

Schedule of Responses – Appendix H.1

Consultation 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)
Tractivity 62613	Public	Stage 2	23/8/10 - Wanted to know why there was no key on the Environmental Appraisal Volume2-Chapter 10-Figure 10.8 (Personal details removed)	10160-280-48			/	<p>Pre-application consultation on the Hinkley Point C application for a Development Consent Order (DCO) consisted of a series of formal stages of consultation. This was set out , as required by the Planning Act 2008 and in line with guidance published by the Infrastructure Planning Commission and the Department of Communities and Local Government. Other guidance and advice has also been taken into account, including that of the local authorities (see Chapter 1 of the Consultation Report). In addition to this statutory formal consultation, EDF Energy has also carried out supplementary informal engagement with consultees.</p> <p>A range of issues were raised by consultees during this consultation process about the consultation materials and documentation published by EDF Energy. These were primarily based around the desire for more information, but also included queries on the form and layout of the documentation, comprehensibility and consistency between documents. Some consultees expressed frustration with the consultation process, and distrust of the information provided by EDF Energy.</p> <p>At each formal stage of consultation, materials and documentation containing the details of the Hinkley Point C proposals were provided to consultees. The aim has been to provide the optimum level of information to consultees at the relevant stage of the project's development, recognising a breadth of differing informational needs. The size and type of consultation documentation has differed through the stages, largely due to the amount of information being consulted upon. At the Stage 2 Update consultation held in February and March 2011 in particular, some comments were received which questioned the smaller scale of the consultation compared to previous stages. EDF Energy's rationale for this is that the Stage 2 Update consultation was addressing specific material changes to the proposals and the consultation document focused on these material changes only. The size of the consultation document was therefore deemed appropriate for the limited scope of this consultation. For more details on the documentation and consultation process, please see</p>
Countryside Council for Wales	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	There are other issues, such as coordination with the relevant Shoreline Management Plans and compliance with the Water Framework directive, that are also relevant to these proposals. However, as for the European sites, more detail than can be provided in the Stage 1 consultation is required before we can provide more detailed comments.	87810-1573-4692	/			
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	RESOLVED (1) that the Council express its serious concern at the lack of detailed information to evidence the options put forward in the Consultation document.	88780-1573-723			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	4.7 The response raises issues about the lack of a robust justification for the preferred Cannington By-pass route (the western route option). As a consequence the response states that "the authorities can reach no material conclusion on the preference for either route option presented in the Stage 1 consultation document and are unlikely to be able to reach a conclusion until the full justification has been provided."	88890-1573-25549	/			
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.	88890-1573-27512	/			
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	12.1 The report sets out the issues relating to the national policy statements relating to nuclear energy and the emerging details proposed by EDF in their current first stage consultation. 12.2 There are significant concerns relating to both processes and the related documentation.	88900-1573-3040			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	12.4 The EDF proposals are fairly blunt and under-developed which is disappointing at this stage of the programme. The proposals lack a coherent and evidenced based planning strategy and are poorly integrated into the a sensitive proposal which integrates into the local towns and adds long term value through design and legacy.	88900-1573-3555	/			

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	Lack of detailed information to be able to discuss issues within the timescale Robust discussion not been possible.	88900-1573-9816	/			<p>Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report.</p> <p>In addition, at each consultation stage the layout and content of the documents, whether text or images, were created with the audience in mind. Summary documents were intended mainly for the local community and general public, whilst the more detailed technical information was created in larger documents for statutory consultees, such as local authorities. The aim has been that where, a general reader would find it difficult to understand the more technical information, the summary documents would assist them. An interactive computer generated visualisation of the proposals was used at exhibitions in Stage 2 of the consultation to assist in understanding the proposals. A small number of comments were made about the quality of some of the figures in the documentation. Efforts have continued throughout the consultation and on into the DCO application documentation to ensure that all figures are as clear as possible. Where relevant, amended scale drawings have been provided to individual consultees during resulting informal engagement (see the Chapter 4 of this Consultation Report).</p> <p>Considerable effort was made to make the consultation documents accessible for consultees. These were all made available in various formats including hard copy and electronic formats (DVD and via download from the consultation website), depending on the consultation stage in question. Some consultees expressed dissatisfaction with the available formats. However, it was felt that the overall suite of documentation provided a sufficient choice of widely available formats.</p> <p>At the Stage 2 consultation in particular, some consultees noted that they found the range of documentation confusing and commented that some EDF Energy staff were unhelpful. EDF Energy believes that the navigation document provided with the Stage 2 consultation material adequately explained what information was contained in which documents and where each document could be accessed. EDF Energy staff were also available throughout the overall consultation period, both at exhibitions and at the EDF Energy Bridgwater office, to explain the proposals and answer questions. Feedback obtained by independent exit surveys of those attending exhibitions showed that most people found staff to be helpful (see Chapter 2 of the</p>
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Lack of evidence in Stage 1 process	88900-1573-13312	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	- It is our view that there is very little information presented in the Consultation Report in relation to the proposed associated sites and it is difficult to reach firm conclusions concerning likely issues and impacts.	87910-1573-829	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	- It is believed that more information should be provided that shows the reasoning and justification for locating accommodation for 700 workers on the main development site.	87910-1573-1057	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	a) Whilst officers have been involved in lengthy, detailed discussions regarding options for new development at Hinkley Point, they are far less familiar with several of the sites now being brought forward in the Consultation Report for possible developments associated with the proposed new nuclear build. There is very little information presented in the Consultation Report in relation to some of the proposed sites and it is difficult on the basis of the information supplied to reach firm conclusions concerning likely issues and impacts. Therefore, at this stage, the Council's officers and its advisors must confine themselves to pointing out some of the potential issues that are likely to arise from pursuing certain options. It is essential that every effort is made to address this matter prior to the finalisation of any firm proposals.	87920-1573-2297	/			

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 Council requests that more efforts are made to ensure that there is a greater level of consistency between the main report and the summary information that is provided.	87950-1573-3846	/			<p>Consultation Report).</p> <p>The information contained within the consultation documents for each stage was also distilled and presented on exhibition boards used at the various consultation events, and this was accompanied by a questionnaire at each stage.</p> <p>Each stage of consultation has progressed the proposals, building upon the consultation feedback received from the previous round and containing further information as a result of ongoing investigative work. EDF Energy has had regard to comments made by consultees that they would have liked more information at a particular stage. Indeed, some of these comments have been partially responsible for EDF Energy undertaking additional stages of consultation. In many cases, however, where consultees have requested more information and details, EDF Energy had already planned to provide that information at a later stage of formal consultation or via informal supplementary consultation, once further work had been undertaken.</p> <p>At other times, however, consultees have mistakenly believed that the consultation proposals should contain the same level of information as the DCO application itself, when in fact the proposals were evolving over more than two years of consultation. Some consultees commented that insufficient information was provided in the initial stage of consultation. However, over such an extended period of consultation, it is inevitable that in order to receive feedback from consultees at an early stage, only initial information on broad options and proposals could be provided at that early stage. Similarly, some consultees have been aware of EDF Energy undertaking ongoing work on the proposals in between consultation stages and have commented on not receiving the new information as soon as it became available. However, this too is simply a part of what has been an iterative process whereby further work is undertaken following each stage before being published in the following stage and ultimately included in the DCO application documentation.</p> <p>A few comments were received that concerned apparently conflicting information contained in the consultation documentation. Where this has been the case, EDF Energy has taken on board the comments in consultation documents provided in later stages of consultation and in the DCO application documentation as appropriate. Additionally, in the case of the Stage 2 Update consultation, the draft strategy documents were not formal consultation</p>
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	24. The Consultation Report provides a level of detail regarding some of the infrastructure (temporary jetty, sea wall, grid lines, subs-stations, etc) that has not been available previously to SCC ecological specialists.	87980-1573-4499			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	1.3. Generally, the Stage 1 Consultation document lacks transport-related impact analysis and supporting information.	87990-1573-2262			/	
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.	88040-1573-3497			/	
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	<p>. Other Technical Issues</p> <p>The authorities recommend that EDF considers all the comments and recommendations set out in the Technical Evaluation Report but highlight below the following additional issues associated with the adequacy of the technical information presented in the Stage 1 Document:</p> <p>a) It is understood that further Phase 2 intrusive investigations are planned, although no details are provided regarding the scope and timing of the investigations. This should be included to allow commentary to be made on its adequacy.</p> <p>b) Whilst the land contamination section adequately identifies potential</p>	88070-1573-1655	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			<p>existing contamination and how this should be considered, there is no reference to identifying potential contamination created during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the proposed Hinkley Point C. A paper explaining how these impacts will be addressed and mitigated should be provided.</p> <p>c) Consideration of non-radioactive and radioactive waste and the long term impact on human health and the environment as a result of such proposals needs to be provided. The future studies setting out this evaluation should be identified and ideally should form part of a comprehensive Health Impact Assessment (HIA) for the project.</p> <p>d) The methodology to be employed to assess the cumulative impacts of the decommissioning of Hinkley Point B, estimated to take place in 2016, needs to be provided and this cumulative impact should form part of the Environmental Impact Assessment of the project.</p> <p>e) Further information is needed on the methodologies to assess in-combination and cumulative environmental and socio-economic impacts of the Hinkley project along with other infrastructure projects, plans and programmes in the wider area (including the Severn Barrage, Oldbury nuclear power station proposals by the Horizon Nuclear Power group; Bristol Container Port and the Steart Peninsula works).</p> <p>f) Further information is required on the scope and methodology for the Flood Risk Assessment study (including approaches to addressing predicted climate change effects);</p> <p>g) The full reports associated with terrestrial ecology surveys should be made available and confirmation is sought from EDF on whether the statutory consultees agree that no further ecological surveys are required to inform the environmental impact assessment.</p> <p>h) Further detail is required on national conservation designations and the qualifying ecological features of importance.</p> <p>i) The full reports associated with marine and coastal ecology surveys should be made available and confirmation is required from the statutory consultees that the numerous marine and coastal ecology surveys completed to date adequately cover the baseline assessment.</p> <p>j) There are gaps in the baseline, methodology and proposed further studies for the air quality assessment (as identified in the Technical Evaluation Report) that should be addressed in the next stage of the assessment to provide transparency and a thorough assessment.</p> <p>k) Whilst the data on radiological effects provides a degree of confidence that surveys completed and ongoing will provide sufficient information it is recommended that the output from these studies be included in full and confirmed at dose (critical group) limits below 20 µSv/y i.e. negligible.</p> <p>l) There appears to be a description of mitigation and residual effects for the visual and landscape assessment without the full assessment being provided. If the full assessment has been completed then this should be made available, including any supporting drawings and plans.</p>					<p>documents and it was made clear that, where there was any perceived or real contradiction between these and the main consultation document, the consultation document should take precedence. Some consultees also noted that the summary documents did not always appear to reflect the more detailed consultation documents. EDF Energy has tried to strike a balance between accessibility and the desire to provide sufficient detail, at the same time as reflecting the need for compliance with regulations on environmental impact assessment. Inevitably, this can make the published information difficult to follow. EDF Energy's exhibitions have provided an opportunity for those living in the vicinity to ask questions directly.</p> <p>Some consultees also commented on the adequacy of the Stage 1 Consultation Report (appended to this Consultation Report), which was published as part of the Stage 2 consultation in July to October 2010. Concern was expressed about whether all consultees, particularly statutory ones, had been acknowledged in the report. In addition, some consultees were dissatisfied with how their feedback was represented in the report. This was intended as an interim report to provide information to assist in following consultations. Full details of the consultation process, including verbatim comments from all those who responded, are included in this Consultation Report. In the Stage 1 Consultation Report, EDF Energy also wished to provide some summary points of the feedback received, organised by selected consultee. In an effort to avoid consultees feeling that they had been misrepresented, it was decided that rather than producing summaries of consultees' comments in this Consultation Report, comments would be included verbatim (minus any personal information that has since been redacted) as part of this schedule of responses.</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 & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	A common theme that emerges from the review is the absence of detail on the role of the Development Consent Order process, the Town and Country Planning Application Process and the Harbour Empowerment Order as it relates to each element of the works. It would be helpful to set out the purpose of the Consultation document in the context of the approach to planning applications and the Development Consent Order processes that will be required for each element.	88270-1573-205	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	An important general point is that the Associated Development Strategy that has informed the overall distribution of associated development proposed by EDF Energy has not been fully explained or justified. It is acknowledged that the strategy set out in the Pre-Application Consultation Stage 1 report will be based on a series of background studies. Nevertheless, the omission of a more detailed strategy section and explanation of proposals in the pre-application document means there are a number of queries that require a response by EDF Energy.	88270-1573-2101	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	Sedgemoor DC are concerned to see that the potential future uses for the identified areas of search are collectively listed in table 4.10 of the Stage 1 Consultation Document rather than being site specific.	88440-1573-1261			/	
Tractivity 737	Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments? There is no clear overall strategic view of your proposals thus far and no clear mitigation of the disruption to the lives of local people.	9495-1573-2471			/	
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.	9495-1573-7947	/			
Tractivity 864	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Good level of info provided	9622-1573-6593			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 867	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below The whole questionnaire is leading and the stage 2 consultation document is very short of detail making it very hard to form a true picture of the proposals.	9625-1573-6170			/	
Tractivity 878	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 sure you are doing your best for the local environment and community and your information has been excellent. you will do what you like when you like and what we feel is immaterial	9636-1573-6093			/	
Tractivity 953	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 pleased with the changes made to the original proposals	9711-1573-5730			/	
Tractivity 972	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Obviously the new station cannot be built without some disruption to the surrounding area. However, the plans revealed so far seem amateurish and half baked.	9730-1573-6776			/	
Tractivity 979	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 In this day and age this has been a very poor consultation and offering people choices between scheme A and scheme B is not a consultation in today's climate. The whole area is basically pro-nuclear and was disappointed when HinkleyC did not go ahead 20 years ago. As such your consultation should have been a smooth ride, but by patronising and at times, apparently misleading communities, instead of being open, honest and transparent, you have alienated many of your champions. As an example of how not to carry out a 'consultation' this is a prime example. You should also remember this will be the first new nuclear power decision under the new IPC. As such it will set a precedent, which really begs the question as to why you did not put more effort in to trying to get it right. Producing glossy brochures and 'empty' newsletters went out with the ARK. You need to engage with people - and you have failed.	9737-1573-7923			/	

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	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Not enough information given to us to make a full judgement on the proposals. Its a shambles. EDF are not acting upon our concerns. We feel EDF are against the local people. The legacy promised to the area (whole of Somerset) is pathetic. we are very worried indeed and fearful that our lives are to be ruined. Very worried about transport strategy. We do NOT want the campus at Hinkley C. A stage 3 consultation is required to answer all of our questions.	9743-1573-10884	/			
Tractivity 986	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Stage 3 Consultation is needed and on bigger sheets please. The proposals of EDF are poorly laid out and confusing and contradictory. not enough info in them to give a proper opinion. EDF do not act upon what the local people say. They say they are noting what we say and do NOTHING. It appears that they dont care about local people. I am afraid my life will soon be ruined. We especially do not want the campus at Hinkley C. very disappointed with EDF and do not trust them. The legacy of £1M promised to the whole of Somerset is pathetic. Very worried about transport strategy - it has to be properly thought through.	9744-1573-9863	/			
Tractivity 992	Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments? Published plans to date are lacking in detail.	9750-1573-2458	/			
Tractivity 1005	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Not able to view information	9763-1573-672			/	
Tractivity 1040	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Require more information	9798-1573-125	/			
Tractivity 1040	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? again difficult to visualise without more information.	9798-1573-403			/	
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.	9821-1573-7324			/	

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>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>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.</p>	9825-1573-9092			/	
Tractivity 1074	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>Very well thought out</p>	9832-1573-5956			/	
Tractivity 1091	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>Having read the proposals in detail, they appear to be in a stage of infancy, not mere months from submission to planning authorities. Not nearly enough thought or research has been completed to allow the build to go ahead with minimal disruption for local villages and towns. The accommodation and transport strategies need to be more closely linked. EDF should have regulations about where workers live. Accommodation should be managed like a University campus, with EDF seeking accom. and then offering it via an accom. office with regard to transport links. Not in such a haphazard fashion. EDF seem unsure of too many basics. Aside from the day to day transport/accom.</p>	9849-1573-13993	/			
Tractivity 1092	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>Most of us recognise that Hinkley C is a necessity if the UK is to "keep the lights on", and are prepared to bear our share of the inconvenience. My beef is with EDF's cynical exploitation of the local population. The company could have had support and cooperation from the community, if only the company had been honest from the start. Now we know that we were deliberately deceived throughout the cynical stage 1 consultation the trust is broken. The community will only take so much abuse of its good nature, and is currently mobilising itself. EDF has made its task more difficult by assuming we would sit back and take whatever is thrown at us - particularly when what is thrown is not what was promised.</p>	9850-1573-9032			/	

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	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Lack of detail in the proposals has made it difficult to comment fully on these proposals, particularly with regard to mitigation to those residents most affected in Stogursey Parish and Shurton and Wick in particular.	9857-1573-8000			/	
Tractivity 1104	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 The relationship between EDF and local residents has not been successful. Personally the lack of faith on the Bridgwater personnel has meant that as a family we tend not to communicate with them. On more than one occasion when questioning an EDF proposal we have been told 'well we do own the land after all?' - this does not generate goodwill and is seen as arrogant.	9862-1573-6965			/	
Tractivity 1120	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below NOT ENOUGH DETAIL HAS BEEN PROVIDED IN CERTAIN AREAS EG TRANSPORT/TRAVEL PLAN FOR INFORMED COMMENTS TO BE MADE. IT IS UNSATISFACTORY TO BE TOLD THAT THIS IS A WORK IN PROGRESS!	9878-1573-7962	/			
Tractivity 1130	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below EDF have failed to consult with impacted groups. Their plans have changed radically and details have been deliberately withheld, or contained in such a large document that no one individual would have a chance to read and digest. How could the plans for such a massive project still be evolving. Are residents being told the truth, or will the goal posts move once again. At the July meeting at Combswich EDF admitted that they had not considered using Hinkly A or Dunball, or building bridges and jetties. It is appalling that proposals could have gone to this stage without due consideration of sensible alternative solutions. The entire consultation process has been managed in a very unprofessional and haphazard manner. Do EDF intend to construct a new nuclear power station in the same ill thought out way? It appears that EDF seem to be in complete ignorance of planning laws and protocols or they have chosen to ignore them.	9888-1573-8975			/	
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.	9895-1573-6234			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1162	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Your plans are an example of unjoined up thinking on the grand scale. A secondary school could do better.. I have to tell you that your current plans will not succeed.	9920-1573-6506			/	
Tractivity 1182	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below This Stage II consultation is VERY disappointing. It lacks justification and evidence. A lot of text with little to say that is meaningful. From experience, your proposal comes over as immature, lacking any in depth knowledge or understanding of the nature of the workers of a large scale long programme project of this type. When you do propose values they are underestimated in my view and your programme OVER optimistic. You have failed to understand the area in which you wish to work or its problems. For a positive proposal see website www.savecannington.weebly.com . A hard copy of a paper therein is enclosed.	9940-1573-8154	/			
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.	9941-1573-391			/	
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.	9952-1573-1367			/	
Tractivity 1195	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below The whole process is a sham with EDF tickvking the boxes to placate the IPC. The quality of information does not allow for an accurate considered option. The level of compensation and mitigation is inadequate. There is no effective legacy for the community of for individuals. Recent information regarding the integrity of PPS brings the distinct possibility that this whole process may be flawed. Having taken many hours to read the supplied information I felt that a response was still worth making but I question how the Stage 2 proposal is being handled. Indeed was Stage one fair? I also agree with the local authority response.	9953-1573-10484			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1196	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? With very limited information available and with nothing capable of being confirmed it appears to me that all manner of changes could take place at the whim of EDF. I feel these proposals need overseeing by an independent body to ensure fairness in the area.	9954-1573-125			/	
Tractivity 1303	Public	Stage 2 Update	As a general comment on the whole document, these are only words, the real thing will probably be far removed from proposals and expectations, particularly where time and money are concerned.	89569-1573-367			/	
Tractivity 308	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? Please send me a copy of the full length consultation document. I enclose £20 towards printing and postage.	8996-1573-3387			/	
Tractivity 321	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? not enough information	9009-1573-4117	/			
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	9100-1573-3652			/	
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	9103-1573-3540			/	
Tractivity 519	Public	Stage 1	Need to know about all the alternatives EDF have considered	9191-1573-397			/	
Tractivity 670	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? Deeper consideration and further consultation needed on key issues identified.	9333-1573-4530	/			
Tractivity 515	Public	Stage 1	In Favour of Hinkley Point C but doesn't like dumbing down of document. 6% of nations electricity is irrelevant. To put into power load should be number of megawatts toward UK need. Output of powerstation not mentioned in megawatts	9372-1573-15			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62291	Public	Stage 2	I now have two copies, the second kindly hand-delivered by one of your colleagues whom I advised that the first copy did not work (apart from showing file titles) on a modern DVD player. I cannot access CD-Rom (if this is the format) and others locally appear to be having the same problem. Is it possible for this "DVD" to be re-issued in a format appropriate to your published description ? Please advise.	9986-1573-102		/		
Tractivity 62317	Public	Stage 2	Some of these questions may be available on the DVD. but currently I have been unable to find them, if they are there could you give me the reference number and section?Many thanks in advance for your help with these matters	10004-1573-684			/	
Tractivity 62319	Public	Stage 2	Further to your Stage 2 consultations publication we feel that we are unable to consider the whole impact of your proposal due to a lack of information.	10005-1573-0			/	
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 details 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.	10005-1573-2325			/	
Tractivity 62426	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	The consultation documents themselves are imprecise and frequently erroneous or lacking. This is not consultation. It is an insult to the communities which the company professes to respect and to wish to recruit as good neighbours.	10063-1573-2251			/	
Tractivity 62430	Public	Stage 2	There is not enough information to make a considered response and specific questions by phone and at exhibitions have not been answered satisfactorily. - how, for instance, can we decide if buses down our lanes are acceptable, if we do not know how many or how big, or if we would consider a small hostel on site as acceptable, if no justification is given. I therefore reserve the right to make further comments when better information is available	10064-1573-90			/	
Tractivity 62431	Public	Stage 2	As in many instances the proposals are incomplete, lacking in detail, inadequate and ambiguous, I find it hard to comment on some areas.	10065-1573-147			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62437	Public	Stage 2	1. I have had access to the full set of Stage 2 Consultation documentation provided by EDF. I find this to be inadequate in a number of respects, as many of the documents are still to be finalised. Of particular concern are the Transport Strategy and Travel Plans, which are very immature as they do not consider many types of road user.	10069-1573-55	/			
Tractivity 62442	Public	Stage 2	The way EDF have allegedly "consulted" is not only poor, but scandalous and I would like to lodge a formal complaint about your consultation process. Despite your 9000 pages of documentation you seem to have conveniently skimmed over many important factors in your Newsletters and have hidden other important information in the depths of the Masterplan documents, some of which even contradicts itself in places.	10070-1573-2177			/	
Tractivity 62442	Public	Stage 2	Please don't tell me to read or refer to anymore of your Masterplan or consultation documents. I don't have time to trawl through them all looking for the answers to my questions.	10070-1573-10978			/	
Tractivity 62449	Public	Stage 2	EDF's proposals appear to have been poorly thought out in many instances and asking the public to choose between two options is not a consultation. How were those options arrived at? What were the other alternatives? Why was that site chosen? Where is the research to justify that option?	10075-1573-2623			/	
Tractivity 62458	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Thank you for organising the Workshop on Monday evening. I thought it was at least an opportunity to see that there is still a great deal of accord with those affected as to what can be done to improve your proposals - though obviously without prejudice to the fact that we all would prefer it didn't happen at all! I have just one point arising from the evening. (Personal details removed), kept re-iterating at our table that the original phase 1 Consultation did not provide for the bypass to be in a cutting where it ran alongside Chads Hill. Unfortunately I had not brought all of my notes with me. Having looked back at your Phase 2 Consultation Report then clause 5.4.4 page 21 of the document Masterplan:Cannington Bypass references the fact that Indicative Vertical designs were produced and states that 'the bypass would have gone into a deep cutting (up to 8m high) through the west-east ridge'. Going back to Phase 1 of your consultation it does clearly state in 4.4.16 that 'an 8m deep cutting will be required where the route bisects Sandy Lane, which should help to screen the bypass within the landscape'. Exactly our point and made by every table at the workshop. This is the position to which you need to return - your original vertical designs need to be revisited. Perhaps you might pass this on to the Highway Engineers who seem to have mislaid the original designs	10082-1573-54			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62460	Public	Stage 2	Disillusionment with the Planning Process, endless meetings, more and more rhetoric and heated argument, mindless thick and heavy documents filled with technical jargon that few understand and nobody reads - all to no avail for EDF and National Power/Grid will in the end do exactly what they want.	10083-1573-52			/	
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.	10091-1573-2223	/			
Tractivity 62504	Public	Stage 2	The consultation documents should be considered as a 'Project Manager's Guide' and convey no effective opportunity to question the need, health and environmental threats facing the local communities, should this development go ahead. Local communities are being denied consideration of the evidence relating to wider questions of nuclear power, as these are distanced for consideration by statutory consultees e.g. Environment Agency, Natural England and Nuclear Regulatory bodies at National level. This avoids discussion of relevant justification, environmental, health and safety issues with local people. There is no consideration of alternative investment opportunities which might provide substantially increased employment and benefits to the local economy, rather than the export of revenues from the local area.	10097-1573-58			/	
Tractivity 62504	Public	Stage 2	If such vital fundamental health related matters are being misrepresented by Ed F, one must wonder as to the reliability of other information the French company is providing and for which the vast majority of people, bar the authors, will have no way of detecting. The size of the consultation document, just under 10,000 pages, puts thorough understanding, beyond the ability of ordinary people to comprehend or appraise for inconsistency and inaccuracy within the time scale allowed. 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.	10097-1573-4619			/	
Tractivity 62547	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	If "any challenges we are given are an opportunity to make our case even more explicit" (Mr personal details removed) why will EdF not take up the challenge of supplying detail to those who ask for it?	10110-1573-329	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62572	Public	Stage 2	I have read most of the Stage 2 documentation and have found it lacking in detail and ambiguous, vague and wholly inadequate to give an informed response. Stogursey Parish Council raised many questions because of lack of information in the preferred proposals. I feel it is necessary for EDF to take on board the criticisms of the local councils and general public and enter into a further round of consultation, providing all the answers to the questions raised by Stage 2 and filling the gaps in the information.	10123-1573-65	/			
Tractivity 62577	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	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	10128-1573-11346			/	
Tractivity 62581	Public	Stage 2	Perhaps more worrying than both these things, however, is the hollowness of the consultation itself. Local people are being asked to respond to proposals that are unaccompanied by the rationale behind those proposals. Why 700 people resident on site? I have no idea. Why put buses on minor local roads? 'Because it is a better route than the A39,' says EDF. Better for whom? Not the people of the parish, for sure.	10132-1573-1491	/			
Tractivity 62582	Public	Stage 2	My overall view on the proposals is that you haven't given us enough information, especially on the transport strategy for a proper Stage 2 consultation, therefore I cannot answer all the questions completely. My view is that a Stage 3 Consultation is needed in the near future, in order to give the local residents a fair chance of responding to the proposals.	10133-1573-12004	/			
OFWAT	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We note that responses by Wessex Water and the Environment Agency to your stage 1 consultation are recorded in the appendices to the Stage 2 consultation document. We expect, from reading section 4.8, that you have taken into account our response forwarded to you on 24 February 2010. Your stage 2 consultation asks twelve questions that are essentially on planning matters which we expect to be resolved locally. Whilst Wessex Water and the Environment Agency may have their views we have nothing further to usefully add.	10197-1573-687			/	
Devon County Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	Whilst this Authority has no comments to make on the Preferred Proposals, it is noted that Somerset County Council has commented that a number of key documents have not been included in the Stage 2 Consultation, and that there is a lack of justification and supporting evidence for the proposals for the main site (and the associated development). It is hoped therefore that the concerns of that Council are addressed in the formal submission of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.	10217-1573-180	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Cheddar Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	All the material provided by EDF appears to 'gloss over' the true impacts of this development on the immediate and further localities. EDF have developed a scale range of impact that goes from High - Medium - Low - Very Low. This is skewing the datum points. This seems to be a trend that EDF have adopted throughout their consultation process. By doing this they can appear to reduce the severity of the actual impact on the community.	10222-1573-960			/	
Cheddar Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	While the Stage 2 Consultation appeared to start in a better manner than Stage 1, there still seems to be a lack of clarity in the consultation documents, the manner in which they are presented could be seen as misleading. Also there continues to be a lack of evidence to support the justification for decisions that have led to EDF proposals. Evidence of 'fudging the figures' is still present with EDF's insistence on moving datum's on graph's, along with the skewed scales for measurement, which leads to a generic distrust of information presented. A lack of thought to either the local environment, or population is constant throughout the consultation, in both EDF's descriptions of the various problem area's, and their treatment of the local infrastructures within their documentation.	10222-1573-4849	/			
Nether Stowey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	2.2 It is noted that in the Stage 2 "Preferred Proposals" documents the scale and location of much of the associated (off site) developments has changed from those outlined at Stage 1. Whilst some of these changes may reflect comments made at Stage 1 it is notable that on some issues, despite local opposition, EDF Energy has not amended its position.	10226-1573-6461			/	
Hinkley Point Site Stakeholder Group (A+B) Sites	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	1) The Stage 2 document is a heavy tome and contains a great deal of important information and detail, unfortunately quite a bit of the detail conflicts with each other. It is clear that there has been some 'Silo' thinking and not 'joined-up' thinking when coming to decisions and solutions for problems.	10255-1573-789			/	
Sedgemoor District Council, West Somerset Council and Somerset County Council Joint Councils Response	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee (Somerset) and consultee with an interest in land (Somerset and Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Firstly, we wish to draw your attention to a number of documents which we believe are missing from the Stage 2 consultation. Specifically, the documents that are missing are: Thematic Vision Next Steps Document Freight Management Strategy Updated Saturn Forecasting Report Supporting Traffic Flow data Paramics Forecasting Report Local Model Validation Report (Saturn and Paramics) Draft Transport Assessment Legacy plans for both the proposed M5 Park & Ride sites Visitor Management Strategy Site Waste Management Plan Integrated Waste Strategy Construction Management Plan Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan Detailed 1:500 drawings of Masterplans	10275-1573-827		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			<p>Overarching Accommodation Strategy including location of temporary accommodation, permanent and affordable housing, housing sector mitigation and details of management systems to be employed Community Safety and Wellbeing Plan</p> <p>Procurement Strategy and Contract Implementation Strategy</p> <p>Operations Workforce Development Strategy</p> <p>Lighting Strategy</p> <p>Delivery Plan for the Low Carbon Business Cluster</p> <p>Fire and Rescue Resourcing Strategy</p> <p>Ambulance Resourcing Strategy</p> <p>Security Management Strategy</p> <p>Incident Management Plan</p> <p>Archaeology - Written Scheme of Investigation, Amec 2009 'Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment, Hinkley Point Hinkley Point Foreshore Survey, Gloucester CC Archaeology Service Intertidal and offshore Archaeology at Hinkley Point</p> <p>Cannington Bypass - Geophysical Survey</p> <p>Junction 24 P and R - Geophysical Survey</p> <p>Junction 23 P and R - Geophysical Survey</p> <p>Williton - Geophysical Survey</p> <p>Combwich - Geophysical Survey</p> <p>Integrated Land Management Plan</p> <p>Site Drainage Management Scheme</p> <p>Soil Management Plan</p> <p>Ecology Surveys Findings</p> <p>BEEMS 2010. Impact of new nuclear build at Hinkley Point on intertidal food availability for birds.</p> <p>BEEMS 2009. The combined effects of Hinkley B + C and refuelling scenarios.</p> <p>BEEMS 2010. Coralline alga thermal sensitivity report.</p> <p>BEEMS 2010 Hinkley Jetty Scour Assessment</p> <p>Amec 2010 Environmental Impact Assessment. Technical Note Radiological (CIDEN-002). Issue 04 - Preliminary. March 2010</p> <p>Details of the Contractor's Charitable Trust</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, West Somerset Council and Somerset County Council Joint Councils Response	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee (Somerset) and consultee with an interest in land (Somerset and Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Similarly, we also would like to raise a concern regarding the quality and depth of the detailed information presented in the following reports; Modelling files (Paramics, ARCADY and PICADY) Bridgwater Bypass NATA Trip Generation Spreadsheets Gravity Model EIA and Cumulative Effects document Health Impact Assessment Glasson HPC Technical report May 2010 Planning requirements and obligations Construction Workforce Development Strategy -1st Draft Local Business Engagement and Mitigation Strategy	10275-1573-4377			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	a) There is insufficient information in a number of areas as well as assertions made with no supporting evidence at all	89469-1573-274			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	b) The quality of information is variable with examples of inaccuracies in reporting, e.g. in the health report where you have omitted an infant study and misrepresented COMARE by reporting an error of theirs that COMARE had subsequently corrected	89469-1573-397			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	d) The Navigation Document was very superficial and barely helpful.	89469-1573-1690			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	e) There is too much duplication	89469-1573-1759			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	f) There were pages on your CD ROM that were unreadable (mainly Figures where the text was tiny) and, when enlarged on screen, went fuzzy/pixelated and were still unreadable	89469-1573-1797			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	c) Just because we live with a risk/threat does not mean we like it or can accept more of it. EDF's assertion in the summary of the Stage 1 consultation suggesting broad support to the principle of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley is statistically unsubstantiated and had not been empirically researched. Therefore you are distorting things. I also note that your wording of that spurious claim of support was for a single power station. What about two? There is a difference.	89472-1573-142			/	

