait for planning approval like the rest of us. WSDC obviously make up the roles as they go, hedges, trees, woodland, wildlife all gone takes years to come back and establish, once ripped up!	9198-214-4799			/	
Tractivity 539	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Since EDF is so confident that the IPC will grant permission for the 2 reactors and since I understand that such works could be undone if not, I am not greatly concerned. Creation of hideous white elephants, if finance runs out and when these installations are superseded concerns me more.	9208-214-6412			/	
Tractivity 549	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? These developments should await planning consent. The outcome should not be pre-judged!	9218-214-5238			/	
Tractivity 550	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Will this take place prior to planning permission? Surely the rest of the infrastructure should be in place before embarking on any major projects.	9219-214-5518			/	
Tractivity 562	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? For once let us do the job correctly.	9231-214-4208			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 578	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Intake location- 1) Impact on bass fishery located at Cobblers Patch and North West patches 2) Design of intake to minimise catch of bottom-feeding species Intake-3) extent of current exclusion zome around intake and outfall structures 4) extent of any near-surface or of intake and outfall structures 5) extent of exclusion area around jetty. 6) at end of jetty life to be dismantled and used as artificial reef.	9247-214-3799	/			
Tractivity 581	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Any other comments? Why risk damaging the local environment before full planning permission is grante	9250-214-6280			/	
Tractivity 593	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Nothing should happen untill Planning approval has been granted because if it is not granted, there would have been site disturbance together with loss of wildlife, fauna & flora & associated habitats which will take years to return. This is Environmental Vandelism.	9259-214-3935			/	
Tractivity 594	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? This will be damaging to the environment and habitats for years to come if planning is not approved.	9260-214-5506			/	
Tractivity 595	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Untill full planning consent has been guarantee this work should not commence.	9261-214-4418			/	
Tractivity 596	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? The power station must be built. There are no other options and time is running out. Therefore, any preliminary work carried out now would only speed up the date the station goes live. The only concerns are outside the construction site as detailed in all the previous comments.	9262-214-6004			/	
Tractivity 612	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? I think EDF already knows it is going to build at Hinkley Point C	9276-214-4638			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 671	Public	Stage 1	11. Construction of temporary sea jetty Box ticked: Don't Know 11. Construction of sea wall Box ticked: Don't Know 11. Site preparation and earthworks Box ticked: Don't Know 11. Any other comments? Again, for local residents to discuss	9334-214-5156			/	
Tractivity 62319	Public	Stage 2	You appear to be extremely confident of obtaining permission regardless of the concerns and views of the local community. To this effect you have not and are not listening or acting on any of our concerns with the exception of a small movement of the southern boundary. If you really want to be "good neighbours" to the community as (Personal information removed) states then you should reconsider your proposals and issue a revised scheme. We want and are entitled to far more information than in your Stage 2 proposal. The whole process is having an impact on our health and wellbeing, and is bringing about a deterioration of our quality of life.	10005-214-2325			/	
Tractivity 62325	Public	Stage 2	You (EdF) are now proposing to spend up to two years - with or without a Bypass - doing preliminary build without any regard to the health or safety to Cannington Residents; and a further 6+ years on the main buildings. All this on roads which have been almost unchanged for 100 years - but with vastly increased traffic.	10009-214-456			/	
Tractivity 62352	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3) No PRELIMINARY WORK to be undertaken - ie clearing of the site - until such time as planning consent is granted	10029-214-2995			/	
Tractivity 62374	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Meanwhile EdF are apparently so confident that they will succeed in their final planning application that they are prepared to gamble millions on the preparatory works. Both the works and the final plans will have a devastating effect on scores of individuals in several communities for a very long time.	10045-214-379			/	
Tractivity 62384	Public	Stage 2	It is wrong that EDF proceed with these preliminary works. These works should be part of the main application for Hinkley C and I believe EDF are bypassing the Infrastructure Planning Commission by using local authority planning rules.	10047-214-322			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62425	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	d) no preliminary works, to be started before planning consent, it could never be 'put back', 'improved', we don't want it improved, we like it now!	10062-214-1032			/	
Tractivity 62431	Public	Stage 2	EdF wish to apply for planning permission to strip the whole of the site, close all PRow, and fence off the whole area prior to gaining Planning permission for the build of the reactors. I find this unacceptable. Although it has been stated that the land, hedges and trees including habitats would be reinstated if Pp were not given, I believe that gradual work could be carried out, in stages, to give some respite to local residents and to cause the least disruption. It would be impossible to recreate the landscape as it now is. EdF should also create new PRow to enable local residents to continue to enjoy walking in the area.	10065-214-4458			/	
Tractivity 62502	Public	Stage 2	The proposed preliminary works should not go ahead until consent is granted.	10096-214-3475			/	
Tractivity 62504	Public	Stage 2	Authorities have a statutory duty to protect health, without reliable and accurate information, they cannot fulfil this obligation. It is vitally important that Local Authorities obtain answers to these and other essential questions, especially before allowing any preliminary works to be carried out. The risk of major works being undertaken, not only being questionable under planning law, only to be followed by the IPC refusing permission (http://infrastructure.independent.gov.uk/) will leave local authorities with a massive re-instatement obligation to oversee without any associated funding.	10097-214-5108			/	
Tractivity 62504	Public	Stage 2	If local development authorities allow preliminary works to enable the Hinkley Point C project, then they also must share this mental flight from reality.	10097-214-6945			/	
Tractivity 62531	Public	Stage 2	Under the unassuming banner of "Preliminary Works" EdF is proposing to raze the entire area where the power station would be built in advance of receiving consent from the Infrastructure Planning Commission, This would involve removing most of the vegetation, including mature woodland, excavating holes and terraces where the reactors would eventually be bedded underground, grading the coastline and building a sea wall, constructing a jetty out into the sea and fencing the whole area with a security fence, eliminating rights of way. The company says that it will restore the site if it does not obtain consent from the IPC. This is absurd. There is no way that a landscape created and matured over hundreds of years can be "restored". The developers should not be granted permission for these "preliminary works" until the IPC has held its hearings and come to a conclusion on the main application.	10104-214-5558	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62554	Public	Stage 2	The intention to conduct site works there, prior to planning permission and even before a planning application has been made, is outrageous. It is not possible to "restore" such a piece of countryside within any conceivable timescale, once the damage has been done.	10114-214-1079			/	
Tractivity 62572	Public	Stage 2	Preliminary Works I believe that the Preliminary Works should not be carried out before the DCO has been granted permission.	10123-214-4130			/	
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Comment You should wait for permission as everyone else has to do when planning a new building.	10124-214-1036			/	
Tractivity 62577	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	- The land cannot be reinstated. The preliminary works are too devastating. These facts do not need elaboration.	10128-214-3299			/	
Tractivity 62577	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	- No detail is given for the works themselves. By what process of double-think can EdF call this question a 'consultation'? - Should works proceed all disruption will be borne by the host communities as the infrastructure exists and with no mitigation suggested or proposed The company should go through the full planning process before it sets spade to soil. In conjunction with the lack of detail they provide and their poor record of community engagement the haste with which the company proceeds makes their entire operation seem unreliable and badly planned. It gives the local community no confidence in EdF's competence or good faith.	10128-214-3415			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62578	Public	Stage 2	<p>3. In order to speed up the process of building the new power station, and enable us to finish work earlier, we intend to apply this summer to undertake preliminary works to prepare the main site and build a temporary jetty for the delivery of bulk materials. If permission for the power station is not obtained, we will be required to reinstate this land. What are your views on our plans for preliminary works?</p> <p>You dont actually state in your question which temporary jetty you're talking about - is it the wharf at Comwich or a jetty at Hinkley?</p> <p>If you are building it at Hinkley, why is it a "temporary" jetty? Why not make it permanent if you're going to the trouble of building one for the "delivery of bulk materials"?</p> <p>If you're talking about Comwich, have you actually got planning permission yet for your "Preliminary works"? If so, why are you hiding your works behind a curtain of high fencing? If you haven't got permission yet, what exactly are you doing behind that fence? What are you hiding?</p>	10129-214-1683			/	
Tractivity 62582	Public	Stage 2	<p>Q3</p> <p>My view is that you can't undertake preliminary works before you have had planning permission, because no-one in their right mind would decimate 500 acres of land and seriously expect to be able to re-instate it to it how it was before, this is physically impossible. How are you going to reinstate old stone bams and mature trees? Therefore I do not agree that decimation of our land should take place in advance of planning permission.</p>	10133-214-2780			/	
Tractivity 62583	Public	Stage 2	<p>I PRELIMINARY WORKS</p> <p>1. Question 3 in the EDF questionnaire deals with your plan to undertake preliminary works in advance of the IPC decision. We think that this is quite wrong. The IPC decision should not be pre-empted in this way. We appreciate that - if the IPC decision is favourable to EDF - these works would allow the building of the power station to be completed sooner, to the profit of EDF, but this is no justification. The plan is perceived as arrogant and has aroused hostility.</p>	10134-214-753			/	
Tractivity 62615	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>24/8/10 - Not happy about the container arriving on site/or preliminary works taking place.</p>	10162-214-48			/	
Tractivity 62618	Public	Stage 2	<p>(Personal information removed) called with regard to trenches being dug at the proposed C site, also what does our Planning Permission consist of?</p>	10165-214-57			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62631	Public	Stage 2	The premature destruction of this agricultural land and the ecological habitats of this greenfield site should not be allowed when EDF do not have government approval to build a power station. The government will not be able to make a decision for at least another year, and if not given EDF will not be able to return ancient woodland to its original state.	10175-214-2243			/	
Tractivity 62631	Public	Stage 2	There will not be a bypass around Cannington in 2011/2012 when the Preliminary Works would be taking place causing a total disruption to the centre of Cannington for two years. The bypass would only be built if the government gave the go ahead to build the reactor and EDF feel it would be economic to do so. At present with no public subsidies being offered by the government, EDF have massive financial debt, 36 billion Euros, along with a declining credit rating and the falling price of gas it looks unlikely that EDF will build the power station, therefore a bypass would be irrelevant. Lets hope that West Somerset council refuse permission for the preliminary works.	10175-214-6076			/	
Tractivity 62938	Public	Stage 2	It will be a waste of your money when permission is not granted and EDFrancais will look foolish.	10177-214-1525			/	
Crown Estate	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Question 3 - Preliminary Works - Temporary Jetty The Crown Estate is impacted by this proposal but does not object to it as a preliminary proposal to enable the project. This is provided necessary consents are put in place, including a lease (subject to contract) with The Crown Estate, which would include decommissioning and restoration requirements. The jetty would still need to be accounted for in the environmental impact assessments.	10187-214-915	/			
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Question 1. The EDF programme indicates that build work will commence prior to the station go ahead. This will include the building of a jetty, a new sea wall, cooling water tunnels and station site preparations including accommodation block works at Hinkley Point plus the modifications and enlargement of Combwich wharf.	10221-214-8987	/			
Forum 21	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	These works will effectively prepare the site for the construction of Hinkley C. This should not be allowed until permission has been agreed for the power station itself. Despite EdF's use of the argument that national need for new power supplies demands an urgent response, there is no reason why the company should be allowed to take this precipitate action. There is plenty of evidence, for example the recent analysis conducted for the No Need for Nuclear campaign(1), that it is possible for Britain to keep the lights on without nuclear power.	10262-214-10928			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Ministry of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>With respect to EDF's preferred proposals set out in the Explanation and Assessment Document (July 2010), it is evident that the proposals relating to the siting of the temporary jetty and cooling water infrastructure remain unaltered. Accordingly the position of the MOD on these elements of the scheme remains as identified in my responses of 11 January 2010 and 13 May 2010.</p> <p>I note that the notice issued under section 4 of the Planning Act 2008 confirming EDF's intention to apply for a development consent order for the new nuclear power station includes the temporary jetty and cooling water tunnels as associated elements. Taking into account the timescales identified for the implementation of the development programme, it is therefore strongly recommended that EDF engage with this office as soon as possible to identify mitigation and management arrangements to facilitate the marine works identified in the submission.</p>	10266-214-575		/		
Tractivity 846	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	EDF should wait for full planning permission like everyone else before starting any work. The land could never be reinstated as it is now. as we like it. No preliminary works!	10278-214-1193			/	
Tractivity 1169	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Job has to be done get on with it	10279-214-984			/	
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	- Very serious concerns about the timeline for preliminary works and the lack of the improvements to Comwich Wharf, the provision of the Cannington Bypass and the provision of the temporary aggregates jetty.	89183-214-6344			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The differences and controls, including mitigation and compensation, between the preliminary works and main Development Consent Order (DCO) proposals need to be clarified.	89199-214-471	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Clarity needs to be given on the relationship between the Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA) applications and the DCO application as well as the related mitigation and compensation measures directly related to each development.	89199-214-2972	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- There needs to be clarity about what is to be considered by the IPC through the DCO process and what will be considered by West Somerset Council as part of the TCPA process. Both determining bodies need to be clear and consistent on the level/method of control, mitigation and compensation associated with the treatment of the site. As mitigation needs to be directly related to the development proposed then the TCPA application would seem an appropriate stage to impose certain controls about site treatment and other works.	89199-214-5412	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- The Preferred Proposals information has an inextricable link to the preliminary works proposals to be considered by the district council. As such there needs to be clarity between what will form part of the DCO application and what will be considered through the TCPA process.	89201-214-4375	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	3.18 Preliminary Works ES Scoping (issued 13 May 2010) - The County Council requested clarification on whether a full TA and Travel Plan will be prepared to support the Preliminary Works application and there were some contradictory statements regarding the use of rail to transport freight to site (which the County Council understood through other discussions with EDF that these were not being pursued). The Stage 2 consultation does not assess the transport impact of the preliminary works application, however it is understood that EDF is seeking separate scoping discussions on this matter.	89226-214-12971	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>- Concerns were expressed regarding the proposal to clear parts of the main station site in advance of the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) application and a full appropriate assessment and EIA of the whole project that takes account of all the associated development. SCC identified several projects being taken forward under the heading of 'associated development' with the capacity to affect internationally designated sites, sites with national and local designations, habitats and species. So far as the international designations are concerned, the key designations are of the Severn Estuary as a Special Area of Conservation, a Special Protection Area and a Ramsar wetland;</p> <p>- SCC's ecological specialists advised that, in relation to the main development site, sufficient data had probably been collected to that point (i.e. of the Stage 1 Consultation) to inform an EIA;</p> <p>- Using data from the County Council's own ECONET system, SCC Ecologists suggested some site-specific surveys to be carried out on the sites ear-marked for 'associated development' for EIA and appropriate assessment purposes.</p>	89254-214-1087	/			
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>10. Preliminary works</p> <p>EdF is proposing to apply to West Somerset Council (and other relevant authorities) for planning permission to undertake "preliminary works" in advance of the main construction programme.</p> <p>These works include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Removal of the majority of trees and hedges. - Blocking off all badger setts (already agreed). - Closure of existing footpaths and bridlepaths, including the coast path. - Security fencing round an area of more than 400 acres. - Stripping topsoil and vegetation to make terraced area for the proposed nuclear reactors. English Heritage says expressed concern this work could destroy old artefacts. - New roads being built across the site. - Underground streams re-routed. - The excavation of more than 3.2 million cubic metres of soil, sub-soil and rocks. This is more than has been excavated to prepare the site for the 2012 London Olympic Games. - Noise from up to 12,000 vehicle movements per month. - Construction of a new protective sea wall along the coast. - Construction of a jetty out into the sea. 	89452-214-0	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>These works will effectively prepare the site for the construction of Hinkley C. This should not be allowed until permission has been agreed for the power station itself. Despite EdF's use of the argument that national need for new power supplies demands an urgent response, there is no reason why the company should be allowed to take this precipitate action. There is plenty of evidence, for example the analysis conducted for the No Need for Nuclear campaign(30), that it is possible for Britain to keep the lights on without nuclear power. The Department of Energy and Climate Change has also recently produced a series of scenarios for Britain's energy supply up to 2050, entitled "2050 Pathways"(31), one of which, Pathway Gamma, assumes that no new nuclear power stations are built.</p>	89452-214-1308			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	If applications, under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, are to be made (and properly able to be made - see further below) to the local planning authorities then the authorities will require pre-application consultation on these applications in accordance with their Statements of Community Involvement.	89296-214-5851	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	there has been no details provided or discussion undertaken on the draft heads of terms for a Section 106 agreement for the preliminary works and West Somerset District Council require such discussions to take place prior to submission of any major application requiring a s.106 agreement in accordance with the Council's Local Validation Checklist.	89296-214-6183	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The extent to which the Planning Act 2008 caters for the ability for promoters of NSIP to promote Preliminary Works Applications which are part and parcel of the NSIP itself also requires further elaboration/justification.	89297-214-1396	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>Provision of Sufficient Information on Preliminary Works Applications and Other Applications to be made outside of the DCO Process:</p> <p>The authorities alerted EDF Energy for the need to clearly identify those elements of the project that will be brought forward outside of the DCO process, identify the anticipated dates for submission of applications and clearly identify the engagement processes with the relevant communities and local authorities, prior to submission of these applications;</p>	89318-214-12664	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The authorities require further information and pre-application discussions on the preliminary works and any other non IPC applications to be submitted to the local authorities, including discussions on a draft heads of terms, prior to the submissions of planning applications to the local authorities.	89319-214-3603	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Provision of sufficient information on preliminary works applications and other applications to be made outside of the DCO process: the authorities alerted EDF Energy for the need to clearly identify those elements of the project that will be brought forward outside of the DCO process, identify the anticipated dates for submission of applications and clearly identify the engagement processes with the relevant communities and local authorities, prior to submission of these applications. This recommendation remains in place;	89329-214-17107	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The authorities are concerned that splitting out the Preliminary Works into Town and Country Planning Act applications (see EDF's definition of "Development") will mean a disjointed approach to conditions, requirements and planning obligations between the two consent regimes (should both be approved). As little information has been provided on the Preliminary Works, the authorities remain concerned that (and are unable to judge at this stage whether) the whole project may not be appropriately mitigated and controlled unless EDF carries out further consultation on the whole project.	89419-214-11095	/			
Tractivity 62915	Public	Stage 2 Update	In conclusion we earnestly oppose EDF commencing any work on the proposed Hinkley Point C station before any Planning Permission has been granted. Planning Permission has already been gained for the removal of asbestos from Hinkley Point using roads directly through the village. EDF are also intending to use the existing infrastructure through Cannington Village before any/if a bypass is built for their construction vehicles. This will cause huge safety issues, noise, pollution, vibration and a vast amount of distress to the residents of this village. It is not acceptable practice.	89666-214-4144			/	
Tractivity 62953	Public	Stage 2 Update	You cannot exclude the jetty proposals from your consultation - the additional traffic and noise must be considered in conjunction with the whole project, as ALL materials on site will be brought via the C182. The effects are CUMULATIVE.	89682-214-2610		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Marine Management Organisation	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>Jetty</p> <p>The MMO notes that it is proposed not to include the jetty in the application for development consent and welcomes the commitment that the jetty will still be included in the environmental impact assessment for the development consent order.</p> <p>The MMO notes that it is proposed that the consents authorising the jetty will be granted subject to a condition requiring EDF Energy to restore the affected area back to a suitable condition in the event the Infrastructure Planning Commission refuses development consent. The MMO asks that this proposal is considered in light of the letter dated 19 March 2011 from the MMO to an agent of EDF Energy (copy attached).</p>	89716-214-1025			/	
Marine Management Organisation	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>RE: Hinkley Point C - Article 29</p> <p>Following our meeting of 4 March 2011 and earlier correspondence, I write to set out the position of the Marine Management Organisation (the MMO) regarding Article 29 of the proposed Hinkley Point (Temporary Jetty) Harbour Empowerment Order 201[X].</p> <p>The MMO has considered Article 29 carefully but has concluded, for the reasons set out in this letter, that section 16 of the Harbours Act 1964 (the 1964 Act) cannot be used to provide for the closure of a harbour and/or the extinction of the liability of a harbour authority, as proposed.</p> <p>The MMO is of the view that if Parliament had intended that an order made under section 16 could also provide for the closure of the harbour, Parliament would have expressed this clearly. Parliament did not do so. Indeed, the closure of a harbour and/or the extinction of a harbour authority would be the exact opposite of what section 16 is seeking to do, which is to allow for the empowerment of an authority so that harbour works can be carried out.</p> <p>In particular, the dismantling and demolition works for which Article 29(3) of your draft Order seeks to provide could not reasonably be said to come within "the construction, improvement, maintenance or management of a dock" for the purposes of section 16(1)(c). By defining in this way the types of works for which section 16 orders could provide, Parliament clearly envisaged that the "dock" or harbour would still be in existence in some form after the works had been carried out.</p> <p>The MMO also takes the view that the final clause of section 16(1) cannot be relied upon in support of an argument that the dismantling and demolition of the harbour can come within an empowerment order on the basis that it may provide for "all such powers... as are requisite for enabling" one or more of the section 16(1)(c) "object[s]" of "construction, improvement, maintenance or management" to be achieved. It is not considered that the achievement of these aims 'requires' the inclusion of powers to secure their undoing.</p> <p>Furthermore, the MMO is not satisfied that an order made under section 16 could provide for the dismantling and demolition of a harbour on the basis that these would be no more than "supplementary, consequential or incidental" acts within the meaning of section 16(6) that may reasonably be considered to be "requisite or expedient for the purposes of, or in</p>	89716-214-3753	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			<p>connection with, the order". The MMO considers that the scope of such "supplementary, consequential or incidental" provisions must be defined by reference to the statutory "objects" for which an order under section 16 may be granted. In other words, an "incidental" provision within section 16(6) is a provision that may reasonably be said to be incidental to the "construction, improvement, maintenance or management" of a harbour. A provision that would allow for the closure of a harbour, or the extinction of a harbour authority, could not reasonably be said to be "incidental" to the achievement of these positive objects.</p> <p>You may wish to consider, but this is entirely a matter for yourselves, whether you should remove Article 29 from the draft Order. If you were to do this, the MMO would need to consider what measures would then be appropriate to notify interested parties of such a change. This may also require an addendum to the environmental statement and further consultation.</p> <p>Other potential steps may include withdrawing the harbour empowerment order application.</p> <p>You may also wish to investigate the use of a private Act of Parliament to achieve the ends that you seek.</p> <p>The MMO would be willing to meet to discuss any proposals that you may have once you have had a chance to consider your next steps.</p> <p>In the meantime, the MMO will continue to consider the outstanding matter relating to section 120(9) of the Planning Act 2008 and we will write to you about this as soon as possible.</p>					
West Somerset County Council	Local authority	Stage 2 Update	<p>Attached is this Council's and Sedgemoor District Councils joint response to the consultation. It is with regret that the report continues to highlight a large number of areas where there remain significant disagreements between EDF Energy and the Council. This is the main purpose of writing to you directly.</p> <p>We have shown recently through our discussions on Site Preparation Works that through sensible conversation, and pragmatism from both parties, key issues can be resolved. The work conducted by our teams in relation to the Regulation 19 letter and the recent face-to-face discussions on transport matters demonstrated this to us. We also note the comments from (Personal information removed) to the Nuclear Development Forum which support our conclusion.</p> <p>It is therefore, extremely disappointing to note that there continue to be such significant gaps between us as we approach the last few weeks before you intend to submit your application to the Infrastructure Planning Commission.</p> <p>While we understand and accept to a point that there are matters where the business needs of EDF dictate a certain approach there remain a range of issues where we truly feel that, through similar, sensible pragmatic conversation, that the differences between us could be resolved prior to the submission of the DCO application.</p> <p>Our response attached goes into our detailed views. However, West Somerset Council would particularly draw your attention to the following issues that we believe can be resolved:</p>	89734-214-156			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Nether Stowey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1 The Parish Council considers that the works described in the application are, by their scale and nature, effectively the commencement of construction of the Hinkley Point C Power Station and as such should rightly be part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application submitted to the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC). The Parish Council considers that the current application to West Somerset Council is an inappropriate use of the planning system and an attempt to pre-empt the consideration of the full DCO application by the IPC.	89752-214-13477			/	
Nether Stowey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Impact on the Area 2.2 The Parish Council considers that in the event that the DCO application were to be refused it would not be possible to undo fully the proposed works. Accordingly it is considered that suggestions by the applicant that in the eventuality the DCO application is declined the area would be returned to its previous state are incorrect. 2.3 If this application were approved, the works commenced and then the DCO application were refused the resultant work to undo any works carried out up to that date would logically double the length of time on site, with all associated impacts both on and off site. 2.4 As regards the impact on the area immediately adjacent to the application site the Parish Council has noted the formal response by Stogursey Parish Council (dated 11 January 2011) and supports the points made by that Council.	89752-214-14031			/	
Nether Stowey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Off Site Infrastructure 2.5 In their consultation documents relating to Hinkley Point C, EDF Energy have identified a range of off-site infrastructure improvements. Whilst the Parish Council does not consider that EDF's current proposals regarding off-site infrastructure go far enough in mitigating the impact of the construction of Hinkley Point C, it is concerned in the extreme that it is proposed to undertake the preliminary works subject of this application without any improvements to off-site infrastructure, in particular the highway infrastructure.	89752-214-14894			/	
Nether Stowey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	3.1 The Parish Council opposes the application on the following grounds (i) The application is premature and the proposed works should form part of the Development Consent Order Application to the Infrastructure Planning Commission.	89752-214-16568			/	
Nether Stowey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Furthermore, the Parish Council considers that no works relating to Hinkley Point C should be commenced before the necessary highway improvements have been agreed and implemented.	89752-214-17121			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	3 It is not helpful that EDF has chosen to divide the scheme into multiple applications that will be determined by different bodies pursuant to different statutory regimes at different times. This division of the scheme makes it difficult to assess the impact of the complete form of development which may be permitted pursuant to the various applications during its lengthy construction phase and following completion.	89767-214-448			/	
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	4 Further, there remain a great number of issues to be resolved in connection with the application for the Site Preparation Works (see, for example, the points raised in the letter from West Somerset Council to EDF of 11 March 2011) and the Harbour Empowerment Order. It cannot be assumed that any or all of the applications will be successful.	89767-214-872		/		
8	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	3) No PRELIMINARY WORK to be undertaken i.e. clearing of the site - until such-time as planning consent is granted.	89797-214-1746			/	
16	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	I have not yet seen the response to concerns raised by numerous Consultees. Yet EDF are apparently going ahead with preparatory works prior to final approval and planning permission. This is another example of their high handed, arrogant attitude.	89805-214-3676			/	
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	3. In order to speed up the process of building the new power station and enable us to finish work earlier we intend to apply this summer to undertake preliminary works to prepare the main site and build a temporary jetty for the delivery of bulk materials. If permission is not obtained we will reinstate this land. Satisfactory Unsatisfactory No Opinion Don't know - The land cannot be reinstated. The preliminary works are too devastating. These facts do not need elaboration.	89806-214-3324			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	2.132 For both the temporary jetty and Combrich Wharf, contingency plans need to be drawn up in case for whatever reason it is not possible to bring the materials and AILs through these facilities. Contingency measures are mentioned and the use of Dunball Wharf is suggested in 6.8.4; this needs to be developed out into a full contingency plan.	89848-214-8194			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1.1 [2.2.1] The proposed programme starting with preliminary works in spring 2011 is not achievable as the preliminary works application will not be in front of WSC Planning Committee until the summer.	89872-214-2307	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1.5 [4.1.11] How will planning approval be given for all of the temporary buildings around the construction site, given that they will be provided by the contractors, who have not yet been selected?	89872-214-3123			/	
44	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2 Update	Seperately but relevant, according to information from a reliable source at the Hinkley Point Power Station, I am told that some workers are concerned and angry that EDF intend to refurbish Combwich Wharf early this year, so that Scottish stone can be landed and preparatory site work commence on the EDF project in the hope that EDF can 'get away with It'.	89913-214-780			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
CABE	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Impact on views While we acknowledge that the nuclear installation will generate large objects in the landscape that cannot, and should not, be concealed, we are not yet convinced that the masterplan is responsive to the key views. The cumulative impact of the two existing power stations, the existing power lines and the new power station on the distant views should be considered. The visual assessment of views from the Quantocks is important but the team should also ensure that other key views, for example, from Minehead and from the Glamorgan Coast, are adequately considered. The visual impact assessment must not be carried out in isolation; the preparation of the masterplan and visual assessment should be an iterative process.	8732-217-3757	/			A number of comments were received during the consultation to the effect that by dividing the proposed development into a Preliminary Works phase ahead of the main Development Consent Order (DCO) application, it would not be possible to properly take account of all of the potential cumulative and in-combination effects of the Hinkley Point C Project (HPC Project) as a whole. EDF Energy understands why this concern has been raised but does not believe that impacts have been misrepresented by promoting the development in this way. The site preparation works and temporary jetty have each been subject to their own Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and both EIAs have considered the potential for cumulative and in-combination effects between each other and with the HPC Project. In addition, the EIAs have considered potential cumulative and in-combination effects with other relevant plans and projects whose impacts have the potential to overlap in time and space.
Crown Estate	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	The main impacts of the Hinkley C proposals on The Crown Estate are as follows: - Proposed aggregate jetty - Cooling water tunnels - Offshore operations for the intake and outfall structures - Refurbishment of Combwich Wharf (where there is additional seaward land take and associated dredge proposals) and - Any spoil disposal from the construction of the cooling water tunnels, whether used beneficially on site, or disposed of offshore.	8735-217-1006			/	As part of the cumulative assessments, careful consideration was given to the potential combined effects of the Preliminary Works (in combination with other relevant plans and projects) on the amenity of local communities around the HPC site. This is included in Chapter 24, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement for the site preparation works and in Chapter 25, Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement for the temporary jetty.
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	3.4.8 A concern is registered that little detail is provided within the Stage 1 document on the preliminary works and the consent processes for these works. Further details are requested from EDF on the preliminary works aspects of the proposals as well as other elements of the project, including the construction of the jetty, new sea wall, cooling water intakes and outfalls, and refurbishment of Combwich Wharf.	88790-217-25139	/			The applications that have been submitted for the site preparation works and the temporary jetty included 'shadow' Habitats Regulations Assessments (HRAs) considering the effects of the proposals, alone and in combination with other relevant plans and projects, on European protected sites. The undertaking of the appropriate assessment is the responsibility of the 'competent authority'; this is West Somerset Council in the case of the site preparation works and the Marine Management Organisation in the case of the temporary jetty. They are required to undertake their own HRAs in consultation with Natural England.
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	In addition, the authorities require further information on the planning strategy for these applications, including the consultation activities programmed for all elements; the relationship of technical information and the mechanisms to evaluate cumulative effects of the development in its entirety.	88070-217-1347	/			
Somerset Wildlife Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	EDF Energy will need to demonstrate that site clearance will not adversely affect statutorily protected species, such as roosting and foraging bats. The main concern the Trust has with site clearance at this stage is that a mitigation strategy be prepared, and off-site habitat creation be commenced in a timely manner to off-set the on-site destruction.	8769-217-14516	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset Wildlife Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	An examination of the cumulative impacts of this development with others proposed for the districts of West Somerset and Sedgemoor will form an important study. The in-combination effects of housing development, tidal energy schemes in the Severn Estuary, overhead electricity connection, and other major infrastructure projects should be considered within this assessment.	8769-217-15382	/			
Tractivity 979	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? It is fair enough from your point of view but does send out a message that everything is a foregone conclusion. Moving plant on to Combrich wharf the day after you explained the reasons to the village was at the best naive. It would have been better to wait a few days, but EDF's whole consultation policy seems to be very cavalier and only pays lip service to what should be expected in this day and age.	9737-217-1059			/	
Tractivity 1297	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	EdF will be building on a Greenfield site, completely destroying habitats and adding further pollution as the site is constructed. There will be so much light, noise and dust pollution created by the preliminary works,	89563-217-866			/	
Tractivity 1353	Public	Stage 2 Update	Why do you continue to press for preliminary Works before building a northern haul road from J23 directly to Hinkley Point?	89619-217-1320		/		
Tractivity 1371	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	You are using the emergency road entrance for your landscaping work. Do you intend to use this for your preliminary works - I hope not as that would increase my traffic fear as above.	89637-217-1483			/	
Tractivity 62631	Public	Stage 2	The preliminary works are a major building activity involving the building of a sea wall, a marine jetty and major clearing, drainage, roadmaking and landscaping of 450 acres of the site. As there will be no bypass of Bridgwater or Cannington and no jetty built, all the building traffic, machinery, workers and associated materials will have to travel for 2011/2012 through Bridgwater's crowded roads and through the village of Cannington causing a very negative and disruptive affect on the residents quality of life, causing traffic chaos through Bridgwater along he A39, through Cannington and along he C182 to Hinkley.	10175-217-2605	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Countryside Council for Wales	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>Welcome the setting out of the legislative framework. We note the letter of 16 July 2009 from the Department of Communities and Local Government and the department of Energy and Climate Change informing local authorities that where sites have been nominated into the Government's strategic siting assessment for new nuclear development it would be possible for developers to seek planning permission for preliminary or preparatory works ahead of an application to the IPC.</p> <p>Our understanding is that with respect to the Severn Estuary SPA, SAC and other European sites, West Somerset Council and the Marine Management Organisation as competent authorities will need to carry out an HRA when considering these applications and as part of this process will need to consider possible in- combination impacts with the main proposals. We therefore strongly recommend that the ES contains sufficient information to allow all the competent authorities to carry out their HRAs.</p>	89126-217-3446			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>In reaching this view, the authorities are aware that EDF takes the view that a series of preliminary works applications separate from the main DCO application for the HPC station site is defensible in EIA terms. However it is clear that the "wider project development" must be assessed on a cumulative impact basis. This cumulative impact assessment must cover all those matters reasonably required to assess the effects of the development, including all indirect, secondary and cumulative effects.</p>	89330-217-3290			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
West Hinkley Action Group	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	- Minimise destruction of hedges, trees, copses, old buildings throughout the site and re-use/recycle materials from the barns into the community in ways subject to further consultation. Planting and re-planting should be undertaken immediately it becomes possible and not wait for the completion of the entire project. Stone from the barns could be used to make habitats within the community area of the bund and the tiles could be used to roof a structure also within the bund to provided habitat for swifts, owls and bats. More information is required before the local community can make further observation.	8755-218-1675	/			<p>Comments during the Stage 1 and Stage 2 Consultation exercises received in relation to the environmental management of the proposed Preliminary Works (i.e. the site preparation works and the temporary jetty) can be categorised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that the developments should minimise the loss of habitats, hedges, trees, archaeological features including old buildings, and need to demonstrate that site clearance will not adversely affect statutorily protected species. Desire for ecological/landscape planting to be carried out as soon as possible and in a phased manner rather than leaving it all until the end. In particular, any off-site habitat creation should be undertaken in a timely manner to off-set on-site habitat losses. Concern that the developments will not in reality be reversible should the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for the Hinkley Point C Project (HPC Project) be refused. Concern at the lighting, dust, noise and traffic impacts of the developments, particularly to local residents and the potential impacts on their quality of life. The means by which good standards of environmental management would be achieved was questioned. <p>Since the on-shore footprint of the temporary jetty falls entirely within the much larger site that is the subject of the site preparation works application, this response concentrates on the issues relating to the site preparation works.</p> <p>The site preparation works have been designed to minimise land-take, retain and protect key features of importance within the site and minimise loss of habitat, hedges and other features. Key features that would be retained and protected include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ridge running east-west through the centre of the site known as 'Green Lane', in view of its archaeological and ecological interest as well as its strategic importance to help screen views of
Somerset Wildlife Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	EDF Energy will need to demonstrate that site clearance will not adversely affect statutorily protected species, such as roosting and foraging bats. The main concern the Trust has with site clearance at this stage is that a mitigation strategy be prepared, and off-site habitat creation be commenced in a timely manner to off-set the on-site destruction.	8769-218-14516	/			
Tractivity 973	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I am very concerned about the increase in light and noise pollution caused by the preliminary works. Wildlife such as skylarks will be devastated and there do not appear to be any strategies in place to minimise the environmental impact. I feel that EDFs proposals do not offer local residents any benefits and our current ways of living will be destroyed and disrupted for the next 12 years. I have no confidence in EDF and am extremely concerned about the future.	9731-218-10210	/			
Tractivity 979	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? It is fair enough from your point of view but does send out a message that everything is a foregone conclusion. Moving plant on to Combwich wharf the day after you explained the reasons to the village was at the best naive. It would have been better to wait a few days, but EDF?s whole consultation policy seems to be very cavalier and only pays lip service to what should be expected in this day and age.	9737-218-1059			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 985	Public	Stage 2	<p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>I am against the idea of bulldozing 500 acres of land and decimating flora and fauna in advance of a main planning application even if it is said to be legal. It will be impossible to re-instate the land if permission is not granted. It is completely unnecessary to remove mature trees and the old barns which are roosting sites for many creatures including rare species of bat and a variety of insects and birds. As a ?green Company? I am shocked by this uncaring attitude of EDF.</p>	9743-218-2127			/	<p>the northern half of the site .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fields located between latitude 144.750N and the southern boundary of the site preparation works application site to provide a 'buffer' between the site and the hamlet of Shurton, which lies immediately to the south of the application site. Areas of calcareous grassland located mainly along the northern frontage of the site.