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	EDF's CD, that does go into greater depth, still failed to report accurately disputed opinions regarding impact on health and was biased in their interpretation. As a member of the public I am not reassured by official reassurances and by not being open and forthcoming, I can only assume something is being covered up. Lack of transparency does not engender trust.	89472-1573-1094			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	e) As already indicated, the summary documents EDF have provided and the exhibition boards give an unacceptable, distorted view of the project. People are not being given a true picture of what is being proposed and therefore their responses are being manipulated. The picture we are being given is a sanitised, glossy picture that completely skims over what it will all mean	89472-1573-2013			/	
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Looking forward and based on all information received to date we have insufficient technical information to fully assess the likely environmental impact of your proposals. At present the information supplied does not meet the standards we would expect of a draft DCO application. However, treating this as a consultation our interim observation on those areas where further information is required is provided in Annex 2.	89097-1573-660	/			
Quantock Hills AONB Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Main HPC site - Terms of reference and legislative guidance - LI and IEMA guidance for LVIA (2002) has been used. - LCA guidance also identified and used - Referencing inaccurate and inconsistent throughout e.g. reference made to Sandwick et al (e.g. chapters 21.4.3 and 24.4.4) but should be made to Swanick and Land Use Consultants (2002). In the reference list (21.6) these authors are not referred to, hindering members of the public and consultees cross referencing and/or finding documents. There is a need to make corrections to references and ensure consistency throughout document	89117-1573-2211	/			
Quantock Hills AONB Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Main HPC site – Adequacy of consultations - Would expect a full list of consultees to have been included in the LVIA. Other general comments - There is insufficient narrative and too much reliance on judgements being presented in a tabular form with limited descriptions to aid understanding of judgements being made.	89122-1573-1030			/	
Countryside Council for Wales	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Welcome the production of this Environmental Appraisal (EA).	89126-1573-676			/	

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	We have been advised by your consultants that you consider that the Stage Two Consultation documents meet the statutory requirements expected at this stage in the process. Unfortunately however, I feel it necessary to inform you that the Highways Agency (Agency) has found that the documentation submitted does not provide us with sufficient detail to reach informed decisions on the majority of aspects covered. In particular we remain unable to form a conclusion on the impact on the strategic road network (SRN) and the need for mitigation measures. It is imperative therefore that this significant issue is addressed and resolved prior to submission of the Development Consent Order (DCO).	89167-1573-189			/	
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Furthermore, the Stage One Summary document is a disappointing attempt at conveying the Agency's comments. It provides no detail on the level and number of queries that we have raised as an ongoing part of the stakeholder consultation process. The Agency is concerned that this document misrepresents our comments and that the resulting public perception of the transport implications, and our concerns relating to them, may be misguided.	89167-1573-1454	/			
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	Moving into the detail, we are concerned about the adequacy of consultation. Overall we note the volume and presentation of the material consulted on, but have found it substantially lacking in detail, quality and technical integrity.	89181-1573-3214			/	
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	The stage 2 proposals fall far short in presenting detailed matters or solutions and mitigation measures that have been discussed with the local authorities and local communities. In fact the information, for example, is of a significantly lesser standard than a planning authority would expect of large scale applications that it would determine.	89181-1573-3969			/	
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	Therefore, we would like urgent clarification on the next stages of the project and further details of proposals to consult on the project as a whole, and indeed, elements of the project not contained in the Stage 2 consultation material. These include proposals for training facilities, proposals for permanent housing and details on the land use and transport implications of the supply chain. It is our view that the lack of detail on these elements hinders an assessment of cumulative impact and makes it impossible for the authorities to advise on quality issues which need to be addressed prior to submission.	89181-1573-6738	/			
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	Description: Insufficient technical supporting information supplied by EDF in Stage 2 material to support preferred proposals set out in Stage 2 Consultation leading to a lack of understanding / justification for the proposals and the inability of Councils and particularly the Community in understanding the true impact of the proposals.	89182-1573-1342	/			

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	- The lack of detail presented within the consultation material is unacceptable.	89183-1573-4469			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	We would highlight our concern that there is limited evidence of our prior discussions (conducted in accordance with the Planning Performance Agreement) having been incorporated into your current proposals on Hinkley.	89185-1573-659			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>Moving into the detail, we are concerned about the adequacy of consultation. Overall we note the volume and presentation of the material consulted on, but have found it substantially lacking in detail, quality and technical integrity.</p> <p>We believe that the approach taken by EDF for their Stage 2 consultation does not accord with the guidance of the IPC that states "the overriding intention of the legislation is to ensure that detailed matters are consulted upon and solutions or mitigation negotiated with the local community, landowners, statutory consultees and local authorities before submission of the application for development consent to the IPC" - paragraph 8 - IPC's guidance note 1 (Revision 1) on Pre-Application Stages - March 2010.</p> <p>The stage 2 proposals fall far short in presenting detailed matters or solutions and mitigation measures that have been discussed with the local authorities and local communities. In fact the information, for example, is of a significantly lesser standard than a planning authority would expect of large scale applications that it would determine.</p>	89185-1573-1438			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The proposals are less developed than was expected and there is a significant body of technical work still required to finalise both the strategy for the development, the key sites for housing, transport investment, supply chain development, mitigation, as well as details of the associated development sites and their management and operation.	89186-1573-1028			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	iv) That strong concerns are put on record about the substantive shortfalls in technical information, and the nature and quality of material submitted to the extent that this has undermined the adequacy of consultation which could give rise to legal challenge and has hindered the local planning authorities' ability to fully assess local impacts, cumulative effects and represent local communities.	89186-1573-3075			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The off-site associated developments are so under-developed, they undermine the deliverability of the project as a whole.	89186-1573-17536			/	

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	An extensive programme of work continues in parallel to the Stage 2 Consultation exercise. We appreciate that further information will also be available between now and the end of the year. However this response has to focus on the Stage 2 material formally put out to consultation. 12.2 There are significant technical concerns with the proposals currently submitted. Some are issues of principle, others of design and detail. This is to the extent that we have to challenge whether the consultation has been adequate, that is, sufficiently detailed or transparent to enable local people and councils to comment on local impacts.	89186-1573-19062	/			
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Until further details are submitted, the Council should advise the IPC and Department of Energy and Climate Change, that the proposal is not yet adequately developed and the required documentation is not yet in order to accompany an application for Development Consent Order.	89186-1573-20383			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	2. Following detailed review of the Stage 2 consultation documents, it is apparent that key documents have not been included and there is a lack of depth, justification and supporting evidence for EDF's proposals regarding the Hinkley Point main site and the proposed associated developments. This has limited our ability to provide guidance and constructive feedback to the Stage 2 consultation.	89189-1573-1903	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	3. The provisional nature of the proposals at this stage is disappointing given the potential for further amendments and consequent lack of time to consider them fully within your current project plan and, in particular, the timescales in which you wish to submit a Development Consent Order (DCO) application. Somerset County Council is not satisfied that the Stage 2 Preferred Proposals Consultation is fit for purpose due to issues relating to adequacy of evidence base and robust justification for proposals included therein	89189-1573-2901			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	17. Given the information presented above, and the feedback we have received from a number of members of the community, we are concerned as to whether the consultation associated with the Stage 2 proposals has been adequate.	89189-1573-13833			/	

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	Conclusion 54. For the reasons set out above, EDF's current proposals remain unacceptable to the County Council. The County Council will continue to work impartially but constructively with EDF to address the fundamental concerns identified in this letter. We hope that EDF will work with the County Council, West Somerset Council and Sedgemoor District Council.	89194-1573-5635			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	It is apparent that EDF's consultation does not include key documents and lacks depth, justification and supporting evidence for their proposals. This includes a lack of detailed transport and accommodation strategies	89195-1573-989	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	and a failure to adequately address the cumulative impacts or intangible harms.	89195-1573-1298			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	d) The Council requested that the following issues were addressed in EDF's Stage 2 proposals: - Clarification of main on-site proposals at Hinkley Point. - Details of waste management, transportation and disposal.	89196-1573-2081			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Some information and documents which are crucial to justifying the proposals (or discounting other options) are missing. This missing information is required to help assuage outstanding concerns about impacts and justification for proposals. SCC is not satisfied with how the legacy of site developments have been justified, particularly the accommodation sites in Bridgwater. "In combination" and "cumulative" effects assessment needs to be revisited once the full evidence base is available.	89199-1573-776			/	

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 navigability of the documentation and the dispersed nature of information across the chapters has made providing a comprehensive response more difficult. The scale of some plans/maps is insufficient to see clearly what is proposed.	89199-1573-1275			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- All outstanding information/data/evidence needs to be provided as soon as possible to enable proper analysis prior to submission of the DCO application. For example, the Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (EMMP) may include detail for measures to limit the potential impacts of the proposals and to ensure quality monitoring. It would be welcome to have sight of this plan prior to submission to the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC).	89199-1573-1610			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Some outstanding information may impact upon final proposals; therefore there is a concern that there will be limited time to properly consider any changes prior to submission to the IPC.	89199-1573-4262	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The information, evidence and justification for preferred proposals requires improvement to make it robust and fit for purpose. Some proposals may be impacted by other work and outstanding information (e.g. from ecological survey work, noise attenuation considerations, transport assessment/justification) and as such the Preferred Proposals consultation needs to be more explicit about the potential for changes to be made once further information is made available.	89200-1573-320			/	

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	<p>Missing Data</p> <p>The following missing data has been identified in the Stage 2 documentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Freight Management Plan - Waste Management Plan - Operational Management Plans - Landscape planting details - Restoration details of temporary sites - Lighting Strategy - Recreational/open space mitigation/compensation information (relating to Bridgwater accommodation campuses) - Full details on impacts on the historic environment (or clarity if all the expected data has been provided) 	89200-1573-3636	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The IPC's Scoping Opinion refers to the need to clearly define study areas and how proposals and their likely impacts are fully explained and justified based upon quality survey evidence. As some survey information/evidence is outstanding the existing documentation has scope for improvement and is not considered to be fit for purpose.	89201-1573-3015			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>The County Council is disappointed with the lack of information provided for the Stage 2 consultation on socio-economic matters and considers that a significant amount of further work is required, as explained throughout this response.</p> <p>The County Council, along with the Districts, would like to continue to actively engage with EDF and their socio-economic consultants to ensure all the matters raised in this response are dealt with prior to the DCO submission.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that EDF should prepare a note detailing a programme of outstanding work and the process for ongoing engagement.</p>	89206-1573-2363			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Insufficient detail is provided within the Construction Workforce Development Strategy to conduct meaningful consultation with local stakeholders	89210-1573-5424			/	

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	Insufficient detail is provided within the Construction Workforce Development Strategy to conduct meaningful consultation with local stakeholders.	89213-1573-4405			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Insufficient detail is provided within the Construction Workforce Development Strategy to conduct meaningful consultation with local stakeholders. EDF have not adequately consulted with Somerset Colleges.	89216-1573-4355			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Difficult to assimilate and cross reference data as it is spread through many documents.	89247-1573-3549			/	
Otterhampton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The Parish Council question just how are the public expected to participate in a major consultation when major proposals are apparently hidden in documentation in this way? The ease of accessing the documentation also has to be queried when those issued with a 'DVD' on the proposals, needed to read a 'Navigation' handbook first. When questioned on proposals EDF, show no justification or rationale, repeating the mantra that 'plans are evolving' which is unacceptable.	89270-1573-5519			/	

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	<p>1.1. Otterhampton Parish Council strongly believes that consultation with regard to a number of major proposals at Combwich is inadequate for our community and has failed to uphold some of the guiding principles EDF outlined in it's pre - application consultation documents.</p> <p>1.2 We believe information has not only been inadequate but completely absent under Stage One, on what are now preferred proposals under Stage Two.</p> <p>1.3 HM Governments code of practice on consultation, which EDF apparently adopted, has a number of key criteria.</p> <p>1.4 The Parish Council feels EDF may have failed with regard to the following criteria :</p> <p>a. Consultation documents should be clear about the PROCESS; what is being PROPOSED; the scope to INFLUENCE and the expected IMPACTS and benefits of the proposals.</p> <p>b. Consultation should take place at a STAGE when there is SCOPE to influence the POLICY outcome.</p> <p>c. Consultation responses should be ANAL YSED CAREFULL Y.</p> <p>d. The BURDEN of consultation should be kept to a MINIMUM</p>	89274-1573-103			/	

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	<p>2.1 EDF's explanation that plans are 'evolving' raises the question - evolving from what?</p> <p>2.2 'Evolving' appears to be a stock, fallback answer by the company when challenged on certain emerging issues such as the use of Combwich as a road freight depot or as a site for fabrication works.</p> <p>2.3 What process and public examination did these proposals undergo to now appear as EDF's preferred ones ?</p> <p>2.4 Why did we at Combwich have no knowledge or opportunity to comment on some of these preferred proposals under stage one, unlike our neighbouring communities ?</p> <p>3.1 For instance, the sudden unannounced appearance of the Combwich road freight logistics and Storage site as a preferred proposal.</p> <p>3.2 Communities were able to comment on four, Stage One options / proposals on search areas for a road freight logistics site.</p> <p>3.3 However Combwich was never suggested as an original site for a road freight depot.</p> <p>3.4 Throughout the Stage One consultation documents any proposal for Combwich was only ever stated as a freight logistic site for water borne freight.</p> <p>4.1 Generally, most of the Combwich community appeared to accept use of the wharf to enable AIL's to arrive for delivery to Hinkley Point. The village has lived with the wharf being at the centre of our community for over 40 years. The need for a storage area to accommodate these large loads was also recognised and so there was little controversy on the proposal outlined under Stage One.</p> <p>4.2 There was a great deal of concern in the other communities about having a road freight logistics site in their localities and so they commented strongly against the proposal.</p> <p>4.3 Clearly if Combwich residents had known that there was a possibility of their village hosting a road freight facility, then they also would have commented vociferously.</p> <p>4.4 As it was outlined under the Stage One consultation, there was no possibility of a road freight depot at Combwich - and therefore no apparent need to comment!</p> <p>5.1 It appears that EDF may also have failed to analyse consultation responses carefully. (HM Governments key consultation criteria)</p>	89274-1573-1130			/	
Otterhampton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>The Parish Council are clear - EDF - by not complying with most of the governments key criteria on consultation –</p> <p>By ignoring District Council advice that - at the Stage Two consultation no 'new' options should be incorporated –</p> <p>Are conducting an inadequate and failed consultation with regard to the Combwich proposals.</p>	89277-1573-1547			/	

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	SPC finds the consultation material in a number of areas to be inadequate to be able to form a coherent view of the proposals, and requires answers to the many questions raised by this lack of information. These areas are highlighted in Section 1.2 below, with detailed comments and questions in Section 2 below.	89288-1573-3579	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Planning Requirements and Obligations: Many aspects of this are incomplete. There are a number of important plans that EDF will only produce as part of the DCO. There will therefore have been no consultation on these plans, which breaches the EDF SOCC.	89288-1573-6790			/	
Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd)	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	- The current process has not allowed sufficient time to explore potential options nor reach agreement with the landowners. The IPC's guidance note on Pre- Application Stages (December 2009) states at paragraph 8 that the "overriding intention of the legislation is to ensure that detailed matters are consulted upon and solutions or mitigation negotiated with the local community, landowners, statutory consultees and local authorities before submission of the application for development consent to the IPC". Constructive meetings have only commenced since early September leaving little time prior to the October 4th deadline for objections.	89434-1573-1877	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Details of the site selection process are presented in Volume 3 of the Environmental Appraisal for accommodation campuses, Cannington by-pass, Cannington Park and Ride, Comwich Wharf Refurbishment and Freight Logistics/Storage facility, Junction 23 Park and Ride and Freight Logistics facility, Junction 24 Park and Ride and Freight Logistics facility and Williton Park and Ride. Whilst these sections contain a description of reasons why additional sites identified by the authorities, following Stage 1, have been rejected and include information (based on the responses received as part of Stage 1 consultation) on reasons why sites identified as part of the Stage 1 have been rejected or taken forward, there is no information or a separate document that describes the work undertaken by EDF Energy to systematically assess sites.	89296-1573-765	/			
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 supportive of the general thrust of the EDF Energy objectives, although there are concerns over their application to Stage 2 proposals identified throughout this Technical Evaluation and the ability of the team to implement the objectives with tangible action that deliver improved outcomes on the ground.	89302-1573-5160			/	

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>Community benefits</p> <p>Authorities position December 2009:</p> <p>The authorities are concerned that the description of community benefits within the Stage 1 Consultation Report includes limited reference to aspirations from within the community, the local authorities or other key stakeholders who will have an interest in the Hinkley project.</p> <p>Update September 2010:</p> <p>This continues to be an issue and is discussed in more detail 3.2.6.</p>	89325-1573-6687	/			
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 stressed that there was a need to ensure that the information provided as part of Stage 2 would be sufficient to inform the public and the local authorities of the preferred approach to development and the reasons why the preferred option has been chosen and other options rejected. The authorities also required as part of the Stage 2 documentation sufficient details on solutions or mitigation measures to address potential impacts and address the concerns of the local authorities and local communities. There is still insufficient information about: how sites for associated development have been selected, the strategy for construction logistics, or about the transport modelling and assessment findings and how they have influenced the approach to identification of associated development sites:</p>	89329-1573-15645			/	
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 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;</p>	89329-1573-16606	/			
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 chapter lists relevant legislation, summarising national, regional and local legislation and existing waste management infrastructure.</p> <p>Legislation listed is up to date and sufficient detail has been made in the summaries of each piece of legislation.</p>	89336-1573-1317			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62872	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>You must have wondered why I didn't immediately answer your question last evening about receiving the above document. I was unsure whether we'd actually had it - and I thought you'd want to know that we hadn't, as three copies landed on the doormat today.</p> <p>That in part explains my wrath at not receiving the full document. I'm sure you will agree that coming to an exhibition 'cold' as it were, with no prior knowledge of what we were to be faced with is not acceptable.</p> <p>I also feel strongly that a meeting would have been a better way to explain your proposals to the community, even though you would have taken some 'stick'. Do you all feel that you can't face us en masse?</p>	89652-1573-0		/		
Tractivity 62972	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>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.</p>	89687-1573-3373			/	
Tractivity 62998	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>Weak site plans with no keys and no orientation... Very difficult for lay people to understand.</p>	89692-1573-1497			/	
Tractivity 62998	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>There are better maps in the Appendix but, these revised proposals do appear very thin.</p> <p>Until EDF shows in depth analysis we will continue to see disaster ahead.</p>	89692-1573-5422		/		
Tractivity 63012	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>We are still very unhappy about the lack of detail contained in this consultation document. EDF should be in a position to give more information as this will affect the lives of people in this area for 20 years and more. We deserve to know more about work which will affect our lives. Overall we have no confidence in the information EDF is giving.</p>	89696-1573-8328		/		
Civil Aviation Authority	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>Given that the latest material made available does not mention aviation or appear to provide any comment of the various (potential) issues there have been previously highlighted, it will come as no surprise that the CAA's related position remains as detailed in my letter dated 13 July 2010.</p>	89721-1573-643			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Bridgwater Town Council	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	The latest revised 'preferred proposals' address some issues and offer improvements but still leave many questions unanswered, or proferring lack of a detailed evidence base.	89746-1573-1088	/			
Innovia Cellophane Limited	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	From reviewing the consultation document and supporting documents, we are concerned at the level of information provided in contrast to the consultation material provided at Stage 2.	89761-1573-1854			/	
Miller Turner Investments	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	Whilst this latest consultation stage provides the opportunity for further comment before the formal application is submitted it is disappointing that updated technical studies are not available. As this information is not available the robustness of this consultation stage must be questioned, particularly as this prevents the full impact of development to be assessed.	89762-1573-2981			/	
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.	89804-1573-93			/	
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	12. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below - 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.	89806-1573-11704	/			
19	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	The consultation documents themselves are imprecise and frequently erroneous or lacking. This is not consultation. It is an insult to the communities which the company professes to respect and to wish to recruit as good neighbours.	89808-1573-2336			/	
Highways Agency	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.12 Once again the consultation from EDF Energy does not provide clarity regarding their intentions for legacy at each of the Associated Development sites.	89837-1573-7218			/	

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	28. Although the information provided in the consultation document provides a useful overview of need and distribution, it does not provide enough information to enable the impacts upon school places, early years services and adult social care to be fully scoped out and planned.	89844-1573-12688		/		
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	33. Although the Council is pleased to see the publication of the six supporting strategy documents, our understanding is that the documents are not part of the formal consultation. Therefore, although we have been mindful of the content of these documents in framing this response, we considered that it was not appropriate to provide a specific response on each one at this stage.	89844-1573-15154			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	34. Notwithstanding the above, we feel that the supporting strategy documents do not contain the level of detail that we would expect at this late stage of the application process. They cover only a broad outline of the proposals and data and do not, therefore, provide sufficient detail to enable the Council to comment in full. For example, we note that the Construction Waste Management Strategy appears to act as a framework document with more detailed analysis of the different waste types, quantities and disposal routes to be provided at a later stage in line with the application for development consent.	89844-1573-15540			/	
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.	89844-1573-16895		/		
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	37. The language throughout the report is also non-committal. For example, it states that EDF "will seek to avoid any movements between the hours of 10:00pm and 7:00am on Monday to Saturday" (p. 18). We require firmer statements and commitments on such matters.	89844-1573-17344			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	Associated Developments 1.32 Generally it is difficult to provide detailed comments or any commentary on specific proposals, due to the lack of information included within the consultation documents.	89846-1573-0			/	