Tractivity 191	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Do you agree that EDF Energy's proposal to provide a landscape buffer on the southern boundary of the site is the best way of minimising the potential impact of the construction site for nearby local residents?</p> <p>Box ticked: Yes</p> <p>1. If yes, should this be retained as a permanent feature once construction is completed?</p> <p>Box ticked: Yes</p> <p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The hill closest to bishop wood should be raised to minimise visual impact.</p> <p>Great care is required due to risk to watercourses increasing the risk of flooding.</p> <p>2. Return to land to its previous use</p> <p>Box ticked: Not Important</p> <p>2. Creation of wildlife habitats</p> <p>Box ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Grassland</p> <p>Box ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Woodland</p>	8906-218-0			/	<p>There are a number of derelict barns located on-site and three of them would need to be demolished in order for the site to be cleared ahead of the proposed earthworks. Those which lie outside of the areas needing to be cleared would be retained. All of the woodland and the majority of the hedgerows within the site would have to be removed to make way for the proposed development, although those that can be retained would be, including those associated with the majority of the length of Green Lane and those delineating field boundaries south of latitude 144.750N.</p> <p>Site clearance would not have a significant impact on any protected species. Badger setts and bat roosts would be closed and the species relocated under licence from Natural England. Impacts on commuting and foraging bats would be mitigated through a package of measures including controls on construction lighting and habitat creation and enhancement on- and off-site, including the creation of wildflower meadows.</p> <p>EDF Energy recognises the importance of establishing landscape screen planting as early as possible in order to maximise the screening benefit for the main power station construction. Some significant screen planting including 10,000 trees and shrubs has already been planted (in Spring 2011) to help reinforce existing vegetation belts between the site and the hamlets of Knighton to the south-west and Shurton to the south. Consultations were held with Stogursey Parish Council on the details of this planting and local residents were given an opportunity during the planting works to influence the species mix planted near their properties. EDF Energy has committed to constructing a screening bund along the western boundary of the site north of Green Lane and better screen construction activities from the adjacent land, which is recognised as being of outstanding scenic and historic interest and to do this as early on in the earthworks as possible. The screening bund</p>
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	<p>13.20.3 What criteria will be used to determine "best environmental option" in the context of contaminated material discovered during preliminary works? EDF are asked to confirm that such options will be reviewed frequently to ensure use of current best practice?</p>	89444-218-13481	/			<p>EDF Energy has committed to constructing a screening bund along the western boundary of the site north of Green Lane and better screen construction activities from the adjacent land, which is recognised as being of outstanding scenic and historic interest and to do this as early on in the earthworks as possible. The screening bund</p>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>We particularly note the ambiguity with regards to the mechanism for ensuring appropriate environmental management of the preliminary works at the site, which are not addressed by the overall submission.</p>	89332-218-3658	/			<p>EDF Energy has committed to constructing a screening bund along the western boundary of the site north of Green Lane and better screen construction activities from the adjacent land, which is recognised as being of outstanding scenic and historic interest and to do this as early on in the earthworks as possible. The screening bund</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Countryside Council for Wales	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	We note that you are now not proposing to include the jetty proposals in your Development Consent Order (DCO) application to the Infrastructure Planning Commission. We therefore remind you that you will need to add the Temporary Jetty to the list of developments which you will need to consider as part of your in- combination assessment of impacts, through your HRA work, with those aspects of the development which will form part of your DCO application	89834-218-3194	/			would then be planted up in the first available season to provide additional screening. Upon completion of this bund, the construction fence would be realigned inside of the bund in order to screen it from views from the west. In addition, habitat creation activities on- and off-site (including planting of new hedgerows and establishment of wildflower meadows) are scheduled to occur in autumn 2011. Further habitat creation and enhancement measures would take place over subsequent years.
Countryside Council for Wales	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Section 8.1.7- we note that the piling methodology is not yet determined, and therefore welcome the proposed mitigation measures detailed in section 10.6 of the ES to minimise impacts on fish and marine mammals. We recommend that these measures are included as conditions of any permission and are fully implemented.	89836-218-2486			/	The planning application for the site preparation works provides for the removal of any installed infrastructure and the re-instatement of the site in the event that the DCO application is unsuccessful, or if a DCO is granted but works are not commenced within a certain timeframe.
Countryside Council for Wales	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Section 8.2.11- we welcome the mitigation measures proposed for Corallina and recommend that they are included as conditions of any permission, which should be fully implemented.	89836-218-2806			/	An 'outline' re-instatement scheme was included with the planning application supported by a 'Landscape Mitigation & Re-instatement Strategy' (November 2010) that described the rationale behind, and objectives of, the reinstatement proposals, and explained how any such works would be carried out.
Countryside Council for Wales	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Section 8.2.12- we welcome the proposed best practice mitigation measures for marine ecological receptors, and recommend that they are included as conditions of any permission and are fully implemented.	89836-218-2988			/	It is estimated that it would take three years to reinstate the site. Although it would take time for new habitats to mature, EDF Energy is confident that, over time, the site would show gains in terms of landscape character and biodiversity compared against the existing situation.
Countryside Council for Wales	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Section 8.3.15- we welcome the proposed mitigation measures to avoid and reduce disturbance to birds during the construction phase and recommend that they are included as conditions of any permission, and are fully implemented. We refer you to Natural England for detailed comments on birds.	89836-218-3194			/	Following the Stage 1 consultation it was decided to remove the sea wall from the Preliminary Works, because this feature would have been incompatible with a requirement to re-instate the site.
Countryside Council for Wales	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	We were unable to find any reference to assessment of risks from non-native species in the ES. As the proposals include construction of infrastructure on the foreshore, use of vessels and jack-up barges etc, we strongly recommend that biosecurity best practice guidelines should be followed (2). (Editor's note: footnote) (2) Non-native species best practice guidelines: Australian guidance for petroleum, shipping and ports: http://www.marinepests.gov.au/	89836-218-8491			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The TER is focused on Hinkley Point C as a whole and the significance of individual project elements, including the preliminary work, appears to have been underestimated. If the temporary aggregates jetty and other preliminary works are to be treated as elements of the project in their own right, we will require more details of these aspects of the proposals including the construction of the jetty, new sea wall, cooling water intakes and outfalls, and the refurbishment of Comwich Wharf. This information should be provided and discussed with us prior to submission of any preliminary work applications.	88840-216-5409	/			Preliminary works applications to carry out site preparation works and for the construction of a temporary jetty at the Hinkley Point C site were submitted towards the end of 2010. On 28 th July 2011 West Somerset Council resolved to grant permission, subject to completion of an S106 agreement and finalisation of the planning conditions. The applications for a temporary jetty will be considered at a local public inquiry, scheduled to open on the 15 th November 2011.
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	10. In relation to the temporary jetty, consent may be needed from a government agency separate from the IPC. Since the jetty projects into the Severn Estuary, it seems unlikely that there will not need to be some consideration of potential impacts upon the SPA and/or SAC features.	87970-216-2277	/			Consultation comments on the proposed preliminary works were received during the formal Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultations, during which various queries were raised with respect to the potential impacts generated by the developments. These included queries in respect of the impacts generated by the preliminary works applications, in particular in relation to landscape and visual issues, marine ecology, marine sediments, traffic and transport, noise, recreation, ornithology and terrestrial ecology.
Kilve Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Preparatory Works; Although the reconstruction of Comwich Wharf will have little impact on the Parish of Stogursey, the Temporary Jetty, and the Sea defence wall will. First of all, the Jetty. What visual impact assessments have been done? Will the jetty be a prefabricated structure, if so, will it be bought in by road, or sea? What effect will there be on marine ecology? How will it affect tides/sediment movement? Is it permissible to export spoil taken from a vertical shaft, and horizontal tunnel, and "dump it at sea"? The spoil from the tunnelling project will presumably be different composition than that taken from the on-site foundations. What will this "spoil" consist of, how will it be graded, and having been graded, what areas are being considered for its disposal or re-use? Given that it is the intention to create a new harbour, will permission be sought from the local authority in the form of a Town and Country Planning Application (TCPA) or is it more likely that this will be decided by the Ministry for Transport (MFT)? The jetty is to be removed following completion of the new build project, or sooner, if the IPC turn down the application for the nuclear new build. Given that the Sea Defence Wall is to be constructed before the decision on the new build application, what will happen to it, should it be half built, and the application is not approved? Local walkers/residents wouldn't want a half built sea defence wall/coastal footpath to contend with. Would it be completed, or removed?	88930-216-19609	/			It should also be noted that a number of comments were also received during Stage 1 consultation on the Sea Wall, which, at the time, was intended to form part of the preliminary works applications. However, following Stage 1 consultation, and in response to various comments received, EDF Energy decided to not to include the Sea Wall within the package of preliminary works applications. A full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) was completed and an Environmental Statement (ES) was submitted in support of the preliminary works applications which assessed the environmental impacts generated by the proposals, including those environmental topic areas queried during Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultation. It identifies suitable measures to avoid and mitigate impacts where necessary. Whilst the site preparation works and jetty applications comprise standalone projects, the ES also considers the cumulative and in-combination impacts of the proposals with other ongoing and anticipated developments, including Hinkley Point C to ensure a complete and holistic assessment.
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	The Stage 1 Consultation document is focused on Hinkley Point C as a whole and the significance of individual project elements, including the preliminary work, appears to be overlooked. The temporary aggregates jetty and other preliminary works are treated almost as a necessary step in the construction process rather than elements of the 'project' in their own right. The authorities therefore require that more details are provided on preliminary works aspects of the proposals as well as other elements of the project, including the construction of the jetty, new sea wall, cooling water intakes and outfalls, and refurbishment of Comwich Wharf.	88070-216-526	/			Following submission of the applications in November 2010 for the site preparation works and December 2010 for the temporary jetty, the applications were subject to further statutory consultation by the consenting authorities. The authorities considering the applications forwarded the responses to EDF Energy for consideration. The nature of the responses was varied and in some instances, requests were made further clarification or for

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	<p>2.8.1.1 Recommended Additions to Baseline</p> <p>There is a significant omission at present around the proposed temporary aggregates jetty, dredging and sea wall will be assessed and these clearly have implications for marine water and sediment quality assessment. It is also strongly recommended that a future programme of numerical modelling of coastal processes be undertaken and detailed within the Stage 2 consultation process (to include wave, tide and sediment transport).</p> <p>Whilst there is adequate identification of water and sediment quality issues, more detail is required on sediment disturbance and contaminant mobilisation contribution to overall water quality in the baseline section.</p>	88150-216-3715	/			additional information to be provided. In considering the responses, EDF Energy, in the case of the temporary jetty applications, decided to submit an addendum to the ES in June 2011. In respect of the site preparation works application, EDF Energy decided to submit further environmental information by way of a 'Regulation 19 Response' in 2011 and a separate 'Further Environmental Material' in July 2011.
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	<p>2.8.4 Comments on Proposed Studies</p> <p>There is currently very limited data on the description and assessment methodology of the construction of the jetty, new sea wall, cooling water intakes and outfalls, and refurbishment of Combnich Wharf (although it is acknowledged that these elements are given some prominence in Section 4.). Further information is required on proposed studies in order for a fuller commentary to be made.</p>	88160-216-846	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	Confirmation is required under this section as to whether consideration has been given to monitoring suspended sediment levels from pre-construction through to post-construction of jetty (including dredging), sea wall and cooling water infrastructure.	88160-216-1973			/	
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	Currently, there is a relative paucity of detail provided on the assessment methodology for the sea wall, temporary aggregate jetty 'construction activity' and refurbishment of Combnich Wharf (although this is noted as being included in brief in section 4). Greater detail should be provided on cooling water intakes and outfalls. The document is currently focused on Hinkley Point C as a whole; however, the significance of individual project elements, e.g. the proposed new jetty, as a 'project' in its own right should be recognised. The temporary aggregates jetty, for example, appears to be viewed as an essential part of the construction methodology. The inclusion of numerical modelling and monitoring is strongly recommended.	88160-216-2516	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	The description of the proposed jetty construction and operation is inadequate. The sea wall and cooling water works are identified as 'the most significant structures to be introduced to the marine area'. Although, the jetty is proposed to be an open piled structure (rather than solid), its proposed dimensions, construction and design life (10 year plus), mean this is also a significant structure. It should be demonstrated that it is insignificant.	88160-216-4145	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	There is an absence of detail on the sea wall, temporary aggregate jetty 'construction activity' and refurbishment of Combwich Wharf. There is a little more detail provided on cooling water intakes and outfalls. The document is focused on Hinkley Point C as a whole and the significance of the individual project elements are often overlooked. The temporary aggregates jetty, for example, could be viewed simply as a necessary step in the construction methodology. However, this undervalues the significance of this element as a 'project' in its own right.	88170-216-2174	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	The Stage 1 Consultation document is focused on Hinkley Point C as a whole and the significance of individual project elements, including the preliminary work, appears to be overlooked. The temporary aggregates jetty and other preliminary works are treated almost as a necessary step in the construction process rather than elements of the 'project' in their own right. Further details would thus be expected to be provided on preliminary works aspects of the proposals as well as other elements of the project, including the construction of the jetty, new sea wall, cooling water intakes and outfalls, and refurbishment of Combwich Wharf. This information should be provided and discussed with the local authorities and the relevant statutory bodies prior to submission of any preliminary work applications. In addition, the authorities require further information on the planning strategy for these applications, including the consultation activities programmed for all elements; the relationship of technical information and the mechanisms to evaluate cumulative effects of the development in its entirety.	88580-216-1814	/			
Somerset Wildlife Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The time-lag between site clearance and determination of the DCO application by the IPC could be as great as a year, and therefore arrangements to off-set short term biodiversity impacts within this period need to be clarified. The strategy should also address the restoration of the site should EDF Energy fail to obtain a development consent order from the IPC.	8769-216-14871	/			
Tractivity 689	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Need to know more about impact the prelim work (and construction traffic) will have on village roads. Park and Ride or full bypass from M5 should be a precursor. NOT "traffic calming" measures which will be disruptive and intrusive for villagers (and for emergency services)	9449-216-886	/			
Tractivity 724	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Why cant the new jetty be used instead of the small one at Combwich which will have a negative impact on the village	9482-216-886			/	
Tractivity 732	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? This is a good idea to keep road deliveries down to a minimum	9490-216-888			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 835	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Will mean all traffic taking A39 and through Cannington	9593-216-886			/	
Tractivity 959	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? No preliminary works should start until permission to build the powerstation is granted.	9717-216-943			/	
Tractivity 961	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? You should not destroy anything or move any earth until you have permission. We have a process and you are not above it.	9719-216-949			/	
Tractivity 971	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I feel that no site works should begin the necessary road improvements are completed. The Cannington bypass is essential! I feel strongly that absolutely no Hinkley connected traffic should be allowed to come through Stogursey and the surrounding hamlets. The local authority should not grant permission for preliminary works.	9729-216-888			/	
Tractivity 972	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I do not believe that any site works should be allowed before the necessary road improvements have been made, particularly the construction of the new Cannington bypass. Under no circumstances should traffic be allowed to pass through Stogursey or the neighbouring hamlets. I would urge the local authority NOT to grant permission for these works.	9730-216-886			/	
Tractivity 973	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I am very concerned about the increase in light and noise pollution caused by the preliminary works. Wildlife such as skylarks will be devastated and there do not appear to be any strategies in place to minimise the environmental impact. I feel that EDFs proposals do not offer local residents any benefits and our current ways of living will be destroyed and disrupted for the next 12 years. I have no confidence in EDF and am extremely concerned about the future.	9731-216-10210	/			
Tractivity 974	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? It was surprising that throughout the stage one consultation residents were told that this was not possible and that construction engineers needed all of the land. One meeting with the (Personal details removed) helped resolve the issue giving residents the minimum that they could except.	9732-216-870			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 979	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Construction, fabrication works should be confined to the site and adjacent land. In particular options to use part of the A site land or buildings need to be explored thoroughly.	9737-216-395			/	
Tractivity 985	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? My concern is that you are taking far too much land from the local people. When EDF moved the Southern boundary it was only after much arguing and I feel that this was a tactical approach by EDF to give the impression that they had actually listened to local views. If the logistics of the movement of materials and machinery were thought about more thoroughly there would be no need to take so much land away from us.	9743-216-1222			/	
Tractivity 985	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I am against the idea of bulldozing 500 acres of land and decimating flora and fauna in advance of a main planning application even if it is said to be legal. It will be impossible to re-instate the land if permission is not granted. It is completely unnecessary to remove mature trees and the old barns which are roosting sites for many creatures including rare species of bat and a variety of insects and birds. As a ?green Company? I am shocked by this uncaring attitude of EDF.	9743-216-2127			/	
Tractivity 992	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? It is now Autumn and few details are available.	9750-216-1187	/			
Tractivity 1067	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? I am not opposed to the building of the plant but the construction phase does not address the implications for the local communities ie 1.Edf must make proposals for landscaping the construction site (no obligations have been specified). 2.A cumulative assessment of the residual effects of the combination of noise, air quality, visual, transport, recreational and amenity impacts on villages such as Shurton and Burton appear to be omitted from the appraisal. 3. Detailed arrangements for public access, footpaths, need to be agreed prior to the construction of boundary fencing. 4. The planting of additional trees to the west of the site (full length of Benhole Lane) should be actioned immediately to minimise the visual impact to the residents of Knighton. 5. Under the definition of Environment Zones the proposed construction site is defined as a Zone 1 (intrinsically dark) lighting of outdoor work places must comply with BS 12464-	9825-216-129			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1070	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? An early start will have an immediate effect on traffic through Bridgwater, along the A38 and A39 and would be a major disruption to the village of Cannington throughout the year and in particular during the summer period with the annual increase in holiday traffic. There is no logical alternative route to the West coast from Bridgwater to Minehead	9828-216-1071			/	
Tractivity 1104	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? We are concerned that preliminary works will take place prior to permission. We are very concerned about noise, dust etc and would require prior notice so that, in our case, we can warn our holiday visitors.	9862-216-1104			/	
Tractivity 1110	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Carrying out preliminary works at the site will involve the destruction on both sensitive wildlife areas and their natural habitat. To carry out such destruction before even being given the go ahead for the build is, in my opinion, morally wrong.	9868-216-894			/	
Tractivity 1118	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I AM OPPOSED TO PRELIMINARY WORKS STARTING & DISTURBING THE ENVIRONMENT BEFORE EDF HAVE PERMISSION TO GO AHEAD	9876-216-942			/	
Tractivity 1136	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Preparation will be damage local wildlife and agricultural land.	9894-216-984			/	
Tractivity 1137	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? unnecessary disruption to the environment	9895-216-998			/	
Tractivity 1150	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? No works should be carried out at this time until full planning has been granted. You cannot possibly reinstate land once it has been disrupted. The wildlife will not return!	9908-216-962			/	
Tractivity 1156	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? The works that you term preliminary will involve the removal of large areas of land surface and destroy any archaeological remains which survive. It will not be possible to reinstate these as they are finite and non-renewable. These works should not take place until permission for the power station to be built has been received.	9914-216-940			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1207	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? What will you put back if you have to reinstate the land? It will be too late for the wildlife, etc present. How can you pre-empt any planning decision in this arbitrary way?!	9965-216-886			/	
Tractivity 1218	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? How can man however clever they might be reinstate what years of nature has taken to put in place. Habitat and wildlife are disturbed never returns with the same beauty.	9976-216-1181			/	
Tractivity 1220	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? This landscape is irreplaceable. The habitat will be lost forever and the massive earth disturbance will change forever the conditions unique to this area. The seabed will be damaged and coastline destroyed forever. None of the damage done to earth shore and seabed can be made right. The current balance will be regained. Planning permission in full must be granted before any more work is already done ahead of the preliminaries even before anymore work at all is done on the site.	9978-216-1519			/	
Tractivity 1330	Public	Stage 2 Update	here is nothing in your proposal about the environmental effects of your preliminary works at Hinkley and during the construction of your preferred bypass on the village of Cannington which is already showing signs of repeated daily lorries travelling through from Hinkley. It can only get worse!	89596-216-303	/			
Tractivity 383	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? EDF must limit their works until planning consents are agreed following "consultation".	9068-216-4249			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 525	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Do you agree that EDF Energy's proposal to provide a landscape buffer on the southern boundary of the site is the best way of minimising the potential impact of the construction site for nearby local residents?</p> <p>Box ticked: Don't Know</p> <p>1. If yes, should this be retained as a permanent feature once construction is completed?</p> <p>Box ticked: Don't Know</p> <p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>We need more info, we don't want a wall! Will it minimise sound? Proof? Have you done this else where, does it work? We live in SHurton, the land rises up behind us, we are level with the top of your drilling platform? Does the south end of shurton not matter? Youpropose to start the buffer further along past the bridge. We need a site visit, communication and more info. Benhole Lanr residents private consultation we have views to preserve! And daylight.</p> <p>2. Return to land to its previous use</p> <p>Box ticked: no data</p> <p>2. Creation of wildlife habitats</p> <p>Box ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Grassland</p> <p>Box ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Woodland</p> <p>Box ticked: Very Important</p> <p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>We don't want an artificial situation with manicured footpaths. Anyway most of us will be too old to enjoy any countryside left, when you finish.</p>	9196-216-0	/			
Tractivity 585	Public	Stage 1	<p>11. Any other comments?</p> <p>As a matter of principle, it is unacceptable to carry out these works, which will cause irreversible damage to the environment, before a positive decision on the application for the new nuclear site has been made.</p>	9364-216-4915			/	
Tractivity 593	Public	Stage 1	<p>11. Any other comments?</p> <p>Nothing should happen untill Planning approval has been granted because if it is not granted, there would have been site disturbance together with loss of wildlife, fauna & flora & associated habitats which will take years to return. This is Environmental Vandalism.</p>	9259-216-3935			/	
Tractivity 62616	Public	Stage 2	<p>Enquiring about the preliminary works taking place at Stockmoor</p>	10163-216-48			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- We still await submission of the Preliminary Works /Temporary Jetty Applications, but wish to re-emphasise that, in our opinion, the levelling of the site in preparation for the development should not take place before the IPC have determined the main application for a Development Consent Order. We would, therefore, consider the implications of the proposals on the heritage assets and the historic environment are regarded in light of the policies contained in PPS5.	10190-216-1080	/			
Burnham Boat Owners Sea Angling Association	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	1) Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty,	10258-216-104			/	
Stogursey and District Parish Plan Steering Committee	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	3) What are your views on our plans for preliminary works Unsatisfactory The hamlets of Stogursey will suffer grievously during the entire construction process. During the preliminary works there will be no mitigation of traffic impact. Stogursey is the point of social and commercial contact for the parish, which straddles the C182. Those living on the eastern side of the C182 will find the crossing of the highway and their use of the lanes made increasingly hazardous as a consequence of construction traffic. The main village and the hamlets on the western side of the C182 will find traffic on their roads inevitably heavier, with consequent inconvenience, noise, pollution, hazard and delay. Those who ride, walk and cycle on these lanes will find them more dangerous than ever.	10259-216-1736			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	y) By pushing forward aggressively with your plans to undertake site preparation and preliminary works prior to consents being obtained for the whole concept, EDF have fundamentally lost support and trust in the community.	89470-216-9246			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	I'd rather you took the time to get your plans straight first before devastating an existing landscape and ecosystem, evicting badgers and chopping down irreplaceable ancient hedgerows and trees, destroying archaeological artefacts, etc.	89470-216-10183			/	
Avon and Somerset Constabulary	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Provision of a seaward access should reduce the impact of road based deliveries and address potential congestion issues which the increased volume of traffic on the existing highway network may cause.	89054-216-1362			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	HGV and LGV trip generation figures have been supplied for some but not all HPC developments. Daily profiles are required for all trips. The following have been supplied: - HPC development site - Main construction phase HGV freight movements; - HPC development site - Main construction phase LGV freight movements; and - Off site associated development - Main construction phase HGV freight movements. 3.68 Not supplied to date: - Preliminary site works - HGV and LGV freight movements;	89172-216-2506	/			
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	- Very serious concerns about the timeline for preliminary works and the lack of the improvements to Comwich Wharf, the provision of the Cannington Bypass and the provision of the temporary aggregates jetty.	89183-216-6344			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	On the basis on the information supplied in the Transport Appraisal and supporting freight movements spreadsheet, trip generation details have been provided for some but not all developments associated with the HPC. Below is a list of what has been received and what is still outstanding: 3.186 Supplied information: - HPC development site - Main construction phase heavy goods vehicles (HGV) freight movements; - HPC development site - Main construction phase light goods vehicles (LGV) freight movements; - Off site associated development - Main construction phase HGV freight movements; 3.187 Not supplied to date: - Preliminary site works - HGV and LGV freight movements;	89234-216-2996	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The construction phasing is a concern as it appears that not all freight facilities; HPC jetty, Comwich wharf, J23 and J24 logistics facilities will be available for use prior to the construction phase commencing. For example the Transport Appraisal states that as part of Preliminary Works 360,000 tonnes of granular material will be imported from off-site and because the jetty will not be available all material would be delivered by road. Assuming a 15 tonne payload this would require some 24,000 HGV trips, which could potentially be avoided by the use of sea transportation.	89234-216-4201	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[5.1.19] States that Preliminary Works workers will be mainly home based. SPC thinks this is not the case as there are no contractors large enough in the area to take this on, and a company from out of the area will bring their own workforce with them. What will EDF do about housing these workers?	89292-216-4337			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
RSPB	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We note the predicted 'temporary' effect of a jetty (18.7.68), which nonetheless, is likely to remain in place for seven years. For passage populations of birds such as ringed plover, which may not habituate to the presence and operation of the jetty, any displacement impacts in CS1 could be significant within the SPA.	89457-216-8262	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	It is stated in the revised SOCC that EDF Energy will consult with the affected local communities and take their views into account before finalising preliminary works applications. However, based on consultations with local residents, in particular in the Shurton and Burton areas, it would appear that there continues to be uncertainty about when works might commence, what they will ultimately comprise and a great deal of concern regarding the principle of the preliminary works, in particular in relation to impacts from noise, dust and traffic and impacts on quality of life and access.	89296-216-5254	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	It is stated in the revised SOCC that EDF Energy will consult with the affected local communities and take their views into account before finalising preliminary works applications. A statement on their consultation webpage notes that consultation on the preliminary works with local residents took place on the 19th April 2010. Reference is also made to further meetings with local residents in May and June to provide updates on works taking place. However, based on consultations with local residents, in particular in the Shurton and Burton areas, it would appear that there continues to be uncertainty about when works might commence and concern regarding the preliminary works, in particular in relation to impacts from noise, dust and traffic and impacts on quality of life and access.	89319-216-1896	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	concern regarding the preliminary works, in particular in relation to impacts from noise, dust and traffic and impacts on quality of life and access	89326-216-4281	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	In nationally significant infrastructure projects such as Hinkley Point C, the early stages of works involve activities which can bring with them sudden and often significant effects on the environment, for example site mobilisation activities, site clearance and utilities enabling works. Whilst it is understood that consents will be sought by EDF for these early works packages it is concerning that they could begin before the Environmental Statement is produced and the residual effects of the scheme determined.	89417-216-12950	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	- In relation to dust no mitigation is committed at this stage and given the preliminary works have the potential to generate large quantities of dust we would have expected to see more detail on the proposed mitigation at this stage. Further it is difficult on this basis to understand in the assessment of residual effect how its effectiveness therefore was determined.	89430-216-4819	/			
Tractivity 62998	Public	Stage 2 Update	Work should not be going on on site now it should be stopped immediately.	89692-216-5225			/	
Bridgwater Town Council	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	as in the submission to West Somerset Council all routes will be affected from the commencement of the preliminary works, including the jetty building/improvements both at Hinkley Point and Combswich. All this will be in the absence of the park and ride and freight handling which form essential elements of the transport strategy. Timings for provision in relation to the whole programme is still unclear. A detailed timetable of interaction with assessments of capacity, improvement and mitigation works against the programme and the actual carrying out of changes is critical now not later.	89746-216-7443	/			
Nether Stowey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	3.1 The Parish Council opposes the application on the following grounds (i) The application is premature and the proposed works should form part of the Development Consent Order Application to the Infrastructure Planning Commission.	89752-216-16568			/	
Countryside Council for Wales	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	- We remind you to include the Temporary Jetty in your in-combination assessment of impacts in the HRA work that forms part of your DCO application	89833-216-3362	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	The impacts upon terrestrial ecology, as a result of construction works at the main site, have largely been subsumed in the discussions concerning preliminary works. The Council would refer EDF to the Council's comments made in relation to the preliminary works application and the need for conditions in relation to marine ecology, bat conservation, and terrestrial ecology.	89855-216-0			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	Transport related impacts at Cannington, that would occur during the proposed preliminary works and during the main works prior to the construction of a bypass, are a major concern that are not addressed by the consultation and represent an important omission. This potentially represents a substantive period of disruption affecting the amenity of the village for approximately three years.	89875-216-8678			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	-See reference above regarding the need to impose appropriate mitigation and compensation controls at the TCPA planning application for preliminary works stage. - The Preferred Proposals information has an inextricable link to the preliminary works proposals to be considered by the district council. As such there needs to be clarity between what will form part of the DCO application and what will be considered through the TCPA process.	89201-219-4094			/	
West Hinkley Action Group	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	- Minimise destruction of hedges, trees, copses, old buildings throughout the site and re-use/recycle materials from the barns into the community in ways subject to further consultation. Planting and re-planting should be undertaken immediately it becomes possible and not wait for the completion of the entire project. Stone from the barns could be used to make habitats within the community area of the bund and the tiles could be used to roof a structure also within the bund to provided habitat for swifts, owls and bats. More information is required before the local community can make further observation.	8755-219-1675	/			
Somerset Wildlife Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The time-lag between site clearance and determination of the DCO application by the IPC could be as great as a year, and therefore arrangements to off-set short term biodiversity impacts within this period need to be clarified. The strategy should also address the restoration of the site should EDF Energy fail to obtain a development consent order from the IPC.	8769-219-14871	/			
Tractivity 809	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? More information required on the impact this will have on Cannington and Bridgwater. Preliminary works will require an increase in traffic to the site; how will this be mitigated?	9567-219-1134	/			
Tractivity 832	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? If lighting used this should be low level and noise pollution kept to a minimum.	9590-219-916			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 997	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below After talking to your representatives I now know that EDF do not care what effect they will have on peoples lives or what the financial impact that you will surely have and to quote:- EDF will not compensate because legally we don?t have to! DO YOU HAVE NO MORAL CODE!	9755-219-6875			/	
Tractivity 1353	Public	Stage 2 Update	Why do you continue to press for preliminary Works before building a northern haul road from J23 directly to Hinkley Point?	89619-219-1320			/	
Tractivity 1371	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	You are using the emergency road entrance for your landscaping work. Do you intend to use this for your preliminary works - I hope not as that would increase my traffic fear as above.	89637-219-1483		/		
Tractivity 1371	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	It is nice to see you start on the tree planting as declared. Would you now press on with the local mitigation so at least we are ready for the noise, dust, light pollution, etc.	89637-219-1708		/		
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	In addition the building & use of a massive Jetty on the foreshore to bring in aggregate etc for the new build straight over the foreshore where we currently exercise our rights to enjoy our recreational activities on what is a marine reserve and NNR. There are no proposals to mitigate this or provide anything in mitigation and the public will be excluded from the area which is not owned by EDF for a very long time if not permanently.	10091-219-4128	/			
Tractivity 62508	Public	Stage 2	Several "local" projects have been put forward to EdF as mitigation for the preliminary works, which would be direct mitigation for the harm that will be caused as a result of their work.	10098-219-19745			/	
Somerset Wildlife Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The Trust feels strongly that preliminary works involving the clearance of vegetation from the site should not be undertaken prior to alternative habitats being provided in the vicinity of the HPC development site	10263-219-15927	/			
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	15.21 As with the Health Care contribution, the impact of the preliminary works application must also be mitigated and the Estate will expect to see provision for this cost in connection with that application.	89446-219-8864			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	If applications, under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, are to be made to the local planning authorities then the authorities will require pre-application consultation on these applications in accordance with their Statements of Community Involvement. It is also noted that there has been no details provided or discussion undertaken on the draft heads of terms for a section 106 (s.106) agreement for the preliminary works and West Somerset District Council require such discussions to take place prior to submission of any major application requiring a s.106 agreement.	89319-219-3021	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The travel plan does not include SMART targets and the monitoring proposed is inadequate.	89426-219-2112	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Further mitigation is likely to be necessary, by early construction of the Cannington Bypass to mitigate the impact of the preliminary works.	89426-219-2205		/		
Tractivity 62972	Public	Stage 2 Update	Additional shift hours will add to negative impact on health and wellbeing of local residents: unrelenting noise from the site; increase in road congestion. EDF's desire to complete asap needs to be weighed against the human rights of local residents to peace and quiet if they have chosen to live in a rural location. It is not sufficient for EDF to state (as on BBC Points West December 2010) that it will give financial support to those residents who wish to move. EDF needs to show that it can implement its plans with due heed to the welfare of the existing community and not push them out by industrialising the countryside on a massive scale.	89687-219-181			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	there remain substantial concerns around the impacts of the project at the construction phase as well as issues around fully compensating and mitigating the impact of the project, including the storage of nuclear waste for over 100 years.	89876-219-2298			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	3.4.9 The response also recommends that EDF considers all the comments and recommendations set out in the Technical Evaluation Report (Appendix 3) including comments on geology, soils and land use, land contamination and waste, hydrogeology, hydrology, drainage and flood risk, fresh water quality, marine water and sediment quality, hydrodynamic and coastal geomorphology, terrestrial, marine and coastal flora and fauna, noise and vibration, landscape and visual amenity, archaeology and cultural heritage and amenity and recreation.	88790-224-25558			/	
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	3. In order to speed up the process of building the new power station and enable us to finish work earlier we intend to apply this summer to undertake preliminary works to prepare the main site and build a temporary jetty for the delivery of bulk materials. If permission is not obtained we will reinstate this land. Satisfactory Unsatisfactory No Opinion Don't know - The land cannot be reinstated. The preliminary works are too devastating. These facts do not need elaboration. - No detail is given for the preliminary works themselves. By what process of double-think can EdF call this question a 'consultation'? - should works proceed all disruption will be borne by the host communities as the infrastructure exists and with no mitigation suggested or proposed. The company should go through the full planning process before it sets spade to soil. In conjunction with the lack of detail they provide and their poor record of community engagement the haste with which the company proceeds makes their entire operation seem unreliable and badly planned. It gives the local community no confidence in EdF's competence or good faith.	89806-224-3324			/	
Tractivity 396	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? All preliminary works must be carried out by workers living on site in temporary accommodation and all materials supplied by sea or Comwich Wharf (Providing the access road is built).	9085-215-4793			/	
Tractivity 62972	Public	Stage 2 Update	My main points regarding negative impacts: Additional shift hours will add to negative impact on health and wellbeing of local residents: unrelenting noise from the site; increase in road congestion. EDF's desire to complete asap needs to be weighed against the human rights of local residents to peace and quiet if they have chosen to live in a rural location. It is not sufficient for EDF to state (as on BBC Points West December 2010) that it will give financial support to those residents who wish to move. EDF needs to show that it can implement its plans with due heed to the welfare of the existing community and not push them out by industrialising the countryside on a massive scale.	89687-266-135			/	
Tractivity 1463	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	Destroyed the landscape (I refer to your pre-proposals) and created transportation chaos.	90037-216-661			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's	Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	- The phasing of highways works and deliverability of a transport package will also need to be explained and assessed. It likely that the HPC preliminary works will have commenced by the time further junction improvements need to be implemented to support the main HPC construction stage, meaning that the road network will all already be subject higher levels of vehicle movements than would normally be the case. In these circumstances, highways work could cause further traffic congestion with impacts upon business, economic development and communitie	89956-216-5698	/			
Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's	Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	- The phasing of construction and deliverability of highways improvements will need to be assessed. It is possible that the HPC preliminary works will have commenced by the time further junction improvements to support the main HPC construction stage are implemented, meaning that the road network will already be subject to higher levels of vehicle movements than the project baseline case. Under these conditions, traffic congestion could adversely impact upon the operations of businesses, economic development and attracting inward investment, and local communities. The Councils would seek to ensure that the costs of delays experienced are factored into the socioeconomic assessment for the HPC project as a whole.	89959-216-13657	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	We would also raise the issue of the impact of this scheme on the historic landscape of this part of the county. The area is characterised by a rolling landform that was clearly attractive to early settlers as evidenced by the evidence from the excavations to date. We would therefore wish to see this undulating landscape reinstated to the southern part of the development site in order to restore the visual quality to this part of the site and in turn to the land belonging to Fairfield House. We do not consider that the bund indicated on Fig10.8 of the TER would meet this requirement. Furthermore, the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment by Gillespies is not comprehensive enough and omits many viewpoints that we consider essential in assessing the full impact on the historic assets in the vicinity. We also query the criteria of what constitutes primary or secondary viewpoints.	88840-220-6747			/	The Site Preparation Works Planning Application provides for the removal of any installed infrastructure and the re-instatement of the site in the event that the Development Consent Order (DCO) application is unsuccessful, or if a DCO is granted but works are not commenced within a certain timeframe. An 'outline' re-instatement scheme was included with the planning application (Planning Application Drawing HPCSPW020) supported by a Landscape Mitigation & Re-instatement Strategy (November 2010) that described the rationale behind, and objectives of, the reinstatement proposals, and explained how any such works would be carried out.
Kilve Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The jetty is to be removed following completion of the new build project, or sooner, if the IPC turn down the application for the nuclear new build. Given that the Sea Defence Wall is to be constructed before the decision on the new build application, what will happen to it, should it be half built, and the application is not approved? Local walkers/residents wouldn't want a half built sea defence wall/coastal footpath to contend with. Would it be completed, or removed?	88930-220-20659	/			The intention would be to recreate the undulating landscape that presently exists within the site, to reinstate Holford valley and all existing watercourses and ditches and to recreate much the same agricultural pattern delineated by field boundaries, hedgerows and woodland brakes. Following the Stage 1 consultation it was decided to remove the sea wall from the Preliminary Works because the cliff that fronts the site would be impossible to re-create. In addition, the proposals for accessing the foreshore for the site preparation works and the temporary jetty were amended to utilise a natural gap in the cliff so as not to damage it.
Tractivity 682	Public	Stage 2	7. Any other ideas or comments? How will it be removed without environmental impact???	9442-220-3420			/	
Tractivity 716	Public	Stage 2	I am pleased that EDF is taking the trouble to reinstate the natural environment it will be destroying at Hinkley Point I UTTERLY OBJECT TO EDF'S STANCE ON PROPOSED APPLICATION FOR WIND TURBINES AT THE ENORMOUSLY ECOLOGICALLY SENSITIVE HUNTSPILL SITES	9474-220-160			/	The re-instatement proposals would see the north-western part of the site returned to agricultural use – achieving the same agricultural land classification within this area as at present – with the north-eastern part of the site and the area south of Green Lane planted and managed for wildlife benefit. Although it would take time for the new planting and habitats to mature, EDF Energy is confident that, over time, the site would show gains in terms of landscape character and biodiversity when compared against the existing situation.
Tractivity 935	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I think you should wait until you have planning permission before any preliminary works are done. I notice walking down there that the land is already resembling a building site. The loss of established flora and fauna cannot simply be re-instated?.	9693-220-1168			/	The only existing features of significance that would not be possible to 'recreate' within the scheme would be the archaeological heritage of the site – notably the five suspected buried archaeological sites identified within the development site during the archaeological evaluation. It is proposed that these features are
Tractivity 947	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? A good idea	9705-220-933			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 985	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I am against the idea of bulldozing 500 acres of land and decimating flora and fauna in advance of a main planning application even if it is said to be legal. It will be impossible to re-instate the land if permission is not granted. It is completely unnecessary to remove mature trees and the old barns which are roosting sites for many creatures including rare species of bat and a variety of insects and birds. As a 'green Company' I am shocked by this uncaring attitude of EDF.	9743-220-2127			/	preserved 'by record' during the development.
Tractivity 1093	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Preparation of the main site before permissions cannot be reinstated without impact - ancient hedgerows being an example of ecosystems that cannot be reinstated as they were. Work should not begin unless permissions are given	9851-220-1033			/	
Tractivity 1145	Public	Stage 2	It is impossible to reinstate the land as after your preliminary works it will no longer exist, it will just be an enormous hole.	9903-220-1278			/	
Tractivity 1150	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? No works should be carried out at this time until full planning has been granted. You cannot possibly reinstate land once it has been disrupted. The wildlife will not return!	9908-220-962			/	
Tractivity 1156	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? The works that you term preliminary will involve the removal of large areas of land surface and destroy any archaeological remains which survive. It will not be possible to reinstate these as they are finite and non-renewable. These works should not take place until permission for the power station to be built has been received.	9914-220-940			/	
Tractivity 1158	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? If preliminary works are undertaken but the main application does not receive approval, this will amount to criminal environmental damage. The flora, fauna, wildlife & biodiversity has taken 100's of years to evolve. For edf to say they will reinstate the area if the main planning application is refused is totally ludicrous. It would take 100's of years to evolve back to its current state. Preliminary works should not take place.	9916-220-894			/	
Tractivity 1165	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? but would you do so?	9923-220-913			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1192	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? How will you reinstate the wildlife? Taking the piss of planning process	9950-220-1046			/	
Tractivity 1195	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? This is totally unacceptable. The flora and fauna of the area will be decimated. This includes mature trees, scrub, grassland and semi derelict barns. (Personal details removed) from EDF (Personal details removed) has admitted that EDF will NOT be able to reinstate the land to its original condition. This should not be a separate application but should be considered as part of the application to the IPC.	9953-220-1560			/	
Tractivity 1207	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? What will you put back if you have to reinstate the land? It will be too late for the wildlife, etc present. How can you pre-empt any planning decision in this arbitrary way?!	9965-220-886			/	
Tractivity 1213	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Essentially, your conduct here has been, and is, disgraceful. Without consent, no preliminary works should be undertaken. Your definition of ?temporary? is flawed and misleading, and by using it you intend to wilfully misinform and minimise the impact of your actions on the local community. How will you re-instate fully grown trees? How will you reinstate a coast line that has taken millions of years to form? I expect answers personally.	9971-220-2127			/	
Tractivity 1216	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Reinstating the land is never very successful	9974-220-1015			/	
Tractivity 1218	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? How can man however clever they might be reinstate what years of nature has taken to put in place. Habitat and wildlife are disturbed never returns with the same beauty.	9976-220-1181			/	
Tractivity 377	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? All areas should be returned to its natural beauty as soon as work on that part of the site is completed not wait years until the whole project is complete	9064-220-776			/	
Tractivity 393	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? How can land be restored when the impact of building a nuclear power station will be so great and longlasting?	9078-220-729			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 428	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Need more information about reinstatement of site if plans are abandoned	9109-220-3645	/			
Tractivity 466	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? If there is little justification for the land to return to former use then I would suggest priority to varied wildlife by varied vegetation together with new public rights of way to replace the mileage lost within the HPC site	9356-220-881	/			
Tractivity 62305	Public	Stage 2	Bishops Wood, planted in 1999 with taxpayers money, is to be flattened to make way for Hinkley C. Is it not possible to transplant at least some of those saplings on the southern boundary. The screening effect would be almost immediate and the equipment and expertise is commonplace. New trees will take a decade to reach the same state of maturity.	9994-220-0		/		
Tractivity 62431	Public	Stage 2	EdF wish to apply for planning permission to strip the whole of the site, close all PRow, and fence off the whole area prior to gaining Planning permission for the build of the reactors. I find this unacceptable. Although it has been stated that the land, hedges and trees including habitats would be reinstated if Pp were not given, I believe that gradual work could be carried out, in stages, to give some respite to local residents and to cause the least disruption. It would be impossible to recreate the landscape as it now is. EdF should also create new PRow to enable local residents to continue to enjoy walking in the area.	10065-220-4458	/			
Tractivity 62554	Public	Stage 2	The intention to conduct site works there, prior to planning permission and even before a planning application has been made, is outrageous. It is not possible to "restore" such a piece of countryside within any conceivable timescale, once the damage has been done.	10114-220-1079			/	
Tractivity 62572	Public	Stage 2	EDF say that they will re-instate the land should permission be denied but this is impossible. EDF cannot replant mature woods and hedgerows, reinstate disturbed wildlife, put back fences and barns. EDF say it will in fact be better, but I disagree as what has taken may be a hundred years to establish will take a similar time to replace and the people who will suffer that loss most are the local residents who chose to live in this peaceful rural location for the tranquility of the lifestyle and the nature on the doorstep.	10123-220-4258			/	
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	1. Comment Disappointed you need to chop down mature trees. There's no way you can reinstate those when you are gone.	10124-220-121			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	It is highly unlikely you will reinstate the land preferring to use it as a 'legacy' (your word not mine) for the locals.	10124-220-1141			/	
Tractivity 62577	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	- The land cannot be reinstated. The preliminary works are too devastating. These facts do not need elaboration.	10128-220-3299			/	
Tractivity 62582	Public	Stage 2	Re. the landscaping: you mention early planting but I don't think you understand how long deciduous trees take to grow and mature. I have spoken to (Personal details removed) re. your 'landscape strategy' and she tells me that the planting will be 75% deciduous, to include willow and poplar, 25% coniferous, and hedgerow plants and scrub. The highest tree you intend to plant is only 6 feet, all the others being 'tiny saplings'. This means that it will be at least twenty years before the deciduous trees reach any reasonable size and maturity, therefore much taller trees that 6 feet need to be planted early. Many of us human residents of Shurton will probably have died by then. I am sure that the Hinkley C budget of billions of pounds can stretch to a better early planting of larger trees.	10133-220-547	/			
Forum 21	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	EdF says it will "restore" the site to its original state if it does not receive planning permission for the power station. This is impossible - you cannot recreate a landscape that has taken hundreds of years to mature.	10262-220-10704			/	
Tractivity 846	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	EDF should wait for full planning permission like everyone else before starting any work. The land could never be reinstated as it is now. as we like it. No preliminary works!	10278-220-1193			/	
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	3.1 Chapter 12, Section 12.5.29 (Volume 2) of the Environmental Appraisal, notes that soils and land use would be returned to agriculture under a proposed Restoration Plan. EDF's preferred proposal document notes that, for preliminary works, they will reinstate land to a good condition in the event that permission for the power station is not obtained. A later section of that proposal, outlining construction land use, similarly states that the area used during construction would also be restored to a good condition. The Estate requests clarification as to what is meant by the term "good condition".	89440-220-8684	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	EdF says it will "restore" the site to its original state if it does not receive planning permission for the power station. This is impossible - you cannot recreate a landscape that has taken hundreds of years to mature.	89452-220-1084			/	
Nether Stowey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>Impact on the Area</p> <p>2.2 The Parish Council considers that in the event that the DCO application were to be refused it would not be possible to undo fully the proposed works. Accordingly it is considered that suggestions by the applicant that in the eventuality the DCO application is declined the area would be returned to its previous state are incorrect.</p> <p>2.3 If this application were approved, the works commenced and then the DCO application were refused the resultant work to undo any works carried out up to that date would logically double the length of time on site, with all associated impacts both on and off site.</p> <p>2.4 As regards the impact on the area immediately adjacent to the application site the Parish Council has noted the formal response by Stogursey Parish Council (dated 11 January 2011) and supports the points made by that Council.</p>	89752-220-14031			/	
Countryside Council for Wales	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>Section 9.5.49 refers to the removal/dismantling of the jetty 'if necessary'. We refer you to our comments above that our advice on these applications is given on the basis that the aggregates jetty is a temporary structure which will be dismantled/removed in accordance with Regulation 29 of the HEO (ref: DC 9229), as described in section 6(b) of the FEPA application (ref: DC 9228).</p> <p>In addition, we query whether there are any proposals for reinstatement of the berthing pocket, noting that there is no reference to this in Chapter 6 or Chapter 9 of the ES.</p>	89836-220-4724			/	
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	3.4.9 The response also recommends that EDF considers all the comments and recommendations set out in the Technical Evaluation Report (Appendix 3) including comments on geology, soils and land use, land contamination and waste, hydrogeology, hydrology, drainage and flood risk, fresh water quality, marine water and sediment quality, hydrodynamic and coastal geomorphology, terrestrial, marine and coastal flora and fauna, noise and vibration, landscape and visual amenity, archaeology and cultural heritage and amenity and recreation.	88790-224-25558			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	<p>3. In order to speed up the process of building the new power station and enable us to finish work earlier we intend to apply this summer to undertake preliminary works to prepare the main site and build a temporary jetty for the delivery of bulk materials. If permission is not obtained we will reinstate this land.</p> <p>Satisfactory Unsatisfactory No Opinion Don't know</p> <p>- The land cannot be reinstated. The preliminary works are too devastating. These facts do not need elaboration.</p> <p>- No detail is given for the preliminary works themselves. By what process of double-think can EdF call this question a 'consultation'?</p> <p>- should works proceed all disruption will be borne by the host communities as the infrastructure exists and with no mitigation suggested or proposed. The company should go through the full planning process before it sets spade to soil. In conjunction with the lack of detail they provide and their poor record of community engagement the haste with which the company proceeds makes their entire operation seem unreliable and badly planned. It gives the local community no confidence in EdF's competence or good faith.</p>	89806-224-3324			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Trinity House	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	It is noted from the pre-application consultation that Combwich Wharf is to be refurbished, temporary jetties to be constructed and a cooling water infrastructure proposed (horizontal tunnels and vertical wells), in such cases Trinity House will consider any requirements for marking once details have been provided or at the time the application for consent to the Marine and Fisheries Agency is made.	8692-215-376			/	The temporary jetty forms an integral part of EDF Energy's Freight Strategy for the construction of Hinkley Point C which seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the development and hence minimise environmental impacts related to construction traffic.
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	3.4.8 A concern is registered that little detail is provided within the Stage 1 document on the preliminary works and the consent processes for these works. Further details are requested from EDF on the preliminary works aspects of the proposals as well as other elements of the project, including the construction of the jetty, new sea wall, cooling water intakes and outfalls, and refurbishment of Combwich Wharf.	88790-215-25139	/			The jetty proposals have been informed by both formal and informal consultation with stakeholders - including statutory and non- statutory bodies and the public - in the run-up to submission in December 2011 of applications to the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) for a Harbour Empowerment Order (HEO) and Food, Environment Protection Act (FEPA) Licences, and an application to the Department for Energy & Climate Change (DECC) for a Transport and Works Act Order (TWAO) [hereinafter referred to collectively as the 'jetty applications'].
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	First of all, the Jetty. What visual impact assessments have been done? Will the jetty be a prefabricated structure, if so, will it be bought in by road, or sea? What effect will there be on marine ecology? How will it affect tides/sediment movement?	88930-215-19778	/			The MMO has decided to hold a public local inquiry into the jetty applications which will begin on 15 th November 2011. It is anticipated that if the applications are successful the orders will come into force and licences granted in the Spring 2012. Preliminary Works Applications
Kilve Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The jetty and associated storage facility are described in brief within this section. There is a complete absence of any design detail for this construction and limited drawing material to assist with an understanding of its construction. Justification should be provided for the expected HGV movement offset quoted in the Stage 1 Consultation document. It is understood that a Harbour Empowerment Order (HEO) will be made during 2010 and it is expected that full details of the proposal be made available in advance of such an application for public consideration and comment. This detail should include the construction, operation and decommissioning aspects of the proposals.	88590-215-1645	/			The temporary jetty, together with the site preparation works planning application (Ref: 3/32/1025) which was submitted to West Somerset Council, comprise the preliminary works. The Preliminary Works would bring forward the operation of the new power station. In addition, and as set out above, the temporary jetty is an integral part of the EDF Energy's Freight Strategy which seeks to minimise the volume of traffic associated with the development of the Hinkley Point C Project because the jetty would enable the vast majority of aggregate such as sand and cement, together with other construction materials to be brought to the site via sea rather than road. Early consent is therefore sought for the jetty in order to realise the benefits which the jetty brings at the earliest opportunity.
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	There are some concerns regarding aspects of the Preliminary Works (temporary aggregates jetty) not detailed within the Stage 1 Consultation document. It must be demonstrated that the safety mechanisms to be instituted during aggregate loading will protect users of Rights of Way.	88600-215-2901	/			Extent of Consultation EDF Energy carried out consultation on the proposed temporary jetty as part of the wider proposals for Hinkley Point C during Stage 1 (November 2009-

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	<p>The proposal outlined for the construction of a temporary jetty within the range, will obstruct operationally important air gunnery practice from being undertaken by virtue of the presence of the jetty structure, ships and associated personnel in the firing area. In addition other marine structures (such as water intake and outfall pipes for the new power station) could also be located within the range and may permanently affect firing activities by introducing hardened surfaces which projectiles might hit and ricochet off.</p> <p>The document identifies that there is not a viable alternative location for the development of a jetty (section 4.12.12). The MOD recognises the national importance of the construction of this new nuclear power station and is receptive to modifying the range area to accommodate the proposed jetty structure.</p>	8775-215-8116			/	<p>January 2010), Stage 2 (July-October 2011) and the Stage 2a Update (February-March 2011).</p> <p>In addition to this, the jetty applications were subject to statutory consultation, carried out by the MMO and DECC following submission of the applications and again, by the MMO, following submission of the ESA.</p> <p>The Jetty</p> <p>The jetty is a temporary structure which will be used solely in connection with the construction of Hinkley Point C. The jetty itself comprises a “bridge-like” structure extending 500m or so into Bridgwater bay with a jetty head at the end to receive vessels. The area around the jetty head would be dredged so that the jetty can safely receive vessels at all stages of the tide to maximise its efficiency. A conveyor and pipeline would be strung along the jetty from the jetty head that would be used to transfer aggregate into storage infrastructure that would be located on-shore. There would be a roadway along the jetty with a crane at the jetty head for receipt of other construction materials which could be unloaded onto wagons and taken ashore. The on-shore storage infrastructure would comprise silos for cement and stockpiles for aggregate – both external stockpiles and, for finer materials, internal stockpiles housed in a “sand shed”.</p> <p>Full details of the design and some information regarding the construction of the temporary jetty are located within the Construction Method Statement submitted in support of the DCO as well as Chapter 6 of the ES submitted in support of the jetty applications (December 2010). It will be removed when it is no longer required i.e. following construction of Hinkley Point C.</p>
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>The MOD is investigating the possibility of moving the actual firing target area within the existing Danger Area - moving the firing impact zone away from the area of the proposed developments to achieve an appropriate separation distance between the two activities. Relocating firing activities to a different area of the marine environment will necessitate that the MOD completes a Sustainability Appraisal and a Statutory Habitats Regulations Assessment of the proposed changes. In addition the removal and relocation of buoys and associated anchoring points would also be required.</p> <p>Alternatively, to achieve an appropriate separation distance to safely accommodate the proposed jetty and the associated maritime activities, it may be necessary to expand or relocate the entire range Danger Area.</p> <p>This would entail obtaining a modification to regulated UK air space. This in itself can be the subject of an extensive consultation and impact assessment process administered by the Civil Aviation Authority. A Sustainability Appraisal and a Statutory Habitats Regulations Assessment Sustainability to assess the environmental impacts of relocating a military firing activity would also need to be undertaken. It is possible that these procedures may determine that relocation of the Danger Area is not permissible.</p>	8775-215-8961			/	
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>This jjetty may also be used for boating staff for accomodation to and from Minehead, Tides permitting</p>	9476-215-884		/		<p>Various design options were considered in developing the jetty proposals, including larger structures which could enable a wider range of materials (such as Abnormal Indivisible Loads, or AILs) to be imported directly to the site by sea. For a number of reasons – not least the high sensitivity of the foreshore – the lightweight, temporary jetty was selected in order to minimise the impact of the development on the environment, with existing facilities at Combwich Wharf being upgraded and refurbished so that it can</p>
Tractivity 718	Public	Stage 2	<p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Why cant the new jetty be used instead of the small one at Combwich which will have a negative impact on the village</p>	9482-215-886		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 724	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Wish you luck for speedy construction but not at expense of local people's lives, or wildlife or vegetation. The jetty is a good idea but minimise the period when there is no access along the north coast of site. A round walk is a pleasure and you are taking it away. Give positive though to what else you could bring in via the jetty. Preliminary works should not disturb local people at night	9504-215-1998		/		receive ALLs. Together, the temporary jetty and Combwich Wharf will maximise the import of construction materials to site by sea. Nature of Materials to be Imported to the Site via the Jetty The jetty will enable the delivery of at least 80% of the cement, sand, aggregates and cement replacement products (such as pulverised fuel ash) required for the construction of Hinkley Point C by sea. In addition, the jetty is designed to receive other materials such as unitised and/or pre-fabricated items such as pre-cast concrete pipeline units (e.g. for the intake and outfall structures), steel reinforcement bars (e.g. for concrete), brickwork, cabling, piping, ducting, etc.
Tractivity 746	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? The jetty may not be the right choice as a bigger option may be needed to keep all traffic on site	9530-215-1052		/		
Tractivity 772	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Why a temporary jetty it would make far more sense to build a permanent structure for present and future use.	9536-215-886		/		Transport Benefits As set out within the ES (December 2010), ESA (June 2011), and DCO ES (October 2011), use of the jetty would significantly reduce the requirement to import construction material to the site by road. The ESA (June 2011) states that every vessel delivery of bulk material would avoid between 125-250 HGV movements. It is estimated that there would be approximately 32-36 vessel movements per month (including arrivals and departures) during periods of peak demand of aggregates and cement and 14 vessel movements per month during months of "normal" demand for aggregates and cement. Based on the conservative estimate, during months of normal demand, use of the jetty would avoid the requirement for 1,750 HGVs per month. During months of peak concrete demand, use of the jetty would avoid the requirement for 4,000 HGVs per month
Tractivity 778	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? make the jetty a permanent fixture for moving the nuclear waste somewhere else and for getting your goods in. Less pollution, less road congestion, more of using the ships.	9557-215-1898		/		
Tractivity 799	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? The jetty should be a more substantial one able to receive larger and heavier loads to avoid the use of Combwich wharf.	9560-215-882		/		
Tractivity 802	Public	Stage 2	12. Any other ideas or comments? we have a company that can build the temporary jetty	9570-215-6659			/	Jetty Removal It was originally sought to include provisions within the draft HEO to close and remove the jetty. However, owing to a legal issue and in response to feedback received from the MMO, it is not possible to include such a provision. Notwithstanding this, the draft DCO will enable the removal of the jetty.
Tractivity 812	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? All materials without exceptions should be delivered on site via this jetty and NOT on heavy lorries by road (lane!)	9581-215-1165		/		Jetty Damage and Repair In the unlikely event that the jetty is damaged, EDF Energy is obliged (under Article 12 of the draft HEO) to repair and restore the jetty.
Tractivity 823	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Don't bother with a temporary jetty - build a permanent jetty and handle all incoming materials. This would then take a lot of worry and stress from the residents of Combwich!	9597-215-1489		/		Impact, Disruption and Mitigation

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 839	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	12. Any other ideas or comments? Build permanent wharf at Hinkley Point - we do not want round the clock disturbance (i.e.from 4.30 Am to midnight) completely wrecking village life. people in the community have invested a lot of money in property and do not want their way of life to be ruined by EDF planners who have no respect for the people or the countryside in this part of Somerset.	9597-215-7960		/		<p>The temporary jetty has been subject to Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) which is written up in an Environmental Statement (ES) that describes the significant environmental effects and identifies suitable mitigation measures to minimise, and if possible, prevent adverse impacts. The ES considers all relevant impacts including effects on people, natural processes, landscape and wildlife. The ES considers impacts associated with the temporary jetty alone, and the cumulative effects of the jetty in-combination with other relevant plans and projects including the DCO. Likewise the ES for the DCO assesses the impacts associated with the jetty development.</p> <p>Impact upon Recreation and Amenity</p> <p><u>Coast Path and Footpaths</u></p> <p>In order to construct and dismantle the jetty, it will be necessary to stop up a number of footpaths including the Coast Path where it runs along the frontage of the site.</p> <p>EDF Energy will therefore create alternative diversion routes in order to minimise any disruption. Where possible and practical, these footpaths will be reopened as soon as possible. For example the Coast Path would be re-opened once the jetty has been constructed. It should however be noted that construction of the sea wall is scheduled to commence shortly before the construction of the jetty finishes. The Coast Path will remain closed for the construction of the sea wall. However, in the event that construction of the jetty finishes in advance of commencement of construction of the sea wall, the Coast Path will reopen but will subsequently close again to allow safe construction of the sea wall.</p> <p>A number of new footpaths would be created within the jetty site once it has been restored.</p> <p><u>Lighting Strategy</u></p> <p>In response to various consultation comments on the jetty applications, a Lighting Strategy was prepared and submitted as part of the ESA (June 2011). This sets out some details of the lighting be used during construction and operation of the jetty and is available in Appendix 3 of the ESA (June 2011). The Lighting Strategy submitted as part of the DCO incorporates and includes the principles set out within the jetty Lighting Strategy.</p>
Tractivity 839	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? I believe far more work and storage should be be on site at Hinkley Point, if you can unload sand and bulk items there you should also be able to unload container barges there even if it means cutting a channel in the rock outcrops, using for example explosives, if this is done think of the amount of pollution and expense this would save using road transport for containers and fabricated items.	9602-215-129		/		
Tractivity 844	Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments? If all sea freight is landed at Hinkley Point much of the freight Logistics are solved cutting down light, air and noise pollution over a large area of surrounding area and villages. Park and Ride areas away from villages for the same reasons.	9602-215-3288		/		
Tractivity 844	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Good idea, but why temporary?	9618-215-941		/		
Tractivity 860	Public	Stage 2	12. Any other ideas or comments? Why not use the jetty at H/P?	9618-215-6417		/		
Tractivity 860	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Surprised you can build a jetty. At the last enquiry we were told this was impossible!	9636-215-884			/	
Tractivity 878	Public	Stage 2	12. Any other ideas or comments? Why can you not build build a bigger and better jetty at Hinkley and save that road freight.	9674-215-6220		/		
Tractivity 916	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? The use of the sea to bring materials to the site is a sensible and obvious plan. The ?temporary? jetty could be used for the removal of materials following de-commissioning. Presumably this jetty is to be on-side where the existing gantry is.	9695-215-1299		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 937	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? I do not believe that the building of a temporary jetty is necessary just to enable work to finish earlier. Until permission has been granted, impact on bird and wildlife in the area should be kept to a minimum.	9698-215-1044		/		<u>Visual Impact</u> Chapter 21 of the ES, 13 of the ESA and DCO ES sets out the assessment of Landscape and Visual Impact of the jetty and includes visual montages. <u>Night Time Impact</u>
Tractivity 940	Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments? Bigger loads can go by water to a jetty at Hinkley Point.	9710-215-2281		/		In the event that the draft HEO is made, to construct the jetty, it will be necessary to complete some night time working on the off-shore areas. The impact of night time working on local residents has been assessed as part of the jetty ES (December 2010) and ESA (June 2011).
Tractivity 952	Public	Stage 2	10. Any other ideas or comments? Yes I agree with this site as larger loads can be taken across the water from this site	9710-215-5905			/	<u>Impact on Fishing Activities</u> It is acknowledged that the proposed jetty development would result in a small scale restriction of access to elements of the foreshore and open water, both during the construction phase and subsequent operation of the jetty. The impact is assessed as being negligible during the jetty's operational phase in the ES.
Tractivity 952	Public	Stage 2	10. Any other ideas or comments? Why not build a Wharf and all goods could go to Hinkley Point by sea.	9715-215-5552		/		In respect of potential impact on tubeworm, it should be noted that the nearest areas of <i>Sabellaria</i> (a form of tubeworm) are located approximately 200m and 300m away from the location of the proposed jetty and due to the distant location of the <i>Sabellaria</i> reef, the jetty ES (Dec 2010) and DCO ES considers that any impacts upon these receptors would be negligible.
Tractivity 957	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? We have no objection to a temporary jetty to the north or even a permanent jetty.	9726-215-1507			/	Construction Workforce Details of how the Hinkley Point C construction workforce will arrive to the site are set out within the Transport Statement. Various measures are incorporated into the proposal, such as use of Park and Ride schemes to minimise disruption to the local community and other road users.
Tractivity 968	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? The jetty should be used for as much material as possible. Footpaths should be preserved.	9732-215-1631			/	The construction workforce for the jetty will arrive to the Hinkley Point site by road, although to complete the off-shore works, it will be necessary to access the offshore construction area by sea.
Tractivity 974	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	10. Any other ideas or comments? As much freight as possible should come in via the jetty.	9732-215-7018			/	Lilstock Firing Range EDF Energy has held detailed consultations with the MOD to agree an appropriate mechanism whereby the site can continue to be used by the MOD for the purposes of a firing range as well as by EDF Energy for the purposes of the temporary jetty. This includes the preparation and implementation of a management plan which would set out a protocol of communication for informing the other party of when and how the site would be required for their respective uses.