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	1.33 The County Council formally requests that detailed scaled drawings (1:500 scale) of all Associated Developments and proposed highway works be provided, in order for the County Council to fully comment on the suitability of design.	89846-1573-206	/			
Otterhampton Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Whilst we generally welcome most of these changes, as ever apparently with EDF, a close examination of the (sometimes missing) details is required to truly understand the proposals put forward.	89868-1573-686			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	1.1.3 Several items of further information are required in order to fully comment on these emerging documents. As these are drafts, there is an opportunity for EDF to fully include our comments in the final versions.	89872-1573-1655			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	4.4.1 Consistency with EDFE Supporting Information In paragraph 4.1.2 of the Draft Workforce Profile Report a reference is made to '... active training and brokerage measures to support local recruitment in both Sizewell B and Flammanville-3.' No material has been presented to predict the likely distributional consequences of the workforce assumptions.	89883-1573-3964			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	4.5.4 Consistency with EDFE Supporting Information No additional material has been presented by EDFE in the supporting information related to attracting economic development opportunities into the area.	89883-1573-5882			/	
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.	89891-1573-4228		/		

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>Response to EDF re. Stage 2 Consultation from: (Personal information removed)</p> <p>1. Consultation Process</p> <p>It has been very difficult to respond to your Stage Two consultation because:</p> <p>a) There is insufficient information in a number of areas as well as assertions made with no supporting evidence at all</p> <p>b) The quality of information is variable with examples of inaccuracies in reporting, e.g. in the health report where you have omitted an infant study and misrepresented COMARE by reporting an error of theirs that COMARE had subsequently corrected</p> <p>c) Staff at your office in Bridgwater had not had sufficient time to familiarise themselves with the contents of your own consultation documents. When trying to track down some specific information and asked where I might find it in the consultation documents, I exasperated a staff member who said words to the effect that 'How am I supposed to know everything that's in it? There are 10,000 pages there!' However, he did say he would try and find the information for when I came in for an already booked appointment (11 Aug '10). Subsequently, that documentary information could still not be supplied. Some points I made were dismissed as trivial. Other queries that could not be answered were because this was just a consultation and they were still working on proposals. I gave up contacting your office because as my questions related to information that was absent from the documentation, there was no point. To my mind, this was not good enough and illustrated that EDF were not sufficiently prepared for a meaningful consultation.</p> <p>d) The Navigation Document was very superficial and barely helpful.</p> <p>e) There is too much duplication</p> <p>f) There were pages on your CD ROM that were unreadable (mainly Figures where the text was tiny) and, when enlarged on screen, went fuzzy/pixelated and were still unreadable</p> <p>NOT ACCOMMODATION!</p>	89469-12-0			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>(Editor's note: pdf contains 2 submissions. First submission. Text from email dated 21/09/2010)NOT ACCOMMODATION</p> <p>Subject: Stogursey Parish Council response to EDF Stage 2 Consultation</p> <p>A small error in this document has been brought to my attention. On page 25, Section 2.9 Bullet Point 10, '50 persons' should read '50 properties'.</p>	89288-4-0			/	
Tractivity 1408	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	<p>Q1 We support the proposals as set out in the Consultation Doc.</p> <p>Q2 We support the proposals as set out in the Consultation Doc.</p>	89983-1573-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1451	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	Why will EDF not release their plans for safety? Both on the roads and on site. Although requested, not provided. Told these questions will be answered in the application submission to IPC. Is there a problem with this section of proposals that EDF are afraid to release information?	90025-1573-248			/	
Kilve Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	At the Parish Council meeting last night the Councillors said that "There was insufficient detail provided in the publication to give an informed answer to the proposed changes".	89926-1573-72			/	
Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's	Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	- There is concern around the publication of the consultation documents before EDFE received a response from SDC on the Draft Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC). This limits the ability of EDFE to respond to feedback on the draft SOCC provided by Local Authorities.	89956-1573-965			/	
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 indicative plan for the ' Somerfield' site suggests that no alterations to the layout of the site or buildings will occur. This is considered very unlikely, particular as the text of the consultation document refers to the provision of a new access to the A38. The plan therefore provides inadequate detail of the proposals.	89956-1573-1240			/	
Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's	Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	- Only brief text is provided in the consultation documents about the proposed highways improvements, which is not supported by any technical drawings other than red line plans. This leaves stakeholders to draw their own conclusions about what might be proposed, leading to confusion and uncertainty, and a view that the consultation is inadequate.	89956-1573-1576			/	

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	<p>The IPC's Guidance Note 1 on Pre-Application Stages (March 2010) advises that:</p> <p>"The overriding intention of the legislation is to ensure that detailed matters are consulted upon and solutions or mitigation negotiated with the local community, landowners, statutory consultees and local authorities before submission of the application for development consent to the IPC." (para. 8)</p> <p>Guidance published by Communities and Local Government (CLG) entitled "Planning Act 2008: Guidance on Pre-Application Consultation" is also relevant. This states that where a promoter consults a community on changes or new options then:</p> <p>"In such circumstances promoters should supply consultees with sufficient information to enable them to fully understand the nature of the changes (but not necessarily the full suite of consultation documents)."</p> <p>Given the level of concern Local Authorities and the local community have previously expressed about the EDFE transport strategy in particular, it is the Councils view that the current consultation does not provide a sufficient or reasonable level of detail of the proposals. This leaves stakeholders to draw their own conclusions about what might be proposed, leading to confusion and uncertainty, and a view that the consultation is inadequate.</p> <p>The Councils note EDFE's commitment that the public exhibitions will be fully staffed by relevant members of the project team so that communities can understand the extent and complexity of the changes put before them. This does not, however, override the lack of information available about the highways improvements, which prevents a discussion on detailed matters.</p>	89958-1573-4398	/			
Tractivity 63086	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	(Personal information removed) has ignored the response from Somerset County Council, which states in answer to many of EDF's proposals that the information falls short of a satisfactory level.	90057-1573-1516			/	
Tractivity 63086	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	EDF have been guilty of publishing misleading information from the onset of this project and I with a fast growing number of residents feel that your publication should report the real feelings of the local population.	90057-1573-1861			/	
(Personal information removed)	Consultee with an interest in land	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	<p>1. The quality of this consultation was very poor for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The printed document was totally inadequate. I had gone to an exhibition to pick up a number of these for others but because there was nothing in it and I couldn't get answers, I just had to tell people to go and see for themselves - The text lacked detail and explanation 	90081-1573-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 824	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>Note: I have attended every meeting so far and I have never been convinced by your reps. Sorry.</p> <p>We are not against building the power station or the fact it is nuclear, etc. But the problems that will go hand in hand with this are going to have a dreadful impact on this part of Somerset that it will not recover from. Lets say 10 to 15 years build and about 10 years + for the rest. Why Hinkley Point? I think it best if we sell up and move. Any offers?</p>	9582-1575-7127			/	<p>Throughout the formal consultation stages undertaken by EDF Energy on the Hinkley Point C proposals, staffed exhibitions have formed an important part of the overall consultation strategy, providing access to information and EDF Energy representatives for local residents and visitors. (see Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report). A number of comments were received on the exhibitions themselves covering issues such as staffing, alternative meetings, and availability and content of consultation material.</p>
Tractivity 877	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 impression I had after leaving Stogursey Hall and when completeing this questionnaire is ?we ahve all the answers?. The road network from Junctions 23 and 24 are inadequate. the construction of ?C? is expected to be the biggest in Europe so why dismiss this important factor? Finally i support the building of Hinkley C and D when necessary.</p>	9635-1575-6474			/	<p>Events other than exhibitions were also held as part of the EDF Energy consultation strategy, which are detailed in Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report.</p> <p>Exhibitions were held in various locations in the vicinity of Hinkley Point C and the associated development sites at each formal stage of consultation. These were staffed throughout by a mixture of EDF Energy staff and its expertise-specific consultants, such as transport, accommodation, landscaping, and architecture. Partly as a result of feedback from Stage 1, the exhibition teams at the exhibitions for subsequent stages of consultation were widened to include an increased number of experts from different fields, taking into account the particular interests of the host area.</p>
Tractivity 885	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>EDF?s response to the Stage 1 Consultation has addressed many of the issues raised. As a resident of Cannington there is a continuing concern over traffic volume and timings on the A39 and through the village itself but, having attended the exhibition at the college on 10 July, i understand that EDF intends to continually monitor and police these issues.</p>	9643-1575-5738			/	<p>The exhibitions were attended by a range of carefully-selected EDF Energy staff with good project knowledge and people skills. Representation regularly included up to director level. A number of comments were received indicating that staff were either unavailable to speak to them at exhibitions or unable to answer specific questions. However, independent exit surveys showed that the majority of visitors to exhibitions found staff helpful, and information provided useful. Feedback from these surveys was used to ensure that subsequent exhibitions were appropriately staffed.</p>
Tractivity 886	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 stood in Angle place on Fri 16th July where there was 6-8 people from EDF and only after 20 mins did any one ask me if they could help, they were too busy talking about what they were doing tonight. Underground from Holburn. And your so called traffic advisor could not answer any question about how extra traffic could be managed.</p>	9644-1575-6598			/	<p>The content of the exhibition boards and consultation material at each stage was the same at every exhibition. Information was therefore available not only on the issues of specific interest to the host area, but on the proposals as a whole. Where significant interest was expected on certain issues, duplicate boards were provided with the relevant information to try and ensure the information was as accessible as possible. Staff were also on hand to distribute consultation documents on arrival, to explain the proposals and to answer questions. The number of</p>
Tractivity 1005	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>Next step give written information to me on * items on this questionnaire. Give us the chance to respond and make changes. I was along with this area only given one day to see your proposals. I had an appointment in Taunton at 7.30pm on 7th Sept. I work from 6.45 - 6 pm not in Bridgwater, so by the time I got home and changed in 15 minutes I rushed to see only 1 part of your information. I only had 10 minutes. Our area was treated as an afterthought even though your freight/bus park and ride is at the edge of our developement. WHY ONLY 1 DAY.</p>	9763-1575-7212			/	<p>The content of the exhibition boards and consultation material at each stage was the same at every exhibition. Information was therefore available not only on the issues of specific interest to the host area, but on the proposals as a whole. Where significant interest was expected on certain issues, duplicate boards were provided with the relevant information to try and ensure the information was as accessible as possible. Staff were also on hand to distribute consultation documents on arrival, to explain the proposals and to answer questions. The number of</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1236	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? I was very disappointed by the Cannington "exhibition" on 4 March. As this was at Cannington you should have been able to anticipate that the impact on Cannington would be of most concern, and provided additional "boards" to cover this. Wholly inadequate. Typifies the arrogance I see. This was also reinforced by your representative to whom I spoke - when a road from the M5 was mentioned he stated "We've said we will not be doing this" so much for consultation!!!	89502-1575-926			/	sets of boards was a particular lesson learned from the Stage 1 exhibitions, as high numbers attending the Cannington exhibition meant some individuals were not able to view the information in the time that they had available. The exhibitions were arranged to be as accessible as possible for people to view, and therefore took place both during the day and evenings on weekdays and throughout the day at weekends, recognising people's likely work and domestic commitments. Where individuals were unable to attend the specific exhibition that they wished to, it was always clearly advertised when and where the other exhibitions would be taking place. In addition the consultation boards were also on permanent display during the consultation period at the EDF Energy Bridgwater office and were available to view and download from the EDF Energy consultation website, along with other available consultation material. The exhibitions were held for the advertised duration and opening times were extended if required, subject to availability of the exhibition hall and staff. Where necessary, additional exhibitions were introduced midway through the consultation stage, such as at Stage 1 in Cannington, and at Stage 2 in North Petherton.
Tractivity 1250	Public	Stage 2 Update	Thanks for the polite welcome and response to questions	89516-1575-278			/	
Tractivity 1302	Public	Stage 2 Update	EDF run these presentations and none of their personnel make any notes of comments which the public make to them. Obviously it is just a formality. EDF know what they are going to do and us residents of Cannington have to put up with all the traffic because EDF will not build a bypass first. it is needed now. It also appears that Hinkley staff are told different stories to the rest of us. I think it is all lies we are being told. We are British, not French. Why should we be steamrollered.	89568-1575-661			/	
Tractivity 1327	Public	Stage 2 Update	During my visit to EDF's Consultation meeting on Friday 4 March I was given misleading information regarding the transport proposals. It was stated the construction of a 'new' road from Jc23 of the M5 at Dunball direct to the site at Hinkley Point was against Government Policy, which I now understand is incorrect.	89593-1575-1745			/	At the exhibitions for the Stage 1 and 2 consultations, summary documents were available for people to take away with them, along with data DVDs containing the full suite of consultation documents. Hard copies of the full consultation material were also available for people to read at the exhibitions. At the exhibitions for the Stage 2 Update and Junction 24 and Highways Improvements consultations, it was feasible to provide hard copies of the full consultation documents, being of a smaller size, for people to take away. All material was available at the beginning of each consultation stage.
Tractivity 1348	Public	Stage 2 Update	When holding exhibitions at Cannington it would be helpful if lay-out was better - only 2 sets of boards concentrating on village so it was very difficult to get near these while other boards were not of so much interest to locals and so were only looked at briefly. Double the local boards would have been better.	89614-1575-171			/	
Tractivity 1358	Public	Stage 2 Update	A complete lack of openness with local residents. ill informed EDF reps at all meetings.	89624-1575-571			/	The exhibitions were just one way at each stage that people could receive information on the proposals. All the consultation material was also available to download from the consultation website, could be viewed at local libraries, council offices and tourist information offices and at other consultation events such as public meetings, workshops, and focus groups (depending on the consultation stage). The detail of this is contained in Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report.
Tractivity 290	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 in favour generally of the initial proposals but regret the less than honest graphics at our recent consultation, which fail to give a realistic picture of the enormous height of the buildings in contrast to A&B. I am a great believer in transparency.	8978-1575-3659			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 360	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 would be useful to provide personnel at the open days who actually can answer questions on the documents you have provided (or have at least read it). It is most disconcerting to gear yourself up for the day only to be able to find no-one who can definitely discuss the documents and their content with you. I want to ask specific questions yet 80% of the people you field cannot answer them.</p> <p>This may be a fait accompli - you certainly give every impression that you don't care a jot for the local population - but this affects our homes and environment, an appearance of sympathy wouldn't go amiss.</p>	9048-1575-4896	/			Where EDF Energy hosted events during the formal consultation periods (excluding exhibitions), such as the Community Forum, working groups and focus groups, minutes have been produced and made available to attendees. The minutes of the Community Forum and other specific forums, are also made available on the project website.
Tractivity 390	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>we feel that certain members of EDF staff at the recent exhibition at Cannington could have been more helpful. (Personal details removed) was too busy to speak to us but we noticed that when he was approached by (Personal details removed) shortly afterwards he had plenty of time. On the other hand (Personal details removed) went out of his way to be helpful</p>	9075-1575-4020			/	
Tractivity 409	Public	Stage 1	<p>I recently attended a village meeting where you spoke about EDFs plans at Hinkley Point. I was impressed with the concern EDF showed for local communities, the local environment and for energy efficiency, all areas that the Community Council for Somerset (CCS) is concerned about. In addition, I was particularly interested to learn that EDF was</p>	9350-1575-4124			/	
Tractivity 504	Public	Stage 1	<p>Wondering if PPS had set up a Hinkley Liaison group.</p>	9371-1575-0	/			
Tractivity 62352	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>While this may not be directly within your remit, we believe that this is a factor the IPC should take on board, as intimidation is stifling democratic debate at this end. With this in mind, I can report that our Parish Council intervened on (personal details removed) (Personal details removed) behalf at a recent parish meeting to protect him from justified robust questioning! Meanwhile, EDF consultation meetings held in the village have been staffed by young and inexperienced personnel who were unable to answer questions put to them and all of this is unacceptable.</p>	10029-1575-1619	/			
Tractivity 62425	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>The village of Shorton attended yet another EDF meeting on 2/9/2010. We are all so tired of useless meetings with (Personal details removed), his patronizing manner, and never any positive answers to our queries.</p>	10062-1575-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62430	Public	Stage 2	<p>There is not enough information to make a considered response and specific questions by phone and at exhibitions have not been answered satisfactorily.</p> <p>- how, for instance, can we decide if buses down our lanes are acceptable, if we do not know how many or how big, or if we would consider a small hostel on site as acceptable, if no justification is given.</p> <p>I therefore reserve the right to make further comments when better information is available</p>	10064-1575-90			/	
Tractivity 62586	Public	Stage 2	<p>I attended the exhibition for some considerable time and spoke with a number of EDF representatives. However, despite the exhibition being in Combwich I did not come away with a true appreciation of the extent of development here.</p>	10137-1575-1077			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	<p>h) Because of the complexities, it would have been very helpful for EDF to have had a series of public meetings where groups or whole communities could have heard what others thought and posed questions to EDF representatives. I have felt very isolated and burdened by the sheer volume of information to absorb. The exhibitions and summaries only scratched the surface and were deeply unsatisfactory.</p>	89469-1575-3427		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>EDF Energy has recognised that correspondence to residents in the North Petherton area has been inadequate and letters have been sent mid August. To address this concern EDF Energy is proposing to host a further consultation event with this community.</p>	89323-1575-2219			/	
Tractivity 62872	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>You must have wondered why I didn't immediately answer your question last evening about receiving the above document. I was unsure whether we'd actually had it - and I thought you'd want to know that we hadn't, as three copies landed on the doormat today.</p> <p>That in part explains my wrath at not receiving the full document. I'm sure you will agree that coming to an exhibition 'cold' as it were, with no prior knowledge of what we were to be faced with is not acceptable.</p> <p>I also feel strongly that a meeting would have been a better way to explain your proposals to the community, even though you would have taken some 'stick'. Do you all feel that you can't face us en masse?</p>	89652-1575-0			/	
Tractivity 62906	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>My partner and I have attended nearly all of your public consultations and are glad to have done so. We gained a much better insight into the plans for this site and feel speaking about the issues with your staff very helpful.</p>	89661-1575-1328			/	

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	We have attended the public presentations set up by EDF, but were dismayed with their response to public questions. Their ability to alleviate concerns about their proposals for accommodation/ park & ride/ freight facilities in the village of Cannington were limited to their glossy brochures/ maps etc on display. This did little to alleviate the concerns of residents. EDF continuously refused to discuss/ contemplate or consider with the general public's view that a bypass from Dunball to Hinkley Point would be a viable and mutually satisfactory alternative solution for all concerned. In other words totally inadequate public consultation.	89790-1575-0			/	
4	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	Local opposition has not been to the idea of new nuclear, but to the plans of what EDF intends to do to the countryside and villages. There have been some incredibly well attended public meetings voicing dissatisfaction with the EDF proposals including one in Cannington - a fairly pro-nuclear village.	89793-1575-457			/	
8	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	With this in mind, I can report that our Parish Council intervened on (personal details removed) behalf at a recent parish meeting to protect him from justified robust questioning! Meanwhile, EDF consultation meetings held in the village have been staffed by young and inexperienced personnel who were unable to answer questions put to them and all of this is unacceptable.	89797-1575-540	/			
18	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	All this is at risk of degradation and disruption as a result of EdF's ignorance or unwillingness to take account of the quality of the immediate locality where it proposes siting its power stations. This is apparent at EdF open days, where ill informed EdF consultants show that they have not done adequate studies. The response to points made by us seems to be to warn us that the lights will go out if EdF does not get its way.	89807-1575-959			/	
Tractivity 1399	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	Having visited the consultation on Monday at Sedgmoor Auction Centre I have to say that there was no indication that EDF have any idea on how to solve the traffic problems that will arise. There was only one EDF rep dealing with traffic and highway, and he was unable to see everyone , I waited 40 mins to talk to him but could wait no longer. I hope your next consultation will have enough members of EDF staff there. A very poor effort	89974-1575-209			/	
Tractivity 1419	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	Looking back through previous papers we cannot see what your proposals are - could you advise please. Your ?transport man, (Personal information removed), was busy when we called into N. Petherton exhibition today.	89994-1575-253			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1399	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	Having visited the consultation on Monday at Sedgmoor Auction Centre I have to say that there was no indication that EDF have any idea on how to solve the traffic problems that will arise. There was only one EDF rep dealing with traffic and highway, and he was unable to see everyone , I waited 40 mins to talk to him but could wait no longer. I hope your next consultation will have enough members of EDF staff there. A very poor effort	89974-1575-209			/	
Tractivity 1419	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	Looking back through previous papers we cannot see what your proposals are - could you advise please. Your ?transport man, (Personal information removed), was busy when we called into N. Petherton exhibition today.	89994-1575-253			/	

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 have not commented on the relationship of the site to the auxiliary infrastructure development, for example park and ride sites and temporary housing, and would welcome the opportunity to review these aspects alongside the developed proposal for the main reactor site, before the planning application is submitted.	8732-1578-6563			/	The overall strategy for the Hinkley Point C (HPC) Project pre-application consultation was an iterative process of formal stages whereby the proposals have progressed to the point that EDF Energy has submitted its application for a Development Consent Order (DCO). Therefore, particularly at the beginning of the formal process but generally throughout, comments were received from consultees on a desire to see further consultation.
Parrett Internal Drainage Board	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Perhaps of greater interest to the Board are the very many associated developments that EDF is proposing off site from the main development area. Many of the park and ride facilities, freight consolidation depots or other sites will lie in or immediately adjacent to Board areas. The Board is concerned that none of these developments will contribute additional surface water loadings on to the land drainage network and that in accordance with PPS 25 the sites will seek to improve the local flood risk as part of the development. The Board requests that any outline proposals for works at these associated developments are the subject of early consultation with the Board to determine any design criteria or conditions that the Board may wish to apply to their construction. The Board operates its planning and land drainage consenting process via a series of policy documents which may be viewed on the Board's website.	8693-1578-2594			/	In the initial published Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) for the Stage 1 consultation that took place from November 2009 to January 2010 and then in the amended SOCC for the Stage 2 consultation held in July-October, a two-stage consultation process was outlined. Many comments were received at Stage 2 requesting that further consultation, sometimes termed a 'Stage 3' consultation by consultees, should take place. In order to ensure that consultation took place to reflect changes to proposals arising from further development work as part of the evolving proposals, a Stage 2 Update consultation was undertaken in February and March 2011, focusing on specific material changes to the earlier consultation proposals. Included as part of this were draft strategy documents available for consultees to inspect and comment on, although they were not formally part of the consultation material for this stage. A further consultation stage was undertaken on changes to our proposals near Junction 24 and Highway Improvements, from July to August 2011, following feedback from consultees and in response to changing market conditions.
Homes & Communities Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	- Consultation process: The developer should fully take into account the needs and views of local community. The Stage 1 consultation does include information about stakeholders who have been consulted and the issues they have raised, but does not set out a future consultation timetable. A Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) was produced in November 2009, which does include a timetable and it is hoped that further details of the ways the community are and can participate, will be included within the forthcoming Stage 2 consultation.	8694-1578-999	/			These additional focused consultations complied with the guidance provided by the Department for Communities and Local Government in September 2009 entitled 'Planning Act 2008 – Guidance on pre-application consultation', which stated: <i>"Where a proposed application changes to such a degree that the legitimacy of the consultation may be in question, promoters should supply consultees with sufficient information to enable them to fully understand the nature of the change (but not necessarily the full suite of consultation documents), and allow at least 28 days for consultees to respond."</i> Many statutory consultees have made comments
Forestry Commission	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	If you have not already done so you may wish also to consult with the Forest Authority (Forestry Commission) Mamhead Castle, Mamhead, Exeter, EX6 8HD telephone 01626 890666 as they may have some observation as the licensing and grant making body in respect of woodland grants which may apply to some of the screen planting. I hope this response is of some help.	8696-1578-558			/	
British Waterways Board	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	In addition, we would ask that we are kept informed of progress of the Hinckley Point C scheme.	8697-1578-1538	/			
Passenger Focus	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	In the meantime, we would be grateful if you would continue to consult us as you develop your Plans and we look forward to reviewing and contributing to your future plans in respect of proposed bus and rail services in the area as this project progresses.	8700-1578-4500	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	DPTAC would advise that you consult with local disability groups or access groups in the area who are more likely to be affected by your proposals and who could offer more relevant comments on issues such as this.	8701-1578-215	/			<p>throughout the consultation process that they would welcome the opportunity for further consultation on specific details. This has generally been undertaken via informal engagement and meetings between formal consultation stages described in Chapter 4 of the Consultation Report. Similar informal and ongoing engagement with the local community has also taken place, taking on board feedback received during the formal consultation stages, and additional meetings have been set up with local residents. For example, site visits to the Hinkley Point C development site were arranged for local residents, along with additional public meetings outside the formal consultation periods.</p> <p>Where additional requests for consultation or information have been made in response to the Junction 24 and Highway Improvements consultation, EDF Energy has continued to engage informally. Once the final proposals forming this DCO application are accepted by the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC), documents will be made available on the IPC's website. The DCO application has refined the proposals further, having taken into consideration the feedback from the final stage of consultation and subsequent informal engagement and recent investigative works. EDF Energy will publicise the details of the application once it has been accepted, and IPC will invite interested parties to register their interest and undertake an examination process on the proposals.</p> <p>Further engagement with specific groups was also proposed on several occasions, specifically by the local authorities in reference to 'Hard to Hear' groups. EDF Energy responded to this feedback through engagement with representative groups and through provision of consultation materials in a variety of formats, including translation of key documents into minority languages.</p> <p>Other additional engagement that took place included investigative work "drop-ins" where EDF Energy informed local residents that if they had any questions about the investigative works taking place in their area then they could visit a local hall and question EDF Energy representatives. This was an important way of keeping residents informed of progress between formal consultation stages.</p> <p>EDF Energy has continued to update local community residents and representatives, in between and following formal stages of consultation. These updates</p>
Royal Mail	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	As a consequence, Royal Mail Group Ltd wishes to register an objection to the proposed development and would appreciate being included in all future consultations on the proposals. Clearly, if Royal Mail Group Ltd can be satisfied that the impact on its operations will be acceptable then it may in the future consider withdrawing this objection, but based on the information contained within the consultation document Royal Mail Group Ltd foresees adverse impact on its operations.	8704-1578-1643	/			
Western Power Distribution	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>We have no particular comment with regard to the main site or the off site works but thought it prudent to comment on aspects of the off-site works where these are on sites with significant WPD infrastructure.</p> <p>Western Power Distribution have 33,000 Volt (33kV) overhead tower lines running over proposed sites for 'campuses' in Williton and Bridgwater. We request therefore that you consult with us in more detail once developments in proximity to these overhead lines have been decided in outline. Western Power Distribution would look to developers to fund the diversion of less strategic circuits (11 kV and LV) and would normally seek to retain the position of electricity circuits operating at 132,000 Volts (132kV) and 33kV, particularly if the diversion of such circuits placed a financial obligation on Western Power Distribution to either divert or underground them as this would then go against the requirement on Western Power Distribution to operate an economic and efficient electricity distribution system. Planning guidance and layout of developments should take this into account, with uses compatible with the retention of strategic overhead lines, for example such as parking, estate roads, commercial uses or open space, within their immediate proximity.</p>	8706-1578-0	/			
Mendip District Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	We look forward to receiving your response to these issues and further information and analysis of the potential effects of the development upon Mendip and its constituents.	8707-1578-1736	/			
Taunton Deane Borough Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	Taunton wishes to promote itself as a destination for both workers and businesses associated with the EDF development and requests that EDF keep the council informed of opportunities to do so.	8710-1578-2784			/	
Devon County Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	viii) [Question 12] Further clarity needs to be provided on the 'legacy' plan for Hinkley Point C.	8713-1578-1972	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Landowner - Wyndham Estate	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	<p>3. Engagement: In the event EDF wish to give further consideration to either or both of the sites at Williton, the Estate actively welcomes any opportunity for early engagement, positive discussion and negotiation in respect of potential leasehold agreements for relevant parcels of land, on the basis of Heads of Terms which would secure 'legacy' development, such as:</p> <p>i. Essential infrastructure - in the form of drainage, access and roadways to facilitate future, positive redevelopment of the land.</p> <p>ii. Traditional buildings - to complement the village of Williton and provide long-term rental income for the Estate in the future.</p>	8729-1578-1457			/	<p>came via the EDF Energy community newsletter, regular meetings, the consultation website and editorial and news coverage in the local media. As the consultation process has unfolded, these means of communication have helped to publicise the timetable for consultations, with new SOCCs being produced and published prior to each new stage.</p> <p>Consultations on the applications for site preparatory works and temporary jetty which have been undertaken in line with statutory requirements. Information has also been made available by EDF Energy in parallel with pre-application consultation on the DCO application. To prevent consultation fatigue, these consultations were integrated with both the Stage 1 and Stage 2 formal consultation periods. Additional elements to both these consultations took place outside of these stages.</p> <p>EDF Energy also chose, although it was not required to do so, to undertake a consultation on a voluntary Main Site Neighbourhood Support Scheme following comments received about people wanting more consultation on property price support and noise mitigation, particularly in regard to impacts in the settlements closest to the Hinkley Point C development site.</p>
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	<p>8.Sewage Capacity</p> <p>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.</p>	88820-1578-7382			/	<p>EDF Energy also chose, although it was not required to do so, to undertake a consultation on a voluntary Main Site Neighbourhood Support Scheme following comments received about people wanting more consultation on property price support and noise mitigation, particularly in regard to impacts in the settlements closest to the Hinkley Point C development site.</p>
Countryside Council for Wales	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>In summary, a number of elements of the proposals have been identified that could have an impact on the matters within CCW's remit, including disposal of spoil to off shore sites, the construction and operation of the cooling water tunnels, construction and operation of the temporary jetty, and flood defence works. We look forward to continuing to work with EDF Energy and other stakeholders to ensure these matters are correctly addressed in the EIA. Following the submission of a formal application we will continue to work with the competent authority/ies on their HRAs</p>	87810-1578-5132			/	<p>EDF Energy also chose, although it was not required to do so, to undertake a consultation on a voluntary Main Site Neighbourhood Support Scheme following comments received about people wanting more consultation on property price support and noise mitigation, particularly in regard to impacts in the settlements closest to the Hinkley Point C development site.</p>

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	<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. Separate planning applications will be submitted to the local authority (West Somerset District Council) for the preliminary works involving the Sea Wall, the terracing of the development site and the temporary jetty together with a Harbour Empowerment Order Application that will be submitted to the Department for Transport for the construction of the jetty. In all cases we would anticipate that we will be consulted by the determining authority on these proposals as statutory advisers on the setting of the Scheduled Monument and for the marine Historic Environment.</p> <p>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), English Heritage would request that further details of these works in the form of pre-application consultations should be made available as part of the Stage 1 consultation material. This is of concern given how far behind the archaeological investigations on the site are and that these findings should be fully understood before any preliminary planning application is submitted for the levelling of the site.</p> <p>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.</p>	88840-1578-4056	/			
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Within the context of substantial development projects of this type, environmental initiatives that cover the wider landscape and historic assets in the area may be sought. We would welcome the opportunity of working with yourselves and the Local Councils to achieve a positive legacy that would be beneficial to the historic environment in this part of Somerset.</p>	88840-1578-11558			/	
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>The Agency provided a high level response to the draft Travel Plan on 23rd October 2009 and requested a meeting to discuss the finer details, we are yet to receive a response from EDF, however, we anticipate that further detail to support the Travel Plan measures will be set out by EDF in future documents and we will provide detailed comments at this stage.</p>	88860-1578-8983	/			
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>The Agency welcomes the continued involvement in the pre-application discussions and seeks to maintain the established and active dialogue with the applicants, local authorities and County Council to ensure that there is a robust evidence base in place and that the options have been comprehensively tested to identify potential impact on the SRN, with mitigation agreed where appropriate. The Agency will provide more detailed comments once the evidence base becomes further developed to test the current options.</p>	88870-1578-7473			/	

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	The Agency welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Stage One Consultation and we look forward to our continued involvement as the options evolve and the evidence base is further refined.	88870-1578-8968			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	the Councils will need to review, challenge, and comment on the adequacy of how potential issues are financed, managed and dealt with promptly at no additional cost to the Council.	88890-1578-32544			/	
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.	87910-1578-624		/		
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.	87920-1578-4069	/			
Kilve Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	It is also hoped that EdF will fully engage with the Parish Council during all phases of the construction period.	88930-1578-31339	/			

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>8. Development Consent Application Documents</p> <p>The authorities request that the issues identified above and in more detail within the Technical Evaluation Report are addressed as soon as possible through dialogue with the authorities and through submission of further technical documentation prior to the commencement of the stage 2 consultation. Ultimately the authorities expect that the full justification for the proposals presented, with evidence of engagement and involvement of the local authorities in the process, will be set out in the Development Consent Order application. The authorities are concerned that the Stage 1 Report does not describe the documents that EDF intend to submit with the Development Consent Order application. We would strongly advise that in addition to the documents that will need to be submitted (to accord with the provisions of the Planning Act 2008 and any associated regulations and guidance), such as an Environmental Statement and Consultation Report, that EDF submits to the IPC the following documents:</p> <p>a) A full Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, including a transport assessment of the associated development and options that have been taken forward and rejected.</p> <p>b) A Flood Risk Assessment</p> <p>c) A Health Impact Assessment</p> <p>d) A Construction Logistics Strategy</p> <p>e) An Environmental Management Plan</p> <p>f) Economic Assessment using the Sedgemoor District Council Checklist</p> <p>g) A Procurement and Training Strategy summarised in an Employment and Skills Charter</p> <p>h) A draft of a Development Consents Obligation</p>	88080-1578-145	/			
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 Stage 1 Consultation document refers to an estimate that 35% of construction workers will be accommodated in purpose-built campuses; 27% will be accommodated in B&B/Guest Houses/Caravan Parks; 13% will live in owner occupied houses; and 25% will be accommodated in private rented accommodation. It is understood that EDF Energy have undertaken some survey work to understand the availability of these accommodation types, but this is not referred to in the consultation document. Sedgemoor DC and West Somerset Council consider that information demonstrating the feasibility of housing the numbers of workers proposed in these accommodation types should be set out in further detail in the Stage 2 consultation.</p>	88300-1578-1360	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	<p>- On completion of the underlying work to establish the magnitude of development that may or may not be required in Williton the authorities urge EDF to consider a further round of consultation , in advance of the Stage 2 consultation, where the authorities and residents can consider the site currently proposed along with any others that maybe more suitable once the quantum of development is confirmed and the transport implications of the development are better understood.</p>	88470-1578-2493	/			

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 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:</p> <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. 	88600-1578-628	/			
West Hinkley Action Group	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>A site visit between EDF/WSDC/Parish Council/Local Residents is proposed and WHAG may be in a better position to comment more fully after this.</p>	8755-1578-703	/			
Somerset Chamber of Commerce & Industry	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>- We would encourage EDF Energy to continue to satisfy local interest in the project by remaining engaged with the local community - including businesses, throughout the process.</p>	8756-1578-2003			/	
IBM (UK) Ltd	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>However, we would certainly like to engage in Stage 2 of the Consultation Programme, and we would be grateful if you would include us in that at the appropriate time.</p>	8759-1578-355	/			
Community Council for Somerset	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>As part of the support we provide to rural communities in Somerset, we work with Officers and Councillors in County, District and Parish Councils in Somerset, along with agencies such as the South West Regional Development Agency and organisations in the voluntary sector.</p> <p>We also provide specific support with parish planning.</p> <p>With this in mind, it is with surprise and concern that we have not been formally consulted by EDF regarding such a significant development as the Hinkley Point C nuclear power station development proposals.</p> <p>Furthermore, we have only recently been informed by a third party, not EDF or PPS, that Stage 1 of the consultation process officially closes on the 11th January.</p> <p>Since that is in only a few days time, it leaves the Community Council for Somerset no time to make a proper and considered response as part of that Stage of the process.</p>	8762-1578-352				

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 1	Given the significance of the planned development, and implications for health service planning for the future, our view is that it would be very valuable to meet with you directly as part of your consultation process.	8773-1578-368	/			
Tractivity 684	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	12. Any other ideas or comments? You may wish to consult Gloucester Harbour Trustees with regard to pilotage through the Bristol Channel. I am aware that (Personal details removed) has previously conducted a number of environmental impact studies for proposed dredging and excavation of areas along the channel and you may find it helpful to contact him.	9444-1578-6317			/	
Tractivity 700	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below We are looking forward to the new Power Station, but feel that local residents' views should be taken into account, as they will be the ones affected. Apart from the extra traffic in Bridgwater and on the A39, we won't really be affected, and so don't feel that we have the right to comment on many of the proposals.	9460-1578-6210			/	
Tractivity 865	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Not bad, but a few things still need to be thought out in more detail, as it has a very generalised feel about it. Roll on Stage 3!!	9623-1578-6513	/			
Tractivity 985	Public	Stage 2	A stage 3 consultation is required to answer all of our questions.	9743-1578-11383	/			
Tractivity 986	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Stage 3 Consultation is needed and on bigger sheets please. The proposals of EDF are poorly laid out and confusing and contradictory. not enough info in them to give a proper opinion. EDF do not act upon what the local people say. They say they are noting what we say and do NOTHING. It appears that they don't care about local people. I am afraid my life will soon be ruined. We especially do not want the campus at Hinkley C. very disappointed with EDF and do not trust them. The legacy of £1M promised to the whole of Somerset is pathetic. Very worried about transport strategy - it has to be properly thought through.	9744-1578-9863	/			
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.	9834-1578-573	/			

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	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!	9863-1578-1321			/	
Tractivity 1148	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? I would like to see more specific details. I wonder how much will change once the project is given the go ahead and EDF say we need to do this or that to complete the project. Any objections then, will be swept away in the interest of the project. So hard luck Burton & Shurton.	9906-1578-129	/			
Tractivity 1172	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below EDF to let residents know monthly what works will be taking place.	9930-1578-6868	/			
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.	9932-1578-7353	/			
Tractivity 1175	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 Its not a done deal, yet! Planning permission has to be obtained and also the NII have to authorise construction, after assessing the design, engineering and construction of the project proposed. A stage 3 consultation is necessary, to allow EDF to answer the many questions that remain outstanding unanswered! (NII = Nuclear Installations Inspectorate)	9933-1578-8795	/			
Tractivity 1211	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 that this has been rushed - cut corners - why no more consultation with the public after this Stage 2 Document?	9969-1578-6168	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 222	Public	Stage 1	<p>11. Any other comments?</p> <p>Do not abandon the Visitor Centre, but relocate it to a position where the public can access progress and be informed of issues as and when they arise throughout the construction phase. Such a place could be in Bridgwater or just outside the perimeter of the new site if visual observation of progress is considered valuable.</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?</p> <p>Clearly considerable thought has gone into the initial proposals and no doubt these will be elaborated and built upon during the coming months. Such an approach is invaluable in building trust and co-operation with local communities and I hope it will continue over the coming months.</p>	8924-1578-5629	/			
Tractivity 242	Public	Stage 1	Villagers to be updated very regularly on the developments. Maybe employment for very local village residents to act as reporters on site development and news.	8938-1578-4610	/			
Tractivity 242	Public	Stage 1	<p>11. Any other comments?</p> <p>Would appreciate a personal visit from management to see the impact of the new build from our home.</p>	8938-1578-5080	/			
Tractivity 256	Public	Stage 1	<p>Local people are being asked questions about what they would like to happen to facilities after construction has finished. It is surely more relevant to engage with them now to see what community benefit is available to mitigate what will be considerable inconvenience.</p> <p>I think there is a feeling people are being asked to comment on options rather than engaged on how some of those options were arrived at.</p> <p>I would like consideration given to extending the length of the proposed western by-pass for Cannington beyond the Combwich turning. The response at the</p>	9343-1578-3924			/	
Tractivity 265	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>We are working on this.</p>	8954-1578-3643			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 285	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>On a personal level I think the effect on our inadequate road systems is worrying.</p> <p>On a professional level, as (personal details redacted) at Mamsey House, I am worried about the detrimental effects worker accommodation might have on our residents, and I would be interested to see more detailed plans regarding the site.</p> <p>NB These are my personal views, NOT those of the owners of Mamsey House.</p>	8973-1578-4643	/			
Tractivity 323	Public	Stage 1	<p>11. Any other comments?</p> <p>I am not able to comment seriously on this until more details emerge and some of the questions I have asked are answered.</p>	9011-1578-5159	/			
Tractivity 323	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 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.</p>	9011-1578-5311			/	
Tractivity 352	Public	Stage 1	<p>11. Any other comments?</p> <p>Is a Blog too wild an idea?</p>	9040-1578-6015		/		
Tractivity 377	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>We have tried on numerous occasions to contact representatives from EDF via telephone and E mail and we have NEVER had a reply back to any of the messages we left. We want an EDF rep to come to our home and see for themselves the upset that your building work will cause. I do not feel that EDF have taken into consideration the feelings and comments of the people of Shurton and Burton for whom the impact is the greatest. As a company I would have expected better.</p>	9064-1578-5155	/			
Tractivity 378	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>From press reports, it appears that EDF needs to do a great deal more to compensate the inhabitants of Shurton and the other villages closest to the construction site. Their rural lifestyle (and property values) seem set to be all but destroyed for some years during the Hinkley C development and these people must be adequately compensated. Free holidays, free energy and free vehicles all come to mind, but all of these would be classed as taxable benefits in kind. EDF must act imaginatively and above all, fully CONSULT the affected communities.</p>	9346-1578-7351	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
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>	9076-1578-5835	/			
Tractivity 421	Public	Stage 1	<p>6. Please give comments on your preferences and any suggestions about the future use of these facilities.</p> <p>listen to local opinion</p>	9103-1578-2063	/			
Tractivity 428	Public	Stage 1	<p>11. Any other comments?</p> <p>Need more information about reinstatement of site if plans are abandoned</p>	9109-1578-3645	/			
Tractivity 443	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>Ask the people of cannington</p>	9122-1578-1007	/			
Tractivity 443	Public	Stage 1	<p>6. Please give comments on your preferences and any suggestions about the future use of these facilities.</p> <p>As it appears the vast majority of the Williton population are against any campus in Williton it would seem reasonable to ballot all of the residents for an accurate response, before any further proposals are made.</p>	9122-1578-2008	/			
Tractivity 444	Public	Stage 1	<p>8. What do you think of our proposals for the use of Combwich Wharf?</p> <p>Unable to open map or obtain further details.</p> <p>In principle I support the maximum use of sea transport for bulky materials, and the wharf should be retained after construction.</p>	9123-1578-4300			/	
Tractivity 461	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>Need to keep the dialogue with the local communities open & honest. Environmental impact should be kept as low as practicable, particularly where some of the more vulnerable wildlife still exists (Nightingales, Yellowhammers etc....)</p>	9138-1578-4518	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 476	Public	Stage 1	3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction? SUrly this is a matter for discussion on an ongoing basis with all the local residents involved or affected by the construction process. Bear in mind people have invested their lives and savings in homes. Any form of personal invasion of either lives or privacy is unacceptable without very substantial compensation being paid for loss of quality of life and/or the right to enjoy their home environment in relative peace. Human rights issues may also be relevant.	9152-1578-1598	/			
Tractivity 476	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? It is far too soon to judge EDF Energy's approach however the community will look forward to hearing proposals in the future. These will need to be both detailed and funded. A substantial schools rebuilding/refurbishment programme is in place which it is hoped EDF will consider especially in relation to community benefits.	9152-1578-6794	/			
Tractivity 499	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? Any other ideas or comments? I believe the decision should be left to the residents nearby, who will be most affected	9172-1578-362			/	
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? 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.	9196-1578-362	/			
Tractivity 526	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? Consult with local people at every stage at all times and listen to their ideas. We need to plan for the long term and not opt for the "quickest and cheapest" way!	9197-1578-4565	/			
Tractivity 580	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 excited by the potential impact such a development could have in the social and economic regeneration of towns such as Williton and Watchet. I would be very interested in ongoing consultation in the future.	9249-1578-5670			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 596	Public	Stage 1	3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction? Building sites are inherently dangerous but if it were possible to set up viewing point many of the local would take advantage of these and feel involved and not shut out of what is happening in their area.	9262-1578-897	/			
Tractivity 610	Public	Stage 1	7. Do you think it would benefit the local community for these park and ride facilities to continue to operate once construction is complete and, if so, on which sites? Could someone discuss the Western Bypass around Cannington with me as this has already blighted my property I think a discussion before you published this document might have been courteous and might avoided confusion.	9274-1578-2824	/			
Tractivity 670	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? Deeper consideration and further consultation needed on key issues identified.	9333-1578-4530	/			
Tractivity 671	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? Certainly not against the new station in principle but the impact on the area needs much more thought and discussion before decisions are reached. It just seems too rushed. It appears to be a must do now programme.	9334-1578-5416	/			
Tractivity 62248	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	I think that we all made our feelings clear about the previous lack of direct communication with us from EDF. Well I know that we from (Personal details removed) and our neighbours from (Personal details removed) certainly did hence your offer of this meeting tonight at their home. Saturday was a chance to vent our anger about the total lack of communication from EDF. I hope that this evening will be a chance for us to find out more about how the proposed uses for CAN B would affect our homes and our future lives. We are all living with the uncertainty that this brings. We just keep wondering "what if" and it is affecting the way that we live. We need some information so that we can see what the future may have in store for us, how the certain disruption to our lives could be minimised and allow us to return a consultation questionnaire in a more informed manner.	9369-1578-375	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62248	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	We had the advantage of being informed by a member of the community about the CAN B proposal when they received it 2 weeks ago. As I told you on Saturday, I then passed this information on to our neighbours. Informing us of the edf plans should have been the job of edf. I should not have been in the position of knocking on doors to inform the neighbours that their lives could be changed forever. I can not begin to think how we would have all reacted if the first detailed plan we saw had been on Saturday at the Village Hall. We are also concerned that we will find out about the chosen final proposals in the same way. I trust that edf will now realise that they have a duty of information to affect residential property owners not just those farmers with a few acres that you might want to use.	9369-1578-3378	/			
Tractivity 62119	Public	Stage 1	I represent a charitable trust in the Somerset area that is working very closely with the Building Schools for the Future project in Bridgwater and all the local schools. Members of senior team and our (personal details removed), (Personal details removed) would be very interested in having a discussion with you about how health and well-being, physical and sporting activities could be included in your future plans for the area and benefit the local resident population - as part of a sustainable proposition for the future.	9411-1578-221			/	
Tractivity 62227	Public	Stage 1	We start with questioning the legality of your inclusion of Williton development sites A & B and how EDF curiously came up with these locations. Site A sits within Williton Parish Council & Site B sits within Sampford Brett Parish Council. In your Consultation documents you have detailed from 2008 those bodies who you have entered into discussion with. Parish Councils from all proposed development areas were involved in your initial consultations with the EXCEPTION OF WILLITON AND SAMPFORD BRETT - Why were these Parish councils not consulted when these parishes are now- included in your future development plans?	9436-1578-100	/			
Tractivity 62245	Public	Stage 1	I appreciate that the initial deadline for your consultation has closed, and I apologise for sending in this late response. I have only just been informed on the potential impact of one aspect from your proposal on which I feel I should provide comment. I therefore hope that this response may be considered in any future consultation elements, even if it is too late for the first phase.	9440-1578-46			/	
Tractivity 62310	Public	Stage 2	25/8/10 - In favour of the development, but wants information sent to him	9999-1578-0	/			
Tractivity 62313	Public	Stage 2	At present your proposals make no attempt to help us. If you wish for co-operation from local people then it is suggested that you re-issue a stage 2a) proposal for this Parish on a very urgent basis. The proposal must incorporate at least what has been said in this note and give much more information on subjects of concern by other people who have written.	10000-1578-2326	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62415	Public	Stage 2	I have made this appraisal as a layman and with as little bias as possible (hopefully). It is now essential to get a fair assessment by means of proper discussion and consultation. This is not just a matter for Cannington but must be the concern of the greater Bridgwater area and possibly for the county.	10056-1578-2761	/			
Tractivity 62426	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	EdF should be required to go to a third stage of consultation, and to do it properly this time.	10063-1578-2484	/			
Tractivity 62437	Public	Stage 2	It will be necessary therefore to carry out a further round of consultation to consider and resolve the outstanding issues before EDF apply to the IPC for a DCO.	10069-1578-778			/	
Tractivity 62455	Public	Stage 2	(Personal details removed) asked if there would be a Stage 3 Consultation	10079-1578-3179	/			
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	We believe the second stage consultation is inadequate and should be revisited when sufficient information and reasoning is provided.	10091-1578-12710	/			
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.	10133-1578-53	/			
Tractivity 62582	Public	Stage 2	My view is that a Stage 3 Consultation is needed in the near future, in order to give the local residents a fair chance of responding to the proposals.	10133-1578-12214	/			
Tractivity 62599	Public	Stage 2	9/8/ - phoned to say received pink letter stating the size of park and ride and freight facility. Asked someone to call as not happy. (Personal details removed) phoned	10147-1578-48	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62601	Public	Stage 2	11/8/10 He has received the Stage 2 proposal and would like to talk to someone about how the new station would affect (Personal details removed) (Risks & Assurances)He did mention someone going over and giving a Technical Talk. Tel: (personal details removed) (personal details removed) tried to call - invited to stakeholder workshop	10149-1578-48	/			
Tractivity 62624	Public	Stage 2	I await your reply to my above questions and trust you will get these EDF proposals rejected by your government.	10170-1578-1254			/	
South West Strategic Health Authority	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- I would ask that this process continue as the Stage 2 Proposals are reviewed and to ensure the views of local public health practitioners and key stakeholders are included in the development of the final health impact assessment.	10182-1578-979			/	
South West Strategic Health Authority	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- Finally, I would ask that full consideration be given to the detailed submission to the Stage 2 Consultation prepared by NHS Somerset. As the local health organisation with responsibility for ensuring appropriate health care to meet the needs of the local population and with responsibility for protecting the wider public health and well being in Somerset, they are best placed to respond to the detailed considerations raised in the health impact assessment and wider stage 2 consultation planning documentation, including transport and wider social impacts of the proposed developments.	10182-1578-3898			/	
Devon & Somerset Fire & Rescue Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	In conclusion, as previously stated, DSFRS is keen to work with EDF and other service providers to ensure a successful completion of this vital national infrastructure project. However, it is of the opinion that to provide an adequate response to Stage 2, the consultation period should be either extended, or an additional consultation stage should be introduced in order to fully address the above, and other issues that may be contained within the documents.	10184-1578-4221	/			
South Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	South Somerset District Council welcomes further engagement and looks to EDF and partners to ensure that throughout the process and construction there are clearly defined channels for local input, through use of existing mechanisms, such as the Somerset Strategic Planning conference and other officer networks.	10210-1578-5784			/	
Mendip District Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	The council would be grateful if you would continue to update us and formally involve us in the consultation process.	10211-1578-1001	/			
Mendip District Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	You will also be aware that the Council has also supported the submission of a joint response from all Somerset Councils, signed by both the respective Leaders of the Councils and the Chief Executives, which will arrive with you today.	10211-1578-1499			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Taunton Deane Borough Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	<p>STAGE 2 CONSULTATION: PREFERRED PROPOSALS FOR HINKLEY POINT C NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Taunton Deane Borough Council on your preferred proposals for the Nuclear New Build at Hinkley Point, including the associated development to enable the construction and operation of the station. Whilst the proposed station and associated development proposed are within West Somerset and Sedgemoor, the impacts from a development of this scale will be felt well beyond the boundaries of these two districts alone. This Council therefore feels it is vitally important that the views of Taunton Deane Borough Council are given significant weight in the further development of these proposals.</p> <p>The proposals are less developed than expected at this stage and there is a significant body of technical work still required to finalise both the strategy for the development, accommodation for workers, transport investment, supply chain development, and mitigation.</p> <p>Whilst there is massive potential for economic benefit from the proposal, there is little evidence so far of how this can be secured in the local area. There is also likely to be considerable direct and indirect negative social, economic and environmental impacts across the County which will require mitigation. These have not been fully assessed and responded to.</p> <p>Accommodation</p> <p>Taunton Deane concurs with Sedgemoor District Council's opinion that the proposed accommodation strategy fails to manage the major impacts effectively. The accommodation requirements of the proposal will have a significant impact on the local housing market in Taunton Deane.</p> <p>The strategy identifies spare capacity in local visitor accommodation as a means of accommodating workers. Whilst there could clearly be benefit to holiday businesses from higher levels of occupancy, the proposals fail to assess the potential adverse impact to the wider visitor economy of Somerset resulting from a shortage of visitor accommodation available for tourists wishing to visit the County.</p> <p>The influx of workers will have a major impact on the local housing market, not only within Sedgemoor and West Somerset, but also in Taunton Deane, which is within the same Strategic Housing Market Area. The leisure facilities, educational offer and quality of life provided in Taunton will inevitably mean that large numbers of employees will be seeking accommodation within Taunton Deane. Assessment therefore needs to be made of the potential impact upon all housing sectors and how such impacts will be mitigated. Will there be a rise in homelessness resulting from increased demand on the private rented sector which would impact particularly upon Taunton Deane as we have the largest concentration and number of this type of property in the area?</p>	10213-1578-0	/			
Devon County Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	<p>This Authority looks forward to being consulted on the formal submission of the DCO application in due course.</p>	10217-1578-678			/	

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 2	I understand that following the question and answer session at Bridgwater House, (Personal details removed)spoke to (Personal details removed), who he has met before, (Personal details removed) and yourself, and that he had the distinct impression that our views on a Park and Ride facility in the vicinity of junction 22 of the M5 should be investigated further	10220-1578-17231			/	
Nether Stowey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	2.0 The Consultation Process 2.1 As indicated in the Introduction the Parish Council responded to the Stage 1 consultation by welcoming the proposed development, whilst acknowledging the pressures it would bring on local communities, and suggesting there was the potential for associated developments in Nether Stowey. The Parish Council is disappointed that, apart from a perfunctory acknowledgement of the response, EDF Energy has not seen fit to reply or given any detailed explanation as to why it has not pursued or may disagree with the Parish Council suggestions. This has led to members of the public querying the worth of the consultation process, typified by the comment "are they really listening".	10226-1578-5744	/			
Nether Stowey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	2.4 In the event that, in response to these continued concerns and in the light of ongoing work, EDF Energy decides to further significantly amend its proposals, the Parish Council considers it imperative that the amended proposals are published and that local communities are given an opportunity to comment on them before any formal application is submitted to the Infrastructure Planning Commission.	10226-1578-7212	/			
Somerset Councils and SNEG	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Due to these significant deficiencies and concerns with the Stage 2 consultation work the Councils consider that there is a need for further public consultation on amended or new proposals. Any further consultation should clearly set out in more detail the justification for the proposals supported by the necessary strategies, assessments and other documentation (in the form of draft application documents) which address the issues set out in the Council's full consultation responses. We believe that this approach would accord with the guidance of the IPC that states "the overriding intention of the legislation is to ensure that detailed matters are consulted upon and solutions or mitigation negotiated with the local community, landowners, statutory consultees and local authorities before submission of the application for development consent to the IPC" - paragraph 8 - IPC's guidance note 1 (Revision 1) on Pre-Application Stages - March 2010.	10240-1578-1974	/			
Somerset Councils and SNEG	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	It is the Councils view that, given the substantive nature of all of the issues raised above, the Stage 2 proposals will inevitably be subject to material changes prior to submission of the application to the IPC for DCO consent. The Councils therefore believe that additional consultation is required to ensure that local communities are adequately engaged and that the final application is fit for purpose. We propose that EDF should provide a robust strategy that addresses the need for additional consultation.	10240-1578-11813	/			