Tractivity 974	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	12. Any other ideas or comments? Use the planned jetty. Combwich Wharf will not reduce the burden on the road from Combwich to Hinkley. So this is unacceptable. The road is already overused at peak times and breaking up in places.	9732-215-7997		/		
Tractivity 974	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Temporary jetty where? at Hinkley Point	9741-215-927			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 983	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? If you can build a Temporary Jetty then why on earth can you not build a permanent Jetty instead of using Combwich Wharf?	9771-215-886		/		<p>Markings and Navigational Aids</p> <p>All marking requirement and navigational aids to be used during the construction and operation of the jetty development will be discussed and agreed with Trinity House before deployment.</p> <p>Cooling and Outfall Structures</p> <p>Unlike the cooling and outfall structures, the jetty is located above the ground/sea bed and is a temporary, lightweight structure which will be removed when it is no longer required i.e. following construction of Hinkley Point C. In addition, the cooling and outfall structures are located in a different area to the jetty, comprise different material and are different lengths. As such, it is not possible to house the cooling and outfall structures within the temporary jetty.</p>
Tractivity 1013	Public	Stage 2	12. Any other ideas or comments? Can't understand why you don't build a wharf at the site, this would allow deliveries throughout the life of the station and be good for the decommissioning of HPB & HPC	9811-215-6570		/		
Tractivity 1053	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Make sure the jetty is substantial enough to take aggregates and other goods. EDF should be importing goods by sea all into their HPC site not blocking the roads and abusing small villages such as Combwich.	9866-215-1062		/		
Tractivity 1108	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? If EDF had a commitment to minimal disruption to the countryside, they would build a wharf at the Hinkley Point site so that materials could be shipped there direct, thus not affecting Combwich residents.	9911-215-1430		/		
Tractivity 1153	Public	Stage 2	12. Any other ideas or comments? In section 9.9.5 on bulk materials EDF state 'it has been assumed that once the jetty is operational at least 80% of the bulk materials will be delivered via the jetty...It should be noted that the above assumptions would be subject to contract negotiations with the contractors/suppliers'. This suggests that these figures are worthless. It could be that only 40% comes by sea and the rest would be on the roads. The contract should insist that 80% comes in by sea and would be a part of the IPC application.	9953-215-9935			/	
Tractivity 1195	Public	Stage 2	12. Any other ideas or comments? Why not build a wharf/jetty at the power station and thereby all the handling and vehicle movements in and around Combwich. The Hinkley Point road is already very busy servicing the power station, a number of local villages and the farms, more traffic is going to cause untold problems for all road users.	9954-215-9378		/		
Tractivity 1196	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Makes sense. Would you not leave the jetty for other users? That way only one disruption to the eco system	9956-215-923		/		
Tractivity 1198	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? The construction of a jetty will not be needed if a direct road from Dunball to Hinkley is constructed, since this superior direct route would include the construction of a wharf next a sluice. The wharf could be used for materials delivered by sea and road. A storage area could be constructed here by the wharf/sluice.	9963-215-886		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1205	Public	Stage 2	I also feel the temporary jetty could be made substantially larger to accommodate a vast majority of all the freight needed	89492-215-700		/		
Tractivity 1226	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	As there are no quarries near costline site the sea jetty will only be used for ngineering materials	89571-215-2056			/	
Tractivity 1305	Public	Stage 2 Update	With the temporary jetty, an enhanced Combwich Jetty and port facilities at Dunball; 75% should be transported by sea avoiding huge logisitcs problems in the process.	89605-215-2949			/	
Tractivity 1339	Public	Stage 2 Update	The jetty is liable to become a white elephant in the same way as the Thames Jetty for the 2012 Olympic build remains unused.	89619-215-1700			/	
Tractivity 1353	Public	Stage 2 Update	A temporary jetty is good, use it as much as possible, think of the residents of Combwich.	89626-215-975			/	
Tractivity 226	Public	Stage 1	4. Any other ideas or comments? It appears that the jetty is currently only planned to be used for aggregates. This is completely unsatisfactory as much of the other bulk materials such as steel reinforcing, shuttering, pipes etc can and must be brought in this way to limit road movements	8952-215-1589		/		
Tractivity 263	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference If proper use is made of the jetty and Combwich wharf, this bypass will not be necessary. The money would be better spent improving the rest of the road, such as providing a foot/cycle/ horse path along its length to keep these vulnerable users away form the increased traffic volumes. It will be essential to pre-warn all local users of the timing of the 180 abnormal loads from Combwich to enable them to ensure they are not trying to use the road at that time	8952-215-1945		/		
Tractivity 263	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Instead of building a temporary jetty- built a perminant one.	8991-215-4935		/		
Tractivity 303	Public	Stage 1	8. What do you think of our proposals for the use of Combwich Wharf? Q8a more than one option ticked. The use of Combwich Whalrf and the temorary jetty on site will reduce the amount delivered to site by road and will hae a lower environmental impact on the local villages and beyond.	9006-215-4178			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 318	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Don't do it	9081-215-3726			/	
Tractivity 402	Public	Stage 1	8. What do you think of our proposals for the use of Combwich Wharf? It should only be used as a secondary facility to the temporary wharf at Hinkley.	9142-215-3412		/		
Tractivity 465	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Intake location- 1) Impact on bass fishery located at Cobblers Patch and North West patches 2) Design of intake to minimise catch of bottom-feeding species Intake-3) extent of current exclusion zone around intake and outfall structures 4) extent of any near-surface or of intake and outfall structures 5) extent of exclusion area around jetty. 6) at end of jetty life to be dismantled and used as artificial reef.	9247-215-3799	/			
Tractivity 578	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Ensure the building/reactors are coloured so as to blend into the landscape as much as possible ie not red as it shows on your website! Build all buildings, fences etc as small as possible and as close to existing reactors as possible. Keep any structures eg sea wall to a minimum and ensure the beach to the west of Hinkley is left as natural as possible. Ensure temporary jetty is as small as can be, is as close as possible to existing reactors and definatley removed as soon as it can be ie once all materials have been delievered and it is no longer needed. Ensure lighting is kept to a minimum and downlight things where possible. Visually the power station is going to have massive impact both at day and night and this should be considered carefully.	9275-215-5066		/		
Tractivity 611	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? We were hoping that more materials would be shipped in via the jetty other than the aggregate.	9282-215-4204			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 618	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9288-215-3323			/	
Tractivity 624	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9289-215-3323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 625	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9290-215-3321			/	
Tractivity 626	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc</p>	9291-215-3323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 627	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9292-215-3321			/	
Tractivity 628	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9293-215-3321			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 629	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9294-215-3323			/	
Tractivity 630	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9295-215-3323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 631	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9296-215-3323			/	
Tractivity 632	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9297-215-3323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 633	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9298-215-3323			/	
Tractivity 634	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9299-215-3323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 635	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9300-215-3323			/	
Tractivity 636	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9301-215-3323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 637	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9302-215-3323			/	
Tractivity 638	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9303-215-3321			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 639	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9304-215-3323			/	
Tractivity 640	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9305-215-3323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 641	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9306-215-3323			/	
Tractivity 642	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9307-215-3323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 643	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9308-215-3323			/	
Tractivity 644	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9309-215-3323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 645	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9310-215-3323			/	
Tractivity 646	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9311-215-3323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 647	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9312-215-3323			/	
Tractivity 648	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9313-215-3323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 649	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9314-215-3323			/	
Tractivity 650	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9315-215-3323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 651	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9316-215-3321			/	
Tractivity 652	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9317-215-3323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 653	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9318-215-3323			/	
Tractivity 654	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9319-215-3323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 655	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9320-215-3323			/	
Tractivity 656	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9321-215-3323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 657	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9322-215-3323			/	
Tractivity 658	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9323-215-3323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 659	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>1, Possible loss of fishing grounds, during and after the construction of the jetty and outfalls and intakes.</p> <p>2, Possible loss, disruption of fishing due to an exclusion zone around sensitive areas.</p> <p>3, Loss of fish stocks from affected areas</p> <p>4, Possible loss of ecology (tubeworm beds in construction areas, plus impact on, fish which eat the tubeworms</p> <p>5, At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef, (this has been very successful in USA)</p> <p>6, Possible disruption to out activities as anglers as the maritime areas in question, are very good fishing grounds for Bass, Cod, Ling, Thornback and Spurdoc.</p>	9324-215-3323			/	
Tractivity 660	Public	Stage 1	<p>3. The Intended Jetty: I am sure you are aware of the previous maritime trade between this somerset coast and South Wales (coal in; pit props and stone out). Vessels beaching themselves just before high water, unloading /loading after the turn of the tide, refloating and departing on the next tide - as they still do on the River Parrett at Dunball. Even if your barges are of 5000 gross tonnage this same system could be used nowadays. A secure berth would need to be blasted from the rock plates with probably a stub jetty for crane and outer end of the belted transport unit. This jetty could also form part of the new water circulation system. I believe this is certainly worth considering. I hope that you may find the above comments useful. I am a nuclear power supporter so will continue to watch Hinkley's progress with interest</p>	9390-215-2012			/	
Tractivity 50720	Public	Stage 1	<p>The issues over the wharf and access to it were contentious twenty years ago during the Hinkley 'C' Inquiry and nothing has changed in the interim. Instead of what is proposed, I along with others would like to see a commitment from EDF for a permanent on-site berthing facility, so that local residents may be left in peace. Your project manager, Simon Dunford, has already agreed that he would not want the disturbance caused by the all hours usage of the wharf were his own home close by.</p>	10029-215-4850			/	
Tractivity 62352	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>Using Combwich Wharf seems ridiculous when you propose building a jetty at Hinkley Point.</p>	10043-215-414		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62372	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	why cannot a permanent jetty be built to include housing the cooling water tunnels, and the use of high tides be made for transport of the construction materials and workers from Dunball directly to site?	10048-215-5983		/		
Tractivity 62437	Public	Stage 2	EDF is going to build a temporary jetty at the point, why not build a permanent one; or a road from Dunball to avoid Cannington and Combwich.	10085-215-1011		/		
Tractivity 62462	Public	Stage 2	In addition the building & use of a massive Jetty on the foreshore to bring in aggregate etc for the new build straight over the foreshore where we currently exercise our rights to enjoy our recreational activities on what is a marine reserve and NNR. There are no proposals to mitigate this or provide anything in mitigation and the public will be excluded from the area which is not owned by EDF for a very long time if not permanently.	10091-215-4128		/		
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Temporary Jetty Maximum use should be made of the temporary jetty. It should not just be for aggregates but should be a more substantial structure capable of dealing with other components to minimize road use.	10123-215-3566		/		
Tractivity 62572	Public	Stage 2	- No detail is given for the works themselves. By what process of double-think can EdF call this question a 'consultation'? - Should works proceed all disruption will be borne by the host communities as the infrastructure exists and with no mitigation suggested or proposed The company should go through the full planning process before it sets spade to soil. In conjunction with the lack of detail they provide and their poor record of community engagement the haste with which the company proceeds makes their entire operation seem unreliable and badly planned. It gives the local community no confidence in EdF's competence or good faith.	10128-215-3415			/	
Tractivity 62577	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	If you are building it at Hinkley, why is it a "temporary" jetty? Why not make it permanent if you're going to the trouble of building one for the "delivery of bulk materials"?	10129-215-2239		/		
Tractivity 62578	Public	Stage 2	If you are talking about the refurbishment of the Combwich Wharf, why, when you are planning to build a 760 metre sea wall at Hinkley, together with a "temporary jetty", don't you reinforce that wall and jetty to enable the delivery of ALL materials directly to Hinkley Point? You are afterall building a nuclear power station which will, I trust, be strong enough to withstand a terrorist attack? Reinforcing a sea wall and jetty to withstand heavy goods should be pretty standard stuff?	10129-215-2705			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62578	Public	Stage 2	NPTC recommend that EDF: - Pay for a northern by-pass for Bridgwater from Junction 23, via Dunball wharf to Hinkley Point. - That all possible materials and labour be brought in to the area by sea and rail. - That temporary wharf facilities at Hinkley Point would cause the least disruption.	10227-215-853			/	
North Petherton Town Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	5) At the end of its life can the jetty be used as an artificial reef,(such projects as this , have been very successful in the USA).	10258-215-499		/		
Burnham Boat Owners Sea Angling Association	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- Likewise, it may be that the jetty, being of a design that renders it vulnerable to collision, may itself be unusable in bad weather if risk of collision is to be averted. What would you do then? - What are your plans if the jetty is damaged: will you switch to road deliveries or delay the project until the jetty is fixed? Is the jetty design really substantial enough? I'd rather have a more robust design that could withstand impact to guarantee continuous operation because the implications of additional road movements are too ghastly to contemplate and after so many years of disruption, delays are not acceptable.	89470-215-5891	/			
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	(iv) The use of sea transport for most (80%) bulk materials to be landed via a new jetty is welcomed. We note that some of these preliminary works are the subject of a separate planning application which will be determined by the local planning authority.	89056-215-10943			/	
South West Regional Development Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- Very serious concerns about the timeline for preliminary works and the lack of the improvements to Comwich Wharf, the provision of the Cannington Bypass and the provision of the temporary aggregates jetty.	89183-215-6344			/	
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	. A brief description of the cooling water infrastructure is given in section 2.4 of Chapter 2 of Volume 2 of the consultation documents. There do not appear to be any detailed plans or detailed descriptions of the temporary jetty in the Consultation documents.	89251-215-7820	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Otterhampton Parish Council supports the maximum use of a proposed jetty at the main HPC site - not just for aggregates but other goods and also materials to assist fabrication works on-site.	89267-215-8764			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Otterhampton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	2. Secondly, modify the proposed jetty at Hinkley Point to land bulk materials (except AILs) as well as ballast, sand, cement, etc. This would not be a difficult engineering project. With bulk materials delivered direct to site and the possibility of using the turbine hall - or its footprint - at HPA for fabrication purposes, it would reduce road freight dramatically. It would also eliminate the need to build the industrial site at Comwich, save a green field site and the financial gains can be used to modify the jetty at HPC.	89268-215-5566			/	
Otterhampton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	There is confusion within the documents about what volume and type of materials will be brought to site via the jetty. Maximum use must be made of the jetty to minimise road journeys.	89288-215-4246	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	There is confusion over what use is to be made of the jetty, and this is unacceptable given the vast quantities of freight involved in the development and the opportunity to take more of this off the road network.	89288-215-5613			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Freight Strategy: The scope of the jetty use is unclear. Will EDF provide a definitive statement on the scope of the jetty's contribution to reducing freight movements, bearing in mind that Comwich freight movements are still road movements for SPC residents?	89289-215-2292	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[3.2.5] 'The jetty will be used to deliver bulk materials and, if possible, other construction materials' It is essential that maximum use is made of the jetty to reduce road traffic. Will EDF confirm that they intend to construct the jetty to make it suitable for these other materials, and that they will use it for this purpose? Will EDF confirm that the jetty will be completed before construction commences?	89289-215-4390			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[1.4.4] 80% only of bulk aggregates to be delivered by jetty. Will EDF confirm that they intend to construct a jetty that will be able to handle other bulk materials such as reinforcing bar?	89291-215-2564	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[1.6.53] Jetty lighting. It is essential to balance the needs of sea birds to avoid the jetty with the needs of the local humans not to be dazzled by lights. Will EDF provide details of the proposed lighting for the jetty?	89291-215-5089	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[2.13.12] The jetty is to be built in two stages. Can EDF explain why, and confirm the timetable and capabilities to be provided at each stage?	89291-215-7906	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[4.1.5] This states that the jetty is to be used for bulk materials. However SPC has been told in the past by EDF that the jetty is being designed to enable many other loads to be handled, including reinforcing bar, structural steel, pipework etc. Maximum use must be made of the jetty to reduce road traffic. Can EDF confirm that the jetty will be used for materials other than sand, cement, aggregates and PFA, and therefore what percentage of the total construction material weight will be brought in via the jetty?	89292-215-3241		/		
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[7.3.26] Materials delivered via Combwich Wharf still constitute road movements for Stogursey Parish. Will EDF confirm that maximum use will be made of the on-site jetty, rather than using Combwich?	89292-215-5184		/		
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[8. 3. 8] Bp 4 States that approx. 80% of materials will come by sea including all aggregates, sand and cement. Have EDF considered reinforcing the jetty to bring in a wider range of materials e.g. reinforcing bars?	89293-215-5684		/		
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	With regards to particular design issues associated with the aggregates jetty, the authorities would expect to see design issues, and the discussion of potential impacts associated with these explored in further detail.	89332-215-0		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Discussion of jetty alignment, provided in paragraph 6.6.34 contrasts with the 'indicative' alignments presented throughout the EnvApp. We would further expect additional confidence that the jetty alignment is appropriate and discussion of details of the appraisal process would support this.	89332-215-223	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There is a clear and important role for planning requirements and obligations to appropriately regulate the phasing of the scheme and clear and precise triggers should be made clear in the heads of terms. Use of model "requirements" needs to be inter-woven with scheme specific requirements. Requirements - A time period for removal of the jetty and other temporary facilities should be specified. For example "the jetty and other temporary facilities will be removed within a year after the completion of the construction of the project, unless an alternative legacy use for the facilities is approved by the relevant authority".	89419-215-14101	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	6. The document specifically omits the effect of the jetty because it is a separate application. This is unrealistic and underhand. It is obvious that the effect is cumulative and should be taken into account in transport movements.	89680-215-3859			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62949	Public	Stage 2 Update	You cannot exclude the jetty proposals from your consultation - the additional traffic and noise must be considered in conjunction with the whole project, as ALL materials on site will be brought via the C182. The effects are CUMULATIVE.	89682-215-2610	/			
Tractivity 62953	Public	Stage 2 Update	We are still unclear about the proposed and extensive use of the Comwich Wharf for AILs. Although appreciating that the use of the Wharf will reduce the need to transport AILs by road we are unclear why these loads could not be delivered direct to a jetty at Hinkley. We would like to know why only a temporary jetty is proposed rather than a robust and permanent construction which could be used for both the new build Hinkley C (and further build) and the decommissioning of A and B.	89696-215-5272			/	
Tractivity 63012	Public	Stage 2 Update	No comments other than our questioning about the provision of a temporary jetty rather than a permanent one to take AILs direct.	89696-215-8146		/		
Tractivity 63012	Public	Stage 2 Update	There is no specific information about the waste arising from the construction of the Jetty and would query whether this is included in the Hinkley C Waste arisings? We recommend further specific information relating to the Jetty is included in the Hinkley C waste strategy to demonstrate that waste reduction and management principles are being used. The Jetty will require a Site Waste Management Plan to be produced and submitted.	89711-215-3282	/			
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	<p>Jetty</p> <p>The MMO notes that it is proposed not to include the jetty in the application for development consent and welcomes the commitment that the jetty will still be included in the environmental impact assessment for the development consent order.</p> <p>The MMO notes that it is proposed that the consents authorising the jetty will be granted subject to a condition requiring EDF Energy to restore the affected area back to a suitable condition in the event the Infrastructure Planning Commission refuses development consent. The MMO asks that this proposal is considered in light of the letter dated 19 March 2011 from the MMO to an agent of EDF Energy (copy attached).</p>	89716-215-1025	/			
Marine Management Organisation	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>RE: Hinkley Point C - Article 29</p> <p>Following our meeting of 4 March 2011 and earlier correspondence, I write to set out the position of the Marine Management Organisation (the MMO) regarding Article 29 of the proposed Hinkley Point (Temporary Jetty) Harbour Empowerment Order 201[X].</p> <p>The MMO has considered Article 29 carefully but has concluded, for the reasons set out in this letter, that section 16 of the Harbours Act 1964 (the 1964 Act) cannot be used to provide for the closure of a harbour and/or the extinction of the liability of a harbour authority, as proposed.</p> <p>The MMO is of the view that if Parliament had intended that an order made under section 16 could also provide for the closure of the harbour,</p>	89716-215-3753	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			<p>Parliament would have expressed this clearly. Parliament did not do so. Indeed, the closure of a harbour and/or the extinction of a harbour authority would be the exact opposite of what section 16 is seeking to do, which is to allow for the empowerment of an authority so that harbour works can be carried out.</p> <p>In particular, the dismantling and demolition works for which Article 29(3) of your draft Order seeks to provide could not reasonably be said to come within "the construction, improvement, maintenance or management of a dock" for the purposes of section 16(1)(c). By defining in this way the types of works for which section 16 orders could provide, Parliament clearly envisaged that the "dock" or harbour would still be in existence in some form after the works had been carried out.</p> <p>The MMO also takes the view that the final clause of section 16(1) cannot be relied upon in support of an argument that the dismantling and demolition of the harbour can come within an empowerment order on the basis that it may provide for "all such powers... as are requisite for enabling" one or more of the section 16(1)(c) "object[s]" of "construction, improvement, maintenance or management" to be achieved. It is not considered that the achievement of these aims 'requires' the inclusion of powers to secure their undoing.</p> <p>Furthermore, the MMO is not satisfied that an order made under section 16 could provide for the dismantling and demolition of a harbour on the basis that these would be no more than "supplementary, consequential or incidental" acts within the meaning of section 16(6) that may reasonably be considered to be "requisite or expedient for the purposes of, or in connection with, the order". The MMO considers that the scope of such "supplementary, consequential or incidental" provisions must be defined by reference to the statutory "objects" for which an order under section 16 may be granted. In other words, an "incidental" provision within section 16(6) is a provision that may reasonably be said to be incidental to the "construction, improvement, maintenance or management" of a harbour. A provision that would allow for the closure of a harbour, or the extinction of a harbour authority, could not reasonably be said to be "incidental" to the achievement of these positive objects.</p> <p>You may wish to consider, but this is entirely a matter for yourselves, whether you should remove Article 29 from the draft Order. If you were to do this, the MMO would need to consider what measures would then be appropriate to notify interested parties of such a change. This may also require an addendum to the environmental statement and further consultation.</p> <p>Other potential steps may include withdrawing the harbour empowerment order application.</p> <p>You may also wish to investigate the use of a private Act of Parliament to achieve the ends that you seek.</p> <p>The MMO would be willing to meet to discuss any proposals that you may have once you have had a chance to consider your next steps.</p> <p>In the meantime, the MMO will continue to consider the outstanding matter relating to section 120(9) of the Planning Act 2008 and we will write to you about this as soon as possible.</p>					

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Marine Management Organisation	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	The wharf at Combrich should be restricted to the delivery and unloading of, Abnormal Indivisible Loads, only all other supplies should be transported to the Hinkley Jetty, or by road directly to the Hinkley site.	89764-215-143			/	
(Personal details removed)	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	Your argument about shipping in ALL's and freight via Combrich Wharf because it's not possible to bring them into Hinkley directly is quite pathetic. You are building a 760 metre sea wall and a nuclear power station, for heaven's sake. An on-site wharf would surely be a walk in the park for your engineering masterminds!	89815-215-1776			/	
26	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	EDF is going to build a temporary jetty at the point, why can't they build a permanent one or a road from Dunball to the point and avoid Cannington and Combrich? These will solve most of their problems for the next 50/75 years or so when C, D, E and F reactors are built at the point.	89818-215-1003		/		
29	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	Our comments on these applications are also made on the basis that the aggregates jetty is a temporary structure which will be dismantled/removed in accordance with Regulation 29 of the HEO (ref: DC 9229), as described in section 6(b) of the FEPA application (ref: DC 9228). In our assessment of these applications and the accompanying ES, we have primarily considered impacts on coastal hydrodynamics and geomorphology, marine ecology and cumulative impacts. Please note that we look to Natural England to provide detailed comments on birds. It is currently unclear how the documents provided for this application relate to the information being provided for the main site works. Any further detailed comments we may have on the technical reports will therefore be provided as part of our response to the main Hinkley Point C proposed development.	89835-215-1523			/	
Countryside Council for Wales	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Provided that the conditions as set out in the ES are attached to any permission given and are fully implemented, and taking into account our comment made above with respect to our Welsh remit, CCW is of the opinion that the proposal would not be likely to have a significant effect on the following designations: Severn Estuary Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Severn Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA), Severn Estuary Ramsar Site, River Wye SAC and the River Usk SAC.	89835-215-2703			/	
Countryside Council for Wales	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Severn Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest Similarly, with respect to the Severn Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), CCW is of the view that the proposal would be unlikely to have a significant impact on this site, provided that the proposed conditions within the ES are attached to any permission and are fully implemented.	89835-215-3182			/	
Countryside Council for Wales	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	- We welcome the detailed and well structured nature of the Environmental Statement (ES). - We also welcome the efforts made through early discussions to avoid or minimise impacts through modified design of the proposed structure.	89836-215-391			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Countryside Council for Wales	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Section 6.4.8- we welcome the proposed disposal of dredge material at Cardiff Grounds as the preferred option as it retains the sediment in the estuary system.	89836-215-2323			/	
Countryside Council for Wales	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Chapter 24 - we welcome the detailed assessments of risks to navigation in this Chapter, and welcome the proposed mitigation measures in described in section 24.6. We recommend that these are included as conditions of any permission given, and are fully implemented.	89836-215-7339			/	
Countryside Council for Wales	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1.4 [3.3.3] SPC would favour the installation of the jetty piles into pre-drilled sockets to avoid the noise associated with percussive piling.	89872-215-2974			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1.10 [4.1.28] It is worrying to still see statements such as 'The jetty could (SPC emphasis) also be used for the import of other bulk materials to the site where practicable.' EDF are to build the jetty to take these other materials, and SPC wish to see absolute maximum use of the jetty to minimise road traffic. There needs to be an absolute commitment to this, not a vague statement about the possibility.	89872-215-4489			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.3.1 [4.1.4] Once again the jetty is quoted as being just for on-site concrete production materials. EDF must show commitment throughout their documentation and in practice to maximising the use of the jetty for other materials.	89872-215-10598			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.3.4 [6.3] Again the amount of materials to be delivered by sea is noted as just an aim of just 80% of the aggregates. This is not an acceptable target, and EDF must ensure their contractors are required to maximise deliveries of all types by sea, with substantially higher targets than currently. There is no point in constructing Phase 2 of the jetty otherwise.	89872-215-11488			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	We note the predicted 'temporary' effect of a jetty (18.7.68), which nonetheless, is likely to remain in place for seven years. For passage populations of birds such as ringed plover, which may not habituate to the presence and operation of the jetty, any displacement impacts in CS1 could be significant within the SPA.	89901-215-2142			/	
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	It is not anticipated that the development of the actual nuclear power station will in itself affect any defence interests. However, we are concerned that some of the ancillary marine infrastructure associated with the proposed station may inhibit the use of Llistock Range. The proposed structures and temporary jetty will be within the offshore firing range. It is important that this firing range is not obstructed by the development proposed.	8775-1780-1046			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Ministry Of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Alternatively, to achieve an appropriate separation distance to safely accommodate the proposed jetty and the associated maritime activities, it may be necessary to expand or relocate the entire range Danger Area.</p> <p>This would entail obtaining a modification to regulated UK air space. This in itself can be the subject of an extensive consultation and impact assessment process administered by the Civil Aviation Authority. A Sustainability Appraisal and a Statutory Habitats Regulations Assessment Sustainability to assess the environmental impacts of relocating a military firing activity would also need to be undertaken. It is possible that these procedures may determine that relocation of the Danger Area is not permissible.</p>	8775-262-9550			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Homes & Communities Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	- Waste management: The management of hazardous wastes, including radioactive wastes will be of great importance. The Government will need to be satisfied that effective arrangements exist or will exist to manage and dispose of the waste they will produce. Interim storage is also important in relation to radioactive waste.	8694-242-3478	/			<u>Intermediate Level Waste (ILW) & Spent Fuel Disposal</u> At both Stage 1 and Stage 2, a substantial number of consultees commented on the issues associated with the disposal of spent fuel and ILW from Hinkley Point C (HPC) and also commented on the validity of EDF Energy's assumptions regarding the availability of a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF). In some instances consultees suggested that EDF Energy should delay its Development Consent Order (DCO) application to the IPC until a GDF is available.
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	6. Life of the development - The summary of the development proposals, section 9, states that the duration of use is 70 years (including 10 years build and 60 years of reactor operations). We recognise that the decommissioning of the reactors will be covered by a separate EIA for the decommissioning regulations (EIADR99), However it is not clear how long the Spent Fuel Store will remain operational for but it will be more than 70 years and the operational period is too short.	88810-242-3908	/			Within the Stage 1 and Stage 2 proposals EDF Energy has set out its proposed strategy for the management of spent fuel and ILW. This strategy includes the interim storage of higher activity wastes on site until they can be disposed of at a GDF. The details of the strategy are set out in Chapter 7 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement for the DCO application. EDF Energy has developed its radioactive waste and spent fuel management strategy for Hinkley Point C in accordance with Government policy and guidance and specifically the waste base case that Government has set out in its guidance on the Funded Decommissioning Programme to prospective new nuclear operators. This guidance recognises that the Government is satisfied that effective arrangements will exist to manage and dispose of the waste produced from new nuclear power stations, and indicates that the operator should assume that all higher activity wastes (essentially ILW and spent fuel if declared as waste) should be stored on the site of its generation until a GDF is available. In accord with this, there is no intent for the Hinkley Point C site to be used to store waste or spent fuel generated at any other site.
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	a) The outline description of the nuclear power station clearly states that the development will include the storage of spent fuel and radioactive wastes from the power generation process. The issue of radioactive waste is a key concern for the community of Somerset and the on-site storage of radioactive wastes, in particular spent fuel and other high level wastes, represents a departure from the current practices at Hinkley Point. Furthermore, this is the first nuclear proposal where on-site storage of this material will be developed. Whilst the use of the site at Hinkley Point for power generation may be demonstrated to be in the public interest, it has not been demonstrated that the site is an appropriate location for the management, treatment and storage of waste that arises from other locations. To ensure absolute clarity on this point it would be beneficial for EDF to state whether they intend to manage wastes that are only generated at the site or whether the development of a regional waste facility is envisaged.	87910-242-3021	/			EDF Energy has developed its radioactive waste and spent fuel management strategy for Hinkley Point C in accordance with Government policy and guidance and specifically the waste base case that Government has set out in its guidance on the Funded Decommissioning Programme to prospective new nuclear operators. This guidance recognises that the Government is satisfied that effective arrangements will exist to manage and dispose of the waste produced from new nuclear power stations, and indicates that the operator should assume that all higher activity wastes (essentially ILW and spent fuel if declared as waste) should be stored on the site of its generation until a GDF is available. In accord with this, there is no intent for the Hinkley Point C site to be used to store waste or spent fuel generated at any other site.
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	- that dangerous nuclear waste from the reactors will be stored on site for at least 160 years and having at present no ultimate repository site to be sent to;	88940-242-373			/	The availability of a GDF for ILW and spent fuel will be a key factor in determining the length of time that the interim storage facilities will remain on site following the end of reactor operations. The selection of a site for the GDF is being taken forward by Government through the Managing Radioactive Waste Safely (MRWS) process. This is based, in the first place, on an invitation to local communities to volunteer to host the GDF and, as such, a definitive timetable for implementation cannot be predicted. However, the
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	- Managing radioactive waste: an assessment on the disposability of the highly radioactive spent fuel arrived too late for consideration for this part of the assessment. Campaigners are keen to examine this area as the spent fuel will be twice as hot and twice as radioactive as from conventional PWRs and will need to stay on site at Hinkley for an estimated 160 years before it can be physically put in 'permanent' containers for eventual movement to a hoped for (but as yet unplanned) Deep Geological Repository.	88960-242-3122	/			

¹ In this context the term “short half life” refers to waste containing radionuclides that will undergo sufficient decay during an initial managed surveillance phase that would allow the disposal site to be released from institutional control.

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	We are concerned at the prospect of highly radioactive spent fuel being stored at Hinkley Point during and for a long time after the operation of the two proposed EPRs at Hinkley. The fuel will be 'high burn up fuel' which means it must be stored in mechanically cooled water for one hundred years before it is capable of being handled in preparation for the next stage of its management.	88960-242-24558		/		Radioactive Waste Management Directorate (RWMD) of the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) has indicated in its 2010 document "Geological Disposal - Steps towards implementation March 2010", that a UK GDF could be available to accept ILW for disposal by 2040 and spent fuel by 2075, with all legacy waste disposed of by 2130. More recently in June 2011, Charles Hendry, the Energy Minister, has said that he would like to "set a goal of putting the first waste into a geological disposal facility by the end of 2029. I have tasked the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority to look at opportunities for accelerating progress to meet this aim." Given that these dates are for the disposal of existing legacy waste, it is considered that it is highly improbable that by the time EDF Energy would begin disposal of waste to the facility (some 40 years after the proposed start of legacy ILW emplacement and 55 years after the start of legacy spent fuel/High Level Waste emplacement) there will be no UK GDF available to accept the waste. Nevertheless, there are a number of ways that the remote risk of a repository being unavailable could be dealt with. The waste and spent fuel could continue to be stored on site until such time as a repository was available. The storage facilities will be located on the main development site platform at 14m AOD, with protection against coastal erosion provided by the sea wall which itself is capable of being increased in height should this be required in response to sea level rise. The facilities are designed to be capable of refurbishment to extend their lifetimes, where required. Alternatively, Government could decide that it may be appropriate to store all the wastes from the UK's nuclear power stations in a single centralised facility pending final disposal. A further option, which does not form part of
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	This problem so far into the future means we are leaving a serious legacy to future generations. Part of the risk is that of a terrorist attack and we do not know whether terrorism will have become more accurate and sophisticated. Nor do we know whether the economy and social cohesion will have collapsed with unthinkable consequences in terms of managing the hot spent fuel. The fuel management process is not a 'passive' one. Another issue is that because of the very heat of the fuel, its containment is more likely to splinter or corrode, creating potential local contamination and a headache of a problem to solve.	88960-242-24950		/		
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	We support the recent paper submitted to EDF by (personal details removed) of Wales Anti-Nuclear Association which delves into much greater detail on the subject referring to the US regulator's long term concerns about the spent fuel. We are also concerned that the advice given by the former committee looking into nuclear waste has been ignored. The Committee on Radioactive Waste Management came down against Deep Geological Disposal for new build nuclear waste. This was because, while 'legacy' waste had to be dealt with in some way despite obvious risks, 'new build' spent fuel did not need to be created in the first place as there are alternate means of generating electricity. CoRWM's proposal that communities should only volunteer to host the Repository looks shaky now that the Government has stated it may force Cumbria or other communities to accept the nuclear waste dump if they do not volunteer. The whole process is very flawed and has produced no results thus far in terms of any agreed permanent site or solution.	88960-242-25577		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>1.6. In the consultation document EdF give the impression that it is absolutely confident that plans to deal with the radioactive wastes produced by a possible Hinkley Point C reactor exist or will exist. It says, "Spent fuel assemblies are discharged from the UK EPR reactor unit and placed into the spent fuel pool to cool and to allow levels of radioactivity to decay for a period of about ten years. Spent fuel is then moved to an on-site storage facility, designed to accommodate the nuclear power station's lifetime spent fuel arisings and capable of lasting for at least 100 years...The current long-term strategy for the management of spent fuel is that it will ultimately be disposed of in a geological disposal facility."</p> <p>1.7. Yet the amount of useful information EdF has published on spent fuel in its consultation document is laughable. To say that it is woefully inadequate is an understatement. The reason for such paucity is obvious: EdF has no idea how precisely it will deal with the spent fuel arisings from any EPR that may be built in the UK.</p> <p>1.8. In a presentation from the Environment Agency a senior regulator working on new build and spent fuel conceded that firm plans for how to deal with spent fuel from EdF's reactors will not be known until 2012 or 2013 (5). In addition, a recent HSE report noted that "EDF and AREVA still need to show that the encapsulation of spent nuclear fuel for disposal is ALARP and that the environmental impacts are acceptable. I have raised a TQ requesting EDF and AREVA to provide this information' (6) We are also aware that Areva is now openly challenging the government's proposals on spent fuel (e.g. that it would be stored for 100 years prior to disposal) (7).</p>	8766-242-2345		/		<p>the Government's base case, but which could be attractive if uranium prices rise significantly, would be to reprocess the spent fuel to retrieve the re-usable material and manufacture into new fuel. This would substantially reduce the volumes of waste that would need to be stored and disposed of.</p> <p><u>Timing of spent fuel and ILW disposal</u></p> <p>At both Stage 1 and Stage 2, a number of consultees commented on the uncertainty over the time period that would be required for ILW and spent fuel interim storage following the end of reactor operations.</p> <p>Spent fuel from HPC will remain in storage at HPC after the completion of the main site decommissioning. At the End of Generation (EoG), following an initial cooling period in the reactor storage ponds, all remaining spent fuel would be transferred to the Interim Spent Fuel Store (ISFS). During the main site decommissioning phase, the spent fuel would continue to be stored in the ISFS and the store would be modified to allow it to be a standalone facility after the rest of the site has been decommissioned.</p> <p>Following the end of the main site decommissioning, the spent fuel would remain within the ISFS. The facility would continue to be licensed and would include the provision of a number of additional facilities to accommodate the requirements for a small workforce to operate the storage facility, ensure security of the site, and maintain the continuation of all safety and environmental obligations. Only when all the spent fuel has been removed from the ISFS, and decommissioning of the facility is completed, would this remaining part of the site be delicensed and the land released for alternative use.</p> <p>The time that would be required for the safe and secure on-site interim storage of spent fuel prior to disposal depends on two key factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • availability of a GDF; and • spent fuel characteristics that are suitable to allow disposal to the GDF (i.e. the spent fuel has sufficiently cooled to allow disposal).
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>1.9. No assumption can be made that disposal even of legacy wastes will take place and certainly not on the timeline proposed by the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority. This issue is fraught with difficulties. The addition of new build waste could create many more problems. The first CoRWM noted: "We believe that future Government decisions on new build should be subject to their own public assessment process, including consideration of waste, because such decisions raise different political and ethical issues when compared with the consideration of wastes which already exist. We have noted before that the prospect of a new nuclear programme might undermine support for CoRWM from some stakeholders and citizens and make it more difficult to achieve public confidence' (8).</p>	8766-242-4081		/		<p>With regard to the availability of a GDF, RWMD have published their plans for the scheduling and implementation of the GDF (<i>Geological Disposal – Steps towards implementation, March 2010, NDA/RWMD/013</i>), which provides a timeline which schedules the end of legacy spent fuel disposal to</p>
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>1.10. CoRWM II has yet to fully examine the technical and practical issues surrounding new build spent fuel storage, encapsulation and disposal itself. Its report on this is not expected until late 2010.</p>	8766-242-4865			/	
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>1.11. The Nuclear Decommissioning Authority itself has gone on record as saying: "There is no guarantee that the process will succeed in Cumbria. We need to bear in mind that the community has the right of withdrawal at any time and they do not need to justify their decision' (9). This means that deep geological disposal is by no means a done deal.</p>	8766-242-5072			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The most advanced site, Yucca Mountain in the USA, has effectively been abandoned: "Yucca Mountain has been placed in what the Department of Energy calls "cold standby." Congress cut almost \$100 million from its \$386 million budget this year, forcing DOE to lay off 500 of its 1,400 workers. The new Obama administration budget proposes to stop funding altogether while a "blue ribbon" panel explores other alternatives for nuclear waste disposal" (11).	8766-242-5817			/	GDF by 2130. Thereafter the GDF could be available to dispose of spent fuel from HPC. Regarding disposability of spent fuel, recent work undertaken by RWMD on behalf of the Nuclear Industry Association (NIA) has concluded that the spent fuel from the UK EPR could be suitable for disposal after approximately 50 years of storage post end of generation. It is therefore assumed that the date for start of transfer of spent fuel from the HPC site to a GDF is 2128. The process of transfer from the site will take approximately 8.5 years and therefore all fuel would be expected to be removed from the site by 2136. On completion of transfer of the spent fuel from site, the spent fuel ISF would be decommissioned. The final stage of decommissioning would be to demonstrate that there is no longer any danger from radioactivity on the site, and that it can therefore be de-licensed and the operator's period of responsibility brought to an end.
Tractivity 892	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Landscaping could be better . This looks too cheap. Far more important is the unacceptable waste mountain you intend to leave behind.	9650-242-129			/	
Tractivity 892	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below The most unsatisfactory aspect of your whole proposed development is your plan to keep spent fuel on site a) at all, and b) for so long after. TAKE IT BACK TO FRANCE	9650-242-6546		/		
Tractivity 1011	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? It is insulting to ordinary people?s intelligence to be asking what we think about your landscaping ideas when you?re not actively engaging people in discussion about far more pressing issues such as the health & safety issues brought up by your proposal, such as the issue of ionising radiation, or the fact that the reactors that you are proposing are far bigger, dirtier and more dangerous than the current 2nd generation reactors that we are currently saddled with. Or the fact that you intend to turn one of the most beautiful places in the UK into a long term toxic dump by storing radioactive waste so hot that it cant be moved for at least 160 years. All of the research that has been published so far regarding nuclear waste only refers to what is known as legacy waste and doesn?t consider new nuclear waste. This is not a legacy I wish to leave for my children and I am not so arrogant or blindly faithful in human ingenuity to assume th	9769-242-129		/		EDF Energy's baseline assumption is that ILW from HPC which is held within the ILW Interim Storage Facility (ILWISF) will be removed from site during the main site decommissioning phase and that the ILWISF itself would be demolished within 20 years of the EoG. The key determining factor for timing of disposal of ILW will be the availability of the GDF. This is because the characteristics of ILW generated at HPC are such that they would be suitable for disposal to a GDF without the need for further storage beyond the end of the main site decommissioning in order to permit disposal. Although the Government's waste base case assumes that new build ILW will be disposed to the GDF after legacy ILW, EDF Energy believes there is scope to optimise the current scheduling programme to allow disposal of new build ILW on earlier timescales. For the purposes of decommissioning planning, it is assumed that the GDF scheduling can be optimised to allow transfer of packaged ILW during the main site decommissioning phase.