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 2	West Hinkley Action Group requests, requires, desires, demands a further stage of genuine, well-informed, wholly transparent consultation in which the company demonstrates that it is willing to work with the local community in a spirit of co-operation.	10253-1578-2661	/			
Hinkley Point Site Stakeholder Group (A+B) Sites	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	From the responses I have received it is very clear that my villages fears and thoughts we not contrary to the views of others.	10255-1578-434			/	
Stogursey and District Parish Plan Steering Committee	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	This leads the Committee to find the consultation process to date inadequate, and to demand a further and infinitely more reciprocal and responsive form of consultation.	10259-1578-5232			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	i) There has been insufficient time to fully analyse and respond to your inadequate proposals and would request that a further consultation is conducted when you have got something worth spending time on. This exercise has been premature and wasteful of people's time and effort because of the extensive flaws.	89469-1578-3831	/			
Avon and Somerset Constabulary	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	ASP has to lodge objections to a number of facets of the proposals but welcomes continuing dialogue with EDF to endeavour to resolve and reach agreement before a Development Consent application is lodged to the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) or such amended body.	89052-1578-2618			/	
South West Regional Development Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	In particular, we are keen that Hinkley Point C seeks to achieve the highest possible standards in community engagement, including involving resident and business communities in innovative, long-term initiatives with lasting benefit.	89056-1578-13235	/			
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	4.3 The Agency wishes to re-establish regular meetings with the applicant to ensure our considerations are addressed.	89174-1578-7772	/			
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	Members of Scrutiny Committee specifically outlined that they consider that a Stage 3 consultation will be required given the lack of evidence and coherent strategy presented within the Stage 2 material.	89181-1578-1597		/		
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	The scale of potential benefits is also a matter for further exploration with Councils requiring a net benefit to areas, as opposed to any national benefit.	89181-1578-4769	/			

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	Therefore, we would like urgent clarification on the next stages of the project and further details of proposals to consult on the project as a whole, and indeed, elements of the project not contained in the Stage 2 consultation material. These include proposals for training facilities, proposals for permanent housing and details on the land use and transport implications of the supply chain. It is our view that the lack of detail on these elements hinders an assessment of cumulative impact and makes it impossible for the authorities to advise on quality issues which need to be addressed prior to submission.	89181-1578-6738	/			
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	In order to plan our resource requirements we do need to understand the nature of further consultation prior to the finalisation and prior to the submission of the draft Development Consent Order to the IPC six weeks before final submission.	89181-1578-7357	/			
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	Any further consultation should clearly set out in more detail the justification for the proposals supported by the necessary strategies, assessments and other documentation (in the form of draft application documents) which address the issues set out in the Council's full consultation responses.	89181-1578-7943	/			
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	Moving forward we hope that in preparing the revised proposals the EDF team will work collaboratively with the Councils to address the advice of the local planning authorities and put some data, strategy and evidence behind revised proposals that better fit with the local policies.	89181-1578-8244	/			
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	<p>4.26 In order to achieve the objectives and work towards the visions set out above, it is considered necessary for the Council to work with its partners and EDF between now and the submission of an application to the IPC.</p> <p>4.27 Therefore, it is proposed that the Council continues to work collaboratively with EDF to resolve the evidence gaps and consider options available to develop an alternative strategy. This alternative approach fits with the Council's community leadership, planning and regulatory roles to ensure that the needs and concerns of local people are addressed in the proposals coming forward. Given the key issues and risks from the Council's assessment of EDF's Stage 2 consultation, priority will be given to accommodation, economic development, transport impacts, and mitigation. Work will be undertaken without prejudice and with embedded legal advice.</p> <p>4.28 Given the many and understandable concerns expressed by the local community, it is important that the development of an alternative strategy is undertaken with meaningful, positive and transparent consultation with the community. Therefore any amended or new proposals must involve consultation which in turn, will seek to minimize the potential for legal challenge in the longer term, will enable refinement and will ensure the highest standards of design and sustainable development are met. The recommendation at 2.2 seeks Member endorsement of the approach set out above, as well as the alternative strategy set out in Chapter 18 of Appendix A.</p>	89184-1578-2995	/			

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	<p>EQUALITY & DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS</p> <p>7.1 There are no direct impacts as a result of this report. However, as part of the wider project, EDF will need to assess the equality and diversity implications of their proposal and the Council's will need to review, challenge, and comment on the adequacy of how potential issues are financed, managed and dealt with promptly at no additional cost to the Council.</p> <p>7.2 A report on the success of EDF's engagement with 'hard to reach groups' will be presented to the Scrutiny Committee in due course, following the close of the Stage 2 consultation.</p>	89184-1578-6422			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>In order to plan our resource requirements we do need to understand if a further round of consultation is planned prior to the finalisation and prior to the submission of the draft Development Consent Order to the IPC six weeks before final submission.</p> <p>Many of our communities have found it impossible to evaluate the impacts on their homes and villages. Due to these significant deficiencies and concerns with the stage 2 consultation work the local communities and the Council consider that there is a need for further public consultation on amended or new proposals. Any further consultation should clearly set out in more detail the justification for the proposals supported by the necessary strategies, assessments and other documentation (in the form of draft application documents) which address the issues set out in the Council's full consultation responses.</p> <p>Moving forward we hope that in preparing the revised proposals the EDF team will work collaboratively with the Council to address the advice of the local planning authority and put some data, strategy and evidence behind revised proposals that better fit with the local policies.</p>	89185-1578-5430	/			
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>There is a strong feeling from local people that the consultation has not been adequate and there should be a further stage of consultation when the full detail of proposals and the total picture of the development required to implement the project is available. This should include the Development Consent Order and any parallel Town and Country Planning Act applications to fully comprehend impacts and their cumulative effect of local people, places and businesses.</p>	89186-1578-19700		/		
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>Further consultation is required to communicate changes that are made following the Stage 2 consultation, and on any new proposals. This could be via a Stage 3 process or on a themed basis for housing.</p>	89186-1578-20667	/			

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	Following the close of the consultation, it is imperative that a robust assessment is undertaken as to whether there is a need for a further process of public consultation and engagement, which could be a Stage 3 consultation. We insist EDF to do this for two key reasons. Firstly, to assess whether EDF have given the members of the community affected by the proposals the opportunity to adequately engage in the consultation process, as some proposals only appeared in Stage 2 and were not part of the Stage 1 proposal. Secondly, if material changes are proposed as a result of the further assessment work that this Authority believes is absolutely essential to ensure the Development Consent Order application is fit for purpose, this would require EDF to consult stakeholders again on these proposals before the application is submitted. For this reason we believe that a subsequent stage of consultation is imperative to ensure that the consultation element of EDF's proposals could be deemed as adequate.	89189-1578-14057	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	It is proposed that the Council responds robustly to EDF to set out our concerns, and to encourage EDF to adequately consult the community on the final proposals. It is our belief that, if properly planned and delivered, this development can have a significant transformative effect on Somerset and its economy. Accordingly, it is recommended that we continue to work constructively with EDF to address the weaknesses in their proposal, and to ensure that it is delivered in the best interests of Somerset's current and future communities.	89195-1578-1803			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	1.17. Consultation and engagement: There has been considerable concern raised by the community that a number of significant proposals have been incorporated into the Stage 2 material without inclusion in Stage 1 or any discussion with the community in the interim. Furthermore, as there is an absence of evidence to support these proposals, it has not been explained to the community why these developments are required. Given the lack of strategy and evidence it has also been difficult for the community to understand how the proposals will affect them and therefore to engage with EDF. This is particularly true of communities not in the immediate vicinity of the proposals. As a result there is considerable community demand for a further stage of consultation.	89196-1578-9563	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	1.21. Following the close of EDF's Stage 2 consultation, the developer will consider the responses received and whether, as a result of the feedback received, there is a need for a further stage of public engagement. However, we understand it is EDF's intention is to move to submitting an application to the IPC without conducting a full further stage of public consultation (ie a Stage 3). They have indicated that if required they would consider an iterative approach. EDF have stated that they intend to submit an application to the IPC in the winter of 2010/2011, although a specific submission date and subsequent timetable for the consideration of the application is yet to be determined. EDF have a significant amount of further assessment work to complete prior to any application being submitted. This further assessment work may result in material changes to the proposals as presented in the Stage 2 documentation. Any material change will result in the need to consult with those stakeholders affected.	89196-1578-12054	/			

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	1.24. On the basis of the information presented above, it is therefore recommended that EDF are encouraged to undertake further consultation to ensure that they adequately consult the community and other stakeholders on all aspects of the proposals, sharing with them the basis on which these proposals have been developed, and to provide to stakeholders a full opportunity to inform EDF's proposals so that they are fit for purpose. It is suggested, given the scale of the issues and gaps in information identified, that the County Council, together with the District Councils, works constructively with EDF to ensure that these issues are addressed.	89196-1578-14237	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The County Council is disappointed with the lack of information provided for the Stage 2 consultation on socio-economic matters and considers that a significant amount of further work is required, as explained throughout this response. The County Council, along with the Districts, would like to continue to actively engage with EDF and their socio-economic consultants to ensure all the matters raised in this response are dealt with prior to the DCO submission. It is therefore recommended that EDF should prepare a note detailing a programme of outstanding work and the process for ongoing engagement.	89206-1578-2363	/			
Bridgwater Town Council	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	There is an urgent need to press for Stage 3 or 2b consultation - especially as some authorities and agencies are only just waking up to the potential impacts. In the main we find that the Phase 2 plans are incomplete, often misplaced and very short on realistic justification.	89263-1578-2096	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	SPC believes that a further round of consultation is essential to address the large number of serious shortcomings of the present EDF Preferred Proposals noted below before the DCO application is placed before the IPC.	89288-1578-1802	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[2. 2. 13] States that a developer should consider a phased consultation consisting of two or MORE stages. This is particularly encouraged for larger projects with long development periods. As Hinkley C will be the largest construction site in the whole of the SW and possibly in GB, how can EDF justify not having a Stage 3 consultation, particularly as many of their Stage 2 proposals remain sketchy and lacking in detail?	89291-1578-1135	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[2. 2. 17] Guidance from IPC states that the SOCC should give consideration to whether there should be multiple stages of consultation. Given the rushed nature of the Stage 1 consultation and the inadequacies of many aspects of the Stage 2 consultation, will EDF now enter into a meaningful Stage 3?	89291-1578-1563	/			

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	[7.4.1] 'It is recommended that wider community engagement programmes are implemented.' Will EDF act on this recommendation, and will they say what community engagement there will be?	89293-1578-15653	/			
Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd)	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	- On the basis of the above there is clearly a need for further analysis of the site and its potential to accommodate development. Whilst discussions between Bridgwater Gateway Ltd and EDF are underway they have not been concluded satisfactorily to the extent that it has been demonstrated that all reasonable alternatives have been considered.	89434-1578-3331	/			
Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd)	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	- It is clear that potential alternatives which deliver appropriate legacy uses for the site should be explored further. In order to assist the process an alternative scheme has been prepared which demonstrates that EDF's proposals are compatible with the wider development objectives for the area. - These proposals clearly demonstrate that a more appropriate scheme can be achieved with further discussion. The opportunity exists to accommodate EDF's proposed freight consolidation requirements at the same time as providing complimentary phases of development which achieve SDC's objectives for the site. A final phase of development can be delivered once EDF have vacated the site as part of the overall EDF 'legacy'. This would represent a logical approach to development in the area. - In contrast to the EDF stage 2 consultation document masterplan, the alternative development proposals attached to these representations would achieve the safeguarding of the "Gateway Frontage", optimise the beneficial development of the whole site, maintain flexibility and the ability to respond to future demand, minimise adverse effects upon the Stockmoor Village residents and enable a more rational and cost efficient infrastructure design.	89434-1578-5357	/			
RSPB	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	As you may know, The RSPB is working in partnership with The Port of Bristol towards the delivery of the Avonmouth Deep Sea Container Terminal compensation scheme at Steart. In addition, the Environment Agency with WWT, are looking to develop a similar managed realignment scheme. We would welcome an early opportunity to discuss how we might cooperate in the development of visitor and access facilities, and potential habitat mitigation/compensation measures, with EDF Energy, West Somerset and Sedgemoor District Councils.	89457-1578-2217	/			
NHS Somerset Primary Care Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Before finalising the health action plan it would be advisable to engage further with communities to assess their views on the health impacts and to give due weight to the views of communities most affected when determining the required actions for mitigation of the affects.	89459-1578-7227	/			

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	9.3 NHS Somerset and local NHS provider organisations look forward to working closely with the local authorities and EDF to develop and agree the detail of the final health action plan, related mitigation and community benefits.	89463-1578-6812			/	
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 require an up to date and comprehensive assessment of alternative sites to justify the sites selected as presented at both Stage 1 and Stage 2. The sites should be assessed against a range of environmental, sustainability, socio-economic and planning criteria, including an assessment of the sites to delivering legacy benefits in accordance with local authority policies and strategies.	89296-1578-2951	/			
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.	89296-1578-6536	/			
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 request that the issues identified above and in more detail within the Technical Evaluation Report are addressed as soon as possible through dialogue with the authorities and through submission of further technical documentation. The authorities remain concerned that an application is expected to be made which includes elements subject to only one stage of consultation (namely at Stage 2) allowing insufficient time to acknowledge and evaluate the effects of those proposals. The authorities would urge EDF Energy to consider an additional consultation prior to submitting an application to address, in full, the significant issues raised within this consultation response. The authorities have yet to see the full justification for the proposals presented, with evidence of engagement and involvement of the local authorities in the process, and this would be expected before submission of a Development Consent Order application. Our preference is to work up a collaborative proposal that better addresses the local policy framework and local needs, as well as delivering the wider EDF Energy corporate responsibility commitments, to ensure that the final proposal is integrated into the locality for the long term.	89301-1578-5406	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Reference to the vision statements are provided in Chapter 2 of this response. It is important to note that that these vision statements were largely excluded from EDF Energy's Stage 2 consultation documents due to their timing. It is now a central challenge for EDF Energy to genuinely respond to the joint visions and turn words into action.	89302-1578-6282	/			

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	It is the view of the authorities that the Stage 2 proposals fall substantially short of achieving the ambitions set out in the vision statements. It is for this reason that the authorities are seeking to adopt a proactive approach to setting out alternative strategies that aim to meet the business needs of EDF Energy, while also aligning with the wider visions, strategies and policies for the area.	89302-1578-6629			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Therefore in accordance with the open and transparent process of consultation that is expected under the new planning system for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, the authorities recommend that EDF Energy make available the database and specific Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultation responses.	89319-1578-6287	/			
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 welcome EDF's additional measures to engage these groups and would welcome clarification from EDF energy in their post consultation feedback on how the views raised in particular by women and young people have influenced the nature of the proposals, in particular in relation to the associated development.	89320-1578-1281	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	August 2010 Update: Exhibiting at the Disability Somerset exhibition on 17 September 2010 Authorities' comments September 2010 As this event was cancelled, alternative options for engagement will be necessary and further engagement with FEDS and with CCF is strongly recommended	89320-1578-4633	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Consultees are keen to understand how they will be kept up to date on changes and the final proposal following completion of Stage 2. Whilst information in the SOCC is provided noting that a new newsletter will be published alongside a Stage 2 Consultation Report, this message has not been communicated as widely as it might have been; Many residents have asked if there will be a Stage 3 consultation round so that communities can comment on further changes;	89323-1578-3973	/			

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 relation to the shortcomings of information provided, these concerns have been picked up by the technical teams reviewing all of the EDF Stage 2 materials. However, regarding inconsistency of correspondence (both direct to residential and business properties) and leafleting to properties in the wider areas, the authorities are particularly concerned that the full extent of engagement has been inadequate.</p> <p>The authorities would therefore request a full schedule of postcode information on what households and businesses have been contacted and how, including details of dates. This should include clarification on what type of correspondence has been sent and copies of standard letters circulated. The authorities would prefer if this information is also mapped for ease of reference.</p> <p>It is believed that this is an essential task to enable the authorities to check whether all households and businesses that will potentially be affected have been contacted.</p> <p>Further to this issue, the authorities have concerns that as a consequence of growing objections in the North Petherton area, there is a possibility that the overall profile of the development and objectors will increase with potentially serious implications for EDF Energy and the authorities.</p>	89323-1578-5891	/			
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 December 2009:</p> <p>The authorities would also encourage EDF Energy to detail options at the earliest opportunity and that when documenting preferred options at the Stage 2 consultation no 'new' options should be incorporated.</p> <p>Update September 2010:</p> <p>A number of major new elements of the project have emerged through Stage 2 raising particular concerns amongst local communities affected, for example at Junction 24 and Comwich.</p> <p>Update September 2010</p> <p>The authorities believe that on the basis of this new additional information, further consultation will be necessary</p>	89325-1578-6084	/			
Tractivity 62992	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>Question 6</p> <p>I am pleased to see your proposal to return fish to the sea - I trust alive and unharmed? Can you say more on this point in your next documents?</p>	89691-1578-662	/			
Tractivity 62992	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>Question 7</p> <p>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?</p>	89691-1578-824	/			

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	We would like to take this opportunity to welcome continued liaison on the scope and content of the relevant documentation for these development proposals. All of which should be completed and agreed with us prior to your submission to the IPC.	89711-1578-6139	/			
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	We note your intentions to acquire or use Environment Agency land at Bridgwater Bay and at Combwich Wharf. Your letter refers to continuing discussions in relation to the potential acquisition of our land. However, the Environment Agency was not consulted formally as landowner as part of the original Stage 2 consultation. In addition, our agents have not been approached either in respect of the land required for the Cooling Water Tunnels, the Fish Recovery and Return System and Associated Infrastructure, and the land at Combwich Wharf. Furthermore, the Consultation documents do not provide detailed and accurate plans of the precise boundaries of the land required from us so do not allow us to provide a meaningful response. Our agents have now requested this information directly from EDF's agents, Savills, on 14 March but have received no response to date.	89711-1578-6696	/			
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	As landowner, the Environment Agency welcomes the opening of negotiations at the earliest opportunity so that further applications for compulsory purchase can be avoided. We note that your letter states that EDF is committed to acquiring interests in all land through private agreement but, at the moment, this commitment is not apparent to us. The Environment Agency will respond separately in its capacity as statutory consultee on remediation, flood and coastal erosion issues and the Fish Recovery and Return System.	89711-1578-7780			/	
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	Thank you for your letter dated 1 April regarding your interest in acquiring or using Environment Agency land at Combwich and to the west of Dunball Roundabout, near Junction 23 of the M5, Bridgwater. This letter is our response to you in our capacity as landowner. We can confirm that we are also committed to seeking agreement with you on terms for the acquisition of interests in our land, to avoid the need for compulsory purchase. We would be grateful, therefore, if you could supply final plans showing the full extent of our land that you are proposing to acquire or use. That will enable meaningful progress to be made with the terms of the proposed transactions and instructions given to our professional advisers. Further to our Consultation Response of 25 March, we also await your detailed proposals and plans to acquire or use our land for the construction of Sea Defences, for Cooling Water Tunnels and for a Fish Recovery and Return System and Associated Infrastructure.	89711-1578-8481			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
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 Vincent de Rivas 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>	89734-1578-156			/	
West Somerset County Council	Local authority	Stage 2 Update	We certainly acknowledge the effort that your team has been making to ensure progress on a whole range of fronts and feel that with a final, joint push we could enter into the IPC examination with a very limited number of issues between us.	89734-1578-8337			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	It is the Council's view that, when measured against the PPA vision and objectives significant concerns remain about the proposals and a further commitment is required to translate rhetoric into tangible action. Nevertheless, we acknowledge the effort that your team has been making to ensure progress on a whole range of fronts and feel that with a final, joint push we could enter into the IPC examination with a very limited number of issues between us.	89735-1578-13150			/	
Holford Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Holford Parish Council urges EDF Energy to address the issues outlined above and refine further its proposals before application for consent is made.	89750-1578-2364	/			
NHS Somerset	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>Community Fund</p> <p>We note the proposed increase in the overall Community Fund, and would welcome further information on the comparability of this with similar projects elsewhere. In terms of beneficiaries, we recognise that discussion of the detail is ongoing, and are keen to work with yourselves and our local authority colleagues to ensure that key health projects are considered appropriately.</p>	89773-1578-3811			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
David Wilson Homes	Consultee with an interest in land at Stage 1	Stage 2 Update	3.9 DWH would welcome the opportunity to discuss their proposals with EDF to assess the potential of the Cattle Market site and wider area to contribute to the development proposals.	89778-1578-7129			/	
8	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	5) In our opinion, there should be a properly conducted PUBLIC INQUIRY.	89797-1578-1975			/	
19	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	EdF should be required to go to a third stage of consultation, and to do it properly this time.	89808-1578-2569		/		
23	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	My family did not choose to live in an industrial estate - why do EDF have the power to change the lifestyle people have chosen and have worked so hard to achieve! We would welcome a visit from Parliament to enable you to see how lovely our village is and to highlight how detrimental EDF's plans will be for the are.	89812-1578-1535			/	
Highways Agency	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.6 The document does not address the Agency's comments made during the Stage 2 Consultation process and indeed the vast majority of these comments are still outstanding. The Agency requests that EDF Energy respond to all the issues raised by the Agency in the previous consultation process along with the comments made herein.	89837-1578-4486			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	39. Together with West Somerset Council and Sedgemoor District Council, the County Council will continue to work in an 'impartial, cooperative and constructive' way with EDF to address the fundamental issues identified in this letter. We acknowledge that there is considerable work underway to assess the impacts of the proposals and to ensure that they are mitigated effectively. This is not only in the interests of the community of Somerset but to ensure that EDF is able to construct the power station in a timely and efficient manner.	89844-1578-18263			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	1.33 The County Council formally requests that detailed scaled drawings (1:500 scale) of all Associated Developments and proposed highway works be provided, in order for the County Council to fully comment on the suitability of design.	89846-1578-206	/			

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	1.67 We request all County Council comments that have been provided during the HPC consultation process and scope of work set out in the Transport Proposal to be responded to prior to the DCO submission.	89846-1578-14255	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	3.4 Many of our concerns raised in response to EDF's Stage 2 consultation remain unresolved. We believe that further consultation is still necessary before the DCO application is placed before the IPC.	89871-1578-16659	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.2.6 [5.1.1] Again EDF do not actually lay out their justification for campuses, nor their size.	89872-1578-8258			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.2.7 [5.2.1] Comparison with Sizewell B is irrelevant, as the campus was far further away from any local residents than is planned at HPC.	89872-1578-8359			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	3.2 The documents are noted as being drafts, and the comments provided can therefore be incorporated into the final version. 3.3 A number of items require further information to be provided by EDF, and SPC will be pleased to receive these before the next versions of the documents are made available.	89872-1578-20489			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	Community Engagement The Councils support the positive statement within the document confirming that the EDFE "communication teams in Bridgwater will engage with the local community throughout the project, and will be available for the community to contact should they have any questions in relation to the project". Nevertheless the Council have a number of concerns with the community engagement undertaken by EDFE to date. A significant shift in approach and methods of engagement will be required to ensure that future engagement initiatives are more responsive and sensitive to local community issues and that EDF play a more proactive role in the re-investment and regeneration of Bridgwater, raising the ambitions of the community and improving the quality of life for local people.	89874-1578-12022	/			
RSPB	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	We are increasingly worried at the lack of dialogue with you over these critical issues. We have sought and you have now agreed to a meeting next Tuesday 29th March between the RSPB and your consultants Atkins. We remain unsure whether a senior EDF staff member will be present, although we believe this would be very helpful. We have set out a series of specific issues which we would like to discuss with EDF and hope this meeting will provide a good basis for closer dialogue with EDF about the issues of greatest concern to the RSPB.	89898-1578-699			/	

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 Update	We are conscious of EDF's intention to submit a proposal to the IPC this year. We are equally conscious of the limited amount of time this leaves to negotiate outstanding issues with us. Please understand, the RSPB seeks to work positively with EDF and its consultants to resolve all outstanding issues. However, the lack of engagement from EDF following the RSPB's consultation responses has delayed resolution of this complex situation.	89898-1578-1240			/	
Royal Mail Group	Statutory Consultee	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	<p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although EDF is making progress with developing its proposed package of mitigation measures, the "Proposed Changes to the Preferred Proposals including M5 Junction 24 and highway improvements in the Bridgwater area" set out in the July 2011 consultation document do not change Royal Mail's position as set out in its Stage 2 Consultation response and accordingly this latest consultation response re-affirms Royal Mail's objection. - This consultation response sets out the information and actions that Royal Mail requires in order for it to consider lifting its objection. -- It is understood that it remains EDF's intention to submit the IPC application in quarter three of 2011. If Royal Mail's objection has not been satisfactorily addressed by the IPC application submission date, then Royal Mail will maintain its objection during the IPC determination period. 	89928-1578-6141			/	
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 Councils are prepared to work with EDFE and the County Council to understand the planning history and local issues at various locations to inform design and deliverability considerations.	89956-1578-10171			/	
Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's	Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	- We wish to highlight that we cannot yet comment on whether this list of junctions is adequate and represents a comprehensive transport package of investment for Bridgwater and its surrounds, until the evidence base is completed and provided to the Councils. Given the lack of evidence presented to date, and lack of testing of alternatives including a Bridgwater bypass, it is questionable as to whether this consultation can be sufficient to inform proposals to the IPC and whether further consultation will be required prior to or indeed during the IPC processes.	89956-1578-16586			/	
Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's	Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	- Further consultation on transport proposals should be supported by appropriate information, such as Travel Plans, Freight Management Strategy, details of Construction Worker Hours and timing of transport activity at associated developments sites, and Preliminary Environmental Information.	89958-1578-13709		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Miller Turner Investments	Consultee with an interest in land	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	It is noted that the purpose of this consultation stage is to seek comments before EDF's application is submitted to the IPC. However, it is assumed that further consultation information will be provided by EDF beforehand as the current information lacks sufficient detail to enable a full appraisal of the proposals. This is particularly the case with regard to the proposals at Junction 24	89948-1578-894		/		
Puriton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	In all of these issues the Parish Council strongly requests that they be continually consulted in all such matters that affect both its environs and its residents with regards to future infrastructure improvements and mitigation proposals. The Parish Council in return fully commits itself to attend any meetings and consultations that will assist EDF and other agencies in reaching suitable working solutions to the problems that the village will face during all the various stages of the proposed development.	90108-1578-1986			/	
Royal Mail Group	Statutory Consultee	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	<p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although EDF is making progress with developing its proposed package of mitigation measures, the "Proposed Changes to the Preferred Proposals including M5 Junction 24 and highway improvements in the Bridgwater area" set out in the July 2011 consultation document do not change Royal Mail's position as set out in its Stage 2 Consultation response and accordingly this latest consultation response re-affirms Royal Mail's objection. - This consultation response sets out the information and actions that Royal Mail requires in order for it to consider lifting its objection. -- It is understood that it remains EDF's intention to submit the IPC application in quarter three of 2011. If Royal Mail's objection has not been satisfactorily addressed by the IPC application submission date, then Royal Mail will maintain its objection during the IPC determination period. 	89928-1578-6141			/	
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 Councils are prepared to work with EDFE and the County Council to understand the planning history and local issues at various locations to inform design and deliverability considerations.	89956-1578-10171			/	
Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's	Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	- We wish to highlight that we cannot yet comment on whether this list of junctions is adequate and represents a comprehensive transport package of investment for Bridgwater and its surrounds, until the evidence base is completed and provided to the Councils. Given the lack of evidence presented to date, and lack of testing of alternatives including a Bridgwater bypass, it is questionable as to whether this consultation can be sufficient to inform proposals to the IPC and whether further consultation will be required prior to or indeed during the IPC processes.	89956-1578-16586			/	