Tractivity 1011	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Nuclear energy is unviable, unsustainable and unjust. To hell with your greenwash. No to Hinkley C. No to Somerset becoming a radioactive dumping ground for the next two centuries. No to new nuclear anywhere - over my dead body.	9769-242-14537		/		<u>Safety of Geological Disposal</u> A number of consultees expressed concerns over deep geological disposal of spent fuel and radioactive waste at a GDF, particularly in west Cumbria. The RWMD of the NDA is the organisation tasked by Government to implement the GDF, including design of the GDF. The RWMD is also tasked to perform the

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1024	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below There are many safety issues that concern me, particularly the storing of nuclear waste on site and the question of whether Hinkley will be use to store nuclear waste from other sites. EDF still have lots of questions to answer.	9782-242-5983	/			research and development required to demonstrate that the requirements of the UK regulators for safety (the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR)) and the environment (the Environment Agency (EA)) will be met both during disposal operations and after closure of the facility. This will need to take account of the potential for gas generation, corrosion and any other factors impacting on the endurance of the barriers to migration of radioactivity. EDF Energy will ensure that any waste or spent fuel generated at HPC is managed to meet fully the regulatory requirements of the future UK GDF.
Tractivity 1036	Public	Stage 2	Nuclear energy is extremely dangerous, when you consider there is no safe way to dispose of the unspent radiation,	9794-242-7373			/	
Tractivity 1083	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I think this project is far too big for the local infrastructure of this rural community, in particular, the roads. The proposed power plants are much larger than existing ones at Hinkley with much hotter and more dangerous radioactive waste. There is no current safe way to store this and the plans are to store this at Hinkley for more than 160 years (if the station operates for 60 years. The government has still not found a safe place to store waste from existing power stations. I don?t think we should leave this for future generations.	9841-242-8086		/		Regulatory guidance advises that conditioned and packaged radioactive waste should be compatible with existing or future planned management and disposal options. This is demonstrated through a disposability assessment, which is generally provided by NDA RWMD through application of the Letter of Compliance (LoC) assessment process. RWMD has undertaken a GDA disposability assessment for the higher activity wastes and spent fuel expected to arise from the operation and decommissioning of an EPR. On the basis of the GDA Disposability Assessment for the EPR, RWMD has concluded that, compared with legacy wastes and existing spent fuel, no new issues arise that challenge the fundamental disposability of the wastes and spent fuel expected to arise from operation of such a reactor. This conclusion is supported by the similarity of the wastes to those expected to arise from the
Tractivity 1093	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The proposed storage on site for radioactive waste is unsatisfactory in providing an environmental hazard with no viable plan to end or remove the hazard	9851-242-127		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1105	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>It is insulting to ordinary people?s intelligence to be asking what we think about your landscaping ideas when you?re not actively engaging people in discussion about far more pressing issues such as the health & safety issues brought up by your proposal, such as the issue of ionising radiation, or the fact that the reactors that you are proposing are far bigger, dirtier and more dangerous than the current 2nd generation reactors that we are currently saddled with. Or the fact that you intend to turn one of the most beautiful places in the UK into a long term toxic dump by storing radioactive waste so hot that it cant be moved for at least 160 years. All of the research that has been published so far regarding nuclear waste only refers to what is known as legacy waste and doesn?t consider new nuclear waste. This is not a legacy I wish to leave for my children and I am not so arrogant or blindly faithful in human ingenuit</p>	9863-242-129		/		<p>existing Pressurised Water Reactor at Sizewell B. Given a disposal site with suitable characteristics, the wastes and spent fuel from the EPR are expected to be disposable. EDF Energy would continue to work with RWMD through the LoC process to ensure that packaged spent fuel and ILW from HPC would be acceptable for disposal in a GDF.</p> <p>EDF Energy has been working with other prospective nuclear generators through the Nuclear Industries Association to ensure that the waste and spent fuel inventory associated with the new power station is considered during the planning and design of the GDF.</p> <p><u>LLW (and Very Low Level Waste (VLLW)) Disposal Facilities</u></p> <p>Responses received to the consultation requested further details regarding the proposed EDF Energy strategy for disposal of Low Level Waste (LLW) from HPC and the future availability of facilities for disposal, especially in light of the limited capacity of the Low Level Waste Repository (LLWR) in Cumbria.</p> <p>Waste from Hinkley Point C will be transferred to LLW disposal sites only if it has been demonstrated to represent Best Available Techniques (BAT) for the disposal of the waste and disposal has been authorised by the UK regulatory bodies. The Government?s LLW policy (<i>Policy for the Long Term Management of Solid Low Level Radioactive Waste in the United Kingdom, 2007, Defra, DTI and the Devolved Administrations</i>), considers that VLLW could be disposed of through controlled burial to licensed landfill sites in the future. This may provide a viable management option for a number of HPC waste streams, particularly those arising from decommissioning. If a VLLW disposal route is not available these wastes will have to be disposed of as LLW, which will reduce the capacity of the LLWR and increase costs.</p> <p>The LLWR referred to within the Chapter 7 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement is the Low Level Waste Repository, near Drigg, in Cumbria. EDF Energy is aware that the LLWR has a current estimated lifetime shorter than the operation of Hinkley Point C. It is assumed that, as stated in Government policy (<i>Policy for the Long Term Management of Solid Low Level Radioactive Waste in the United Kingdom, 2007, Defra, DTI and the Devolved Administrations</i>) and enshrined in</p>
Tractivity 1119	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>Your proposed EPR reactor is already experiencing serious problems and long delays in France and Finland. According to (personal details removed), University of Greenwich, "the UK government is in danger of backing a design that could prove unlicensable, unaffordable and unbuildable". If building begins and is stopped, damage will already have been done to this rural area. There are also safety problems to be addressed. As for waste, no answer has yet been found to storing it safely elsewhere yet.</p> <p>How will you pay for all this when your credit rating has been reduced to A and your debts far outweigh your profit</p>	9877-242-6238			/	<p>The LLWR referred to within the Chapter 7 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement is the Low Level Waste Repository, near Drigg, in Cumbria. EDF Energy is aware that the LLWR has a current estimated lifetime shorter than the operation of Hinkley Point C. It is assumed that, as stated in Government policy (<i>Policy for the Long Term Management of Solid Low Level Radioactive Waste in the United Kingdom, 2007, Defra, DTI and the Devolved Administrations</i>) and enshrined in</p>
Tractivity 1141	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>There is no credible disposal system for nuclear waste. Our generation will leave it for future generations to somehow keep safe and they may well not have the financial means to do so. We are told that we should not leave the present financil problems for future generations to sort out so why should we leave lethal nuclear waste for them to deal with just so we can watch huge TV screens and use energy in other wasteful ways?</p>	9899-242-129		/		<p>The LLWR referred to within the Chapter 7 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement is the Low Level Waste Repository, near Drigg, in Cumbria. EDF Energy is aware that the LLWR has a current estimated lifetime shorter than the operation of Hinkley Point C. It is assumed that, as stated in Government policy (<i>Policy for the Long Term Management of Solid Low Level Radioactive Waste in the United Kingdom, 2007, Defra, DTI and the Devolved Administrations</i>) and enshrined in</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1192	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I do not believe that a new nuclear power station is the answer to this country's power requirements. How are you going to dispose of the nuclear waste?	9950-242-6109	/			<p>Environmental Permitting Regulations 2010 (<i>EPR10 Part 3 Schedule 23</i>), new disposal facilities (either at existing LLWR or elsewhere) will ultimately be provided by the NDA by the time the current LLWR has ceased to receive waste. However EDF Energy will apply the waste hierarchy and waste segregation to demonstrate best use of existing UK LLW management assets. Direct disposal to LLWR is seen as the least desirable option and where a reasonably practicable alternative disposal route exists, e.g. incineration or metal melting, this has been chosen as the preferred option. This approach is consistent with the national strategy for LLW and EDF will aim to utilise alternative disposal routes to the LLWR as available. This will contribute to the minimisation of disposal of wastes to the LLWR and maximise its remaining operational lifetime.</p> <p>Prior to disposal, suitable LLW could be transferred off-site to specialised licensed waste treatment facilities including super-compaction. Within the UK there are super-compaction facilities located in Winfrith (Dorset) and Sellafield (Cumbria), EDF Energy will utilise this treatment mechanism where the use of super-compaction is demonstrated to represent Best Available Techniques (BAT) in compliance with its environmental permit. The use of super-compaction facilities will reduce the volume of LLW requiring disposal to LLWR.</p> <p><u>Disposal Route for "short-lived" ILW</u></p> <p>A consultee observed that EDF Energy's suggestion for potential changes in the UK disposal concept for short-lived ILW might be a sensible option but that implementation would need to be progressed through a change in UK policy.</p> <p>In the Stage 2 proposals, EDF Energy set out a strategy and proposed baseline for management of all radioactive waste from HPC. This baseline is in accordance with Government policy and regulatory guidance. Outside of the preferred proposal, EDF Energy noted that there were a number of alternative future scenarios for the disposal of ILW generated from the HPC site, including the potential that shorter lived ILW (i.e. ILW with a short half life¹) could be disposed of by a concept other than the current UK proposal of deep geological disposal in a GDF.</p> <p>The approach for short-lived low and intermediate level wastes utilised in France since 1992 at the Centre de l'Aube is for waste packages to be disposed of in cells made from reinforced concrete measuring 25m square and 8m high and located at surface level, unlike the UK deep geological disposal concept. Mobile roofs protect waste packages from the weather</p>
Tractivity 1228	Public	Stage 2 Update	The spent fuel would not be sent off site as it is now but stored on site for 160 years.	89494-242-1394			/	
Tractivity 1296	Public	Stage 2 Update	SPENT FUEL STORES SHOULD NOT BE INCORPORATED WITHIN THIS SITE PLAN THIS ADDS YET ANOTHER GOOD CASE FOR A NORTHERN B/W BYPASS AS A MEANS OF REMOVING THIS FUEL FROM SITE AND FOR EMERGENCY USE	89562-242-2515		/		
Tractivity 1362	Public	Stage 2 Update	Yes. How will you safely dispose of nuclear waste of various grades? Please publish detailed plans for how this will be done to allow those living nearby to have confidence in your procedures. How will you monitor radiation levels in the local area and communicate this information?	89628-242-2168	/			
Tractivity 244	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Little has been said about the short and long term storage and disposal of nuclear waste, and the short and long term safety implications for the area.	9340-242-5277	/			
Tractivity 319	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Whatever ameliorations offered I object to nuclear power stations until safe permanent waste handling available. (it is NOT, as yet) Some investment in wind and tide generation preferred.	9007-242-3854		/		
Tractivity 391	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? I am neither for or against nuclear power due to its low carbon footprint but highly toxic waste. However, I have lived locally to the previous plants and providing all works on the ground are undertaken with the same care that the reactors must be built with then I will welcome the building of this plant and the extra security of energy supply. There are two issues that I am still rather concerned with and they are the disposal of spent fuel and plant decommissioning and secondly the loss of generating potential between the reactor and the turbine output. Though these issues are not a part of the initial works to prepare for building the plant they are a consequence of it to which I would welcome some further information.	9076-242-5835			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 418	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? publicise EDF proposals for dealing with nuclear waste	9100-242-3652	/			<p>whilst cells are being filled. Once a cell is filled up with waste packages it is sealed with a concrete slab. When the facility has reached its disposal capacity of one million cubic metres, it will be covered with a thick layer of clay and planted with vegetation. It will then enter into a surveillance phase for several centuries, during which time access will be controlled and its environment will be monitored.</p> <p>EDF Energy recognises that implementing an alternative strategy for disposal of short-lived ILW would require a change in Government policy and an appropriate disposal site would need to be found.</p>
Tractivity 421	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Make proposals for dealing with nuclear waste public from the outset	9103-242-3540	/			
Tractivity 446	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? New Nuclear power stations are unnecessary, will damage the marine ecosystem of the estuary, become permanent high level radioactive waste dumps virtually for ever, will make the local area a major terrorist target, will cause a health hazard to the local population from the regular radioactive discharges to the environment, are a potential risk to a major release of radioactivity and will do very little to benefit local employment and be too late and too little to do anything to help climate change.	9125-242-5093			/	
Tractivity 477	Public	Stage 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly radioactive spent fuel remaining on site for 160 years plus No planned repository for onward disposal of this spent 	9153-242-5303			/	
Tractivity 495	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? need to be clearer on the management of waste. need to start building asap.	9168-242-4079	/			
Tractivity 570	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Any other comments? I do believe nuclear energy is one of the most sustainable energies we have at the moment. However I also think, we need to work hard to find other solutions to using radioactive materials in a positive way rather than just barying them.	9239-242-5327			/	
Tractivity 576	Public	Stage 1	9. What are your views on EDF Energy's general approach to community benefits and do you have any specific suggestions about what should be included in the package? What community benefits are EDF proposing? What are EDF proposing to do about nuclear waste no evidence of this is any of the local presentations.	9245-242-4121	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 576	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? How can EDF be proposing this construction when it has such huge financial problems. There is still no information about the disposal of nuclear waste this must be the most important issue for the future.	9245-242-4837	/			
Tractivity 665	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? We have to have electric! But worried about waste been stored at site and eventually the disposal of it.	9328-242-3992			/	
Tractivity 50885	Public	Stage 1	My seventh reason is that you have nowhere to put the radioactive fuel when you are done with it. So it will just sit there on top of the ground while it cools down.	9394-242-1596			/	
Tractivity 50899	Public	Stage 1	3. There is still no disposal site for nuclear waste. The highly radioactive fuel from Hinkley C would be stored on site for 160 years despite the risk of rising sea levels.	9396-242-1058			/	
Tractivity 62121	Public	Stage 1	You say in your consultation document that: 'The spent fuel removed during refuelling will be stored underwater in a fuel pond, which will provide cooling and radioactive shielding. The radioactive waste will be treated and packaged in a waste building serving both UK EPR units. The spent fuel and higher level radioactive waste will be kept on-site, in stores capable of lasting for at least 100 years, pending despatch to a national geological disposal facility. I note that your colleagues in AREVA believe that: "Leaving the spent fuel onsite for extended periods of time was never intended and is not responsible. ISFSIs can safely operate past 100 years by implementing an ageing management program...(but) More responsible options exist, recycling and final disposal need to be pushed forward" [Research and Data Needs for Very Long-Term Dry Storage - AREVA Perspective (personal details removed) Transnuclear, Inc. June 11, 2009] If you dont want to be irresponsible, dont create waste that cannot be disposed of unless it has been cooled for 100 years. The long term storage of high burnup spent fuel is expected to result in greater fuel cladding failure, with consequent higher risk of radiation exposure for the generation attempting to retrieve and condition the failed fuel elements.	9412-242-485		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62121	Public	Stage 1	The nuclear regulators have confirmed that further work is required or additional information needs to be provided in order to assess: "...the safety of the long term storage of the fuel before final disposal focussing on the role of the levels of burnup." The Royal Society has described as a pressing problem the need to: "ensure that waste producers do not create waste management problems for which solutions are not currently available." Waste management and disposal is regarded as an integral part of the one single practice of nuclear power generation so we have to consider all detriments, including that from the waste, before allowing any new nuclear programme. We have been told nothing about how the public and workers are to be protected from accidents and deliberate attacks, or how the deterioration of high burnup spent fuel is to be addressed over a 100 year cooling period. As this fails to comply with the pre-application requirements of the IPC, I suggest that you prepare this material and put it in the public domain forthwith.	9412-242-1790	/			
Tractivity 62128	Public	Stage 1	(e) the big problem of disposal of high level radioactive waste has not yet been solved and is still going nowhere;	9415-242-728			/	
Tractivity 62128	Public	Stage 1	(j) the planned storage of high level radioactive waste on site for 160 years or more is not fully justified nor adequately explained as to what it will entail in detail, particularly re security.	9415-242-4720			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	To merely state that: "[t]he decommissioning period of Hinkley Point C, more than 60 years hence, will only be considered to the extent where the environmental effects can be reasonably assessed having regard to current knowledge and methods of assessment." (8) avoids the real world implications of our current level of ignorance. The text below provides many examples of the extent of the scientific problems associated with the notion of Burial of Radioactive Waste - and the Environment Agency have made it quite clear that even if extensive further research is undertaken these problems may not be resolved. The result of this would be that it would not be possible to Dispose of Nuclear Waste sure in the knowledge that subsequent leaks would not cause undue harm.	89480-242-1488			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	In September 2001, at the start of the 'Managing Radioactive Waste Safely' (MRWS) programme the Environment Minister, (personal details removed) stated: (9) "The legacy of a wrong decision could be catastrophic." To suggest that it would be acceptable to pursue the Hinkley C Project - in the certain knowledge that we simply have no idea just how harmful it would be - would be wholly irresponsible.	89480-242-2269			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	<p>The Government propose that a future programme of RadWaste Burial would serve to keep the synthesised radionuclides from nuclear power out of harms way for timescales far into the future.</p> <p>Such an approach has been advocated by the nuclear industry for many years. For example in November 1978 (just over thirty years ago) (personal details removed of the Atomic Energy Research Establishment at Harwell in Oxfordshire gave a lecture to the British Nuclear Energy Society (BNES) on the issue of long term management of the most intensely radioactive wastes 'high level wastes' - (or 'HLW').</p> <p>In April 1979 this talk was made available as a brochure.(38) On page 19 (Fig 4) a cutaway drawing of the 'conceptual' design of an underground RadWaste burial facility is shown.</p> <p>The present-day idea for RadWaste Burial is more or less the same now as it was in the Seventies.</p> <p>During the intervening period work has been undertaken in order to establish the degree to which leaks from such a Burial facility would be contaminated. In the 1990s, the work that had been carried out to date on this issue was scrutinised at a Planning Inquiry in Cumbria - where it was planned to initiate excavation works for a RadWaste Burial facility.</p> <p>This Inquiry was an extremely rigorous process, involving as it did 'Proofs of Evidence', supporting references, witnesses and cross-examination. The Inquiry lasted for 66 days (from Sept '95 to Feb '96) and was presided over by a Planning Inspector, who had the assistance of a Technical Assessor.</p> <p>The Inspectors report was delivered in March 1997.</p> <p>Overall, the Inspector concluded that the Nuclear Industry should not be given the go- ahead to begin their planned programme:</p> <p>"in [their] current state of inadequate knowledge' (39, 40)</p> <p>The Government accepted the Inspectors conclusions, and the planned Excavation programme did not go ahead. In the subsequent period very little additional research work was done.</p> <p>In October 2009, the European Union - Joint Research Centre released the following Reference Report:</p> <p>"Geological Disposal of Radioactive Waste: Moving Towards Implementation" (41)</p> <p>Chapter Two of this Report (pp 10 - 21) - entitled: "The Technical Concept of Geological Disposal" identifies nearly forty outstanding research areas.</p> <p>In November (2009) (personal details removed) of Radiochemistry at the University of Manchester and a Member of the 'Committee on Radioactive Waste Management' (CoRWM) (42) said:</p> <p>"In recent years we have recognised where we do not have relevant expertise, [concerning radioactive waste management] and that is a first step towards dealing with these pressing problems. We are starting at a very low base along what will be a long and complex journey."</p>	89481-242-3774			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	<p>The nuclear industry accept that if radioactive waste were to be buried deep underground - then it would leak back into crops and drinking water supplies.</p> <p>However the problem that the nuclear faces is not just the complexity of trying to calculate contamination levels far into the future. They also face the contradiction of needing to be able to release gas (to avoid hydrogen pressure) - but at the same time keep gas in (to avoid high doses from radioactive methane.)</p> <p>There are many other problems with the notion of RadWaste Burial - which the nuclear industry seem very far from resolving - if indeed they can be resolved.</p>	89483-242-35			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	<p>Geological Screening Criteria and the Gas Issue</p> <p>(i) Hydrogen and the Need for Gas Release</p> <p>Nirex (59) was formed in 1982. In 1985/86 they carried out an initial review of their plans to bury nuclear waste. This immediately indicated the significance of the 'gas issue'(60) - the issue being that due to the corrosion of the large amount of steel that would be utilised in the burial facility, the quantity of hydrogen gas generated would be likely to be extremely large. This factor demanded that a gas release pathway had to be included in order to avoid over-pressurisation.</p> <p>In the November 2005 Nirex, ' Viability Report' (61), the section which addresses the 'Gas Issue' starts off with the Statement:</p> <p>"Post-closure performance assessments [Risk/Time Predictions] have consistently shown that there would be no significant risk from overpressurisation due to gas generation for a repository in a hard fractured host rock' (page 55)</p> <p>This would be due to the fact that gas would be expected to escape through the fractures.</p> <p>(ii) Methane and the Need for Gas Retention</p> <p>However, just two pages on from the assured statement on overpressurisation - on page 57 of the ' Viability' report - there is a 'Risk/Time' curve that considers the possible risks that may arise from a repository if radioactive methane (containing 'carbon-14') is allowed to escape. This graph indicates a possible risk of 'one in a thousand' (which is one thousand times greater than the EA 'one in a million' target). - occurring within about fifty years of closure of the disposal facility (which is much different than figure of the one million years that has been generally assumed.)</p> <p>Clearly, these figures are unacceptable. Nirex state on page 58 of the report:</p> <p>"If, through further work, the calculated rates and quantities of carbon-14 containing methane generated were not to be significantly reduced, compared with those used in the scoping calculation presented here, it could be necessary to establish siting criteria that would ensure that significant gaseous release to the biosphere would be unlikely."</p> <p>" ...further work is planned which may include the identification of specific siting requirements"</p> <p>If further research were to confirm that the release of methane would be unacceptable then - clearly - it would appear that the site selection criteria should require a geology that would seal in the methane gas. However, as discussed above - this would be directly contrary to the site selection criteria required when the need to avoid a pressure build up is considered.</p>	89483-242-673			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	<p>In the Government White Paper "Managing Radioactive Waste Safely: A Framework for Implementing Geological Disposal" (DEFRA, June 2008) (62), the decision making steps for disposal are set out on pages 50 and 51; and the geological screening criteria are set out on pages 74 -75.</p> <p>It is of concern that the geological screening criteria on pp 74,75 make no mention of the gas release/gas retention issue discussed above - thus indicating that the geological community have not yet taken a view on this issue.</p> <p>Until this issue of the appropriate criteria is carried out - it is difficult to see how local communities that are expected to 'volunteer' to host a nuclear waste repository can have confidence that a rigorous process will be adopted for site selection.</p>	89483-242-3308			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	<p>In August 2009, the Environment Agency reported (63) that the "C-14 methane 'story' is a knowledge gap" (page 201). (Quotation marks around 'story' in original)</p> <p>Not only does this quote indicate that the matter is as yet unresolved - and therefore that no progress has been made wrt the site selection dilemma; the quote also indicates that the Environment Agency are approaching the issue with a degree of flippancy. To refer to a potential dose that is one thousand times the target and within fifty years post-closure as a 'story' does not indicate respect for the communities that are being approached as potential repository hosts.</p>	89483-242-4118			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	<p>On page 7 of the DECC (64) RadWaste Summary it is stated that:</p> <p>- "The reference design currently being used by NDA for the purposes of estimating the costs of a GDF envisages spent fuel being packaged in copper canisters prior to disposal"</p> <p>and page 27 (66) refers very specifically to the Finnish disposal project which is heavily based on the use of copper.</p> <p>Copper is proposed on the grounds that basis it possess a relatively low corrosion rate. For example, the most recent (July 2008) 'Safety Case Plan' (66,67) on the Finnish (68) web site states that:</p> <p>- "The KBS-3 concept for spent fuel disposal in crystalline bedrock was first introduced by the Swedish SKB in 1983 and has since been subject to intense research and development work both in Sweden and in Finland (SKBF/KBS 1983). The KBS-3 concept, which is based on the multiple barrier principle, aims at long-term isolation and containment of spent fuel assemblies within durable copper-iron canisters in a way that any releases of radionuclides from the canisters are prevented for as long as they could cause any harm to man or the environment." (page 4)</p> <p>- "safety rests first and foremost on the long-term isolation and containment of radionuclides within the copper-iron canisters" (page 10)</p> <p>The Posiva 'Radionuclide Release and Transport' report from December 2008 (69) makes similar points, thus:</p> <p>- "The repository design is based on a multiple-barrier concept referred to as KBS-3V, where spent fuel elements in copper canisters are emplaced in vertical holes in the bedrock (one canister per hole) and surrounded by a buffer of bentonite clay. The original KBS-3 concept was introduced in the report SKBF/KBS (1983)" (page 7)</p> <p>- "There is strong scientific evidence suggesting that the copper walls of the canisters will resist corrosion for such a long period of time that the residual radioactivity of the content will decay below harmful levels, before penetrating holes will develop in the canister. " (page 8)</p> <p>- "The safety rests on the long-term isolation of radionuclides within copper-iron canisters surrounded by a buffer of bentonite clay located deep underground in crystalline rock." (page 15)</p> <p>Specifically, this document refers to a copper thickness of 50 mm (or 5 centimetres)</p> <p>- "In the KBS-3V concept the spent fuel is encapsulated in canisters with a cast-iron insert and a copper overpack with a nominal thickness of 50 mm." (page 15)</p> <p>However, in July 2009, the Chemistry Journal 'Catalysis Letters (70)' reported:</p> <p>- "According to a current concept, copper canisters of thickness 0.05 m will be safe for nuclear waste containment for 100,000 years. We show that more than 1m copper thickness might be required for 100,000 years durability." (Abstract - p311)</p> <p>** needs text on implications of this 1 metre figure **</p>	89483-242-4784			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	<p>In November 2005 the Environment Agency reported their scepticism over Nirex's prediction that carbon dioxide containing the radionuclide 'carbon-14' would be held underground through a reaction with the cement.(71)</p> <p>This may be compared with present concern that the carbon-14 would be released within forty post-closure in the form of methane gas (CH4) at a dose that would be one thousand times the regulatory limit.</p> <p>Carbon-14 - References</p> <p>-In 2006 Nirex quoted (72) the 'Tolerable' release rate of radioactive carbon ('carbon-14') as 2.4×10^3 units.(73) However, in 2008, the NDA quoted (74) that it was possible that 10 units (75) of 'carbon-14' (76) could be released from a RadWaste Burial facility.</p> <p>This (2008) figure indicates that it is possible that the release of radioactive carbon - could result in a dose that is 4, 000 times greater (77) than what the EA judge to be 'tolerable'. In addition it was predicted by Nirex that this dose would arise just forty years (78) after the Burial facility was closed.</p>	89483-242-7714			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	<p>A specific example which illustrates the problems associated with predicting the risk associated with radioactive disposal may be provided by the difficulties of predicting uranium contamination levels.</p> <p>As discussed above, a fundamental flaw in nuclear industry risk estimates is that they are based on the radioactive atom and do not take adequate account of the chemical compound in which it is held, nor the chemical environment of this compound. These two factors can have a very profound influence on the behaviour of the radioactive atom; however the nuclear industry calculations do not allow for this phenomenon. Errors can be introduced into their risk calculations of a factor of up to 100 million fold.</p> <p>For example in 1991 'Nirex' (the 'Nuclear Industry Radioactive waste Executive - who were then responsible for developing a disposal facility) went over to a Uranium mine in Brazil to test the accuracy of their computer predictions of contamination levels. (79)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the predicted contamination level was - 1.4×10^{-11} mg/l (80) - and the measured contamination level was - 3×10^{-3} mg/l (81) <p>This represents an under-estimate of a factor of: 200 Million Fold.</p> <p>Although the piece of work quoted above was undertaken in 1991, work published in (2007) indicates that the nuclear industry are still experiencing the same sort of problems. Thus SERCO - in a Consultants report to Nirex report a data range for uranium contamination levels of up to 'one hundred million' units (82)</p>	89483-242-8825			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	<p>If radioactive waste were to be buried underground in the UK it would very quickly become saturated with groundwater. This means that if the chemical compounds that contain the wastes happen to be soluble they would be carried away from the waste drums - and depending on the water pressure system - they may end up in crops or drinking water supplies.</p> <p>Before a decision can be made to bury radioactive wastes - there must be some degree of certainty that the resultant leaks would not be too dangerous. In particular, - there must be a large degree of confidence in the pre-calculation of the amount of radionuclides carries by the leaking water. [This calculation must be carried out in order to satisfy the Environment Agency that the resultant doses would not be too great]</p> <p>Given that the nuclear industry is based on uranium - this section looks at the nuclear industries ability to make reliable estimates of uranium leakage rates. It uses as an example the experiment carried out by the Nuclear Industry in 1991 at the 'Pocos de Caldas' Uranium Mine in Brazil.</p> <p>In this experiment the hypothesis that was tested was that the chemical information that was fed into the nuclear industry's computer would enable an accurate prediction of the uranium contamination levels in the underground water found at the site.</p> <p>The data was duly fed into the computer - and the contamination level that was predicted was:</p> <p>1.4 x 10⁻¹¹ mg/l (pp 9,19)</p> <p>However, when actual contamination levels were measured the contamination level that was found was:</p> <p>3 x 10⁻³ mg/l (p10)</p> <p>These figures mean that the Nuclear Industry under-estimated the uranium contamination of the underground water at the Mine by a factor of:</p>	89483-242-10391			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	<p>he following text shows that the chemical explanation for the unexpected error in the calculation was not established. In fact there were four possible explanations for the (200 million fold) error.</p> <p>Possible Explanations of Pocos de Caldas Error in Prediction of Uranium Contamination Level</p> <p>Nirex - Pocos de Caldas Modelling Study (NSS/R252) April 1991 (pp 12-13) Verbatim Extract (Emphasis and Summary added)</p> <p>".. .in the reduced region, the predicted value is significantly lower than that observed. There are a number of possible reasons for this discrepancy. The base-case run assumed that the uranium concentration was controlled by a fully-crystalline uraninite phase.</p> <p>There is, however, evidence from the field measurements for the presence of pitchblende at the site [5]. Pitchblende is a term that is used to describe the dense botryoidal variety of uraninite that is commonly found in veined deposits. This naturally-occurring form is likely to be only partially crystalline. Also, natural uraninite always shows a higher degree of oxidation than the stoichiometric formula, usually in the range UO_{2.0} to UO_{2.25} 17.</p> <p>To scope these effects, the calculation was repeated assuming amorphous UO₂ as the solid phase in the reduced region, to represent the partial crystallinity. This calculation predicted a total uranium concentration in solution of 5.3 x 10⁻³ mg/l, which is now higher than the field measurement.</p> <p>To scope the effect of the partial oxidation of the uraninite solid, some aqueous speciation calculations were carried out with HARPHRQ, assuming U₃O₈, as the stable solid. The predicted solubility in the reduced region was then about 2 x 10⁻³ mg/l, which falls within the range of field values.</p> <p>Both predictions are therefore more consistent with the field observations. Another possible explanation for the underestimate for the uranium concentration may be that some uranium was associated with colloidal material, which has resulted in the measurement of enhanced uranium solubilities in the field measurements.</p> <p>Uranium (V) species were omitted from these calculations. Further sensitivity tests were performed, including these species. The predicted solubility was increased, and is in agreement with that calculated in the modelling study of Lichtner18, who used a database in which U(V) species were included."</p> <p>Thus, four possible explanations for discrepancy between predicted concentration and measured concentration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - not fully crystalline, - non-stoichiometric - colloids, - Uranium (V) <p>Although the piece of work quoted above was undertaken in 1991, work published in 2007 indicates that the nuclear industry are still experiencing the same problems. Thus the data range used in the uranium calculations can vary up to 'one hundred 84 million' units (84)</p>	89483-242-12428			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	<p>RadWaste Burial - Other Recent Problems</p> <p>"Expansive Fracturing" (Aug 2008)</p> <p>A number of waste streams at Sellafield have been cemented up. However in August 2008 it was reported that, as this was carried out without allowing the reactive metals (particularly uranium) to corrode in advance, those drums that have been cemented up are now due to expand and crack with 140 years.(85)</p> <p>Selenium-79 Half-life</p> <p>In May 2009 the NEA ('Nuclear Energy Agency' - part of the 'OECD' the 'Organisation of Economic Cooperation and Development') reported (86) that changes in the reported value of the half-life for selenium-79 over the last decade had strongly influenced degree of harm that it was predicted that a RadWaste Burial facility would cause.</p> <p>[NB - this seems odd, as one would assume that the value of a radionuclide's 'half-life' was a well-known physical constant..]</p>	89483-242-15260			/	
Tractivity 62206	Public	Stage 1	<p>3) Highly radioactive spent fuel remainnig on site for 160 years plus</p> <p>4) No planned repository for onward disposal of this spent fuel</p>	9428-242-211			/	
Tractivity 62206	Public	Stage 1	<p>7) Our world is in such a mess due to decisions made that are extremely short-term eg. finance, housing, energy investment, etc. - we need as caring, responsible human beings to turn to alternative sources of energy eg. tidal wave, solar - as is already happening successfully around the world and put the investment into creating a world for the future - and also solve the problem of the current nuclear waste that we need to dispose of safely!</p>	9428-242-477			/	
Tractivity 62239	Public	Stage 1	<p>I object to proposals for the largest UK nuclear power station due to my concerns over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Health risks from radioactive emissions - Risks of leaks, accidents, terrorism - Highly radioactive spent fuel remaining on site for 160 years plus - No planned repository for onward disposal of this spent fuel 	9438-242-34		/		
Tractivity 62240	Public	Stage 1	<p>object to proposals for the largest UK nuclear power station due to my concerns over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Health risks from radioactive emissions - Risks of leaks, accidents, terrorism - Highly radioactive spent fuel remaining on site for 160 years plus - No planned repository for onward disposal of this spent fuel 	9439-242-34			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62352	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	I am opposed to the construction of further nuclear power stations because of the unacceptable associated risks. There is an established link between the high incidence of breast cancer in communities that are in close proximity to nuclear power stations and there is also the inherent danger linked with the waste products and the continuing dilemma as to what to do with them. This said, I do believe that, where the nuclear industry is concerned, the French are more competent in this field and I am impressed by the candid replies you have given when interviewed on the subject by (personal details removed) of CH4 News.	10029-242-4097			/	
Tractivity 62495	Public	Stage 2	i) confirm that you do not plan to dump radioactive waste from the proposed Hinkley C reactors at a land-fill site in Cumbria; and ii) clarify whether, by LLWR, [Ch Six page 42 para 6.52.3] you are referring to the Drigg low level waste site in Cumbria - and if so, are you aware of the capacity problems that this site is experiencing; iii) whether you plan to send any radioactive wastes (including exempt and VLLW) for disposal in landfill sites - if so where would the landfill sites be situated; and iv) what contingency plans have you if LLW disposal capacity at Drigg in Cumbria was unavailable.	10095-242-82	/			
Tractivity 62504	Public	Stage 2	With no known solution to the problem of radioactive waste, no known materials that can contain it for 100s of years, the very real risk of terrorist disruption, the forecast rise in sea level, the idea of going ahead with this or any other nuclear project, is simply incomprehensible. We are talking about a geological time-scale, over which there is no evidence of continuous human political or social continuity. If Hinkley C were to be permitted, then the site will effectively become a nuclear waste storage facility, as spent and highly contaminated fuel will be stored there for a period that is several times longer than the period it would operate for.	10097-242-5978			/	
Tractivity 62504	Public	Stage 2	This is therefore, primarily, a waste storage facility, a fact conspicuously absent and obscured from the consultation.	10097-242-6640			/	
Tractivity 62531	Public	Stage 2	My fundamental objections to EdF's revived Hinkley C are: 1. It carries safety risks, from the health effects of radiation through to the possibility of a catastrophic accident, unlike any other means of generating electricity. The storage of radioactive waste at Hinkley for 100 years after electricity generation has ceased is an example of these risks.	10104-242-637			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62531	Public	Stage 2	2. Radioactive Waste Storage EdF refers in para. 4.2.4 of its "Preferred Proposals: Explanation and Assessment, July 2010 to "interim spent fuel storage facilities". This is a misleading description. "Interim" will mean storing 3,600 tonnes of spent fuel for a period estimated to be 100 years after the reactors have stopped operating, i.e. for more than 160 years from now. "Spent fuel" is the technical description for fuel whose energy has been extracted in the reactor, but in reality it is radioactive waste. EdF has no proposal to do anything else useful with it, such as reprocessing to reclaim uranium.	10104-242-2361			/	
Tractivity 62531	Public	Stage 2	The result is that Hinkley Point will have a long term radioactive waste dump in addition to a nuclear power station. This transforms the application into something quite different from an electricity generating plant. Apart from the obvious risks associated with a waste store (breach of containment, aircraft crash, flooding, terrorism, climatic changes over such a long timescale) there is still no certainty that this waste will be removed to a permanent repository.	10104-242-2979			/	