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	- Further consultation on transport proposals should be supported by appropriate information, such as Travel Plans, Freight Management Strategy, details of Construction Worker Hours and timing of transport activity at associated developments sites, and Preliminary Environmental Information.	89958-1578-13709		/		
Miller Turner Investments	Consultee with an interest in land	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	It is noted that the purpose of this consultation stage is to seek comments before EDF's application is submitted to the IPC. However, it is assumed that further consultation information will be provided by EDF beforehand as the current information lacks sufficient detail to enable a full appraisal of the proposals. This is particularly the case with regard to the proposals at Junction 24	89948-1578-894		/		
Puriton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	In all of these issues the Parish Council strongly requests that they be continually consulted in all such matters that affect both its environs and its residents with regards to future infrastructure improvements and mitigation proposals. The Parish Council in return fully commits itself to attend any meetings and consultations that will assist EDF and other agencies in reaching suitable working solutions to the problems that the village will face during all the various stages of the proposed development.	90108-1578-1986			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Taunton Deane Borough Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	Taunton Deane welcomes the opportunities that the proposed development at Hinkley Point will bring to Somerset and wishes to be involved in all discussions on business and community involvement over the coming period. We have discussed the consultation paper with our members and we would like to make the following comments:	8710-1577-131			/	The approach to consultation taken by EDF Energy has consisted of a multi-layered and multi-stage process designed to provide information in an accessible manner and encourage participation across all types of consultees. A large number of comments on the consultation process were made during the consultation stages, focusing mainly on the formal consultation process described in Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report .
Nether Stowey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	2.9 With Cannington, Nether Stowey is one of the largest rural communities within the hinterland of Hinkley Point. The Parish Council is of the view that the potential new nuclear build at Hinkley Point will have an impact on the village and has opened discussions with EDF Energy regarding how the village can benefit from that development.	8717-1577-23297			/	Comments were spread across a wide range of issue areas. These included: the general consultation strategy; the zones of community consultation; the types, frequency and content of meetings; timings of the consultation periods; the informal engagement; the communication techniques and response mechanisms; the process of feedback following consultation periods; and consultation fatigue. Many responses from local residents expressed frustration that EDF Energy did not appear to be as responsive to comments as they would have liked.
Wembdon Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>1.1 In November 2009 EDF Energy published their Initial Proposals and Options with regard to the proposed development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point (Hinkley Point C). On 9 February 2009 representatives of EDF Energy made a presentation to a regular meeting of the Wembdon Parish Council.</p> <p>1.2 Members of the Parish Council also attended the consultation event in Bridgwater hosted by EDF Energy. Parish Council representatives have also held various discussions with neighbouring Parish Councils in Sedgemoor and West Somerset.</p> <p>1.3 The Parish Council's response takes into account information gained through the various meetings and documents outlined above and the verbal and written comments made by residents of the Parish both at the Parish Council meetings and sent to the Parish Clerk.</p> <p>1.4 Wembdon has a long standing and positive connection with the Hinkley Point power stations and the Parish Council considers and welcomes the proposed development of Hinkley Point C as a significant and positive investment in the area.</p>	8724-1577-355			/	<p>Consultation Strategy and Scope</p> <p>Developers of large infrastructure projects are required by the Planning Act 2008 (the Act) to publish in a local newspaper a Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC) that sets out how they plan to consult people living in the vicinity about their proposals (s47(1) of the Act). This follows consultation on the SOCC itself with relevant local authorities which, in the case of Hinkley Point C, are Somerset County Council, West Somerset and Sedgemoor district councils.</p>
Countryside Council for Wales	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	We are aware that the authorisation process required for the proposed power station and associated works is complex and has yet to be finally resolved. This has resulted in uncertainty as to the identity and number of 'competent authorities' that could be involved. We welcome the approach taken by EDF Energy to date, in particular the creation of the various liaison groups to advise on both the authorisation process and the issues that need to be addressed in the EIA. We welcome the commitment to providing information in the EIA to allow the impacts identified to be fully assessed. We also welcome the commitment to provide details on both the construction and operation phases, together with details of possible conditions or restrictions to attach to any authorisation(s), to ensure adverse impacts on the European sites are avoided.	87810-1577-3605			/	EDF Energy produced a new SOCC for each stage of formal consultation. The evolving nature of the proposals has meant that the consultation process itself has developed, resulting in the need to revise the SOCCs. At the Stage 1 consultation that ran from November 2009 to January 2010, detailed information on the consultation strategy was included in the published SOCC. However, following this stage and after the publication of the Infrastructure Planning Commission's (IPC) Guidance Note 1 in March 2010, the later SOCCs were more concise documents, which were supported by consultation strategies published on the EDF Energy consultation website

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 strongly advise that EDF consider the benefits of concentrating facilities within a smaller number of sites, possibly within or on the edge of Bridgwater rather than dispersing construction activity over a wider area. Such an approach may be more sustainable and could result in reducing adverse impacts on places identified as having a high instance of historic interest such as Cannington. We would also encourage EDF to detail options at the earliest opportunity. We would expect the results of the workshops to feed directly into this process in a transparent and robust way.	88840-1577-9895	/			and available in hard copy at EDF Energy's Bridgwater office. The individual SOCCs and local authority consultations on them are described in Chapter 1 of the Consultation Report . The Act also requires developers to consult with prescribed organisations and relevant local authorities, habitually termed 'statutory consultees'. Some consultees requested that it be made clear who has been consulted under this overarching description. A list of all such consultees is appended to the Consultation Report, whilst Chapter 2 provides details of the consultation activities.
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	8 CONSULTATION IMPLICATIONS 8.1. The responsibility of consulting both statutory consultees and the general public rests with the developers under the new Planning Act (in this case EDF and National Grid). Both developers have submitted a Statement of Community Consultation document to the IPC detailing how they will go about this process. However, given the significance of the proposals on our community it is right and proper for the Council to supplement that process and supports its community through this new and challenging process. Various pieces of work are underway to do this and ultimately the Council will report on the adequacy of the developer's consultation within its Local Impact Report.	88800-1577-0			/	No comments have been received about the consultation process undertaken with the general public, but for clarity the Act also requires developers to make the general public (as distinct from the local community) aware of the proposals through notices in publications (known as section 48 notices), which EDF Energy has complied with. Details of this consultation are described in Chapter 2 of this report. One consultee, in response to the Junction 24 and Highway Improvements consultation, commented that EDF Energy only advertised in The Times newspaper. This is not the case, as all section 48 notices advertising the consultation stages appeared in a range of local, national and trade press. The consultation strategies described in the SOCCs covered the consultation zones for local community consultation, which were made up of an inner, middle and outer zone (see Chapter 1). Following feedback at Stage 1, the inner zone was amended to include a half mile radius around all of the associated development sites. The local authorities commented that the zones should be amended to include those living near transport routes. EDF Energy believes that residents in these areas, though not living in the vicinity of the proposed developments themselves, were already adequately covered through the previously agreed consultation zones and therefore there was no need to amend the zones any further.
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.	88890-1577-27931			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	8.1 There are no direct impacts as a result of this report. However, as part of the wider project, EDF will need to assess the community safety implications of their proposal and the Councils will need to review, challenge, and comment on the adequacy of how potential issues are financed, managed and dealt with promptly at no additional cost to the Council.	88890-1577-32363			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	12.1 The report sets out the issues relating to the national policy statements relating to nuclear energy and the emerging details proposed by EDF in their current first stage consultation. 12.2 There are significant concerns relating to both processes and the related documentation.	88900-1577-3040			/	Some feedback received during the formal consultation stages and the consultations with the local authorities about the SOCCs stressed the need to consult 'Hard-to-Hear' groups, such as young people, the economically disadvantaged and the

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	Stage 1 not in line with local opinion.	88900-1577-7147			/	disabled and elderly. As a result of this feedback, EDF Energy expanded its strategy and committed to specific actions designed to bring Hard-to-Hear groups more into the consultation. These included home visits on request to those with mobility issues, presentations and workshops with local schools and undertaking focus groups with specific groups such as the unemployed. The Community Forum described later in this response also had its membership widened to welcome a range of groups at the suggestion of the local authorities, such as local faith groups. For the two update consultations, namely Stage 2 Update and Junction 24 and Highway Improvements, the general arrangements for Hard-to-Hear group involvement were continued although no dedicated meetings were arranged at this time.
Kilve Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Appropriate mitigation to offset negative impacts will require a great deal more consideration. It should be down to the local people affected by this development to decide what mitigation projects should be considered, not have others assume they know what's good for them, and end up foisting unwanted legacies upon them.	88930-1577-7413			/	EDF Energy has treated the comments of all consultees in a fair and transparent manner. Some comments have been received expressing concern at whether consultees with vested interests (whether that of a local authority, landowner or others) will have had a stronger influence on the proposals to the detriment of other consultees trying to make their views heard. EDF Energy has aimed to be open and transparent in reflecting which comments are made by what type of consultee in this report. In addition, the quantitative analysis undertaken in Chapter 3 of this report demonstrates the views of individuals responding to the consultation stages analysed by their general geographical location. Lastly, Chapter 4 of this report, as mentioned below, clearly illustrates the more informal engagement that has been undertaken and with whom.
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	Comments on Consultation to Date A number of Socio Economic Stakeholder Workshops are referenced in the text during the course of developing the baseline analysis. Somerset Nuclear Energy Group of local authorities and key agencies are also referenced although there are limited descriptions of the effect that this consultation has had on the approach to the Stage 1 Consultation document.	88260-1577-1531	/			Some consultees have felt that EDF Energy has tried to split opinions within local communities. As the consultations have proved, the reality is that there are differing views across communities on the proposals and this is often reflective of where a person lives. No attempt has been made to make communities disagree with one another and all views have been considered.
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 to the above issues the results from the community consultation in terms of aspirations for community social investment should be presented in full.	88490-1577-4162	/			<u>Consultation Timings</u> The timings of the consultation stages also came under scrutiny. The process of the consultation was based on the requirements set by the Act and the consequent published guidance. As such, the consultation was arranged in a series of iterative stages where the proposals evolved from early options through to final proposals and then to some specific amendments. Overall, the consultation period - from initial informal discussions and exhibitions in the
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 not clear as to the extent of dialogue with partners and communities if the "package of facilities which the local community can enjoy has been taken forward into an action plan or the basis of an agreement. This should be investigated further.	88490-1577-5066			/	
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 a need for EDF to demonstrate how Bridgwater College will work alongside community development organisations and organisations such as Homes in Sedgemoor, to effectively reach certain difficult to reach target groups especially at a neighbourhood level and amongst sub groups of the economically inactive. The engagement strategy should be detailed in this section (cross referenced with paragraph 7.2.5) identifying the Logistics Academy, the Taunton based Construction Skills Academy and the Somerset University projects. It is recommended that these references be consolidated in 7.1.11.	88520-1577-3488	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Community Council for Somerset	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>As part of the support we provide to rural communities in Somerset, we work with Officers and Councillors in County, District and Parish Councils in Somerset, along with agencies such as the South West Regional Development Agency and organisations in the voluntary sector.</p> <p>We also provide specific support with parish planning.</p> <p>With this in mind, it is with surprise and concern that we have not been formally consulted by EDF regarding such a significant development as the Hinkley Point C nuclear power station development proposals.</p> <p>Furthermore, we have only recently been informed by a third party, not EDF or PPS, that Stage 1 of the consultation process officially closes on the 11th January.</p> <p>Since that is in only a few days time, it leaves the Community Council for Somerset no time to make a proper and considered response as part of that Stage of the process.</p>	8762-1577-352			/	<p>autumn of 2008 to submission of the application for a Development Consent Order (DCO) - has totalled three years. Throughout this period, timings have been provided to consultees on EDF Energy's proposed consultation activities.</p> <p>Some consultees commented, particularly at Stage 1, that they felt either that there should have been more consultation prior to Stage 1, or alternatively that there was too little information available and would have preferred more detail rather than less. Through having an iterative process of consultation, as recommended by guidance, EDF Energy feels that these concerns have been addressed as much as possible. EDF Energy also believes that a balance of consulting early enough for consultees to be able to influence the consultation, but late enough for there to be enough detail to comment on, has been achieved.</p>
Bridgwater Education Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>The Trust has a value and outcomes to engage with the community at large. The Trust would be interested to know more about what support EDF will provide for community facilities. The Trust would wish to work together with EDF on consultation and assist in identifying provision.</p>	8772-1577-1379			/	<p>The required minimum time period for a consultation by the Act is 28 days. Stages 1 and 2 exceeded this minimum, with Stage 1 taking place over six weeks, and Stage 2 over three months. The focused consultations of Stage 2 Update and M5 Junction 24 and Highway Improvements did not contain the same level of detailed consultation documents and therefore took place over shorter periods, but were compliant with statutory minimum requirements. All of the above is considered in keeping with guidance.</p>
Tractivity 685	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 believe EDF have steam rolled the local public and have used subterfuge and bluff to get their own way in the development of this site. Ask the French engineers what they thought of the reaction of the general public when they visited the local area.</p> <p>This area is a wonderfully beautiful place that EDF intend to destroy for ever. I am in constant contact with members of the public that live in this area and have heard their fears and concerns repeatedly.</p>	9445-1577-6255			/	<p>Due to the timings of the project, it was necessary to hold the Stage 2 consultation over the summer holiday period, which some consultees remarked upon. A longer period for this consultation was allowed, recognising that many people take a holiday over the summer period.</p>
Tractivity 714	Public	Stage 2	<p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>A build of this size (biggest in W. Europe?) does not need to be rushed - that is when mistakes happen. Take your time to get it right</p>	9472-1577-1283			/	<p>Although set timings were given for the formal periods of consultation, EDF Energy did not reject responses received after the closing date. For the Junction 24 and Highway Improvements consultation from July to August 2011 it was necessary, due to the timing of the consultation, to have a strict cut-off point for representing the responses in this report. However, all responses have been appropriately considered prior to the submission of the DCO application (see Chapter 5).</p>
Tractivity 726	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>So far my thoughts on the initial consultation have shown up on second consultation.</p> <p>Obviously we residents will suffer inconveniences of some sort but all must realise Hinkley is a necessity.</p> <p>Windfarms are too intrusive in all ways.</p>	9484-1577-6619			/	<p>Some requests were made by the local authorities and others to extend the end date of the Stage 2 Update and Junction 24 and Highway Improvements consultation stages. Both stages took place over a</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
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.	9508-1577-8178			/	28-day period, although for Junction 24 and Highway Improvements this was staggered with statutory consultees being consulted at an earlier stage, with the local community consultation officially beginning a few days later to allow sufficient time for the consultation on the SOCC. The proposals were, however, advertised and made informally available to the local community at the same time as statutory consultees, meaning that ultimately local community consultees received an extended period of time to respond. It is felt that, given the focused nature of these consultation stages, 28 days was sufficient time for consultees to respond.
Tractivity 755	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Communication has been terrible. Move it all to hinkley - don?t take away our countryside, don?t take away my children?s childhood as they know and enjoy it!!!	9513-1577-7365			/	Sedgemoor District and West Somerset councils commented that their overall time to respond to the Junction 24 and Highway Improvements consultation was just 13 days. However, they were mistakenly basing this on the time period between the start of the formal local community consultation (15 July 2011) and the end of the statutory consultee consultation (28 July 2011). The actual period of consultation for statutory consultees started on 1 July 2011 and ended on 28 July 2011, a period of 28 days, which was explained to consultees. Details of the response EDF Energy sent to the local authorities can be seen in Chapter 1 of this report. EDF Energy nevertheless accepted the late response received from the councils, thereby remaining consistent with the flexible approach taken with all late responses.
Tractivity 767	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Tread gently, we are not anti-nuclear but we - local farmers, residents, tourists - were here first. Respect our views	9525-1577-6992			/	<u>Consultation Events</u>
Tractivity 772	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 Ill thought out . No consideration for local residents.	9530-1577-6266			/	The formal consultation events have been a combination of exhibitions, public meetings, focus groups and workshops. No one type of consultation event was considered the sole route for engaging with consultees. The exhibitions took place in a range of locations throughout the consultation zones at every stage. One particular issue raised was that some people felt there were too many meetings that were not specific enough to local issues. At every event EDF Energy was conscious of the area in which it was held, and the concerns of people within that particular have taken precedence when considering appropriate staffing for the events. For example, where events were held with Stogursey Parish Council, discussions would tend to focus on issues such as the proposed on-site campus and the area of construction land. In contrast, in Cannington discussion would generally be around traffic and the proposals for the Cannington bypass and in the early stages, about the proposed campus.
Tractivity 774	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below No doubt whatever opinions are voiced on here, they will probably be ignored since the might of the proposed development will outweigh any local concerns.	9532-1577-6053			/	Concern was expressed by some respondents about
Tractivity 778	Public	Stage 2	4. Any other ideas or comments? whilst you have sought to appease those who have voiced objections you have not in reality had any dialogue with those who are supporting you, especially in terms of accommodation etc.	9536-1577-1589	/			
Tractivity 799	Public	Stage 2	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.	9557-1577-9082			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 808	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below yOU FAILED MISERABLY in notifying the residents of stockmoor park early enough of you diabolical proposals, at the recent council meeting the councillors agreed this not just the residents. all your proposals do not take into consideration of the effect they will have on the everyday lives of ordinary people, you have and will ride roughshod over us.	9566-1577-7752			/	the amount of notice given prior to events. EDF Energy took a multi-layered approach to letting people know about these events, using the tools mentioned in the Consultation Communications subheading below. Press releases were also sent to the local media to advertise dates of events. Additionally, advertisements were published in the press to encourage attendance, plus on occasion posters were distributed around specific areas.
Tractivity 822	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Like many people I moved to Cannington to enjoy village life and this will be ruined if EDF? present plans are carried out. you do not seem to be listening to the villagers at all in any of the villages involved.	9580-1577-6123			/	A key regular event held by EDF Energy was the Community Forum, which was set up in September 2009. Following feedback on the need for some more specific forums, two further sub-forums were created in 2011, one on transport and the other on main site issues. These meetings provided consultees and stakeholders with the opportunity to focus specifically on issues surrounding the Hinkley Point C proposals, as opposed to the existing nuclear forum, the Hinkley Site Stakeholder Group. The forums will continue to operate as long as necessary, ensuring that community representatives remain involved with EDF Energy throughout the construction period.
Tractivity 823	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 EDF are protecting their shareholders at our expense. We are not getting satisfactory responses to our comments after Consultation 1, and therefore assume that your response to Consultation 2 will be equally DISMISSIVE of our comments. We are not against Hinkley ?C? itself, but we firmly believe that there are arrangements which can mitigate against disruption. The offer of £1M is derisory and insulting. Listen to us- or ignore us at your peril!	9581-1577-7230			/	<u>Consultation Fatigue</u> There have been several other consultations taking place at the same time as EDF Energy's consultation on its Hinkley Point C proposals. These other consultations are described in Chapter 1 of this report. Some concern has been expressed at all stages of EDF Energy's process about whether people could potentially be confused by these other consultations or feel fatigue at being asked to contribute to varying consultations. Where possible, EDF Energy has worked in conjunction with other organisations such as National Grid, the Environment Agency and the local councils to combine events and share literature. Details of other consultations and relevant contact details have been provided on EDF Energy's consultation website and community newsletters to make it as clear as possible what was being consulted upon. In some cases, more detailed articles have been published in the EDF Energy community newsletter to provide people with additional context, such as progress on the National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6).
Tractivity 885	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below EDF?s response to the Stage 1 Consultation has addressed many of the issues raised.	9643-1577-5738			/	Where EDF Energy has undertaken additional consultation to that of the pre-application consultation on the DCO application, such as consultations for the
Tractivity 891	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Previous views seem to have been listened to. Overall EDF communication of proposals are good.	9649-1577-6053			/	
Tractivity 901	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Proposals have been presented in such a way as to mask the impact. The key is cost - and the cost of M5yJ23 road (somewhat offset by convenience of uninterrupted access to EDF - and this should be carried as part of the overall cost of construction (and of course factored into eventual price of electricity produced). Not fobbed off, piecemeal, onto local communities.	9659-1577-7270			/	

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	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Generally unsatisfactory with being propoerly thought through. The whole thing has an air of a cheap-jack solution and ruining the job for a ha?porth of tar. I appreciate that EDF is not a charitable organisation but equally we as customers deserve a fair days pay for a fair days work?.	9689-1577-7194			/	Site Preparation Works and the Temporary Jetty applications, these have been combined where possible with the main Hinkley Point C DCO consultation activities to keep the process simple and prevent consultation fatigue. <u>Feedback and Analysis</u>
Tractivity 936	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below This consultation process is a farce! EDF are going through the motions to comply with legislation so avoiding high court injunctions. EDF will take NO notice of concerns expressed by local people, they will do what they want. Nobody believes anything that the nuclear industry says.	9694-1577-9252			/	Some early comments were made at Stage 1 where people were concerned about whether their comments would be able to influence the proposals. As this report demonstrates, the evolving set of proposals over the past three years has come about partly as a result of feedback received during both the formal consultation stages and informal engagement. The responses received to the consultation at each stage were carefully analysed and taken into account when producing the following stage of consultation and the final DCO proposals. This appendix contains the identified comments from each formal consultation stage with the decision made marked next to them in the tickboxes. The accompanying topic responses (of which this is one) provide an explanation of how EDF Energy has responded to issues raised.
Tractivity 940	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I dont think my views or comments would have the least affect on your proposals (so I will keep them to myself!) P.S. good luck!	9698-1577-7777			/	It was always the intention of EDF Energy that the overall Consultation Report would be the main route to feedback to consultees on their issues. It therefore answers the concerns some people have had about not knowing what impact their comments may or may not have made. EDF Energy believes this approach takes on board and expands upon that required in the Act and related guidance. Where more specific and immediate enquiries were made to EDF Energy rather than formal consultation responses, the EDF Energy Bridgwater office and its consultation consultants PPS Group would respond to the consultee via a combination of written and oral replies.
Tractivity 942	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? I have no arguments about the need for this Powerstation (my original opinion). However from the way EDF have approached the problem of logistics and treated the villagers in the area I am feeling strongly that the build at Hinkley Point should be cancelled!	9700-1577-127			/	Throughout the consultation period, the local authorities have asked to have sight of the consultation responses received. During the consultation exercise, EDF Energy made it clear to all consultees that it would provide a final Consultation Report as part of its DCO application that would include all formal consultation comments together with an explanation of how EDF Energy has had regard to those comments. It was considered unnecessary and potentially unhelpful to disclose consultation
Tractivity 942	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below It appears that EDF have started out with an outrageous proposal for Cannington and revised it to what they really wanted in the hope that the residents would think that they had won some concessions. Come down to planet earth EDF! Cannington want ZERO EDF intervention. EDF would have saved a lot of time and money had they planned for a road from Dunball to Hinkley thus avoiding all villages.	9700-1577-7285			/	
Tractivity 952	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? It is nice that EDF is listening to community concerns	9710-1577-604			/	
Tractivity 952	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? It proves that the station is going ahead no matter what the community says.	9710-1577-1145			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 974	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>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.</p>	9732-1577-8234			/	<p>comments prior to the production of this report.</p> <p>One comment was received asking that there should be independent adjudication of the responses received during consultation. The IPC will only accept this DCO application if it is satisfied that EDF Energy has complied with its pre-application consultation requirements under the Act. In making that decision, the IPC will have regard to this report, including the consultation comments and EDF Energy's responses within this appendix.</p>
Tractivity 979	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>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.</p>	9737-1577-1059			/	<p>Informal Engagement</p> <p>A number of consultees have questioned to what extent there has been informal engagement during the overall consultation period, and with whom. For the past three years, EDF Energy has informally engaged with statutory consultees and the local community. This engagement has been integral in moving forward with the proposals and has covered large numbers of issues in depth, including transport, education, health, emergency services, and mitigation and compensation amongst many others. This is detailed in Chapter 4 of this report.</p> <p>In addition to this large number of informal meetings, EDF Energy has also chosen to conduct targeted consultation with local communities on a voluntary Main Site Neighbourhood Support Scheme, which was held outside of the formal consultation periods.</p> <p>If the Infrastructure Planning Commission approves EDF Energy's proposals for Hinkley Point C, there will also be ongoing community engagement during the construction and operational periods of the project. In particular, an off-site mitigation manager has already been appointed who will deepen this continued engagement, along with a better-resourced, locally-based communications team. Some comments were made in later consultation stages that it would be helpful to have an EDF Energy office in Stogursey. It is considered that for the DCO consultation the office in Bridgwater has been more than sufficient. However, should the DCO be granted, there will be members of the EDF Energy team available on the main Hinkley Point C site to liaise with the local community.</p> <p><u>Consultation Communications</u></p> <p>The process of communicating with consultees about the consultations and proposals has also received attention and been commented on throughout the overall consultation period. This process is described</p>
Tractivity 980	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>This must be the only project in the U K that has not been thought through from start to finish before any of it was made public.The so called consultationprocess concerning this village was a sham and thus you have lost the trust of many in this community. No one wants to live here if all this comes to fruition and I beleive you should offer to re house us in a like for like property in an area of our choice at no expense to us for any resident who wishes to move. We love it here and moved for the peace and quiet after 58 years in London where we lived by a lorry yard, I don?t ever want to go back to that level of noise and air pollution again. We have nade considerable improvements to our property and invested our savings in it to make it suitable for our ailments, it will no longer suit our needs if all this happens in this village. Moving now is very difficult as no one wants to but a house here now.</p>	9738-1577-9605			/	<p>In addition to this large number of informal meetings, EDF Energy has also chosen to conduct targeted consultation with local communities on a voluntary Main Site Neighbourhood Support Scheme, which was held outside of the formal consultation periods.</p> <p>If the Infrastructure Planning Commission approves EDF Energy's proposals for Hinkley Point C, there will also be ongoing community engagement during the construction and operational periods of the project. In particular, an off-site mitigation manager has already been appointed who will deepen this continued engagement, along with a better-resourced, locally-based communications team. Some comments were made in later consultation stages that it would be helpful to have an EDF Energy office in Stogursey. It is considered that for the DCO consultation the office in Bridgwater has been more than sufficient. However, should the DCO be granted, there will be members of the EDF Energy team available on the main Hinkley Point C site to liaise with the local community.</p> <p><u>Consultation Communications</u></p> <p>The process of communicating with consultees about the consultations and proposals has also received attention and been commented on throughout the overall consultation period. This process is described</p>
Tractivity 985	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>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.</p>	9743-1577-129			/	<p>In addition to this large number of informal meetings, EDF Energy has also chosen to conduct targeted consultation with local communities on a voluntary Main Site Neighbourhood Support Scheme, which was held outside of the formal consultation periods.</p> <p>If the Infrastructure Planning Commission approves EDF Energy's proposals for Hinkley Point C, there will also be ongoing community engagement during the construction and operational periods of the project. In particular, an off-site mitigation manager has already been appointed who will deepen this continued engagement, along with a better-resourced, locally-based communications team. Some comments were made in later consultation stages that it would be helpful to have an EDF Energy office in Stogursey. It is considered that for the DCO consultation the office in Bridgwater has been more than sufficient. However, should the DCO be granted, there will be members of the EDF Energy team available on the main Hinkley Point C site to liaise with the local community.</p> <p><u>Consultation Communications</u></p> <p>The process of communicating with consultees about the consultations and proposals has also received attention and been commented on throughout the overall consultation period. This process is described</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1005	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Not able to view information	9763-1577-672			/	<p>in detail in Chapter 2 of this report. EDF Energy decided at the beginning of the consultation process that it would undertake a multi-layered communication strategy to make the information as accessible as possible. Identified consultees, both statutory consultees and other relevant stakeholders, and the local community, were provided with information on the proposals in various forms at all formal stages. Every effort has been made to consult with the relevant statutory consultees, and amendments to the list of required statutory consultees and their contact details are covered in Chapter 2 of this report. As the proposals have progressed through the stages with new associated development proposals, revisions were made to the list of local community consultees. One particular issue that arose at Stage 2 was around the proposals at M5 Junction 24 where residents of new properties in Stockmoor village were accidentally left out of the distribution of the newsletters. This is covered in more detail in Chapter 2 of this report, but on realisation of the issue, newsletters were hand delivered to the area and a special exhibition was arranged.</p> <p>The general process of communication included the creation of a regular community newsletter, a consultation website, exhibitions and other meetings including those with local parish councils, drop-in meetings, an office located centrally to the consultation in Bridgwater, a community freephone line and consultation documents made available at local libraries, tourist information centres and council offices. Comments were received at varying stages of the consultation about people not being able to access the website, attend exhibitions or not finding the Bridgwater office comfortable for viewing documents for extended periods. However, EDF Energy feels that, through the approach outlined above, there was ample opportunity for people to become informed about the Hinkley Point C proposals from a variety of locations.</p> <p>Similarly, people were offered various different means to feed back their views on the proposals to EDF Energy. These included the options of a hardcopy questionnaire available from exhibitions and, on request, an online questionnaire on the consultation website, via a freepost address, and the consultation freephone line. As investigative works have continued, a 24-hour hotline has also been provided. Some people expressed confusion about the simplicity of the freepost address, and EDF Energy has therefore always made it clear in its literature what was required to be placed on the envelope. Overall, if</p>
Tractivity 1005	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Next step give written information to me on * items on this questionnaire. Give us the chance to respond and make changes. I was along with this area only given one day to see your proposals. I had an appointment in Taunton at 7.30pm on 7th Sept. I work from 6.45 - 6 pm not in Bridgwater, so by the time I got home and changed in 15 minutes I rushed to see only 1 part of your information. I only had 10 minutes. Our area was treated as an afterthought even though your freightybus park and ride is at the edge of our developement. WHY ONLY 1 DAY.	9763-1577-7212			/	
Tractivity 1016	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Will there be any independent adjudication of the consultation responses?	9774-1577-6610		/		
Tractivity 1041	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I believe that the consultation has failed due to you not being open and honest which has caused EDF to lose the trust of the entire area.	9799-1577-6930			/	
Tractivity 1059	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 We were pleased that EDF seemed to respond to the wishes of the people in Stage 1 of the consultation. We were pleased to see the details of the proposal for the P&R in Williton included some good environmentally sensitive ideas and will be returned to its original use. We are concerned about our local Councils? responses as they seem to come up with a different idea each week and then accuse EDF of not consulting properly. We hope EDF will resist pacifying them by agreeing with demands that have not been thought out properly and are not fully supported by local residents.	9817-1577-7178			/	
Tractivity 1060	Public	Stage 2	12. Any other ideas or comments? you have got a large development for Combwich, which some of it was not disclosed in the information you sent to some of the village. This information was sent to one side of estuary park and not the other. How can such a large development (the fabrication) be missed out of your exhibition and document sent to the residents of Combwich? These plans will have a massive impact on the lives of the villagers. The quality of life will reduce and it will be like living in an industrial estate and not a village. you have not been open and honest with this fabrication site which has led you to lose the trust from the community.	9818-1577-7161			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1061	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Overall I am quite happy for the power station to be built. But I feel that EDF needs to be prepared to take on the concerns of the people who live in the area. And not just try and ride rough shod over people's concerns as seems to have happened in the Stage 2 consultation.	9819-1577-6939			/	<p>a consultee considered it difficult to get in touch via one route, another route was always open to them.</p> <p>Overall, throughout the consultation process at least 4,593 consultees attended the public exhibitions during the formal consultation stages, and 1,888 people attended meetings and other events. Nearly 1,300 people returned questionnaires, and nearly 600 responded through other routes. More than 240 responses from statutory consultees were also received. There were also more than 109,000 unique visitors to the consultation website.</p> <p>End Process</p> <p>Some consultees queried who the decision-maker on the DCO application should be. EDF Energy has included in its communications throughout the stages of consultation an outline of the process post-submission of the application, including an explanation of role of the IPC as the deciding body. This is detailed in Chapter 1 of this report.</p>
Tractivity 1064	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Everything is being rushed - most work seems to be started before consultation - we are being 'walked over'.	9822-1577-1102			/	
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	9834-1577-8457			/	
Tractivity 1078	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below In the main the majority of Shurton residents understand and support the need for a new build at Hinkley. The previous support provided by the CEGB, Nuclear Electric and British Energy has been welcome and we always felt that they listened and understood our concerns and acted accordingly. Unfortunately this is not the feeling EDF projects. It is one of an arrogant company "who knows best" and is not prepared to give us the time of day.	9836-1577-6505			/	
Tractivity 1087	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I have been very disappointed in the lack of openness and relevant information coming from EDF.	9845-1577-6832			/	
Tractivity 1089	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 you have gone back on most of the promises made in consultation 1.	9847-1577-6897			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1092	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Like everyone else in the area, we have been duped. EDF has deliberately kept key information out of the first stage consultation. Our discussions and feedback have therefore been on falsely stated proposals. I am deeply disappointed that EDF, which I had thought was a decent organisation, has turned out to be dismissive, arrogant and deceptive. I'm afraid that from now on, we have to assume that all EDF's communications are simply made up to maintain the appearance of consultation that is, in reality, a sham.	9850-1577-692			/	
Tractivity 1108	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below The Consultation with regard to the Combwich proposals was unfair, misleading and inadequate as well EDF know. Overall the preferred proposals are ill thought out ,divisive and do not seem to show any central planning. Actually i am pro HPC but the overall scale of the Combwich proposals have contributed to a sense that our communities trust has been abused and common sense ignored.	9866-1577-7522			/	
Tractivity 1122	Public	Stage 2	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.	9880-1577-678			/	
Tractivity 1123	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below As (personal details removed), I take no view on specific proposals. However, as an organisation, we do urge that all statutory and non-statutory agencies, as well as the public are involved in decision-making as far as is practicable, and we ask that implications on both the English and Welsh sides of the estuary are fully considered. We also encourage open and transparent decision-making processes.	9881-1577-5719	/			
Tractivity 1126	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I feel that EDF have been less than honest during this consultation process, leaving the local population to discover what will really happen. I do sincerely hope you take notice of our views. This is going to affect our lives for the next ten years. For some of the population this means the rest of their lives.	9884-1577-7095			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1130	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below EDF have failed to consult with impacted groups. Their plans have changed radically and details have been deliberately withheld, or contained in such a large document that no one individual would have a chance to read and digest. How could the plans for such a massive project still be evolving. Are residents being told the truth, or will the goal posts move once again. At the July meeting at Combwich EDF admitted that they had not considered using Hinkly A or Dunball, or building bridges and jetty. Its appalling that proposals could have gone to this stage without due consideration of sensible alternative solutions. The entire consultation process has been managed in a very unprofessional and haphazard manner. Do EDF intend to construct a new nuclear power station in the same ill thought out way? It appears that EDF seem to be in complete ignorance of planning laws and protocols or they have chosen to ignore them.	9888-1577-8975			/	
Tractivity 1140	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below you have not listened to local people - meetings have not addressed our issues	9898-1577-6028	/			
Tractivity 1143	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Consultation not good enough	9901-1577-5892			/	
Tractivity 1182	Public	Stage 2	Local dialogue WILL BE worth the effort.	9940-1577-301			/	
Tractivity 1186	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below your proposals are unjustified and lack any evidence to support them, they lack an understanding of the area and do not take into consideration that the major activity in this area is farming. you should be working with local authorities and other local groups to find a satisfactory solution. See our website: www.savecannington.weebly.com	9944-1577-8032			/	
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.	9952-1577-1367			/	
Tractivity 1212	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below We only saw the consultation Stage 2 after we returned to school 8th September. As most of us live out of County not very good.	9970-1577-5826			/	