Tractivity 62531	Public	Stage 2	Discussions have been taking place since the 1980s about such a repository, which is fraught with technical issues even if a willing host community can be found. In the 1990s an application to construct a test "rock laboratory" for a repository was turned down at a public inquiry. Although local authorities in West Cumbria have had discussions with government departments about "volunteering" to accept such a repository, funding for this dialogue was recently suspended and there is no certainty anyway that the geology near the potentially willing community will be suitable. The government now suggests that a repository could be operational by 2040, but only initially for existing waste from the UK's Magnox and AGR reactors. With considerable doubt cast over whether a repository to receive "spent fuel" from Hinkley C will be built at any given time in the future, it must make sense for EdF to postpone the application to construct a new power station and its associated waste storage facility until such time as the repository is operational.	10104-242-3453		/		
Tractivity 62554	Public	Stage 2	The problems of nuclear waste have still not been satisfactorily solved.	10114-242-1590			/	
Tractivity 62631	Public	Stage 2	3. It is immoral to produce a lethal and toxic waste product, which we cannot deal with hoping that some time in the future our children's children will have to deal with.	10175-242-8943			/	
Tractivity 62938	Public	Stage 2	Nuclear power creates environmental poisons (deadly radiation) that will have to be stored in the area for 160 years until it is cool enough to be moved to a repository that doesn't even exist.	10177-242-8492			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Bristol City Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	Bristol City Council is minded to maintain its objection to the proposal to locate an additional nuclear power station on the Hinkley Point site and has serious concern on a number of issues, including the following: - inefficient use of resources in face of alternative and safer sources of energy; - constraint placed on the effective delivery of alternative renewable energy to the energy network in the Hinkley Point area; - impact of the proposed use on the environment of the Severn Estuary in combination with other proposed developments and any proposed mitigation; - long term on-site storage of highly radioactive spent fuel.	10214-242-891			/	
Cheddar Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	People seem unaware of the storage facility for spent fuel, or indeed the time scale for the proposed storage, considering that the UK has no current facilities for the handling of nuclear waste. Evidence again of the 'gloss over' approach from EDF.	10222-242-4075			/	
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	1.4 In the consultation document EdF give the impression that it is absolutely confident that plans to deal with the radioactive wastes produced by a possible Hinkley Point C reactor exist or will exist. Relentlessly optimistic, EdF claim that spent nuclear fuel "would be stored initially for a period of around 10 years in the reactor fuel pool which provides cooling and shielding. It would then be transferred to an on-site Spent Fuel Interim Storage Facility, pending final disposal in the national geological disposal facility (GDF) once it is available." It adds that "interim storage of spent fuel is practised worldwide and consistent with government policy. Facilities can be based on either wet or dry storage concepts. The scheme illustrated is the wet system...This is the preferred approach for HPC." 1.5 In a presentation from the Environment Agency a senior regulator working on new build and spent fuel conceded that firm plans for how to deal with spent fuel from EdF's reactors will not be known until 2012 or 2013.(2) No assumption can be made that disposal even of legacy wastes will take place and certainly not on the timeline proposed by the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority. CoRWM II has yet to fully examine the technical and practical issues surrounding new build spent fuel storage, encapsulation and disposal itself. Its report on this is not expected until late 2010.	10260-242-1505			/	
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	1.6 EdF should be honest by telling the public that there is no environmentally acceptable and proven 'solution' for the disposal of high level radioactive wastes and spent fuel. There is no disposal site operational anywhere in the world for spent fuel, as Areva (the supplier of EdF's reactor) has noted.(3) Given the huge dangers posed by spent fuel to both people and the local environment, EdF's actions in this respect are entirely unacceptable. On this basis alone are grounds for the development process for Hinkley Point C should be stopped.	10260-242-2910			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	1.7 Greenpeace does not believe that EdF has published adequate information on the detail of plans for spent fuel management and storage on site. Nor has it made clear that people living near to the site of the reactor would in effect be living next to a nuclear waste dump for up to 160 years. This issue was raised in the 1st consultation but very little has subsequently changed. The reason for the paucity of information is obvious: EdF has no idea how precisely it will deal with the spent fuel arisings from any EPR that may be built in the UK.	10260-242-3462			/	
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	1.8 It claims that "the size of the building is derived from the functional capacity requirements of the pool and the storage area that will be required for the operation and the mechanical system for placing and retrieving spent fuel." But no further explanation or information is given on what technologies EdF will use to encapsulate, condition and store its spent fuel arisings. Without this information it is impossible for the public to understand the implications of living next to a spent fuel storage facility for an extended period of time.	10260-242-4018	/			
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	1.9 Greenpeace again asks that EdF answer the following questions regarding plans for spent fuel management: - Is EdF currently in a position to say publicly exactly what its agreed plan to deal with spent fuel from any potential new reactors on site is? If so, what are these plans? - Will storage be sub-surface or at surface level? - Exactly how long will spent fuel be stored on site for? - How will spent fuel be conditioned? Where? - How will spent fuel be encapsulated? Where? - When will title and liability of EdF's spent fuel arisings pass to the government? - Where will final disposal of Hinkley C's spent fuel arisings eventually take place? When? - If EdF has no substantive plans at present as to how to deal with its spent fuel, why has it chosen not to make this absolutely clear in its consultation document?	10260-242-4572			/	
Forum 21	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	In its Stage 2 Consultation document Preferred Proposals: Explanation and Assessment, July 2010, EdF refers to "interim spent fuel storage facilities". "Interim" in fact means storing 3,600 tonnes of spent (used) nuclear fuel for a period estimated to be 100 years after the reactors have stopped operating. This means for more than 160 years from now. "Spent fuel" is the technical description for fuel whose energy has been extracted in the reactor, but in reality it is radioactive waste. EdF has no proposal to do anything else potentially useful with it, such as reprocessing to reclaim uranium.	10262-242-459			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Forum 21	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The result is that Hinkley Point will have a long term radioactive waste store in addition to a nuclear power station. This transforms the application into something quite different from an electricity generating plant. Apart from the obvious risks associated with a waste store (breach of containment, aircraft crash, flooding, terrorism, climatic changes over such a long timescale) there is still no certainty that this waste will be removed to a permanent repository.	10262-242-1063			/	
Forum 21	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Discussions have been taking place since the 1980s about such an underground repository, which is fraught with technical issues even if a willing host community can be found. In the 1990s an application to construct a test "rock laboratory" for a repository in Cumbria was turned down at a public inquiry. The government now suggests that a repository could be operational by 2040, but only initially for existing waste from the UK's Magnox (such as Hinkley A) and AGR (such as Hinkley B) reactors. The model proposed for this repository, known technically as a "geological disposal facility", is the one currently under discussion in Sweden. This has yet to receive approval from the Swedish authorities, let alone be constructed.	10262-242-1538			/	
Forum 21	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	With considerable doubt cast over whether a suitable location to receive "spent fuel" from Hinkley C will be available at any given time in the future, EdF should at least delay the construction of the new power station until such time as the repository is operational.	10262-242-2273			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	This is an area in your proposals that is so undeveloped that it is hard to know where to begin giving you feedback. Again you underplay the implications and skim over your arrangements. Also there is a strong possibility that a permanent repository for this waste will never materialise and therefore you have not even considered that it will be at Hinkley permanently and what arrangements will need to be in place. The storage of waste poses a serious risk in its own right. You need to urgently address the shortcomings in your proposals. You have failed to consider the impact on the local people.	89472-242-12666			/	
Tractivity 62486	Public	Stage 2	- the most recent technical findings on nuclear waste disposal. These indicate that the approach to waste management advocated by EdF would be likely to release significant amounts of radioactivity and so seriously harm future generations.	89473-242-4170			/	
Tractivity 62486	Public	Stage 2	- the recent report by the Environment Agency that even after a 100 year cooling time it may still not be possible to remove waste fuel from the site - due to the fact that there may not be a disposal facility available to accept it. This has implications in terms of the possibility of deterioration or flooding of the waste stores and the resultant dose implications. EdF have not taken these possible doses into account.	89473-242-4545	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62486	Public	Stage 2	<p>The proposed Hinkley C station would produce over 3,500 tonnes of waste fuel. (20) Initially, the waste fuel rods taken out of a reactor are so lethal that they would almost immediately kill someone if they were to be anywhere near them. (21) The wastes do become less dangerous with time - however they would remain a risk to health for millions of years to come. (22, 23)</p> <p>This summer DECC reported that even if radioactive wastes had been disposed of following due legal process it would still be possible for people to receive radiological doses that had not been anticipated. (24) This statement is of even more concern in the case of Hinkley C, as EdF refer to the Swedish KBS approach as a means of demonstrating the viability of their planned waste disposal method. (25)</p> <p>In 2010 (personal details removed) of Genewatch carried out a substantial literature review of the scientific and technical credibility of the Swedish approach to waste disposal (the so-called KBS approach). In September 2010, Greenpeace International published a report documenting her findings. The report identified a number of flaws in the design - such that significant amounts of radioactivity could be released and so seriously harm future generations.</p>	89475-242-1214			/	
Tractivity 62486	Public	Stage 2	<p>EdF estimate that the waste fuel from the proposed Hinkley C reactors would remain on-site up to the year 2180. This date assumes a reactor closure date of 2080 plus a 100 year period to allow for fuel cooling. (37)</p> <p>However, the Environment Agency have recently stated that this date may be incorrect. They have pointed out that wastes may need to remain on site for a longer period of time as there may not be a disposal facility available to accept them. (38)</p>	89477-242-19			/	
Tractivity 62486	Public	Stage 2	<p>"The determining factor for the duration of storage might be availability of the GDF (Geological Disposal Facility) for emplacement rather than heat generation, that is the GDF might not be available to accept spent fuel from the UK EPR fleet as soon as the heat generation reaches an acceptable level. Therefore the necessary storage period could be longer than anticipated in the disposability assessment, and could be independent of assumptions about burn-up. (39)</p> <p>"If the storage period is determined by availability of the repository for disposal, then none of the arguments about heat generation are relevant and storage for the longer period would need to be assessed." (40)</p> <p>The implications of this are that EdF's decommissioning programme could very easily not work out as set out in the Stage Two text. The Environment Agency do not specify an expected date when the problems associated with disposal would be resolved.</p>	89477-242-521			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62486	Public	Stage 2	<p>given the very large number of problems involved, and the degree of their significance (see text above) it is possible that</p> <p>i)it may take a number of centuries before a disposal facility becomes available, or</p> <p>ii) it may be decided that disposal is unacceptable due to the risk of harmful leakage</p> <p>In both of these instances - and especially in the second instance - the spent fuel would be likely to remain on site far longer than envisaged by EdF.</p>	89477-242-1466			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Waste management continues to be an area where there is limited information provided to assess potential impacts. The submitted information is vague on transport implications, which, considering the potential amount of waste arising, needs further clarification. The use of the Low Level Waste (LLW) repository near Drigg is noted however capacity is limited and further arisings from new nuclear build will increase pressure on the site, and on finding another location to accommodate the increased volume.	89201-242-4657			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Reference is made to supercompaction of waste prior to transporting. Clarification on the location of this work would be welcomed.	89201-242-5170	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Reference is made to the Geological Disposal Facility for waste arising from nuclear sites. Clarification is needed whether this Facility is to be provided for arisings from the new nuclear build or only the existing fleet of power stations.	89201-242-5714	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>2.1. Preferred Proposals: Summary</p> <p>Components: It is not made clear that the spent fuel store is High Level Waste.</p>	89289-242-136			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	13.11 In addition, EDF are asked by the Estate to confirm: 13.11.1 On what basis they consider that ILW shipments won't commence before 2080 (6.37.1) and that a 100 year ISF design life (6.42.1) is an appropriate timescale?	89444-242-7360	/			
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We also believe that the consultation skims over the issue of spent nuclear fuel, which is expected to stay stored in a pond on site for 160 years or more. It may end up staying permanently, as no repository (geological disposal facility) has yet been established for UK nuclear waste. The planning process should examine this issue in much greater depth.	89447-242-2503			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	8. Radioactive waste storage In its Stage 2 Consultation document "Preferred Proposals: Explanation and Assessment, July 2010", EdF refers to "interim spent fuel storage facilities". "Interim" in fact means storing 3,600 tonnes of spent (used) nuclear fuel for a period estimated to be 100 years after the reactors have stopped operating. This means for more than 160 years from now. "Spent fuel" is the technical description for fuel whose energy has been extracted in the reactor, but in reality it is radioactive waste. EdF has no proposal to do anything else potentially useful with it, such as reprocessing to reclaim uranium. The result is that Hinkley Point will have a long term radioactive waste store in addition to a nuclear power station. This transforms the application into something quite different from an electricity generating plant. Apart from the obvious risks associated with a waste store (breach of containment, aircraft crash, flooding, terrorism, climatic changes over such a long timescale) there is still no certainty that this waste will be removed to a permanent repository.	89450-242-4677			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Discussions have been taking place since the 1980s about such an underground repository, which is fraught with technical issues even if a willing host community can be found. In the 1990s an application to construct a test "rock laboratory" for a repository in Cumbria was turned down at a public inquiry. The government now suggests that a repository could be operational by 2040, but only initially for existing waste from the UK's Magnox (such as Hinkley A) and AGR (such as Hinkley B) reactors. The model proposed for this repository, known technically as a "geological disposal facility", is the one currently under discussion in Sweden. This has yet to receive approval from the Swedish authorities, let alone be constructed. Search for a geological disposal site As government funding has dried up to assist local authorities in Cumbria (the only ones currently interested) to determine whether their locality is suitable for a "Deep Geological Repository", it is impossible to say with any certainty that a community will step forward under the "voluntarism" scheme. In any case this approach is fundamentally flawed, as the geology should come first in any such decision.	89450-242-5790			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	For the lower activity wasteforms - namely LLW and VLLW - disposal facilities are currently available, notably at the Low Level Waste Repository (LLWR) near Drigg in Cumbria. However, capacity of Drigg is limited, and additional capacity will be required to accommodate operation and decommissioning of Hinkley Point C. Also, though VLLW is now a permitted waste for near-surface disposal, the provision of relevant UK capacity is currently very limited.	89335-242-2795	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Noting the legislative requirements associated with radiological waste management which will need to be complied with, EDF Energy's proposals for management of radioactive waste generally align with contemporary experience in operating and decommissioning PWRs worldwide. The authorities' concerns, however, are with regards to the potential requirements of radioactive waste associated with availability of, and timescales associated with radioactive waste management facilities. These stem from Government policy issues and from the uncertainty in the timing of deliverables from the MRWS programme. Where off-site waste disposal facilities are not available according to current programme, on-site storage, of quantities and periods exceeding those currently forecast, may be required.	89335-242-3253			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	EDF Energy's estimates of LLW generation, presented in Table 6.18.1 of the EnvApp, appear reasonable. While EDF Energy proposes to dispose of LLW 'as soon as reasonably practicable' (para 6.18.1), this will depend not only on the issues associated with on-site treatment capacity to minimise volume and package, but also on UK-wide LLW disposal capacity. This is currently being pursued by LLWR Ltd and the NDA as part of UK policy. Whilst it is noted that volumes of LLW forecast for generation are not significant in the context of the UK's LLW generation as a whole, the authorities are concerned that there remains residual uncertainty with regards to future capacity at the current LLWR in Drigg. Paragraph 6.28.2 of the EnvApp reflects that "a new LLW disposal site would need to be constructed in the future". Given that there is currently no commitment to delivery of a further LLWR, or for this to accommodate LLW from HPC, we would expect the discussion of radioactive waste management provided in the EnvApp to provide further details of contingency plans covering the eventuality of the unavailability of LLW disposal facilities.	89335-242-5483	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Noting the discussion provided with regards to Very Low Level Waste, presented in Section 6.12, the authorities are also concerned that there is a shortage of disposal facilities licensed for acceptance of VLLW. The authorities therefore request that due consideration be given to the availability of VLLW authorised disposal facilities, and consider the need to manage VLLW in the event that disposal facilities are not available.	89335-242-6905			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The duration of on-site storage of ILW will be defined by the operational lifetime of the reactor, its decommissioning and the availability of the Geological Disposal Facility. While a date for availability of the GDF of 2040 is proposed in the EnvApp (para 6.36.1), this is not a firm commitment, and neither is the 2130 programme for disposal of new build waste within the GDF. As these dates would be reliant on a range of external factors, including siting availability, planning consent, design and construction programmes, there remains considerable uncertainty with regards to these figures. While para 6.36.2 of the EnvApp anticipates that all ILW could be packaged and ready for transfer by approximately 2090, and the NDA anticipate new build ILW disposal by 2040, there are opportunities for deviation either direction of the 2040 date.	89335-242-9026			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The authorities therefore request further details with regards to contingency planning for ILW waste management in the event of failure to deliver the GDF according to timescales currently anticipated by the NDA, and are particularly keen to understand the potential periods for which ILW may be required to be stored in on-site interim storage facilities following the end of generation (2077 and 2080).	89335-242-9877			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>The EDF Energy proposals for spent fuel management, presented in Section 6 of the EnvApp, are, on the face of it, generally adequate and accord with current policy and with worldwide experience. The authorities concerns however, relate primarily to the open-ended commitment to on-site interim storage of spent fuel which is a result of the current uncertainty regarding the potential deliverability of a GDF. While Section 6.8 of the EnvApp describes that Government has concluded it would be technically possible and desirable to dispose of Higher Activity Waste from new nuclear power stations in a GDF, and that it is Government's preferred long-term approach, future delivery of a GDF is not yet assured.</p> <p>The authorities therefore request further details with regards to contingency planning for management and disposal of spent fuel management in the event of failure to deliver the GDF according to timescales currently anticipated by the NDA. While it is noted in Section 6.48 that GDF may allow waste disposal ahead of the current programme, details of contingency plans should also consider the event that GDF is not delivered to anticipated timescales. With the current lack of commitment to delivery of a GDF, it is important to understand the potential periods that spent fuel may be required to be stored in on-site interim storage facilities following the end of generation (2077 and 2080), and this should also be discussed clearly within the EnvApp.</p>	89335-242-14006			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	with regards to ILW and spent fuel disposal, the achievement of prompt decommissioning would depend on both the GDF being available and on a 'place in the queue' being designated for HPC ILW. We note, however, that dates associated with availability of GDF for disposal are not yet firm commitments and that there a number of factors which may affect the overall programme for decommissioning. In addition, further uncertainty is also associated with disposal of LLW at LLW repository and VLLW at licensed facility as discussed above. As such we consider that further information should be provided with regards to contingencies in the event of unavailability of GDF, and particularly with regards to the effects that this would have on the overall decommissioning programme.	89335-242-17260			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The proposal for the management and storage of high level radioactive waste, which could remain on site for up to 160 years, is a significant concern for the local authorities and the communities that will have to live with the real and perceived risks of the storage facility for several generations.	89418-242-4757			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	These concerns can include the actual and perceived impacts on public health and the environment and on local infrastructure and the economy (as described above). The proposals for the management and storage of high level radioactive waste, which could remain on site for up to 160 years, are a significant concern for the local authorities and the communities that will have to live with the real and perceived risks of the storage facility for several generations.	89422-242-3546			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The main areas of concern relate not the operation of the UK EPR or their wastes themselves, but the current and future capacity of UK licensed radiological waste management facilities. Low Level Waste Repository capacity is currently limited, and proposals are reliant on delivery of further capacity, while the deep geological facility for managing intermediate level waste and spent fuel is still to be developed. This results in a degree of uncertainty, particularly about the length of time both intermediate level waste and spent fuel would need to remain on-site after reactor shutdown. Several possibilities for improvement in the current timescales are mentioned, but they are matters which cannot be progressed by EDF alone. They may require optimisation and improvement of UK disposal programmes, together with potential modifications in the policy area.	89423-242-12918	/			
Tractivity 62915	Public	Stage 2 Update	Storage of Spent Fuel on-site The close proximity of the Nuclear Power Stations to the proposed spent fuel storage ponds is an extreme safety issue. This fuel should be removed immediately from site and taken to a purpose made processing facility. The implications of leaving in-situ are too enormous.	89666-242-2388			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Selworthy & Minehead Without Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	The Parish Council understand that waste will be stored on site. Is this true?	89753-242-1580	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	2.2. Para 2.1.5. refers to "general operational waste and radiological waste produced during the operational phase of Hinkley Point C were set out in detail at the Stage 2 consultation". As part of the dialogue with EDF, Somerset County Council seeks greater clarity on EDF's approach on the management of in particular low level and intermediate level wastes arising from Hinkley Point C.	89867-242-810	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1.9 [4.1.21] It is disingenuous to refer to the ILW and spent fuel facilities as being 'interim', as they will require to be used for the planned 60 years operational life of the station and possibly for 100 years beyond that, dependent on progress on providing a deep storage facility. It must be assumed that this facility will not be available until such time as it becomes a reality. They are likely to be the last buildings to be decommissioned.	89872-242-4030			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	there remain substantial concerns around the impacts of the project at the construction phase as well as issues around fully compensating and mitigating the impact of the project, including the storage of nuclear waste for over 100 years.	89876-242-2298			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	j) I know it is very fashionable to use the term 'legacy' in current business parlance, but EDF have shown very poor judgement in using it in their consultation documents here. It shows a total lack of sensitivity to the local population. For us, the ONLY legacy, with regard to nuclear power, is the long-term, hazardous radioactive waste we, and future generations, have to live with.	89472-243-11306			/	At Stage 2 Consultation, consultees requested further clarification of terminology used within the Spent Fuel and Radioactive Waste Management chapter of the Environmental Appraisal. These terms have been placed in the glossary within the Spent Fuel and Radioactive Waste Management chapter of the Environmental Statement (Chapter 7 of Volume 2).
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	13.10 In light of the above information, EDF are asked to clarify what is meant by: 13.10.1 The term "viable", as used in the term "viable route" (section 6.12.1). For example, a route may be technically feasible but may not be economically viable if the operator cannot afford the cost. At what point will "affordability" be the key factor and not "viability". Alternatively, is the intention to use the word "viable" in place of "feasible" where cost isn't considered? Who will judge this question when it arises?	89444-243-6367			/	The term " <i>legacy waste</i> " within the Spent Fuel and Radioactive Waste Management chapter of the Environmental Statement refers to the radioactive waste and spent fuel from existing nuclear facilities which have already been produced, and therefore must be managed in any case. Some of that waste has been processed, and is in storage, but most of it is contained within existing nuclear reactors and other nuclear facilities. It will not be processed until these are shut down and dismantled. This waste is the legacy of past and current civil and military nuclear programmes.
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	13.10.2 The term "suitable", as used in the phrase "a suitable disposal or management route" (section 6.12.1). Who will determine what is "suitable"?	89444-243-6889			/	In determining whether a disposal route is " <i>viable</i> ", or " <i>suitable</i> ", EDF Energy is required to demonstrate to the Environment Agency that its proposed disposal strategy represents Best Available Techniques (BAT), which involves the consideration of a number of factors including the safety, cost, technical feasibility and environmental impact of different disposal options. The Environment Agency (EA) will review our
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	13.10.3 The term "off site" that is used in several places in Chapter 6. The term could mean on adjacent property owned by EDF or infer well away from the locality?	89444-243-7042			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	13.10.4 The term "commercially available route" (6.12.2) and especially in the context of (section 6.12.1) namely "viability" and "affordability"?	89444-243-7210			/	<p>proposed plans as part of the Radioactive Substances Regulations (RSR) permit application, which has been submitted prior to the Development Consent Order application, and the EA will only grant a permit if EDF Energy can demonstrate that the requirements have been met.</p> <p>Where the Spent Fuel and Radioactive Waste Management chapter of the Environmental Statement refers to a "Commercially available route" the term relates to licensed facilities/organisations with the capacity to carry out treatment/disposal of radioactive waste for third parties, and prepared to do so under appropriate commercial arrangements.</p> <p>Lastly, references in the Spent Fuel and Radioactive Waste Management chapter of the Environmental Statement to "off-site disposal or transfer of waste" refer to locations away from the Hinkley Point C (HPC) site. The existing UK disposal/treatment sites for Low Level Waste which have been proposed for use by EDF Energy for the HPC Project are away from the HPC site. These include the Low Level Waste Repository and metals treatment facility, which is in Cumbria, and the Tradebe incinerator which is in Fawley (Hampshire). For Intermediate Level Waste and spent fuel, the site for a Geological Disposal Facility has not yet been determined and the siting process, led by the UK Government, is based on encouraging local communities to take a voluntary approach to host the UK repository site. This arrangement has worked well in Sweden and Finland, and three local authorities, all in Cumbria, have expressed an interest in entering discussions about the siting process.</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 512	Public	Stage 1	You say high level waste will be stored for at least 100 years. This seems a very short time in terms of radioactive decay. Are you satisfied waste can be dealt with satisfactorily?	9184-246-4235			/	A number of consultees requested further information regarding the use of decay storage as a strategy for management of radioactive wastes at Hinkley Point C.
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	13.11.4 That given that Caesium137 has a half life of 30.2 years, what period of time will this material need to be stored on site in order to achieve the lower activity level that allows disposal elsewhere at a lower classification?	89444-246-8435			/	<p>The radioactivity of all radioactive materials diminishes with time (known as radioactive decay). Each radionuclide contained in the waste has a characteristic half-life (the time it takes for any radionuclide to lose half of its radioactivity) and eventually all radioactive waste decays into non-radioactive elements. The process of waiting for a natural decline in the level of radioactivity to allow waste to be disposed of as a lower category of waste is known as decay storage.</p> <p><u>Intermediate Level Waste</u></p> <p>EDF Energy will utilise decay storage of certain suitable Intermediate Level Waste (ILW) streams to enable re-categorisation as Low Level Waste (LLW) following a period of storage. ILW identified as being suitable for decay storage, in the light of its radionuclide content, will be packaged into suitably robust containers within the Effluent Treatment Building (ETB) and transferred into the interim storage facility for ILW. Following the period of interim storage, the radioactivity of the selected wastes would have reduced to such levels that the waste would no longer be classified as ILW. This waste would be removed from the ILW interim storage facility and managed as LLW.</p> <p>As ILW is not expected to be transferred from the site until around 2080, the shorter-lived radionuclides that dominate some of the waste streams (particularly cobalt-60 (half life of 5.27 years), and iron-55 (half-life of 2.7 years)) will have significantly reduced during the storage period.</p> <p>As an example, if wastes containing caesium-137 (half life of 30.2 years) above the LLW threshold were generated early in the operational life of the nuclear power station they would undergo two half-life decays before emptying of the store such as a filter containing 1MBq Cs137 would only contain 0.25 MBq Cs137 after 60 years' storage. Over the period of storage a proportion of this material would have a sufficiently low activity to be disposed of as the lower category waste.</p> <p><u>Spent Fuel</u></p> <p>Storage of spent fuel to allow radioactive decay to take place is required prior to disposal, primarily to allow the residual heat levels to reduce. However decay storage of spent fuel would not result in re-categorisation to LLW.</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
								<p>The decay of radioactive fission products and other constituents generates heat (decay heat). The amount of heat and radiation generated by a spent fuel assembly after it is removed from a reactor depends on the number of fissions that have occurred in the fuel, called burn-up, and the time elapsed since the fuel was removed from the reactor.</p> <p>At discharge from the reactor, a single spent fuel assembly generates around 100 kilowatts of heat, much of which is due to very short-lived radionuclides, for example, iodine-131 (8 day half-life). The decay heat production diminishes quickly as these short-lived radionuclides decay away, and this reduces heat generation to around 10 kilowatts after the first year. Within a year of discharge from the reactor, decay heat production in spent fuel is dominated by longer-lived radionuclides including ruthenium-106 (372.6 day half-life), cerium-144 (284.4 day half-life), caesium-137 (30.3 year half-life) and caesium-134 (2.1 year half-life) and their decay products. As these radionuclides continue to decay, the yet longer-lived radionuclides such as americium-241 (432 year half-life) and plutonium-238 (373,000 year half-life) come to dominate the inventory of the spent fuel; the longer-lived nuclides will decay at a much slower rate generating less decay heat.</p> <p>Following the period of interim storage, the radionuclide composition of the spent fuel will have changed significantly. The short-lived radionuclides that initially dominated the inventory will have decayed to low levels while longer-lived nuclides will remain. At the end of interim storage the spent fuel would still be highly radioactive, but due to the reduction in the shorter-lived radionuclides the heat generation will be considerably reduced, making the spent fuel suitable for disposal to the proposed UK Geological Disposal Facility.</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Handling and disposal of waste important. Uranium 235 Decommissioning - how will this be achieved successfully.	88900-247-12725			/	At Stage 1 and 2 consultees requested further details on how decommissioning of Hinkley Point C (HPC) (and associated waste disposal) would be funded and for further details on the decommissioning strategy and plan. EDF Energy provided details within the Environmental Appraisal for the Stage 2 proposals, and has updated this for the Development Consent Order (DCO) application (Chapter 5 of Volume 2 – Decommissioning of Hinkley Point C).
Kilve Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	(Editor's note: end of second submission. Third submission. Text undated) Personal Response to Hinkley Point "C" Proposed Nuclear Development, Pre-Application Consultation (Stage 1) (Personal details removed) Paragraph 1, 1.1.10 The village of Shurton lies to the south of the development, in some cases, less than 100 yards from the boundary of the development. That should be made abundantly clear. i) On-site Associated Development 1.1.15 Interim spent fuel storage facilities; This needs further clarification! Local people will not accept spent fuel from other nuclear facilities being imported to the site for re- processing. Interim radioactive waste storage facilities; again, clarification. There is a certain acceptance that spent fuel from the new reactors will be stored on site, there is little doubt that local residents will not consider it acceptable to host imported radioactive waste from other nuclear sites to be stored at the Hinkley Point site. This is also covered in 3.1.13 of the consultation document. To date, no mention of this appears in the nuclear National Policy Statement, (NPS) A major concern regarding spent fuel, (3.4.14) Through the Funded Decommissioning Programme (FDP), Government will accept title to and responsibility for spent fuel! Will this, and subsequent Governments see this as a means of raising revenue (stealth tax) and the eventual financial burden of decommissioning will fall upon the tax payer? Clarification needed on waste disposal. 1.1.16 Other road improvements; It is accepted that an emergency exit/entrance be made available to the site via the route indicated on the map (fig 10.5) however, this must not be seen as an alternative to the main road access (C182) other than in extreme circumstances, i.e. RTA. There will also be an opportunity to make alterations to the priorities at the Clayland Corner junction, which will undoubtedly become an issue as extra housing is built, and extra road users from and to the village of Stogursey. This could take the form of re-alignment of the road, or a roundabout system.	88930-247-0			/	<u>Planning for Decommissioning</u> The Energy Act 2008 requires that any operator of a new nuclear power station shall be responsible for the full costs of decommissioning and its full share of the costs of waste management and disposal. To this end it requires the operator to have a Funded Decommissioning Programme (FDP), approved by the Secretary of State (SOS), in place before construction work on buildings with nuclear safety significance commences. The FDP would include: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• provision for the steps necessary to decommission the installation and manage and dispose of hazardous waste;• an estimate of the costs of taking those steps; and• details of any financial management and security to be provided in relation to those costs. EDF Energy's Decommissioning and Waste Management Plan (DWMP) sets out the plan for the decommissioning of the proposed HPC power station. The DWMP draws on knowledge of the proposed development and experience gained from decommissioning of other nuclear power stations in the UK and abroad, and is designed to comply with Government policy on disposal of spent fuel and radioactive wastes. The DWMP also provides an estimate of the associated decommissioning and waste management costs, thus addressing the first two bullet points above. The financial management and security arrangements are set out in a Funding Arrangements Plan (FAP). The DWMP and the FAP collectively form the Funded Decommissioning Programme for HPC. The scope of the DWMP covers all work associated

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	It is noted that cumulative impacts of the overlapping operational phase of Hinkley B and Hinkley C will be considered as given in Section 5.2 of the Appendices. This needs to be cross-referenced in section 3.2. The methodology to be employed to assess the cumulative impacts of the decommissioning of Hinkley Point B, estimated 2016, needs to be included.	88130-247-1111			/	with the decommissioning of the site and the management and disposal of all wastes from a period commencing five years prior to End-of-Generation (EoG) until all plant, facilities and buildings have been decommissioned and all wastes, including spent fuel, have been removed from HPC. There is no intent for radioactive wastes or spent fuel from any other site to be stored at HPC, nor for spent fuel to be disposed of at HPC.
Tractivity 1093	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below The cost of a serious nuclear accident or incident - Chernobyl style - will not be underwritten by EDF but the community - indeed the European Community has spent manyhundreds of millions on the Chernobyl disaster which was not even within the EC borders. EDF will not pay for the full cost of dealing with nuclear waste - the likely bill for dealing with nuclear waste is far more than the cost of building and running the site through its life - this again is not an acceptable arrangement. EDF will be making profits over a 30 year period and after this far higher costs will be incurred by the community, and in the event of a disaster the community carry the full cost. It is also unacceptable that nuclear sites cannot control radiation risks - as shown by serious health risks to employees and ?hot spots? for cancers near nuclear sites; nuclear industry has managed to deny such links in the same sort of ways the tobacco industry did.	9851-247-6085			/	The DWMP will be reviewed at least every five years and the estimates of the costs updated in line with best practice and practical decommissioning experience. Financial provision to cover the costs of decommissioning and waste management will also be reviewed to ensure that the full costs of decommissioning and full share of waste management and disposal costs will be met as they fall due. <u>Funding of Decommissioning and Waste Disposal</u> Consultees requested further details on the funding of decommissioning and reassurance that the cost would not fall on the taxpayer or future generations. Government policy has set out the requirements and mechanism that EDF Energy must follow to demonstrate the adequacy of funding arrangements; the details were set out within the Stage 2 consultation and have been set out again in the Environmental Statement of the DCO application. The costs for decommissioning, waste and spent fuel management would be funded by the operator through a FDP, as outlined above, which must be in place before the operator begins construction work on buildings with nuclear safety significance.
Tractivity 1272	Public	Stage 2 Update	Your plans are hopelessly flawed as you simply push the costs for decommissioning and disposal of nuclear waste into the future, burdening future generations with debt, without considering their need to perhaps operate in an entirely different economic and technical environment. What if sea levels were to rise? What if a tsunami hit the site as in 1600 AD? You are operating in the short term, for short term profits and should be ashamed of yourselves.	89538-247-38			/	The costs for decommissioning, waste and spent fuel management would be funded by the operator through a FDP, as outlined above, which must be in place before the operator begins construction work on buildings with nuclear safety significance.