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	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>The proposed build of Hinkley point C is going to have a huge impact on everyone in the area and beyond, causing total disruption. I do not think EDF has taken the time to address all the problems arising from a huge ten year construction. Life for a lot of us will never be the same. Local feelings MUST be taken into account. EDF please listen!!!</p>	9974-1577-7065			/	
Tractivity 1227	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>Q1 Do you have any comments on our proposals for the workforce and for employment, skills and business engagement?</p> <p>yes, you have just ignored the feedback from the stage 2 consultation, if it can be called a consultation when many of those worst affected by your plans know nothing about it. I hope that the IPC a wise to EDF?s bribery, lies and deceit.</p> <p>Q2 Do you have any comments on our updated accommodation proposals?</p> <p>yes, you have just ignored the feedback from the stage 2 consultation, if it can be called a consultation when many of those worst affected by your plans know nothing about it. I hope that the IPC a wise to EDF?s bribery, lies and deceit.</p> <p>Q3 Do you have any comments on our proposed community mitigation and benefits?</p> <p>yes, you have just ignored the feedback from the stage 2 consultation, if it can be called a consultation when many of those worst affected by your plans know nothing about it. I hope that the IPC a wise to EDF?s bribery, lies and deceit.</p> <p>Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals?</p> <p>yes, you have just ignored the feedback from the stage 2 consultation, if it can be called a consultation when many of those worst affected by your plans know nothing about it. I hope that the IPC a wise to EDF?s bribery, lies and deceit.</p> <p>Q5 What are your views on the proposed changes to our transport proposals?</p> <p>yes, you have just ignored the feedback from the stage 2 consultation, if it can be called a consultation when many of those worst affected by your plans know nothing about it. I hope that the IPC a wise to EDF?s bribery, lies and deceit.</p> <p>Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans?</p> <p>yes, you have just ignored the feedback from the stage 2 consultation, if it can be called a consultation when many of those worst affected by your plans know nothing about it. I hope that the IPC a wise to EDF?s bribery, lies and deceit.</p> <p>Q7 Do you have any other comments?</p> <p>yes, you have just ignored the feedback from the stage 2 consultation, if it can be called a consultation when many of those worst affected by your plans know nothing about it. I hope that the IPC a wise to EDF?s bribery, lies and deceit.</p>	89493-1577-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1234	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? Just that you look very hard at the comments being made by all concerned and have a measure of understanding of the anxiety there is in all our minds over the complexities of the proposed project and therefore have some consideration of the impact you are making not only in the immediate future by for the expected 60 years life of the the c station	89500-1577-1944	/			
Tractivity 1238	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? EDF do not consult as you do not listen to local residents - you do not compomise.	89504-1577-904			/	
Tractivity 1250	Public	Stage 2 Update	Thanks for the polite welcome and response to questions	89516-1577-278			/	
Tractivity 1259	Public	Stage 2 Update	Consult with us, rather than confront. Listen to us while fully engeged, not as a means of directing us.	89525-1577-1231			/	
Tractivity 1267	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? I have attended the previous consultations. I can see there have been changes but there?s little evidence that these are in response to the consultation process.	89533-1577-1134	/			
Tractivity 1269	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? yes why won?t you listen to what we have said????????????????????	89535-1577-1545			/	
Tractivity 1282	Public	Stage 2 Update	I believe EDF has been listening locally and is trying hard to ?strike the balance?.	89548-1577-1127			/	
Tractivity 1283	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? EDF need to absorb the wishes of the local communities which are affected by their plans.	89549-1577-1019			/	
Tractivity 1284	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? EDF are NOT listening and being very dismissive.	89550-1577-1026			/	
Tractivity 1293	Public	Stage 2 Update	youve no doubt made up your mind about what youre going to do - in my opinion this is a cosmetic exercise to make people think you care..	89559-1577-1139			/	

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	Q7 Do you have any other comments? We have written to EDF on Stage 1yStage2 & now Stage 2A. IN OUR OPINION THESE CONSULTATIONS HAVE BEEN COMPLETELY IN EDF'S FAVOUR ONLY - NO REPRESENTATION OF CANNINGTON VILLAGERS? VIEWS HAVE BEEN INCORPORATED. THIS HAS JUST BEEN A PUBLIC RELATIONS PAPER EXERCISE.	89562-1577-2711			/	
Tractivity 1301	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? It is time EDF actually acted on the long-standing concerns of it?s host community. Publis relations with our nuclear neighbours has reached an all time low since the EDF takeover of British Energy heralding an unheard of "take it or leave it approach".	89567-1577-1777			/	
Tractivity 1302	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q1 Do you have any comments on our proposals for the workforce and for employment, skills and business engagement? Does it matter what we think? No	89568-1577-0			/	
Tractivity 1302	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? What is the point of all these questionnaires??? - just giving you a job!!	89568-1577-549			/	
Tractivity 1303	Public	Stage 2 Update	By its intransience on the bypass EDF has alienated a large proportion of pronuclear supporters. The bypass would have provided the biggest socio-economic benefit possible, recent meetings I have attended recently suggest that the backlash is building up steam and needs to be listened to.	89569-1577-2627			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1308	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>Q1 Do you have any comments on our proposals for the workforce and for employment, skills and business engagement? LIES</p> <p>Q2 Do you have any comments on our updated accommodation proposals? LIES</p> <p>Q3 Do you have any comments on our proposed community mitigation and benefits? LIES</p> <p>Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? AND</p> <p>Q5 What are your views on the proposed changes to our transport proposals? MORE</p> <p>Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? LIES</p> <p>Q7 Do you have any other comments? 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.</p>	89574-1577-0			/	
Tractivity 1323	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land only at Stage 2 and Public	Stage 2 Update	While we appreciate the need for new nuclear power stations, it is gratifying that EDF have in turn appreciated the views and local knowledge that has come out of the consultation process. It has become obvious that the majority of sonstruction workers will commute from the towns and cities along the M5 corridor and EDF have revised their plans to accomodate this fact.	89589-1577-38			/	
Tractivity 1334	Public	Stage 2 Update	The huge increase from ?1 million to ?20 million at least recognises in some way the public feeling of discontent from the previous consultation	89600-1577-1591			/	
Tractivity 1335	Public	Stage 2 Update	This consultation has been rushed, and there was little notice before the public events. The plans may change further before submission - will you be consulting on further refinements?	89601-1577-929			/	
Tractivity 1340	Public	Stage 2 Update	It would appear that EDF do not listen to local people.	89606-1577-485			/	
Tractivity 1356	Public	Stage 2 Update	Usual indifference to local opinion makes me wonder why I am filling in another form, such indecent haste mey lead to a Japan incident here! No confidence in your openness.	89622-1577-1003			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1365	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? Makes little difference! The main project will still be progressed minor changes will hardly be noticed.	89631-1577-1015			/	
Tractivity 1365	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? The changes proposed will make little difference to main proposals, overall!	89631-1577-1197			/	
Tractivity 1370	Public	Stage 2 Update	you say you want to maximise the use of non-car modes of transport, but have nothing in your plans to widen the C182 to make it safe for locals to cycle to work. The quarry lorries that you are using NOW take the full width of the road. I have heard reports of near misses and cyclists forced off the roads when these lorries pass. If you do not believe me look at the verges and see the tyre tracks. A fatality will happen if this is not improved A.S.A.P. PLEASE LISTEN TO LOCAL PEOPLE.	89636-1577-78			/	
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.	89638-1577-484			/	
Tractivity 1372	Public	Stage 2 Update	Stop treating people who are affected by HPC as insignificant	89638-1577-1245			/	
Tractivity 1375	Public	Stage 2 Update	24 hour working has only recently been mentioned and we were assured that this would not happen 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.	89641-1577-645		/		
Tractivity 1376	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? It slowly improves - which merely indicates how right people were to object in the first instance. It could and should be subject to constant improvement.	89642-1577-1189	/			
Tractivity 1377	Public	Stage 2 Update	The consultation has been poor as EDF have not listened and dictated their terms.	89643-1577-404			/	
Tractivity 1380	Public	Stage 2 Update	i?m also concerned that the detail of public responses to your proposals are not being made available to public boides. only a summarised and sanitised version is being published.	89646-1577-718	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 191	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>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 misled 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.</p>	8906-1577-6696			/	
Tractivity 204	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>Not really - at this stage, I am fairly happy with the consultation work done so far, although there are far-reaching issues that will have to addressed as work continues.</p>	9335-1577-8180			/	
Tractivity 215	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>EDF appear to have an excellent approach to community benefits but I really hope they do seriously listen to what the residents want at the end of the day.</p>	9336-1577-4311			/	
Tractivity 228	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>We recognise the need for nuclear power to be an integrated part of the nation's power supply. However, we are very concerned that decisons have already been made and our concerns are being recorded simply as a PR exercise.</p> <p>The voices of the local residents being affected by this enormous project must be heard and dealt with sympathetically as when you are gone we will be here trying to rebuild our communities.</p>	9338-1577-7078			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 292	Public	Stage 1	<p>4. Accommodation</p> <p>Box ticked: Not Satisfied at all</p> <p>4. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The process so far has been arbitrary and non-consultative about the widest range of options. EG:</p> <p>1. Why these location options and no others?</p> <p>2. Why NO information about consultation process in Williton? No flyers to all households, no prominent advertisements, no timely local paper coverage. Danesfield School presentation on 05.12.09 was only known about because a private individual found out and publicised it on telegraph poles.</p> <p>3. The social problems from large encampments of single men in rural villages with tiny police coverage will be enormous, especially with shift working. The argument that testing on arrival at work will prevent social problems from drug and alcohol abuse is very debateable - it hasn't worked at other construction hostels and it doesn't even work in prisons!</p>	8980-1577-1183			/	
Tractivity 301	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 will happen what ever we all say, but we appreciate the chance to be heard.</p>	8989-1577-3630			/	
Tractivity 303	Public	Stage 1	<p>4. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>All construction accomadation should be on site and not sited in local villages. This would eliminate the need for fleets of buses to be used to transport them to work. Also why should Burton & Shurton be get their requests addressed and Cannington & other villages lumbered with transport and accomodation problmes. We don't want it.</p>	8991-1577-960	/			
Tractivity 337	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>Would have appreciated learning of local implications a good deal earlier. EDF might be able to ride roughshod over communities on France but we are used to a little more democracy - excluding this current government!</p> <p>Why didn't we have a public meeting as happened in Cannington?</p>	9025-1577-4413			/	
Tractivity 345	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>I believe EDF should be very careful not to be over-influenced by people with vested interests, who could personally profit to the detriment of the village.</p>	9033-1577-4735			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 380	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>We are all aware that the country needs power stations to supply us all with power and are not against a further power station at Hinkley point but the way EDF have gone about this. EDF do not and have not listened. There have been untruths (Personal details removed). EDF are riding rough shod over local peoples concerns without any care or due dilligence.</p> <p>All local residents (Shurton) ask for is compensation so we can decide to move as the construction completely ruins our way of life. This is the ONLY thing that will benefit us with oncoming noise, light pollution etc. which will be for 24 hours a day,7 days a week for the next 8 - 9 years.</p>	9066-1577-5734			/	
Tractivity 382	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>At present EDF seem to have based all their proposals on what would serve themselves and the local councils best. The consultation with members of the public is too late, and appears purely "window dressing" to appease public opinion as minds seem to be already made up . The local councils unfortunately need money and therefore are not acting in the best interests of local residents.</p>	9347-1577-5143			/	
Tractivity 388	Public	Stage 1	<p>his total lack of consideration for so many aspects of local proposals is going to make it harder for anything to be accepted. Residents are furious as seen at a public meeting on 5 jan. Many highly intelligent and experienced professionals live here, we have been severely underestimated, and are well aware of local " landowners" wanting to expand and build kingdoms.</p>	9073-1577-4883			/	
Tractivity 393	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 dangers and uncertainties of relying on nuclear power have been well documented elsewhere. Perhaps most frightening is that any meaningful consultation with the people most likely to be affected is no longer possible. How can this have happened in a so called democracy?</p>	9078-1577-4232	/			
Tractivity 394	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 believe that EDF is not in the slightest interested in what the public has to say about the project as it is probably already decided</p>	9079-1577-4159	/			
Tractivity 403	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The local residents affected should decide.</p>	9086-1577-356			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 403	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? This is a business decision which EDF alone can make.	9086-1577-4207			/	
Tractivity 404	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 public consultation has been very good, but I think local people have not taken part!!	9087-1577-3680			/	
Tractivity 418	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? Hope that EDF will always give appropriate importance to local opinion	9100-1577-2987			/	
Tractivity 424	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? Though not terribly 'aware' of the scheme understand that this is the future of energy but do think that the impact of introducing a foreign workforce to the local community should be thought about very carefully and that the opinions of the surrounding towns and villages should be taken into consideration and that the locals views should count. I hope that this will not as usual be a 'whitewash' and that our views will count for nothing and that it will be decided by councillors and government at County and National level	9106-1577-3657	/			
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.	9117-1577-4482			/	
Tractivity 448	Public	Stage 1	8. What do you think of our proposals for the use of Combwich Wharf? Not qualified.	9126-1577-3294			/	
Tractivity 448	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? Public consultation always a good thing- provided the results are considered. There should be the least disruption to status quo all round.	9126-1577-3384	/			
Tractivity 460	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? Don't upset all the local community. Extremely difficult to get involved.	9137-1577-3661			/	