Tractivity 391	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? I am neither for or against nuclear power due to its low carbon footprint but highly toxic waste. However, I have lived locally to the previous plants and providing all works on the ground are undertaken with the same care that the reactors must be built with then I will welcome the building of this plant and the extra security of energy supply. There are two issues that I am still rather concerned with and they are the disposal of spent fuel and plant decommissioning and secondly the loss of generating potential between the reactor and the turbine output. Though these issues are not a part of the initial works to prepare for building the plant they are a consequence of it to which I would welcome some further information.	9076-247-5835	/			In parallel with the FDP arrangements, it is proposed that there will be a waste transfer contract between the operator and Government whereby Government will take title to and liability for the Intermediate Level Waste (ILW) and spent fuel at the end of the reactor decommissioning period in exchange for a payment from the operator to cover the costs of disposal and on-site waste storage and management post decommissioning. The costs of waste disposal are expected to be ultimately set on a fixed-price basis following a 30-year period of deferral to allow more certainty around the expected repository costs. Nevertheless, the fixed price will include a substantial premium over the

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- It is noted that waste (non-radioactive) would be treated on site. As there is going to be a significant amount arising, clarification if the Decommissioning Waste Processing Facility will do all treatment would be welcomed.	89201-247-5306			/	<p>expected disposal cost so as to protect the UK taxpayer. The costs of waste management will be estimated by the operator as part of the DWMP and subject to independent review by a third party expert.</p> <p>The UK Government has created the independent Nuclear Liabilities Financing Assurance Board (NLFAB) to provide impartial scrutiny and advice on the suitability of the FDP submitted by operators of new nuclear power stations. NLFAB will advise the Secretary of State on the financial arrangements that operators submit for approval, and on the regular review and ongoing scrutiny of funding.</p>
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	EDF are asked to clarify: 13.20.1 Why the planned management of conventional wastes does not include any proposals at this time for plant decommissioning, when it is understood that "the IWS will aim to ensure that during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the HPC Development, workers, the public and the environment (including non-human species) are protected'. This question is underpinned by the belief that the overarching environmental and planning principles were to design [the plant] for decommissioning?	89444-247-12675			/	<p><u>Assessment of impacts from decommissioning of HPC</u></p> <p>A number of consultees requested that a more in-depth analysis of the impacts of decommissioning should be undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment for the HPC DCO application. The impacts associated with decommissioning of the HPC site were considered at Stage 2 within the decommissioning section of the ES, and have been updated for the DCO application (Chapter 5 of Volume 2 – Decommissioning of Hinkley Point C). The chapter outlines the key elements and impacts of the decommissioning strategy and how it would apply specifically to the decommissioning of HPC.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	Reference to the potential cumulative effects of the decommissioning of the B Station and construction of Hinkley C is welcome (section 5.2.4), however all aspects of the decommissioning (particularly transportation and effects on air quality / noise) should be considered in detail with the construction process.	88560-228-1628			/	<p>EDF Energy has not provided significantly more detail in the DCO application than was provided at Stage 2, as it is recognised that before decommissioning can take place there is a requirement for the operator to obtain consent from the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) under the Nuclear Reactors (Environmental Impact Assessment for Decommissioning) Regulations 1999 (EIADR 99). This requires the submission of an Environmental Statement following an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and a period of public consultation. For the HPC UK EPRs, this would take place immediately prior to the End of Generation at HPC, anticipated to be in approximately 2080, and would consider fully the environmental impacts of decommissioning. EDF Energy therefore believes that provision of an overview of the decommissioning process and identification of potential environmental impacts is reasonable at the current stage.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	Decommissioning Whilst it is recognised that the decommissioning process will be the subject of the Nuclear Reactors Environmental Impact Assessment for Decommissioning Regulations 1999 it is anticipated that more information will be provided during the development of the Stage 1 Consultation document. In particular, the arrangements for long term monitoring and its relationship to the future decommissioning strategy should be included in full. Provisions for long term custody of the site and environmental responsibility should be set out as guidelines to underpin the future decommissioning strategy for the site.	88570-228-4			/	<p>Safety will continue to be of primary importance in</p>
Tractivity 742	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Generally satisfactory but when you've "gone" don't leave a "footprint" all over the area!	9500-228-6428			/	<p>Safety will continue to be of primary importance in</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 851	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>I would like to know:</p> <p>1) What arrangements will be made to cover de commissioning costs at the end of Hinkley Point C?s useful life?</p> <p>2) What guarantees are there that taxpayers/consumers will not be required to subsidise any costs (building, operating, decommissioning) of Hinkley C!?</p>	9609-228-5730			/	decommissioning, as during operation. To this end, decommissioning will be subject to the same licensing regime as that applied during the preceding design, construction, operation and shutdown of the power station. This enables a seamless transition of the management of safety during the transfer from operation of the power station to its decommissioning. Activities performed during the post-operational phase will be subject to the same high level of regulatory and management control associated with the operational phase of the HPC site. The decommissioning planning process that EDF Energy needs to follow as part of the regulatory requirements to begin construction of new nuclear power stations will ensure that all aspects of the post-operational phase are fully considered at an early stage of HPC development. These decommissioning plans will be updated throughout the operational life of HPC and will help ensure that a high-quality decommissioning regime is implemented for the post-operational phase at HPC.
Tractivity 1273	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals?</p> <p>The existing plant need decommissioning</p>	89539-228-421			/	Further information was requested regarding the management of non-radioactive wastes during decommissioning. EDF Energy provided details of the decommissioning strategy within the Environmental Appraisal for the Stage 2 proposals and has updated this for the DCO application (Chapter 5 – Decommissioning of Hinkley Point C); this includes EDF Energy’s proposed strategy for management of non-radioactive waste from decommissioning of HPC.
Tractivity 273	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy’s initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>I would ask you to consider the implications for the decommissioning of Hinkley A and B stations of the new plan. Previous experience suggests a ‘cinderella effect’ is likely in which the decommissioning project finds it almost impossible to recruit and retain good quality staff to progress the work because they are all attracted by the new project. The risk is that by the time the new build period is over the plant knowledge and decommissioning capability to complete the decommissioning of the A and B stations will have been largely lost and the hazard and cost of decommissioning will increase substantially. This effect was seen at the Dounreay Fast Reactor (DFR) in Scotland when its larger and newer replacement was built on the same site. DFR is now one of the most dangerous nuclear liabilities in the UK.</p>	8962-228-5910			/	Decommissioning activities will create large quantities of non-radioactive materials during the deplanting and demolition of buildings and during final site clearance. It is anticipated that clean concrete and brick rubble from demolition of building structures would be crushed and retained on-site. It is planned to re-use as much of this material as possible on-site as infill for basement voids. This would minimise the environmental impact by reducing the amount of waste that has to be transported off-site for recycling or disposal to a landfill site.
Tractivity 280	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy’s initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>Who will pay for the cost of decommissioning the station?</p> <p>Does anyone have a price for decommissioning?</p> <p>Is the cost added onto the cost of a unit of electricity for the 60 years it is operating?</p> <p>We have had 50 years to find a national geological disposal facility. This should be operational before building more nuclear power stations. We can develop other forms of low carbon energy in the meantime.</p> <p>How much greenhouse gases will be produced in the 10 years it takes to build the nuclear power station and the infrastructure? (and the 20-25 years it takes to decommission it?)</p>	8969-228-4349			/	Other non-radioactive wastes would be segregated

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 400	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? It's not worth the upheaval, the damage to the local environment ,the pollution of air and sea, the massive carbon footprint involved in the construction, the radioactive emissions, the risk of accidents for just 6 percent electricity supply. 25 years decommissioning the site is a very long time - but what about the spent fuel? What are you going to do about that? And where will it go in the long term?....	9083-228-3467			/	and sent off site for reuse, recycling or disposal at a landfill site or for other appropriate treatment options. For example, steel work from building structures and redundant plant would be segregated and may be sold for recycling if a route is available at that time. Hazardous wastes would similarly be identified, segregated and securely stored on-site before disposal via waste contractors authorised for hazardous waste management.
Tractivity 446	Public	Stage 1	10. Do you have any comments on our proposals in relation to training and business opportunities? You do need to train staff to be able to dismantle and decommission the existing nuclear reactors.	9125-228-4629			/	During the preparatory work stage, hydrocarbon fuels, refrigerants, oil and other chemical systems would be drained down and tanks emptied. Where possible these materials would be reused on site, or sent off site for re-use or recycling.
Tractivity 62620	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	1. If they go ahead, does the fact that the wharf will be much more accessible to a wider variety of shipping mean the facility is likely to be used for decommissioning Hinkley B - and any other power stations at Hinkley Point?	10167-228-89		/		A specific question was raised regarding the use of the proposed Decommissioning Waste Management Facility (DWMF) to manage non-radioactive wastes. The current decommissioning strategy for HPC envisages using the DWMF primarily to process the main components of the primary circuit, such as steam generators and pressurisers, which will be removed intact from their operational location, and to cut them up and package the wastes. These components become radioactive in service. The facility will also process, characterise and package the radioactive decommissioning wastes arising from the decommissioning of both units. The DWMF will not be used for the management of non-radioactive waste. Suitable segregation and management facilities will be provided locally to the demolition area for crushing of concrete and brick rubble for reuse on site. Other non-radioactive wastes would be segregated and sent off site for reuse, recycling or disposal at a landfill site or for other appropriate treatment options.
Landowner - Department of Energy & Climate Change	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	In relation to decommissioning plans for the land, we are aware that EDF/BE are in ongoing discussions on this issue. We note, however, that EDF's eventual application should not contain any land required for the decommissioning of Hinkley B.	10252-228-681			/	Suitable segregation and management facilities will be provided locally to the demolition area for crushing of concrete and brick rubble for reuse on site. Other non-radioactive wastes would be segregated and sent off site for reuse, recycling or disposal at a landfill site or for other appropriate treatment options.
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	20.1.13 Page 2 Has the decommissioning plan for Hinkley Point B changed? If not it will not be fully decommissioned in 50 years time, but will be "care and maintenance" like Hinkley Point A.	89078-228-2613				<u>Hinkley Point A (HPA) & B (HPB) Impacts</u> At Stage 1 there was a request that EDF Energy present the methodology employed to assess the cumulative impacts of the operation and decommissioning of HPB on HPC impacts. EDF Energy has considered the cumulative impact of the on-going operation and decommissioning (present and future) of Hinkley Point A and B (Volume 11, Cumulative Effects) and presented the methodology used in assessing cumulative impacts for the project within that chapter.
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Decommissioning: A decommissioning plan has to be in place before construction starts. It is stated that this plan has been produced - this should have been included in the Stage 2 documents - when will this be available for inspection?	89289-228-506		/		At Stage 2, consultee feedback highlighted that the proposals for HPC should be designed in such a way
Tractivity 62944	Public	Stage 2 Update	(Personal details removed) called to ask if some of the profit made during the working life of the power station would be used for its decommissioning.	89676-228-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Natural England	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	2) In-combination effects as a result of disturbance to birds identified in the SPA and Ramsar designations including migratory species; wintering and moulting shelduck and the waterfowl assemblage before, during and after construction of the main site development, Combwich Wharf development (including the freight logistics and storage facility), as well as the decommissioning of Hinkley A & B Stations.	89098-251-2915				<p>as not to impact adversely on the decommissioning of Hinkley Point B. The land area being used for the construction and operation of HPC does not include any land previously earmarked for use by HPB for its decommissioning.</p> <p>The redeveloped Combwich Wharf would remain following completion of the construction phase of the HPC Project. At Stage 2 EDF Energy was asked if the redevelopment to allow access by a wider range of shipping would result in it being more likely to be utilised during the decommissioning of HPB. EDF Energy's current plans for transport of materials to or from the HPB site during decommissioning do not include the use of the wharf.</p> <p>Before decommissioning could commence at HPB the decommissioning proposals, including transport arrangements for the movement of materials, would need consent from the ONR under EIADR 99. This will require the submission of an Environmental Statement following an EIA, including consideration of in-combination effects, and a period of public consultation.</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	13.11.3 The location of the on-site ETB and ISF and what safety and environmental protection measures will be incorporated into the design and proposed operation?	89444-254-8269			/	<p>Consultee feedback requested clarification of the location of the building used for radioactive waste management, the Effluent Treatment Building (ETB), and the Interim Storage Facility (ISF) and what safety and environmental protection is incorporated in the design of these buildings.</p> <p>The design process for Hinkley Point C (HPC), including the ETB and ISFs, has used Best Available Techniques (BAT) to minimise discharges at source and to minimise the impacts of discharges by means of abatement. Safety will be ensured through the application of As Low As Reasonably Practicable (ALARP) principles in the design and operation of the facilities. The facilities will be within the site security perimeter and will be subject to stringent security arrangements under regulation by the Nuclear Directorate of the Health and Safety Executive. The implications of direct dose and discharges from HPC, including the waste and spent fuel stores, are minimal and are considered in the radiological chapter of the Environmental Statement (Chapter 21 of Volume 2).</p> <p>The ETB is formed by two linked buildings adjacent to the EPR Unit 1. The facility provides a number of important processes that contribute to the environmental and safety performance of HPC. The ETB's key function is the collection of radioactive liquid and solid radioactive waste for storage, processing and disposal. It is designed to treat waste from the two EPR units. The building is divided into two parts; one section is used for short-term storage of solid waste and the other treats liquid and solid waste.</p> <p>The sorting and treatment systems for liquid radioactive effluent are designed to minimise radioactivity in the liquid effluent and the discharge of liquid radioactive waste into the sea. The Spent Liquid Effluent Treatment System within the ETB has a highly flexible arrangement that will enable optimised treatment for particular effluent streams to minimise the radioactivity of the final discharge. Depending on the characteristics of the effluent, it would be subject to a combination of demineralisation (ion exchange), evaporation and filtration.</p> <p>The systems for storing and discharging the liquid radioactive effluent are designed to check and quantify the activity of the effluent before it is discharged and to minimise the impact of liquid radioactive effluent on the environment by achieving optimal dilution. The operator can also optimise the use of the storage tanks available. This is done through using the control reservoirs to reduce the radioactivity of the effluent by deliberately extending</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
								<p>the holding time before the waste is discharged. In this way, advantage can be taken of radioactive decay, particularly for short-lived radionuclides such as iodine-131 and cobalt-58.</p> <p>The ISFs are to be located in the north-east corner of the site. The Interim Spent Fuel Store (ISFS) will have a range of security and safety features to ensure security and safety during the storage period. The facility will also ensure that the spent fuel will be maintained in a condition that will ensure disposability at the end of the storage period.</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Health and Safety Executive	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	However, we have the following observation to make on Chapter 6 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Appraisal, which describes the proposed arrangements for managing spent fuel and radioactive waste. While acknowledging that the radioactive waste and spent fuel management arrangements described here and elsewhere in the Consultation Documents represent NNB Genco's preferred options, any implemented options will be, in part, dependent on regulatory agreement, and may therefore differ in some ways from those described in the document. We suggest that this point could be made clearer in any subsequent IPC Application Document.	10183-364-3797	/			Following review of the Stage 2 proposals for spent fuel and radioactive waste management, statutory consultee feedback requested that EDF Energy should make it clear in future Development Consent Order (DCO) application documentation that the implementation of the proposals at HPC will be, in part, dependent on regulatory agreement, and may therefore differ in some ways from those described in the document.
Health & Safety Executive	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	You will recall that I wrote to you on 4th October 2010, setting out the Nuclear Directorate's response to the previous Stage 2 consultation. Having reviewed the updates described in the current consultation document, I can confirm that we have no additional comments.	89708-252-370			/	EDF Energy agrees with this comment, and a statement to this effect has now been included within the DCO application (Environmental Statement, Chapter 7 of Volume 2 – Spent Fuel and Radioactive Waste Management).

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 459	Public	Stage 1	9. What are your views on EDF Energy's general approach to community benefits and do you have any specific suggestions about what should be included in the package? Generally the approach sounds good but have you any creative ways of using the waste heat from cooling?	9136-251-3235			/	<p>Consultee feedback requested details of how EDF Energy will minimise the volume of radioactive waste generated at Hinkley Point C (HPC).</p> <p>EDF Energy has set out its spent fuel and radioactive waste strategy within the previous consultation material, and this has been further developed within the Development Consent Order (DCO) application (Chapter 7 of Volume 2 - Environmental Statement: Radioactive Waste and Spent Fuel Management) to include high level information on the minimisation of radioactive waste generated from HPC.</p> <p>EDF Energy will ensure that waste management throughout the life cycle of the HPC development is consistent with UK policy and protects people and the environment. This objective will be achieved by minimising waste and waste discharges to the environment through the application of the waste hierarchy and Best Available Techniques (BAT) to demonstrate environmental optimisation.</p> <p>The design of the UK EPR and auxiliary buildings will facilitate reducing waste arisings at the point of origin, including through the careful choice of raw materials. Wastes will be recycled where practicable, and the installation will make use of recycling and waste recovery facilities as and when appropriate. Where practicable, wastes will be segregated at source and treated to maximise recycling and recovery opportunities, thus minimising the quantity of waste destined for disposal.</p> <p>The development of the EPR has focussed on eliminating as much of the radioactive waste at source as possible. Where elimination is not practicable, efforts have been made to reduce the activity and quantity of radioactivity associated with the waste. This is consistent with the waste hierarchy and is considered to be the most effective means of protecting the environment and members of the public. The key factors in demonstrating the minimisation of the production of radioactive waste are set out in Chapter 7 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement and are summarised below:</p>
Tractivity 62495	Public	Stage 2	<p>Please could you:</p> <p>i) confirm that you do not plan to dump radioactive waste from the proposed Hinkley C reactors at a land-fill site in Cumbria; and</p> <p>ii) clarify whether, by LLWR, [Ch Six page 42 para 6.52.3] you are referring to the Drigg low level waste site in Cumbria - and if so, are you aware of the capacity problems that this site is experiencing;</p> <p>iii) whether you plan to send any radioactive wastes (including exempt and VLLW) for disposal in landfill sites</p> <p>- if so where would the landfill sites be situated; and</p> <p>iv) what contingency plans have you if LLW disposal capacity at Drigg in Cumbria was unavailable.</p> <p>Refs: http://hinkleypoint.edfconsultation.info/Preferred_Proposal_Documents/Environmental%20Appraisal/Volume_2.zip Chapter Six - Spent Fuel and Radioactive Waste Management page 42 - para 6.52.3</p> <p>- this paragraph refers to the use of "an appropriate authorised disposal facility" for exempt and very low level waste (VLLW) disposal</p> <p>- and also to disposal of low level waste at LLWR</p>	10095-251-61			/	<p>The design of the UK EPR and auxiliary buildings will facilitate reducing waste arisings at the point of origin, including through the careful choice of raw materials. Wastes will be recycled where practicable, and the installation will make use of recycling and waste recovery facilities as and when appropriate. Where practicable, wastes will be segregated at source and treated to maximise recycling and recovery opportunities, thus minimising the quantity of waste destined for disposal.</p> <p>The development of the EPR has focussed on eliminating as much of the radioactive waste at source as possible. Where elimination is not practicable, efforts have been made to reduce the activity and quantity of radioactivity associated with the waste. This is consistent with the waste hierarchy and is considered to be the most effective means of protecting the environment and members of the public. The key factors in demonstrating the minimisation of the production of radioactive waste are set out in Chapter 7 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement and are summarised below:</p>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	- Operation of the site will result in production of Low level and intermediate level radiological waste stream, along with spent fuel and high-level waste. Recognising financial incentive to limit quantities of waste, waste minimisation should be assessed, taking into account the sustainability of management of these waste streams.	89413-251-15617	/			<p>The design of the UK EPR and auxiliary buildings will facilitate reducing waste arisings at the point of origin, including through the careful choice of raw materials. Wastes will be recycled where practicable, and the installation will make use of recycling and waste recovery facilities as and when appropriate. Where practicable, wastes will be segregated at source and treated to maximise recycling and recovery opportunities, thus minimising the quantity of waste destined for disposal.</p> <p>The development of the EPR has focussed on eliminating as much of the radioactive waste at source as possible. Where elimination is not practicable, efforts have been made to reduce the activity and quantity of radioactivity associated with the waste. This is consistent with the waste hierarchy and is considered to be the most effective means of protecting the environment and members of the public. The key factors in demonstrating the minimisation of the production of radioactive waste are set out in Chapter 7 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement and are summarised below:</p>
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	13.2 EDF's proposal for Hinkley 'C' is to implement an Integrated Waste Strategy (IWS) for the site. The IWS would be submitted to the Environment Agency as part of the operator's application for an Environmental Permit (section 6.11.1). In section 6.11.12, EDF recognises that the principal objective of the IWS is for a consistent and safe approach to waste management. The IWS reportedly recognises that the station's design can have an impact on the strategy for all wastes, including those that may arise in the future.	89444-365-2962			/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design of fuel, including containment • Efficiency of fuel use • Detection and management of failed fuel • Materials of construction for the reactor and cooling

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>In all the 274 Pressurised Water Reactors (PWRs) operating across the world, of which the proposed UK EPR is a type, almost all the radioactivity produced during operations is contained in the spent fuel. Under UK Government policy, this spent fuel is to be considered as a waste. However, there are small amounts of intermediate level wastes (ILW) and low level wastes (LLW) produced during operation, mainly from corrosion of metal components in the reactor during maintenance and from cleanup systems which minimise liquid and gaseous release of reactivity. The origins, activities and amounts of these materials are described in Section 6 of the EnvApp.</p> <p>EDF Energy will prepare an Integrated Waste Strategy (IWS) which must assure the regulators that Best Available Technology (BAT) processes are being used to minimise liquid or gaseous discharges to the environment and also to deal optimally with the liquid and solid waste streams produced. This IWS will also need to satisfy regulators that the Waste Hierarchy is being followed, with re-use of wastes where possible and with disposal as a last resort.</p>	89335-365-265			/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primary coolant chemistry Commissioning, start-up and shutdown procedures <p>The features set out above will reduce the generation of radioactive waste and will, therefore, make a significant contribution to minimising the activity of the waste that will be discharged or disposed of.</p> <p>The management of solid waste at HPC will follow the principle of 'concentrate and contain'; this encourages disposal of radioactive waste in a concentrated, solid form in preference to dilution and dispersion in the environment. The EPR has evolved to employ features that will concentrate the radioactivity of the wastes and reduce the volume of solid waste that will eventually require disposal. HPC has been designed to contain radioactive waste as close as possible to the point at which it is generated. This will limit the spread of radioactive contamination throughout the plant and prevent the contamination of non-radioactive plant items. Improved fuel use is also expected to reduce the amount of solid waste that will be produced as fewer refuelling operations are expected.</p> <p>In addition to demonstrating minimisation of the generation of radioactive waste at source, a number of techniques will be employed to reduce the volume of radioactive waste that would require disposal from the HPC site including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the selection of methods to minimise solid waste generation such as the selection of Ion-exchange resins on the basis of their efficiency in removing soluble species and their compatibility with operating conditions; and the application of volume reduction processes to solid wastes such as the use of on-site shredding and low-force compaction. <p>Taken together, these techniques will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> make the most efficient use of the UK waste management infrastructure; minimise the quantity of secondary waste that is produced; and reduce the volume of waste that will be disposed of to other premises and therefore minimise pressure on current and future waste disposal facilities.
Tractivity 62486	Public	Stage 2	<p>Clearly such doses must be included in a cumulative environmental impact assessment of the Hinkley C nuclear station proposed by EdF.</p> <p>In addition to these two problems, the Stage Two Cumulative Environmental Impact Assessment is also inadequate. This is because the Stage Two text does not fully account for the possible radiological harm that may arise from operational doses or from site decommissioning</p>	89475-365-2451	/			
Tractivity 1091	Public	Stage 2	<p>it is concerning from a safety aspect that 2 nuclear reactors are being built in such close succession, having not been done in Britain before. With rising tides, threats of terrorism and unclear waste management - what a terrible legacy for our children's future.</p>	9849-41-13993			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	a) The outline description of the nuclear power station clearly states that the development will include the storage of spent fuel and radioactive wastes from the power generation process. The issue of radioactive waste is a key concern for the community of Somerset and the on-site storage of radioactive wastes, in particular spent fuel and other high level wastes, represents a departure from the current practices at Hinkley Point. Furthermore, this is the first nuclear proposal where on-site storage of this material will be developed. Whilst the use of the site at Hinkley Point for power generation may be demonstrated to be in the public interest, it has not been demonstrated that the site is an appropriate location for the management, treatment and storage of waste that arises from other locations. To ensure absolute clarity on this point it would be beneficial for EDF to state whether they intend to manage wastes that are only generated at the site or whether the development of a regional waste facility is envisaged.	87910-1784-3021	/			<p>There were a number of consultee responses requesting confirmation that only Hinkley Point C (HPC) waste and spent fuel would be managed at the HPC site and that no waste or spent fuel from other sites would be brought onto the HPC site for storage, processing or disposal.</p> <p>EDF Energy can confirm that it has no plans for HPC to receive or store spent fuel or waste from other facilities. EDF Energy has no plans to reprocess spent fuel at the HPC site. The facilities provided at HPC have been designed and sized to manage and store the spent fuel and waste generated from the HPC site only. This statement has been included for clarity within the Development Consent Order (DCO) application (Chapter 7 of Volume 2 - Environmental Statement: Radioactive Waste and Spent Fuel Management).</p>
Kilve Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>1.1.15 Interim spent fuel storage facilities; This needs further clarification! Local people will not accept spent fuel from other nuclear facilities being imported to the site for re- processing.</p> <p>Interim radioactive waste storage facilities; again, clarification. There is a certain acceptance that spent fuel from the new reactors will be stored on site, there is little doubt that local residents will not consider it acceptable to host imported radioactive waste from other nuclear sites to be stored at the Hinkley Point site. This is also covered in 3.1.13 of the consultation document. To date, no mention of this appears in the nuclear National Policy Statement, (NPS)</p> <p>A major concern regarding spent fuel, (3.4.14) Through the Funded Decommissioning Programme (FDP), Government will accept title to and responsibility for spent fuel! Will this, and subsequent Governments see this as a means of raising revenue (stealth tax) and the eventual financial burden of decommissioning will fall upon the tax payer? Clarification needed on waste disposal.</p>	88930-1784-445	/			
Tractivity 1024	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>There are many safety issues that concern me, particularly the storing of nuclear waste on site and the question of whether Hinkley will be use to store nuclear waste from other sites. EDF still have lots of questions to answer.</p>	9782-1784-5983	/			
Tractivity 1122	Public	Stage 2	The entire project is in my view unnecessary. There has never been a convincing case for nuclear power, using fission as the basis for generating electricity. the technology is outmoded, the problems associated with waste storage are insoluble and the arguments that it is a ?carbon neutral? operation are false.	9880-1784-8378			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1300	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Q3 Do you have any comments on our proposed community mitigation and benefits? This section does not deal with the waste legacy which will impact on local communities for generations. the impact on local communities for the next 100 plus years should be recognised and practical steps taken to reduce the impact of HP traffic. A permanent dedicated haul road from Dunball to HP should be constructed, reducing the impact of HP traffic on the existing inadequate road network and the necessity for it to go through Bridgwater and Cannington. It would improve access for safety/emergency traffic for the current and proposed developments at HP.	89566-1784-1086		/		
Tractivity 319	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Whatever ameliorations offered I object to nuclear power stations until safe permanent waste handling available. (it is NOT, as yet) Some investment in wind and tide generation preferred.	9007-1784-3854			/	
Tractivity 400	Public	Stage 1	25 years decommissioning the site is a very long time - but what about the spent fuel? What are you going to do about that? And where will it go in the long term?....	9083-1784-3854			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Burnham-On-Sea & Highbridge Town Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Members would therefore like an assurance about the safety of storing the fuel on site and the measures that would be in place to guard against possible terrorist attacks.	8715-256-1997			/	At both Stage 1 and Stage 2, a number of consultees commented on the safety and environmental requirements for storage of spent fuel and Intermediate Level Waste (ILW), and the choice of spent fuel storage technology. EDF Energy has clearly set out its spent fuel and radioactive waste strategy within the previous consultation material, and this has been further developed within the Development Consent Order (DCO) application (Chapter 7 of Volume 2 - Environmental Statement: Radioactive Waste and Spent Fuel Management). EDF Energy has developed its radioactive waste and spent fuel management strategy for Hinkley Point C (HPC) in accordance with Government policy and guidance and specifically the waste base case that Government set out in its guidance to prospective new nuclear operators on the Funded Decommissioning Programme. This guidance indicates that the operator should assume that all higher activity wastes (essentially ILW and spent fuel if declared as waste) should be stored on the site of its generation until a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) is available. There is no intent that either ILW or spent fuel will be permanently disposed of at Hinkley Point, nor is it intended to store waste or spent fuel from any other site at HPC. However, the ability to accommodate the lifetime's arisings provides flexibility, for example to allow the GDF to receive legacy wastes and spent fuel
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	- that dangerous nuclear waste from the reactors will be stored on site for at least 160 years and having at present no ultimate repository site to be sent to;	88940-256-373			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	We are concerned at the prospect of highly radioactive spent fuel being stored at Hinkley Point during and for a long time after the operation of the two proposed EPRs at Hinkley. The fuel will be 'high burn up fuel' which means it must be stored in mechanically cooled water for one hundred years before it is capable of being handled in preparation for the next stage of its management.	88960-256-24558			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	This problem so far into the future means we are leaving a serious legacy to future generations. Part of the risk is that of a terrorist attack and we do not know whether terrorism will have become more accurate and sophisticated. Nor do we know whether the economy and social cohesion will have collapsed with unthinkable consequences in terms of managing the hot spent fuel. The fuel management process is not a 'passive' one. Another issue is that because of the very heat of the fuel, its containment is more likely to splinter or corrode, creating potential local contamination and a headache of a problem to solve.	88960-256-24950			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>1.6. In the consultation document EdF give the impression that it is absolutely confident that plans to deal with the radioactive wastes produced by a possible Hinkley Point C reactor exist or will exist. It says, "Spent fuel assemblies are discharged from the UK EPR reactor unit and placed into the spent fuel pool to cool and to allow levels of radioactivity to decay for a period of about ten years. Spent fuel is then moved to an on-site storage facility, designed to accommodate the nuclear power station's lifetime spent fuel arisings and capable of lasting for at least 100 years...The current long-term strategy for the management of spent fuel is that it will ultimately be disposed of in a geological disposal facility."</p> <p>1.7. Yet the amount of useful information EdF has published on spent fuel in its consultation document is laughable. To say that it is woefully inadequate is an understatement. The reason for such paucity is obvious: EdF has no idea how precisely it will deal with the spent fuel arisings from any EPR that may be built in the UK.</p> <p>1.8. In a presentation from the Environment Agency a (Personal details removed) working on new build and spent fuel conceded that firm plans for how to deal with spent fuel from EdF's reactors will not be known until 2012 or 2013 (5). In addition, a recent HSE report noted that "EDF and AREVA still need to show that the encapsulation of spent nuclear fuel for disposal is ALARP and that the environmental impacts are acceptable. I have raised a TQ requesting EDF and AREVA to provide this information' (6) We are also aware that Areva is now openly challenging the government's proposals on spent fuel (e.g. that it would be stored for 100 years prior to disposal) (7).</p>	8766-256-2345			/	<p>first.</p> <p>A number of consultees commented that the storage of radioactive waste and spent fuel would have a significant impact on the local and wider environment and that the long on-site storage period for spent fuel in the Interim Spent Fuel Store might have serious negative impacts on future generations in the vicinity of the HPC site.</p> <p>Safety will continue to be of primary importance on the Hinkley Point C site in the post-operational phase. To this end, decommissioning and interim storage will be subject to the same licensing regime as that applied during the preceding design, construction, operation and shutdown of the power station. Activities performed during the post-operational phase will be subject to the same high level of regulatory and management control associated with the operational phase of the HPC site. As a condition of the Nuclear Site Licence (NSL) granted by the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR), the facilities on-site, including the ILW and spent fuel interim storage facilities, would be subject to periodic review of the safety case throughout the operational life of the store, ensuring any necessary improvements would be made in a timely manner. This involves consideration of external hazards such as seismic and tsunami events. The operator's period of responsibility under the NSL cannot be ended until the ONR is satisfied that there is no longer any danger from radioactivity on the site.</p>
Tractivity 846	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>eave Benhole lane alone. you dont own it and have no right to change it in any way. So keep out. Hope p. permission is refused for everything!</p> <p>1) individual compensation for residents of Shurton for the stress and anxiety already caused by this long drawn out consultation.</p> <p>2) property devaluation</p> <p>3)loss of human rights, to enjoy the peace and privacy of our homes; and to continue our lives, as we wish.</p> <p>4) Having to live with the threat of nuclear waste stored on si</p>	9604-256-6991			/	<p>The interim storage of both ILW and spent fuel, prior to transfer and disposal at the GDF, would take place within the purpose-built storage facilities. The stores would be required to be compliant with the NSL and Radioactive Substances Regulations (RSR) permit with regard to radiological safety and environmental requirements. For example, EDF Energy will be required to demonstrate that any discharges to the environment are controlled and minimised. The implications of direct dose and discharges from HPC, including the waste and spent fuel stores, are minimal and are considered in the Radiological chapter of the Environmental Statement (Chapter 21 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement). Of the minimal overall discharges from HPC, those from the waste and spent fuel stores contribute only a small fraction.</p>
Tractivity 892	Public	Stage 2	<p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Not acceptable before full planning authority granted. Spent fuel store not acceptable.</p>	9650-256-1178			/	<p><u>Interim Spent Fuel Store</u></p>
Tractivity 892	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>The most unsatisfactory aspect of your whole proposed development is your plan to keep spent fuel on site a) at all, and b) for so long after. TAKE IT BACK TO FRANCE</p>	9650-256-6546		/		<p>The technology chosen for spent fuel storage within the Interim Spent Fuel Store (ISFS) is wet storage, namely storage within an engineered pool. No encapsulation is required, allowing an ongoing ability to monitor fuel condition. The effectiveness of water</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 908	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>A nuclear powerstation is a necessity if the evr expanding population is to have electricity which we cannot do without. Whatever system is used there is going to be a need for Pylons to distribute the electricity to the grid. Hinkley Point must be constructed using the highest available technology and best quality materials and there must be a safe storage of waste.</p>	9666-256-6876			/	as coolant, together with the intent that fuel will be transferred to the ISFS only some years after discharge from the reactors, means that it can accommodate fuel with the full burn-up planned for the UK EPR. The ISFS would have a range of features to ensure security and safety during the storage period. The facility will also ensure that the spent fuel will be maintained in a condition that will allow disposal at the end of the storage period.
Tractivity 1011	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>It is insulting to ordinary people?s intelligence to be asking what we think about your landscaping ideas when you?re not actively engaging people in discussion about far more pressing issues such as the health & safety issues brought up by your proposal, such as the issue of ionising radiation, or the fact that the reactors that you are proposing are far bigger, dirtier and more dangerous than the current 2nd generation reactors that we are currently saddled with. Or the fact that you intend to turn one of the most beautiful places in the UK into a long term toxic dump by storing radioactive waste so hot that it cant be moved for at least 160 years. All of the research that has been published so far regarding nuclear waste only refers to what is known as legacy waste and doesn?t consider new nuclear waste. This is not a legacy I wish to leave for my children and I am not so arrogant or blindly faithful in human ingenuity to assume th</p>	9769-256-129			/	<p>The design criteria for the ISFS include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nuclear safety and security requirements, including the provision of an aircraft crash shell. • Design criteria for internal and external hazards, such as flooding and earthquakes. • Compliance with technical and environmental constraints including the demonstration of Best Available Techniques (BAT). • Statutory industrial safety requirements, including fire separation, fire suppression systems and means of escape. • Radiological protection and separation requirements. • Access for installation, maintenance and inspection of the equipment. • The requirement to be able to carry out repairs, refurbishment and/or replacement of ISFS equipment and functions given the very long lifetime required for the facility. • Requirement for design of systems to ensure that the pool will maintain the fuel in a state suitable for transport and disposal. • Allow the monitoring and inspection of the spent fuel. • Design to consider the ease of future stand-alone operation and final decommissioning.
Tractivity 1024	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>There are many safety issues that concern me, particularly the storing of nuclear waste on site and the question of whether Hinkley will be use to store nuclear waste from other sites. EDF still have lots of questions to answer.</p>	9782-256-5983			/	
Tractivity 1083	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>I think this project is far too big for the local infrastructure of this rural community, in particular, the roads.</p> <p>The proposed power plants are much larger than existing ones at Hinkley with much hotter and more dangerous radioactive waste. There is no current safe way to store this and the plans are to store this at Hinkley for more than 160 years (if the station operates for 60 years. The government has still not found a safe place to store waste from existing power stations.</p> <p>I don?t think we should leave this for future generations.</p>	9841-256-8086			/	
Tractivity 1093	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The proposed storage on site for radioactive waste is unsatisfactory in providing an environmental hazard with no viable plan to end or remove the hazard</p>	9851-256-127			/	The principal criteria that influence the layout and architectural appearance are determined by the requirement to store safely the lifetime arisings of spent fuel generated by the two UK European Pressurised Reactors at HPC. This determines the

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1105	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>It is insulting to ordinary people's intelligence to be asking what we think about your landscaping ideas when you're not actively engaging people in discussion about far more pressing issues such as the health & safety issues brought up by your proposal, such as the issue of ionising radiation, or the fact that the reactors that you are proposing are far bigger, dirtier and more dangerous than the current 2nd generation reactors that we are currently saddled with. Or the fact that you intend to turn one of the most beautiful places in the UK into a long term toxic dump by storing radioactive waste so hot that it cant be moved for at least 160 years. All of the research that has been published so far regarding nuclear waste only refers to what is known as legacy waste and doesn't consider new nuclear waste. This is not a legacy I wish to leave for my children and I am not so arrogant or blindly faithful in human ingenuit</p>	9863-256-129			/	<p>building size, the need for it to resist dynamic loads and external hazards and hence the choice of high-strength thick concrete for the structure. The ISFS building exterior will provide an aircraft protection shell that will protect the halls and the equipment within the facility from impact from aircraft crash.</p> <p>The design and operation of the facility would be required to be compliant with the NSL conditions with regard to the safety of workers and the public. Wet storage of spent fuel has been used widely internationally and in the UK. The use of wet interim storage of spent fuel is capable of providing HPC with a safe, secure and technically flexible solution until such time that the spent fuel is suitable for transfer and a UK GDF, or other off-site management facility, is available. The pool interim storage option proposed for HPC is considered to be flexible enough to be adapted to foreseen future changes in regulatory framework or Government policy.</p> <p>This approach is consistent with current Government policy on spent fuel management. However, the storage of spent fuel does not foreclose future options for reprocessing for re-use should such a route become available in the future.</p> <p><u>Intermediate Level Waste Interim Storage Facility</u></p> <p>ILW will be safely stored within the ILW Interim Storage Facility until the GDF is available to accept waste for disposal. The interim store would provide protection for the waste packages from potential degradation, which could have a long-term impact on the integrity of the package and eventual acceptance at the GDF. The store would require appropriate maintenance and various levels of in-service refurbishment.</p> <p>EDF Energy is confident that the impact of radioactive waste and spent fuel management has been fully examined and addressed within its application, and that any remaining adverse impacts will be minor in nature.</p>
Tractivity 1119	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>Your proposed EPR reactor is already experiencing serious problems and long delays in France and Finland. According to (Personal details removed), University of Greenwich, "the UK government is in danger of backing a design that could prove unlicensable, unaffordable and unbuildable". If building begins and is stopped, damage will already have been done to this rural area. There are also safety problems to be addressed. As for waste, no answer has yet been found to storing it safely elsewhere yet.</p> <p>How will you pay for all this when your credit rating has been reduced to A and your debts far outweigh your profit</p>	9877-256-6238			/	
Tractivity 1228	Public	Stage 2 Update	The spent fuel would not be sent off site as it is now but stored on site for 160 years.	89494-256-1394			/	
Tractivity 1296	Public	Stage 2 Update	SPENT FUEL STORES SHOULD NOT BE INCORPORATED WITHIN THIS SITE PLAN THIS ADDS YET ANOTHER GOOD CASE FOR A NORTHERN B/W BYPASS AS A MEANS OF REMOVING THIS FUEL FROM SITE AND FOR EMERGENCY USE	89562-256-2515		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1300	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	This section does not deal with the waste legacy which will impact on local communities for generations. the impact on local communities for the next 100 plus years should be recognised	89566-256-1168			/	
Tractivity 1373	Public	Stage 2 Update	You are considering drainage systems for extreme rainfall that could occur with a frequency of up to once in 10 000 years. what you are not taking into consideration is the possibility of a tsunami. The last occurrence was in 1607 within 400 years, not 10 000 years. This was possibly caused by an earthquake on an active fault system south of Ireland, which has been active in the last 20 year. This has to be a major reason for not building at all or for long term storage.	89639-256-1853			/	
Tractivity 244	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Little has been said about the short and long term storage and disposal of nuclear waste, and the short and long term safety implications for the area.	9340-256-5277	/			
Tractivity 319	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Whatever ameliorations offered I object to nuclear power stations until safe permanent waste handling available. (it is NOT, as yet) Some investment in wind and tide generation preferred.	9007-256-3854			/	
Tractivity 341	Public	Stage 1	I also feel strongly about the proposal to store nuclear waste on site, for safety and security reasons.	9029-256-4969			/	
Tractivity 446	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? New Nuclear power stations are unnecessary, will damage the marine ecosystem of the estuary, become permanent high level radioactive waste dumps virtually for ever, will make the local area a major terrorist target, will cause a health hazard to the local population from the regular radioactive discharges to the environment, are a potential risk to a major release of radioactivity and will do very little to benefit local employment and be too late and too little to do anything to help climate change.	9125-256-5093			/	
Tractivity 477	Public	Stage 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly radioactive spent fuel remaining on site for 160 years plus No planned repository for onward disposal of this spent 	9153-256-5303			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 576	Public	Stage 1	9. What are your views on EDF Energy's general approach to community benefits and do you have any specific suggestions about what should be included in the package? What community benefits are EDF proposing? What are EDF proposing to do about nuclear waste no evidence of this is any of the local presentations.	9245-256-4121			/	
Tractivity 665	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? We have to have electric! But worried about waste been stored at site and eventually the disposal of it.	9328-256-3992			/	
Tractivity 50885	Public	Stage 1	My seventh reason is that you have nowhere to put the radioactive fuel when you are done with it. So it will just sit there on top of the ground while it cools down.	9394-256-1596			/	
Tractivity 50899	Public	Stage 1	3. There is still no disposal site for nuclear waste. The highly radioactive fuel from Hinkley C would be stored on site for 160 years despite the risk of rising sea levels.	9396-256-1058			/	
Tractivity 62121	Public	Stage 1	You say in your consultation document that: 'The spent fuel removed during refuelling will be stored underwater in a fuel pond, which will provide cooling and radioactive shielding. The radioactive waste will be treated and packaged in a waste building serving both UK EPR units. The spent fuel and higher level radioactive waste will be kept on-site, in stores capable of lasting for at least 100 years, pending despatch to a national geological disposal facility. I note that your colleagues in AREVA believe that: "Leaving the spent fuel onsite for extended periods of time was never intended and is not responsible. ISFSIs can safely operate past 100 years by implementing an ageing management program...(but) More responsible options exist, recycling and final disposal need to be pushed forward" [Research and Data Needs for Very Long-Term Dry Storage - AREVA Perspective (Personal details removed), Transnuclear, Inc. June 11, 2009] If you don't want to be irresponsible, don't create waste that cannot be disposed of unless it has been cooled for 100 years. The long term storage of high burnup spent fuel is expected to result in greater fuel cladding failure, with consequent higher risk of radiation exposure for the generation attempting to retrieve and condition the failed fuel elements.	9412-256-485			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62121	Public	Stage 1	The nuclear regulators have confirmed that further work is required or additional information needs to be provided in order to assess: "...the safety of the long term storage of the fuel before final disposal focussing on the role of the levels of burnup." The Royal Society has described as a pressing problem the need to: "ensure that waste producers do not create waste management problems for which solutions are not currently available." Waste management and disposal is regarded as an integral part of the one single practice of nuclear power generation so we have to consider all detriments, including that from the waste, before allowing any new nuclear programme. We have been told nothing about how the public and workers are to be protected from accidents and deliberate attacks, or how the deterioration of high burnup spent fuel is to be addressed over a 100 year cooling period. As this fails to comply with the pre-application requirements of the IPC, I suggest that you prepare this material and put it in the public domain forthwith.	9412-256-1790			/	
Tractivity 62128	Public	Stage 1	(j) the planned storage of high level radioactive waste on site for 160 years or more is not fully justified nor adequately explained as to what it will entail in detail, particularly re security.	9415-256-4720			/	
Tractivity 62239	Public	Stage 1	I object to proposals for the largest UK nuclear power station due to my concerns over: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Health risks from radioactive emissions - Risks of leaks, accidents, terrorism - Highly radioactive spent fuel remaining on site for 160 years plus - No planned repository for onward disposal of this spent fuel 	9438-256-34			/	
Tractivity 62240	Public	Stage 1	object to proposals for the largest UK nuclear power station due to my concerns over: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Health risks from radioactive emissions - Risks of leaks, accidents, terrorism - Highly radioactive spent fuel remaining on site for 160 years plus - No planned repository for onward disposal of this spent fuel 	9439-256-34			/	
Tractivity 62504	Public	Stage 2	With no known solution to the problem of radioactive waste, no known materials that can contain it for 100s of years, the very real risk of terrorist disruption, the forecast rise in sea level, the idea of going ahead with this or any other nuclear project, is simply incomprehensible. We are talking about a geological time-scale, over which there is no evidence of continuous human political or social continuity. If Hinkley C were to be permitted, then the site will effectively become a nuclear waste storage facility, as spent and highly contaminated fuel will be stored there for a period that is several times longer than the period it would operate for.	10097-256-5978			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62504	Public	Stage 2	This is therefore, primarily, a waste storage facility, a fact conspicuously absent and obscured from the consultation.	10097-256-6640			/	
Tractivity 62531	Public	Stage 2	My fundamental objections to EdF's revived Hinkley C are: 1. It carries safety risks, from the health effects of radiation through to the possibility of a catastrophic accident, unlike any other means of generating electricity. The storage of radioactive waste at Hinkley for 100 years after electricity generation has ceased is an example of these risks.	10104-256-637			/	
Tractivity 62531	Public	Stage 2	The result is that Hinkley Point will have a long term radioactive waste dump in addition to a nuclear power station. This transforms the application into something quite different from an electricity generating plant. Apart from the obvious risks associated with a waste store (breach of containment, aircraft crash, flooding, terrorism, climatic changes over such a long timescale) there is still no certainty that this waste will be removed to a permanent repository.	10104-256-2979			/	
Tractivity 62625	Public	Stage 2	20/9/10 - rang regarding the Stage 2 Proposal. He has some questions about the spent fuel and its storage.	10171-256-46			/	
Tractivity 62938	Public	Stage 2	Nuclear power creates environmental poisons (deadly radiation) that will have to be stored in the area for 160 years until it is cool enough to be moved to a repository that doesn't even exist.	10177-256-8494			/	
Bristol City Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	Bristol City Council is minded to maintain its objection to the proposal to locate an additional nuclear power station on the Hinkley Point site and has serious concern on a number of issues, including the following: - inefficient use of resources in face of alternative and safer sources of energy; - constraint placed on the effective delivery of alternative renewable energy to the energy network in the Hinkley Point area; - impact of the proposed use on the environment of the Severn Estuary in combination with other proposed developments and any proposed mitigation; - long term on-site storage of highly radioactive spent fuel.	10214-256-891			/	
Cheddar Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	People seem unaware of the storage facility for spent fuel, or indeed the time scale for the proposed storage, considering that the UK has no current facilities for the handling of nuclear waste. Evidence again of the 'gloss over' approach from EDF.	10222-256-4075			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Selworthy & Minehead Without Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The Parish Council understand that waste will be stored on site. Is this true?	10229-256-1119			/	
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	1.6 EdF should be honest by telling the public that there is no environmentally acceptable and proven 'solution' for the disposal of high level radioactive wastes and spent fuel. There is no disposal site operational anywhere in the world for spent fuel, as Areva (the supplier of EdF's reactor) has noted.(3) Given the huge dangers posed by spent fuel to both people and the local environment, EdF's actions in this respect are entirely unacceptable. On this basis alone are grounds for the development process for Hinkley Point C should be stopped.	10260-256-2910			/	
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	1.8 It claims that "the size of the building is derived from the functional capacity requirements of the pool and the storage area that will be required for the operation and the mechanical system for placing and retrieving spent fuel." But no further explanation or information is given on what technologies EdF will use to encapsulate, condition and store its spent fuel arisings. Without this information it is impossible for the public to understand the implications of living next to a spent fuel storage facility for an extended period of time.	10260-256-4018			/	
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Will storage be sub-surface or at surface level?	10260-256-4864			/	
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Exactly how long will spent fuel be stored on site for?	10260-256-4918	/			
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	How will spent fuel be encapsulated? Where?	10260-256-5027	/			
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	When will title and liability of EdF's spent fuel arisings pass to the government?	10260-256-5076			/	
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Where will final disposal of Hinkley C's spent fuel arisings eventually take place? When?	10260-256-5164	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Forum 21	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	In its Stage 2 Consultation document Preferred Proposals: Explanation and Assessment, July 2010, EdF refers to "interim spent fuel storage facilities". "Interim" in fact means storing 3,600 tonnes of spent (used) nuclear fuel for a period estimated to be 100 years after the reactors have stopped operating. This means for more than 160 years from now. "Spent fuel" is the technical description for fuel whose energy has been extracted in the reactor, but in reality it is radioactive waste. EdF has no proposal to do anything else potentially useful with it, such as reprocessing to reclaim uranium.	10262-256-459			/	
Forum 21	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The result is that Hinkley Point will have a long term radioactive waste store in addition to a nuclear power station. This transforms the application into something quite different from an electricity generating plant. Apart from the obvious risks associated with a waste store (breach of containment, aircraft crash, flooding, terrorism, climatic changes over such a long timescale) there is still no certainty that this waste will be removed to a permanent repository.	10262-256-1063			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	j) I know it is very fashionable to use the term 'legacy' in current business parlance, but EDF have shown very poor judgement in using it in their consultation documents here. It shows a total lack of sensitivity to the local population. For us, the ONLY legacy, with regard to nuclear power, is the long-term, hazardous radioactive waste we, and future generations, have to live with.	89472-256-11306			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	This is an area in your proposals that is so undeveloped that it is hard to know where to begin giving you feedback. Again you underplay the implications and skim over your arrangements. Also there is a strong possibility that a permanent repository for this waste will never materialise and therefore you have not even considered that it will be at Hinkley permanently and what arrangements will need to be in place. The storage of waste poses a serious risk in its own right. You need to urgently address the shortcomings in your proposals. You have failed to consider the impact on the local people.	89472-256-12666			/	
Tractivity 62486	Public	Stage 2	- the most recent technical findings on nuclear waste disposal. These indicate that the approach to waste management advocated by EdF would be likely to release significant amounts of radioactivity and so seriously harm future generations.	89473-256-4170			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62486	Public	Stage 2	"Any radiological effects would be confined to the operational and decommissioning stages at the HPC [Hinkley C] site" (para 4.4.32 - page 31) This statement is incorrect for two main reasons: i) It does not consider the possibility of radiological impact due to a reactor emergency. ii) It does not consider the radiological impact of the radionuclides that would be synthesised by Hinkley C over the long term - in particular the lack of a robust disposal route.	89475-256-152			/	
Tractivity 62486	Public	Stage 2	The proposed Hinkley C station would produce over 3,500 tonnes of waste fuel. (20) Initially, the waste fuel rods taken out of a reactor are so lethal that they would almost immediately kill someone if they were to be anywhere near them. (21) The wastes do become less dangerous with time - however they would remain a risk to health for millions of years to come. (22, 23) This summer DECC reported that even if radioactive wastes had been disposed of following due legal process it would still be possible for people to receive radiological doses that had not been anticipated. (24) This statement is of even more concern in the case of Hinkley C, as EdF refer to the Swedish KBS approach as a means of demonstrating the viability of their planned waste disposal method. (25) In 2010 (Personal details removed) of Genewatch carried out a substantial literature review of the scientific and technical credibility of the Swedish approach to waste disposal (the so-called KBS approach). In September 2010, Greenpeace International published a report documenting her findings. The report identified a number of flaws in the design - such that significant amounts of radioactivity could be released and so seriously harm future generations.	89475-256-1214			/	
Tractivity 62486	Public	Stage 2	- the store and/or the fuel could deteriorate. It is extremely important that the resilience of the wastes and the waste store into the long term are evaluated.	89477-256-2151			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- The storage of spent fuel nuclear waste on site.	89196-256-1677			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	2.1. Preferred Proposals: Summary Components: It is not made clear that the spent fuel store is High Level Waste.	89289-256-136			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We also believe that the consultation skims over the issue of spent nuclear fuel, which is expected to stay stored in a pond on site for 160 years or more. It may end up staying permanently, as no repository (geological disposal facility) has yet been established for UK nuclear waste. The planning process should examine this issue in much greater depth.	89447-256-2503			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Overall, the conclusion of Stop Hinkley is that, despite any perceived benefits to be obtained by the local area from the construction and operation of Hinkley C - such as increased employment over the period of construction - the negative aspects of this proposal, from radioactive waste storage right through to the destruction of wildlife habitats, will have a disastrous impact on both the local and wider environment for many generations to come.	89452-256-4644			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Section 6.22 of Volume 2 of the EnvApp identifies that operation of HPC will generate ILW, mainly from discharge abatement activities, worker dose reduction and maintenance. Table 6.32.1 of the EnvApp further describes the nature and approximate annual production of waste types, based on the UK EPR Generic Design Assessment for waste volumes. This in turn lists a number of operational waste streams. This is planned to be conditioned and packaged and placed in an on-site interim storage facility (ISF) sized for the lifetime arisings of two reactors, and then to be disposed in the Geological Disposal Facility (GDF). The EnvApp describes the 'Reference Case' for ILW processing, which, apart from ion exchange resins, consists of cement grouting in cylindrical pre-cast concrete casks with optional metal liners. Resins are to be encapsulated in epoxy resin as practised in Trawsfynydd in the UK and in France. EDF Energy will interact with the Radioactive Waste Management Division of the NDA to progress Letters of Compliance for the wasteforms.	89335-256-7390			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The proposal for the management and storage of high level radioactive waste, which could remain on site for up to 160 years, is a significant concern for the local authorities and the communities that will have to live with the real and perceived risks of the storage facility for several generations.	89418-256-4757			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The local authorities believe that the waste storage facility in combination with the power plants puts at risk the confidence of the community in its long term future and has a chilling effect on economic and social vitality.	89418-256-5059			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	These concerns can include the actual and perceived impacts on public health and the environment and on local infrastructure and the economy (as described above). The proposals for the management and storage of high level radioactive waste, which could remain on site for up to 160 years, are a significant concern for the local authorities and the communities that will have to live with the real and perceived risks of the storage facility for several generations.	89422-256-3546			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The local authorities believe that the waste storage facility in combination with the power plants puts at risk the confidence of the community in its long term future and is likely to have a significant effect on economic and social vitality.	89422-256-4013			/	
Tractivity 62915	Public	Stage 2 Update	Storage of Spent Fuel on-site The close proximity of the Nuclear Power Stations to the proposed spent fuel storage ponds is an extreme safety issue. This fuel should be removed immediately from site and taken to a purpose made processing facility. The implications of leaving in-situ are too enormous.	89666-256-2388		/		
Stop Hinkley	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Any temporary local benefits during construction must be set against the fact that, if allowed to start operation, Hinkley C would be an ongoing hazard to health and safety with a dangerous legacy of radioactive waste.	89770-256-2446			/	
40	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2 Update	Storage of Spent Fuel on-site The close proximity of the Nuclear Power Stations to the proposed spent fuel storage ponds is an extreme safety issue. This fuel should be removed immediately from site and taken to a purpose made processing facility. The implications of leaving in-situ are too enormous.	89909-256-2434		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>1.7 Greenpeace does not believe that EdF has published adequate information on the detail of plans for spent fuel management and storage on site. Nor has it made clear that people living near to the site of the reactor would in effect be living next to a nuclear waste dump for up to 160 years. This issue was raised in the 1st consultation but very little has subsequently changed. The reason for the paucity of information is obvious: EdF has no idea how precisely it will deal with the spent fuel arisings from any EPR that may be built in the UK.</p> <p>1.8 It claims that "the size of the building is derived from the functional capacity requirements of the pool and the storage area that will be required for the operation and the mechanical system for placing and retrieving spent fuel." But no further explanation or information is given on what technologies EdF will use to encapsulate, condition and store its spent fuel arisings. Without this information it is impossible for the public to understand the implications of living next to a spent fuel storage facility for an extended period of time.</p>	10260-365-3464			/	
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	<p>13.3 In terms of the high level strategy for Hinkley, section 6.12 states that solid wastes would be disposed of as soon as practicable; where there is a viable route available. Intermediate Level Waste (ILW) and spent fuel would be stored on site until a suitable disposal or management route becomes available. Figure 6.18.1 later records that disposal will be "off-site".</p>	89444-365-3490			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>In Table 6.14.1 of the EnvApp, nine streams of LLW are identified, with Table 6.18.1 anticipating in the order of 150 m LLW generated per year. Dependant on the nature of the waste, a range of management processes are proposed involving segregation, shredding, low force compaction, dewatering, drying, mortar encapsulation, containerisation and shipping. Ultimate management measures for any particular waste would be determined based on the Conditions for Acceptance and relevant regulations including those relating to transport.</p> <p>EDF Energy's estimates of LLW generation, presented in Table 6.18.1 of the EnvApp, appear reasonable. While EDF Energy proposes to dispose of LLW 'as soon as reasonably practicable' (para 6.18.1), this will depend not only on the issues associated with on-site treatment capacity to minimise volume and package, but also on UK-wide LLW disposal capacity. This is currently being pursued by LLWR Ltd and the NDA as part of UK policy. Whilst it is noted that volumes of LLW forecast for generation are not significant in the context of the UK's LLW generation as a whole, the authorities are concerned that there remains residual uncertainty with regards to future capacity at the current LLWR in Drigg. Paragraph 6.28.2 of the EnvApp reflects that "a new LLW disposal site would need to be constructed in the future". Given that there is currently no commitment to delivery of a further LLWR, or for this to accommodate LLW from HPC, we would expect the discussion of radioactive waste management provided in the EnvApp to provide further details of contingency plans covering the eventuality of the unavailability of LLW disposal facilities. Particular concerns relate to potential requirements for on-site storage in terms of quantities of material and duration or storage, and also alternative disposal strategies that would be available where lack of LLWR availability would render removal of waste not practicable.</p> <p>Noting the discussion provided with regards to Very Low Level Waste, presented in Section 6.12, the authorities are also concerned that there is a shortage of disposal facilities licensed for acceptance of VLLW. The authorities therefore request that due consideration be given to the availability of VLLW authorised disposal facilities, and consider the need to manage VLLW in the event that disposal facilities are not available.</p>				/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>8. Radioactive waste storage</p> <p>In its Stage 2 Consultation document "Preferred Proposals: Explanation and Assessment, July 2010", EdF refers to "interim spent fuel storage facilities". "Interim" in fact means storing 3,600 tonnes of spent (used) nuclear fuel for a period estimated to be 100 years after the reactors have stopped operating. This means for more than 160 years from now. "Spent fuel" is the technical description for fuel whose energy has been extracted in the reactor, but in reality it is radioactive waste. EdF has no proposal to do anything else potentially useful with it, such as reprocessing to reclaim uranium.</p> <p>The result is that Hinkley Point will have a long term radioactive waste store in addition to a nuclear power station. This transforms the application into something quite different from an electricity generating plant. Apart from the obvious risks associated with a waste store (breach of containment, aircraft crash, flooding, terrorism, climatic changes over such a long timescale) there is still no certainty that this waste will be removed to a permanent repository.</p>	89450-365-4677			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>The authorities note that it is widely recognised in the UK and internationally that the development of nuclear facilities and radioactive waste storage facilities can result in significant impacts and concerns about real as well as perceived risks. These concerns can include the actual and perceived impacts on public health and the long term environmental liabilities, as well as on local infrastructure and the economy (as described above). The proposal for the management and storage of high level radioactive waste, which could remain on site for up to 160 years, and the associated strategic flood risk from coastal inundation, is a very significant concern for the local authorities and the communities that will have to live with the real and perceived risks of the storage facility for several generations. The authorities consider that the waste storage facility in combination with the power plants puts at risk the confidence of the community in its long term future and has a chilling effect on economic and social vitality.</p> <p>The authorities consider that the requirements and obligations offer, including a contribution of £1 million into a Community Fund, falls far short in mitigating and compensating for the adverse impacts, risks and overall harm of the project.</p>	89300-365-6257	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The proposals for the management and storage of high level radioactive waste, which could remain on site for up to 160 years, are in their own right a significant concern for the local authorities and the communities that will have to live with the real and perceived risks of the storage facility for several generations. The local authorities believe that the waste storage facility in combination with the power plants puts at risk the confidence of the community in its long term future and has a chilling effect on economic and social vitality. It is widely recognised in the UK and internationally that the development of radioactive waste storage facilities can result in significant impacts and concerns about real as well as perceived risks. These concerns can include the actual and perceived impacts on public health and the environment and on local infrastructure and the economy. The authorities would expect to see these impacts and concerns addressed through appropriate compensation, in scale and kind, to the level of real and perceived risk, as part of the obligations.	89421-365-13557			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The proposals for the management and storage of high level radioactive waste, which could remain on site for up to 160 years, are in their own right a significant concern for the local authorities and the communities that will have to live with the real and perceived risks of the storage facility for several generations. The local authorities believe that the waste storage facility in combination with the power plants puts at risk the confidence of the community in its long term future and has a chilling effect on economic and social vitality. It is widely recognised in the UK and internationally that the development of radioactive waste storage facilities can result in significant impacts and concerns about real as well as perceived risks. These concerns can include the actual and perceived impacts on public health and the environment and on local infrastructure and the economy. The authorities would expect to see these impacts and concerns addressed through appropriate compensation, in scale and kind, to the level of real and perceived risk, as part of the obligations.	89421-365-13557			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	The Nuclear Regulatory Regime - Transport 1.8. SCC will need to be consulted on proposals to transport radioactive materials (3.6.14).	87990-260-3508			/	A number of consultees expressed concern about the transport of radioactive waste through local villages in the vicinity of Hinkley Point C (HPC). Others expressed the view that spent fuel and radioactive waste intended for disposal in a future Geological Disposal Facility should be transported from the HPC site by sea rather than road. The UK has more than 50 years of experience of safely transporting radioactive waste and other radioactive materials by road, rail and sea in accordance with international and national regulations that are designed to protect people, property and the environment. Radioactive waste transferred from the site would need to comply with applicable UK and international legislation at the time of despatch. Each consignment would undergo the required contamination checks and external radiation measurements before leaving the site.
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	Long term impacts of waste and waste transfers have not been identified and the cumulative contamination and waste issues have not been identified.	88130-260-963			/	<u>Transport of Low Level Waste (LLW)</u> Radioactive waste is transported in specially designed and approved packages. The Office for Nuclear Regulation which includes the Department for Transport's Radioactive Materials Transport Team is responsible for the approval of packages. Radioactive waste transferred from HPC would need to comply with applicable UK and international legislation at the time of despatch, including the relevant requirements of the Carriage of Dangerous Goods and Use of Transportable Pressure Equipment Regulations 2009. The packages provide protection to operators and members of the public and are required to be sufficiently robust to withstand an accident. Transport of LLW from HPC for off-site disposal or treatment would be anticipated to result in a small number of additional annual Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements from the site to the disposal/transfer facilities each year. The impact of transport during operation of HPC is considered within the HPC 'Transport' chapter of the Environmental Statement (Chapter 10 of Volume 2). EDF Energy considers that the impacts of the transport of LLW would be limited. The transport of LLW for disposal or treatment will involve a negligible public dose. The radiological impacts associated with transport of radioactive materials from the HPC site
Tractivity 799	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? You could build a pier or two to move the nuclear waste (which if you haven't already forgotten is a health hazard to humans) onto the hinkley C site and ship it out, away from everybody here, we laready have enough radiation contamination in the area and don't require more.	9557-260-129			/	
Tractivity 799	Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments? Move the freight logistics facilities and park and rides to the hinkley point C site, which should be expanded to the west to allow for these. We as residents do not trust your company should you build them because you may move nuclear waste to these sites past our homes and store it there, which will effect our health. Also we were here first and don't want our house prices dropped. If you do go ahead will you pay compensation? Also the capacity of taunton road IS NOT sufficient for another 120 lorries every 24 hours, We live ehre and we know our area the best, it is already congested.	9557-260-3292			/	
Tractivity 799	Public	Stage 2	11. Any other ideas or comments? The site poses health risks to the local residents because we don't trust you not to move nuclear waste in the area. also the park and ride is not required if all accomodation is on site. The roads in the area are already congested enough, especially in the summer and wet and cold winter days. If you have to build the facilities, build them the other side of the motorway.	9557-260-8040			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 799	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I don't like your lack of consideration for residents in stockmoor, cannington and bridgwater. We don't want this on our back door step. I also don't trust you as a company to not move nuclear waste near residential areas, especially near a new school for our future generations that is being built in stockmoor village. I personally think you have tried to hide the fact you are building this from nearby residents and that you should just expand your site.	9557-260-8972			/	have been assessed and are presented within the Radiological chapter of the Environmental Statement (Chapter 21 of Volume 2). <u>Transport of Intermediate Level Waste (ILW) and spent fuel</u> Within the Stage 1 and Stage 2 proposals EDF Energy set out its proposed strategy for the timing of the transport of spent fuel and ILW from the HPC site to the Geological Disposal Facility (GDF). The details of the strategy are set out in Chapter 7 of Volume 2 of the Environmental Statement of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.
Tractivity 830	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? If this avoids misery on the roads through the town then it would be an acceptable way forward subject to the proviso that relates to leaving the area in the same state or a better condition that exists at the present point in time. This would also enable nuclear waste not being stored on site to be safely removed by sea and not via the town on road or rail.	9588-260-1877			/	The proposed timings are in line with the Government's waste base case which assumes that waste from new nuclear power stations will only be consigned to the GDF after disposal of legacy waste (existing and committed e.g. from decommissioning of existing power stations). Current scheduling plans from the Radioactive Waste Management Directorate (RWMD) (the organisation responsible for design, build, and operation of the GDF) are for legacy ILW emplacement to be completed by 2080. For spent fuel the current scheduling date is 2130.
Tractivity 1296	Public	Stage 2 Update	SPENT FUEL STORES SHOULD NOT BE INCORPORATED WITHIN THIS SITE PLAN THIS ADDS YET ANOTHER GOOD CASE FOR A NORTHERN B/W BYPASS AS A MEANS OF REMOVING THIS FUEL FROM SITE AND FOR EMERGENCY USE	89562-260-2515		/		The transport of these wastes will fall outside of the operational phase of the HPC UK EPRs and their environmental impact will therefore be fully assessed as part of the HPC decommissioning preparations. There will be a requirement for EDF Energy to obtain consent from the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) under the Nuclear Reactors (Environmental Impact Assessment for Decommissioning) Regulations 1999 (EIADR 99) to allow decommissioning to commence. This will require the submission of an Environmental Statement following an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and a period of public consultation. For the HPC UK EPR reactors this would take place immediately prior to the End of Generation (EoG), i.e. at the cessation of energy generation at HPC, anticipated to be approximately 2080.
Tractivity 62442	Public	Stage 2	11. According to your Masterplan "Low level waste and very low level waste would be segregated and sorted to reduce the volume requiring disposal. It will be sent off-site on a regular basis to appropriate treatment and disposal facilities. Typically this will involve a few lorry journeys per year". Where are these sites? Combwich? Where is your risk assessment for the movement of this waste?	10070-260-10181			/	The information detailed within the current DCO Environmental Statement regarding decommissioning, including radioactive waste transport, is therefore
Tractivity 62560	Public	Stage 2	- The ability to ship used fuel from the 'C' site without negotiating existing public roads would remove the necessity to build a VERY LARGE USED FUEL STORE (a large cost saving).	10117-260-7782			/	
Tractivity 62620	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2. Does it also mean that the wharf could be used for shipping highly radioactive spent fuel from both the B and C sites back to Sellafield (via a Cumbrian port) rather than using the current Bridgwater rail head which is situated in the middle of housing and next to a school?	10167-260-320			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Reference is made to the Geological Disposal Facility for waste arising from nuclear sites. It is noted that Cumbria is the only area to have expressed an interest in hosting the facility, and the transport implications from the south west need consideration by the proposer.	89199-260-4969			/	limited to providing an overview of the process and identifying potential environmental impacts based upon knowledge of the proposed development and experience gained from decommissioning of other nuclear power stations.
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Waste management continues to be an area where there is limited information provided to assess potential impacts. The submitted information is vague on transport implications, which, considering the potential amount of waste arising, needs further clarification. The use of the Low Level Waste (LLW) repository near Drigg is noted however capacity is limited and further arisings from new nuclear build will increase pressure on the site, and on finding another location to accommodate the increased volume.	89201-260-4657	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The appraisal asserts that the demand for freight movements during operations is likely to be "negligible", however it is difficult to assess whether this is the case relative to the baseline level without quantifying this demand. This is especially important given the sensitive nature of some of the routes that might serve this demand. Given that (as the appraisal notes elsewhere) Hinkley Point B offers a good example of demand during planned outages, it would seem appropriate to use this to begin to quantify the likely operational demand for freight transport. In particular, the transportation of spent fuel is considered a key issue that requires addressing.	89234-260-8499	/			
26	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	11. According to your Masterplan "Low level waste and very low level waste would be segregated and sorted to reduce the volume requiring disposal. It will be sent off-site on a regular basis to appropriate treatment and disposal facilities. Typically this will involve a few lorry journeys per year". Where are these sites? Combwich? Where is your risk assessment for the movement of this waste?	89815-260-10046			/	
Burnham-On-Sea & Highbridge Town Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	It would appear also that the possibility of a rail link from Hinkley to Bridgwater for the removal of waste fuel has been discounted (because of the time it would take for such a proposal to go through the planning process) and that waste fuel would be managed on site.	8715-256-1727	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 705	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>I am against the development in any form. I see no mention of the nuclear waste aspects in this form. Too hot a topic to raise? Under no circumstances should "hot" waste be kept on site other than the minimum possible "cooling pond" period commensurate with safe transportation. Logic and economics dictate that once such a facility exists it will continue to be used until a problem occurs. Logic and economics also suggest that for each site to have a long-term storage area does not make sense. The Hinkley one could become a common shared facility. I have been unable to find any mitigation discussion of this horrendous risk area.</p>	9465-256-6613		/		
Tractivity 1457	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	<p>It has recently been announced that there may be a central disposal site in the UK for Nuclear waste as in Finland (Olkiluoto) If so a Bridgwater/Cannington by-pass is paramount in order to transfer 160 years of spoil from Hinkley point C.</p>	90031-260-177		/		