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	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 keep the dialogue with the local communities open & honest.	9138-1577-4518	/			
Tractivity 464	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 whole process is being carried out too quickly. The idea that this is consultation in the widest sense is questionable. I think this consultation is EDF asking the public's opinion on EDF proposals. On such important matters the public should have been in on the formulation of the options and this would have been proper consultations. As with the DECC consultation I am sure the public view the exercise as a ticking of boxes and that their opinions will have very little effect on the outcome. I feel that myself and most of the public are in favour of a new build at Hinkley but not on the current terms.	9141-1577-6498			/	
Tractivity 522	Public	Stage 1	I think EDF has done their best to involve local communities and hope they will continue to consider local circumstances and views.	9193-1577-3818			/	
Tractivity 523	Public	Stage 1	1. Any other ideas or comments? If this project goes ahead it is up to local residents to agree or not to agree. Not for a person who lives some 30 miles distance away.	9194-1577-362			/	
Tractivity 523	Public	Stage 1	10. Do you have any comments on our proposals in relation to training and business opportunities? What training and business opportunities? Can anyone explain? My opinion is if you read objection negative comments it goes in the bin? "DONE DEAL."	9194-1577-4372			/	
Tractivity 528	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? Listen to the views of local residents. I am afraid that our councils often have a separate agenda to the electorate and mostly seek to gain profit to balance their shaky finances.	9199-1577-4251			/	
Tractivity 540	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? Listen to the locals not the councils. The locals have to live and work in the areas proposed. The councils want to make money. I've no objection to Hinkley or nuclear projects, but I do feel local peoples concerns must be addressed.	9209-1577-3868			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 541	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? No amount of community bennefits could compensate for the loss of many of Cannington residents' quality of life. This is a divisive way of trying to split opinion in order to force through the changes proposed.	9210-1577-4530			/	
Tractivity 544	Public	Stage 1	I think the local community needs to be treated with respect	9213-1577-4917			/	
Tractivity 570	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? EDF seem to undertake a serious attitude to educating and encouraging to their way of thinking. I do hope EDF continue to listen to the community voice, and also this is not just to sweeten the public at lare from getting concern over the reactor itself.	9239-1577-4449			/	
Tractivity 584	Public	Stage 1	I fail to comprehend why EDF would consider siting a parkand ride and accommodation in Williton. When I asked one of your advisors I was told it was after discussions with West Somerset District Council. Fact straight out denied by the Williton Councillor, also present, who had been assured by the cheif planning officer this is not the case, who to believe?	9363-1577-2421			/	
Tractivity 605	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 good - so far! Realistic completion date should be released early. 2017 very optimistic!	9271-1577-5434			/	
Tractivity 607	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 is, we are told, a must. What is also a must is that the opinions of local residents be paramount since it is our lives, our environment which are being threatened.	9272-1577-4360			/	
Tractivity 610	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? As previously mentioned you should at least telephone anyone who s potentially directly affected before publishing documents as this can be distressing. Otherwise it remains to be seen how much notice is taken of public consultation.	9274-1577-3651		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 610	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? This is essential for our county but do not make the mistake of alienating local population just to force through your favoured options. Everyone of your workers and everyone of your attempts to expand on your base plans will feel resistance otherwise, as a result in my opinion.	9274-1577-4511			/	
Tractivity 671	Public	Stage 1	7. Do you think it would benefit the local community for these park and ride facilities to continue to operate once construction is complete and, if so, on which sites? As a resident of Williton, I kno that there is a rising feeling og resentment against any developoment here regardless of its proposed temporary nature. It is only very recently that we have learned anything of this (for reasons that are currently unclear) Certainly and development to the east would be most unacceptable environmentally. Any development here would be destructive long term to the area.	9334-1577-3921	/			
Tractivity 50878	Public	Stage 1	In these respects the consultation is not a genuine consultation at all. Its spuriousness happens in these instances to have been revealed by some unguarded statements in the longer document. Quite clearly, however, these instances must cast a doubt over the genuineness of the whole consultation exercise. If the decisions are shown to be pre-empted in these cases, they may well have been pre-empted in others as well.	9393-1577-15167			/	
Tractivity 62113	Public	Stage 1	Please respect us all in our opinions, even those that are against yours, and take heed of those that concern us the most. We do not like to be taken for granted or ignored and would like to believe that you truly have our best interests at heart. Our families are the ones that will continue to live here and raise our future generations while most of you will be long gone.	9409-1577-0	/			
Tractivity 62128	Public	Stage 1	(i) the large populations of Taunton and Bristol which are not many miles away in infrastructure or nuclear accident terms seem to have been missed out in the detailed consultations conducted to date and need to be fully strategically engaged;	9415-1577-4475			/	
Tractivity 62130	Public	Stage 1	Further to your letter to me dated 13 November 2009 regarding the above consultation, I would like to set out the following general comments: 1) I am supportive of the proposal to develop the land adjacent to the existing Hinkley Point A and B power stations for a further nuclear power station; 2) The approach being taken by EDF appears to be trying to take into account the impact on the area and tries to spread this across the vicinity rather than fundamentally change the immediate surrounding area;	9417-1577-197			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62301	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	In the letter signed by (personal details removed) you also say that the electricity generated for 5 million homes and the temporary boost to the economy are "very significant positive impacts". It seems completely to have escaped EdF's corporate understanding that the only reason that residents of Stogursey hamlets have been moderately restrained in their opposition to the development is that they do recognize the benefits to others. As individual households they are distraught. On page 40 of the Consultation Report EdF gives the 'Area of Questionnaire Responses' as Shurton. Burton and Stogursey. This is disingenuous in the extreme. Stogursey main village will bear little if any of the impact of development, whereas Shurton. Burton and Wick will be hugely and disproportionately affected by everything that takes place. Of course I am also affected personally. That may be my hard luck What I fail to understand is how any company which claims to "put social and environmental responsibility at the heart of everything we do" (Mission Statement Item 5) can ignore the very local people to whom it says it wishes "to be a good neighbour" (your words; ShurtonBurton Residents Meeting June 7th 2010) and group them under the post-code for a wider geographical area with a numerically greatly superior population for the sake of statistical returns. Furthermore, when it suits the company's case, even this demarcation within the wider consultation area seems to be eroded by the all-embracing phrase "the local community" especially where associated with responses favourable to the company (p.45; 4.3.20) . This seems to have worked rather well to EdF's benefit in the matter of the on-site hostel to which the whole of Shurton. Burton and Stogursey (sic) is opposed, supported by their Parish Council, and for which the County Council likewise questions the rationale. Ignoring the separate existence of the Stogursey hamlets may conveniently support the company's justification for the Preferred Proposals. It seems to me to be amoral in the circumstances and entirely at odds with the Mission Statement. This is why local residents are eager to take up without further delay (personal details removed) suggestion that he come to talk to them.	9991-1577-1140	/			
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.	10000-1577-35			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62316	Public	Stage 2	(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.	10003-1577-2707			/	
Tractivity 62323	Public	Stage 2	I would be grateful if you could note my concerns to add to any considerations and reports. In particular regard the manner in which this whole affair is being operated.	10007-1577-1528			/	
Tractivity 62351	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. We have had several meetings with representatives from EDF and my first concerns relate to these:</p> <p>At our first meeting on 18th November we understood that EDF was keen to be involved in the development of the club as a potential leisure resource for workers at the Power Station. We understood that this would lead to a growth in membership and a strain on our accommodation for vessels. The impression that we received was that EDF would be prepared to assist the club with the costs and work that this would involve.</p> <p>Although notes were taken we received no minutes of this meeting.</p> <p>A subsequent meeting was arranged with (Personal details removed) for 14th April which she failed to attend.</p> <p>Further meetings were arranged and changed at short notice until one was eventually convened on 23rd June with (Personal details removed) and (Personal details removed) in Bridgwater. I was unable to attend that meeting but I understand it was unproductive because your representatives were poorly briefed and had limited knowledge of the issues involved and no record of any previous meetings.</p> <p>I relate the above because it gives the impression, contrary to that which we initially received, that EDF does not value the views and interests of the local population very highly and is merely paying lip service to the notion of local involvement.</p>	10028-1577-542	/			
Tractivity 62352	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Moreover, I am assured that (Personal details removed) reads and responds in person to every letter he receives and given that he is unable or unwilling to reply to the most recent letter, then we are of the mind that the claim in his (attached) letter of 20th January that "EDF is committed to an open and transparent consultation process" is short on sincerity.	10029-1577-2178			/	
Tractivity 62363	Public	Stage 2	Well over two years ago I raised concerns with EDF representatives at 'information events' and filled out a 'concerns questionnaire'. Approximately 6 weeks ago I sent a fairly lengthy email to the EDF information desk. To date I have received absolutely no response to any of my efforts to invite dialogue.	10037-1577-667	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62363	Public	Stage 2	Although these are my specific concerns about the EDF development of the Hinkley Point site, the lack of any kind of response from EDF points to wider concerns about the lack of a genuine and constructive consultation process.	10037-1577-1853	/			
Tractivity 62374	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Actually I disagree. Dialogue with me can only be a distraction: dialogue with the Parish Council is mandatory; consultation with local organisations and societies likewise. Both the latter styles of consultation focus on the formal process of negotiation and the exchange of information.	10045-1577-90			/	
Tractivity 62374	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	There is apparently no provision for social outreach or genuine personal contact and feed-back. In ordinary life 'stuff happens' and people deal with it, but the development of the power-stations is conscious, deliberate and planned well in advance. It is a process that is already more than a year in the field. The company knew what it was doing when it first assured us that the development 'would not be coming over the first ridge'. This is not stuff happening.	10045-1577-976			/	
Tractivity 62374	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	I appreciate that EdF has floated the possibility of engaging a social and community representative to demonstrate the caring-sharing good-neighbourliness to which the company aspires. I realise that it is probably not your role or area of choice any more than it was (Personal details removed). Nevertheless, until such a representative is engaged and given at least some powers to demonstrate pragmatic responsiveness, my own view is that EdF is not establishing true dialogue.	10045-1577-1447	/			
Tractivity 62374	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	your words as reported and quoted in the West Somerset Free Press September 10th 2010: Once feedback from the second stage of the ongoing consultation had been received. EdF would further refine its proposals in liason with local groups and organizations "We have a positive and constructive ongoing dialogue with local stakeholders. We recognize the important role they have to play in the process. Following the feedback we receive from the consultation when it closes we will work together with all our partners in Somerset to finalise our plans." After Stage 1 EdF dropped from its plans those elements which had been built-in as slack and, cynics say, as decoys to draw fire away from larger targets. At Stage 2 the plans re-emerged virtually otherwise unchanged. The company had ignored the implications of many if not most of local respondents' additional comments, in some cases by losing or devaluing them in statistics. Lay-people may not have the expertise to challenge technical detail but they have enough wit to have identified - in many cases for the second time and at no additional cost to EdF - most of the flaws Arup have pointed out in their recent presentations to the Community Council.	10045-1577-2016			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62374	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	If the movement from Stage 1 to Stage 2 is an example of 'positive and constructive ongoing dialogue' it is surely hardly surprising that EdF should have forfeited the good-will with which it was initially received and that the public have no confidence whatsoever in the company's ability to take its core-values any further into the community than the display-boards on which they are written. (I exclude from this the recent discussions in Stogursey which are locally interpreted as a hasty exchange of beads and mirrors, as yet undisclosed.) Some time ago we exchanged a letter or two about effective dialogue. When do you think it might begin? This is not a personal reflection but a question about corporate attitude and priorities. I ask you to ask your line-management, not necessarily to reply to me.	10045-1577-3228			/	
Tractivity 62411	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	EDF has become a distrusted Company for the way they appear to be bulldozing ahead with their preferences without thought of those immediately affected.	10054-1577-2164			/	
Tractivity 62422	Public	Stage 2	I am writing today to the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change and the Secretary of State for Transport pointing out that the 'consultations' were a farce and deliberately misleading and therefore are rendered null and void in our eyes.	10059-1577-750			/	
Tractivity 62425	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	EDF is carefully manipulating us towards 'divide and rule', wearing us down with placations and indecision. This so called consultation is only one way 'the EDF way'. It is a sham. We are country loving people about to enjoy retirement in a beautiful part of W. Somerset. No! We are angry, demonstrative, threatened and stressed, and do not know how to move forward with our life. EDF proposals are making us ill; forcing us to consider having to move and give up the quality of our life now.	10062-1577-202			/	
Tractivity 62425	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	EDF don't listen and really don't care.	10062-1577-840			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62426	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>The residents' objections are specific and based on experience. Furthermore, in their view they have already made the enormous concession of not objecting to the construction itself in spite of the fact that they know that they will suffer a severely and comprehensively reduced quality of life for at least ten years and that in many respects the area will never recover. They look to EdF to acknowledge this in the form of serious partnership with the community.</p> <p>It was made abundantly clear to us as a group - indeed in so many words - that our views carried no weight at all and that the host parish will bear the full impact of the construction process without any perceptible mitigation or benefit whatsoever. Granted, vague promises have been made, but nothing specific, guaranteed or proportionate has been suggested or confirmed in spite of considerable local feedback on the possibilities. Not least of these was the modification of the plans as they stood and still stand.</p> <p>All the observations made by the residents were made at Stage 1. With the exception of moving the southern boundary, which was achieved only because without it the company could not proceed to Stage 2, these observations have been comprehensively ignored at Stage 2. The reasons are not given but acknowledged at the meeting to include questions of EdF's commercial viability and government impatience.</p> <p>Locally, no questions to EdF are answered in writing. Requests for meetings have been resisted for as long as possible. The residents are left to speak to employees who can and will only repeat the standard company phrases and who carry the community messages back, diluted and second-hand, to their immediate superiors.</p> <p>At no stage, except at the last moment on the southern boundary, has EdF had the courtesy to bring to these meetings any member of the executive with negotiating power.</p>	10063-1577-361	/			
Tractivity 62437	Public	Stage 2	<p>2. It has not therefore been possible to form a coherent judgement on the overall proposals. EDF is required to engage with affected stakeholders and act on their comments. This has not been possible during this round of consultation due to the lack of detail in some areas, which means that it is not possible to comment and therefore not possible for EDF to act on those comments.</p>	10069-1577-396			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62449	Public	Stage 2	<p>It is obvious that since the Hinkley C Public Inquiry, Hinkley Point has been a firm favourite for new build. As a result when EDF got the nod to seek to build Hinkley Point C using the new IPC process, the consultation should have been a straightforward operation and other than one or two pockets of anti-nuclear protest, it should have progressed smoothly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The unions wanted a new power station - Local authorities were in favour - Other local politicians were in favour - Local communities recognised the need and were generally in favour - Even the media seemed to accept that it should go ahead. <p>It is therefore a clear indicator of just how badly EDF has carried out its so-called "consultation" in the amount of criticism there has been of some its plans from the majority of the above, not to mention one of the world's leading global engineering consultancies who publicly said the consultation contained: "erroneous and misleading information" and "poor quality of information".</p> <p>In my opinion its consultation has lacked openness, honesty and transparency - three critical measures in any engagement. I raised the poor quality of the consultation with the local MP as long ago as December 2009.</p>	10075-1577-1401			/	
Tractivity 62449	Public	Stage 2	<p>EDF's proposals appear to have been poorly thought out in many instances and asking the public to choose between two options is not a consultation.</p> <p>How were those options arrived at?</p> <p>What were the other alternatives?</p> <p>Why was that site chosen?</p> <p>Where is the research to justify that option?</p>	10075-1577-2623			/	
Tractivity 62449	Public	Stage 2	<p>During the Environmental Impact Assessment for decommissioning Hinkley A (the first EI A to be carried out on a nuclear power station), the Health and Safety Executive extended the consultation period part way through to ensure raised issues were dealt with. The HSE then publicly praised the nuclear industry for "leaving no stone unturned" in its engagement with the public on plans to decommission HP A.</p> <p>In my view as well as being a poor consultation by EDF where any issue raised is dismissed as "evolving plans", the timescale is far too short to enable the public to fully understand the huge amount of information associated with this project.</p>	10075-1577-4425			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62449	Public	Stage 2	<p>I do not consider this has been a proper consultation by EDF. Pretty much from the start it has been more decide, announce, defend. Glossy brochures and newsletters are ok as part of a bigger picture, but I consider EDF has failed to engage with many areas of the community in an open, honest and transparent manner. This can be perhaps summed up when the wife of a senior employee of BEyEDF told company officials at a public meeting in Combwich: "you have lost the trust of the village."</p> <p>Proposals for Combwich need a complete rethink as does EDF's totally inadequate roadway transport proposals.</p> <p>The final proposal to the IPC or its successor - will set a yardstick for other new nuclear build so it is surely worth a little more time and effort to get it right.</p>	10075-1577-7004			/	
Tractivity 62454	Public	Stage 2	<p>If we go back 20 years to the public enquiry most of the local people were in favour of a new nuclear station the local council, Sedgemoor District council, and Somerset County Council were all in favour of a new nuclear station so what do you think has gone wrong this time. you have succeeded in turning a pro nuclear area into an anti nuclear area. you can not just move into an area and trample people into the ground no matter how big you are. Keep your storage and Fabrication facilities away from built up areas there is room out on the coast. Now you will say that there will always be losers in a development like this! I disagree, nobody should be a loser. If there is to be losers then here is not the place for the next Power station. There is a unanimous call from all the councils to class this consultation as a failed consultation. Put these wrongs right and you may win back some support if not then I can't see the community ever trusting you again. And I think you may have years of fighting with locals to contend with</p>	10078-1577-2852			/	
Tractivity 62460	Public	Stage 2	<p>Disillusionment with the Planning Process, endless meetings, more and more rhetoric and heated argument, mindless thick and heavy documents filled with technical jargon that few understand and nobody reads - all to no avail for EDF and National PoweryGrid will in the end do exactly what they want.</p>	10083-1577-52			/	
Tractivity 62463	Public	Stage 2	<p>The Consultation Process</p> <p>Through this consultation process, EDF have lost the trust of the local communities.</p> <p>They have been selective with their disclosures, and seem to be offering little to the local communities by way of a positive legacy to their actions. They seem to forget that this will have an impact on peoples daily lives.</p> <p>As such, the stage 1 consultation was inadequate in order for full feedback to be given at the time.</p> <p>Whilst not having a direct objection to the building of a new power station, it is felt that EDF are taking the short term view and are running rough shod over the local communities who will be their neighbours, rather than working with them to get the right solution for all, not just the most profitable one to them.</p>	10086-1577-4788	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62508	Public	Stage 2	It is important to make clear that this element of the Consultation document lacks clarity of purpose, and does not provide sufficient specific information to enable a full and informed response. As such, I question whether the document fulfils the criteria of EdFs Statement of Community Consultation.	10098-1577-10128			/	
Tractivity 62508	Public	Stage 2	It should be emphasised that I do not consider that this consultation is sufficiently comprehensive as to be able to give the robust and inclusive response it should have had. I call into question whether the consultation fulfils the criteria set out in EdFs Statement of Community Consultation.	10098-1577-20955			/	
Tractivity 62536	Public	Stage 2	We need a lot more answers before the stage 2 consultation is closed. EPF need to extend the consultation period beyond 4th October 2010 to give individuals and local councils adequate time to fully understand the implications of the stage 2 proposals and the chance to respond in a constructive manner.	10107-1577-5928	/			
Tractivity 62547	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	If EdF is "all about openness and transparency" (Personal details removed) what can the company possibly have to lose by giving Local Councils access to the raw material of the responses to consultation?	10110-1577-135	/			
Tractivity 62547	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	If EdF is anxious to "work together with local authorities..to limit any adverse effects as far as possible" ((Personal details removed) on) why does it not publicly acknowledge that it has got quite of lot wrong so far (please don't deny that it has); isn't the first stage of a genuine attempt to reach agreement the admission of mistakes?	10110-1577-518			/	
Tractivity 62547	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	"Analysing all the returns by post-code would be too complicated" (your words, Community Forum) but EdF already does this by broad category. What is more complicated about analysing returns by the second part of the post-code rather than the first part alone? And why can you not give a qualitative value to the returns thereby sorted? And balance that against impact? And respond accordingly?	10110-1577-849	/			
Tractivity 62547	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	If a "significant number of local people recognise the benefits of the development" (all those whose expenses were paid to attend suppliers' meetings, perhaps, or who are conveniently far removed from any serious impact?) then what does EdF have to lose by making nice?	10110-1577-1246			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62566	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>I write further to our telephone conversation on 17th. August to confirm.</p> <p>I am again enclosing copies of correspondence sent to EDF, together with a copy of their menacing reply. As with the copy sent to EDF, the CWC letter, for the sake of discretion, does not identify the recipient who, shortly after receiving it was the subject of a permanent police caution subsequent to throwing his torn-up copy over our garden wall and admitting harassment.</p> <p>As I have said, with this 'frightener', I now have confirmation if any were needed, that the intimidation comes from the TOP.</p>	10118-1577-341			/	
Tractivity 62566	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>We write in the face of further EDF intimidation to add to our submission dated 15th & 20th July.</p> <p>Contrary to (personal details removed), (Personal details removed) assertions that "EDF is committed to an open and transparent consultation process", (Para.A of our letter dated 15th July refers), the true extent of EDFTs intentions were NOT REVEALED in the staged consultation and have only come to light because of the vigilance of the Parish Council Campaign Working Group. In short, EDF have misled and are continuing to mislead local residents. Their consultation had been and remains flawed and inadequate and this EDF trickery needs to be remedied.</p>	10118-1577-1037			/	
Tractivity 62566	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>Turning again to the inevitable EDF intimidation, this has progressed since our telephone conversation on 8th. September. I can confirm that the police contacted me on 6th. September about the EDF letter and the ILLEGAL EDF recording of their telephone call on 30th. July. We see this as a sinister attempt by EDF to silence us by way of a police prosecution of the writer, using the anti-terror laws. Moreover, after speaking to our telephone provider we believe - as do the company concerned - that the police are tapping our telephone! We are not subversives, we are merely engaged in a totally lawful and democratic right, which I predicted, in our initial telephone conversation would lead to the current situation. With the above in mind, I shall, in due course, write with details as to why we and many other villagers believe EDF has a hidden agenda insofar as Comwich Wharf and Comwich itself is concerned. Copies of self-explanatory letters to (Personal details removed) and (Personal details removed) are attached.</p>	10118-1577-2540			/	
Tractivity 62567	Public	Stage 2	<p>The Consultation Process</p> <p>Through this consultation process, EDF have lost the trust of the local communities.</p> <p>They have been selective with their disclosures, and seem to be offering little to the local communities by way of a positive legacy to their actions. They seem to forget that this will have an impact on peoples daily lives.</p> <p>As such, the stage 1 consultation was inadequate in order for full feedback to be given at the time.</p> <p>Whilst not having a direct objection to the building of a new power station, it is felt that EDF are taking the short term view and are running rough shod over the local communities who will be their neighbours, rather than working with them to get the right solution for all, not just the most profitable one to them.</p>	10119-1577-4837			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62568	Public	Stage 2	I wish to put the following points forward to show my views on the above proposals. I am truly amazed at the attitude of EDF with their plans for the whole area and apparent lack of understanding or even awareness of local people's problems and concerns.	10120-1577-41			/	
Tractivity 62574	Public	Stage 2	Even though it may appear EDF have listened to the "PEOPLES' response to the Stage One consultation by removing the threat of accommodation campuses; a freight logistics facility; and a reduction of the intended park and ride facilities, it is widely agreed within the Canning ton community, that EDF have attempted to use the oldest 'political ploy' in the book by asking for more than it ever expected, to reduce it to their intended requirements, following consultation!	10125-1577-62			/	
Tractivity 62576	Public	Stage 2	Most people know that the planning proposal is a farce and that the new power station will go ahead regardless of local feeling or the feelings of the local authorities because it has long been a 'done deal' between the 'powers that be' and EDF. Nonetheless I would still like to record my total objection to this monstrosity and will be interested to hear your thoughts on the matter.	10127-1577-204			/	
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.	10128-1577-3415			/	
Tractivity 62577	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	- 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 arrogance or duplicity.	10128-1577-11080			/	
Tractivity 62581	Public	Stage 2	I am writing to express my dismay at the cavalier way in which EDF is treating the local community.	10132-1577-54			/	
Tractivity 62581	Public	Stage 2	Time is running out on this consultation and there is an air of pervading frustration amongst local people at both the intransigence of EDF and the awful PR they have allowed to fester. If local people are not given a true account of the logic behind the proposals then the consultation is a sham and local people just become hostile.	10132-1577-1909			/	

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	My overall view on the proposals is that you haven't given us enough information, especially on the transport strategy for a proper Stage 2 consultation, therefore I cannot answer all the questions completely.	10133-1577-12004	/			
Tractivity 62582	Public	Stage 2	I have been to many meetings with EDF regarding the potential construction of Hinkley C during which we, the local residents voice our opinions and ideas regarding the Stage 2 proposals. EDF always say the same thing - they will note what we say however, 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. Therefore my conclusions are that I now distrust EDF and have no confidence that you have any regard for the residents of our small community within this parish.	10133-1577-12369			/	
Tractivity 62586	Public	Stage 2	Having said that a new station is a vast undertaking and will inevitably have a considerable impact on the area however it is done. EDF have a responsibility, in partnership with the local community, to consider how it is best achieved with the least disruption possible.	10137-1577-467			/	
Tractivity 62597	Public	Stage 2	4y8y10 - to DE - 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.	10145-1577-0			/	
Tractivity 62604	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	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	10151-1577-1111			/	
Tractivity 62671	Public	Stage 2	- We would also like to formally complain about the way EDF have "consulted" - we believe it has been inadequate, secretive and underhand	10180-1577-503			/	
Parrett Internal Drainage Board	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	In the first instance I would refer you to the Boards response to the stage 1 consultation sent by my colleague (Personal details removed) on 1st February 2010. All the points raised in his response remain relevant to the proposals and the revised details in the stage 2 consultation. In addition I would comment below.	10189-1577-101			/	

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	<p>- We have been pleased to be involved in the monthly Strategic Officers Group meetings that EDF have organised. However, recent cancellations by EDF have been of concern to us.</p> <p>Separate meetings with EDF representatives on specific matters concerning the historic environment have been most helpful in highlighting issues that have needed further assessment or fine tuning.</p> <p>- The Marine and Water Liaison Group had met regularly up until May 2010 but have been regularly cancelled by EDF since that date with no explanation. This has also caused us concern.</p> <p>- We are disappointed that the EDF proposals for workshops on specialist areas for the off-site development proposals have not been forthcoming.</p>	10190-1577-367	/			
South Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	<p>South Somerset would prefer that the consultation for Hinkley Point was combined with the consultation for power pylons, as they inextricably linked.</p> <p>South Somerset District Council welcomes further engagement and looks to EDF and partners to ensure that throughout the process and construction there are clearly defined channels for local input, through use of existing mechanisms, such as the Somerset Strategic Planning conference and other officer networks.</p>	10210-1577-5633			/	
Cheddar Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>A Consultation is supposed to be a two way discussion - rather than the one way 'this is the way we are doing it, now tell us how much you like it'. Requests for actual figures are vaguely dismissed, or completely ignored.</p>	10222-1577-1696			/	
Cheddar Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>There is a consistent lack of 'joined up thinking' evident in the whole consultation process.</p>	10222-1577-5839			/	
Fiddington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>1. We are concerned at the uncoordinated and inconsistent response to the Stage I consultation, and to your inability to address any of the issues raised by the Parish in previous correspondence.</p>	10223-1577-713			/	
Nether Stowey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>The Parish Council is disappointed that, apart from a perfunctory acknowledgement of the response, EDF Energy has not seen fit to reply or given any detailed explanation as to why it has not pursued or may disagree with the Parish Council suggestions. This has led to members of the public querying the worth of the consultation process, typified by the comment "are they really listening".</p>	10226-1577-6067	/			
Nether Stowey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>5.5 Similarly the Parish Council considers that EDF Energy has underestimated, or ignored, the cumulative impact of the project on the well being of local communities.</p>	10226-1577-14157			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stockland Bristol Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>Can I first of all state that if EDF had started to build its proposed Power Station some 18 months ago then there would have been little opposition. I must now inform you that the sheer arrogance of EDF and their 'so called' consultation has driven most of the support you had into the dust.</p> <p>As (personal details removed) I also sit on the Hinkley Point SSG (A+B) sites as (personal details removed) and if the people want any information about Hinkley then they contact me. It is noted that Hinkley C has its own SSG which fails to communicate with the Parishes and the populous. I have only ever been invited to 1 meeting and this was taken over by the 'Wild Fowlers' and failed to communicate any information to me and I have never received any minutes from that meeting.</p> <p>To the Consultation, a meeting was held by the Parish to look through the Consultation document and we consider that EDF have done nothing but go into 'Silo Thinking' that is to say; give a person a problem to sort and come back with an answer, without looking at the bigger picture. The document makes reference to a meeting held on the 27th of January, in Stockland, where 75 people attended! I organised that meeting and there certainly not 75 people there, in fact the Hall will only hold 50 and it was not full.</p>	10232-1577-40			/	
Stockland Bristol Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	This Parish is rapidly falling into the 'Anti' brigade and unless EDF start to be less arrogant and realise that this is England and you cannot ride roughshod over people the better. We need firm proposals and indications that EDF are taking the populous seriously.	10232-1577-4252			/	
Wembdon Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Wembdon Parish Council is extremely dissatisfied with the revised proposals and notes that the impacts of all of the amendments made between Stage 1 and Stage 2 will be negative to our village and community.	10236-1577-4285			/	
Somerset Councils and SNEG	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The Councils are aware that a substantial amount of time has been invested by EDF in communicating the Stage 2 proposals to the local communities affected by the development. However, feedback from the community suggests that the consultation may not adequate in some instances.	10240-1577-11064			/	
West Hinkley Action Group	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- West Hinkley Action Group finds that the consultation process has been formulaic, dismissive and severely lacking in information; a paper exercise. The moving of the southern boundary notwithstanding, the residents of Shurton, Burton, Knighton and Wick believe that the community has not been engaged in true dialogue by the company. The company has resisted - as far as possible - the community's efforts to elicit details and to discuss them.	10253-1577-2214			/	
Hinkley Point Site Stakeholder Group (A+B) Sites	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	It has been noted that the existing SSG is not and has never been used by EDF and most responders have stated that this has further exasperated matters. People know who to go to about Hinkley and they see Hinkley A,B, and C as 'one' Site, not three. Further dialogue between EDF and the existing SSG is urgently required and will help in further consultation matters.	10255-1577-3862		/		

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	Stogursey Parish Plan Steering Committee passed on to EdF as Stage 1 all comments that had been collected during the Plan consultation process, including those ideas for possible Community Benefit which were supported by the local residents. Although it might have been expected that EdF would give particular weight to the views of the host parish it would seem from the evidence of the proposals made in Stage 2 that the suggestions and hopes of the local community have been completely discounted at this point in the process. This leads the Committee to find the consultation process to date inadequate, and to demand a further and infinitely more reciprocal and responsive form of consultation.	10259-1577-4702			/	
Stogursey and District Parish Plan Steering Committee	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The Committee supports the Stogursey Parish Council response to EdF Stage 2 consultation in every respect.	10259-1577-5405			/	
Somerset Wildlife Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	the Trust questions the usefulness of this consultation exercise. It is hard to see what benefit public consultation over plans based around half-formed evidence bases brings to either the local community or EDF.	10263-1577-12728			/	
Otterhampton Primary School	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	I am writing to you in my capacity as (Personal details removed) following our discussions on the proposed developments by EDF in the village of Combwich at an FGB meeting on the 29th September. We regret your deadline for 4th October as we would have preferred more time to consider these proposals, however we feel, having had a fair and balanced discussion, that we wish to raise the following issues;	10264-1577-0			/	
Ministry of Defence	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>MOD SAFEGUARDING - STAGE 2 CONSULTATION: PREFERRED PROPOSALS FOR HINKLEY POINT C NUCLEAR DEVELOPMENT - PLANNING ACT 2008</p> <p>Thank you for consulting the Ministry of Defence (MOD) with respect to the submissions made by EDF in support of the above consultation.</p> <p>The Stage 1 Consultation Report has accurately captured the issues and concerns that I have previously raised on behalf of the MOD in relation to the interaction between the proposed temporary jetty, cooling water infrastructure and defence training activities carried out in the Bridgewater Bay Danger Area.</p>	10266-1577-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62344	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>you reply 'But input from local people really will help inform the evolution of our ideas.' Local people gave their input a year ago. repeatedly and in detail. EdF ignored them. The drawing of the boundary was only the first of the residents' objections. The remainder are of equal importance. They represent stoical recognition of the heartbreak that we experience and shall endure which EdF has not yet had the grace to acknowledge by any significant adaptation of its plans.</p> <p>We note the frequency with which the company applauds itself for retreating a little on the boundary. As far as the residents are concerned that the original boundary was even contemplated in an indication of the company's arrogance and rapacity and the hamlet showed enormous restraint in its objections by stopping short at latitude 144750. A company which claims to 'act with integrity' and to put social and environmental responsibility at the heart of everything we do' (EdF Core Values) has so far shown itself prepared to evolve only when absolutely forced to do so. This is not civilised or clever.</p>	10280-1577-436			/	
Bridgwater and District Civic Society	Non-statutory Consultee	Stage 2	I write to advise that the Bridgwater & District Civic Society, having been represented at the various consultative meetings held on this subject and, having studied the numerous documents produced over the months, fully endorses the representations made by Bridgwater Town Council in their observations of 8th September 2010 (see enclosed copy). (Editor's Note: no copy attached).	10282-1577-50			/	
Bridgwater and District Civic Society	Non-statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We seek to ensure that EDF exercises care and due diligence and takes note and action on the concerns raised by all parties and which, if ignored, will have a serious impact to the detriment of not only the town of Bridgwater but the surrounding environs.	10282-1577-436			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	g) The layout of your office in Bridgwater was not conducive to study. There was no large desk at which to work - to lay out or cross reference folders and take notes at the same time. My suggestion to provide such a desk was not acted upon. The large, heavy folders were on a table against a wall near the door where the lighting was poor. It was impossible to view the folders and take notes when seated in the high-sided armchairs provided. Using the sofa, you had to lay the folder sideways beside you while taking notes on a pad balanced on your lap. The posture you had to adopt was very uncomfortable and only sustainable for short periods. As the cover flap had to dangle over the edge of the sofa, when the weight of many pages that had been turned got too much, the folder would slide off the edge. As an ill and partially disabled person, it was exhausting to carry? the heavy folders to and from the sofa. Other items of furniture were not suitable for use either. I could not stay in the office for long and had to rely on the CD at home even though I much prefer to work from a printed version as extended periods of time working at a computer exacerbate my health problems. (However, I would add that the receptionist and security guard at the office were very kind and welcoming and tried their best to help.) Nevertheless, the overall impression was that you did not want members of the public to look at your documents too closely.	89469-1577-1974		/		

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	k) I was unaware of the Stage One consultation altogether. I only learnt about it after the consultation period had ended. Considering the size of the population affected, the numbers of non-statutory consultees involved have been miniscule and therefore insufficient.	89469-1577-4435			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	If it wasn't such a serious matter, I would say that EDF belong to the Mr. Bean School of Consulting.	89469-1577-4705			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	7. Consultation Fatigue I am definitely fatigued. It is deeply unsatisfactory that consultations are split into separate parts: Site clearance, preliminary works and the main construction. To be running alongside the consultations for the National Grid power line proposals, the Generic Design Assessment and EDF Renewable's wind farm proposals among other Bridgwater-related things is deplorable and guarantees putting people off getting involved. 8. Conclusion you have angered a lot of people. your reputation has sunk. you were not prepared for this consultation. Pack it in. Just don't spend any more time and effort pursuing a nuclear path. Common sense should tell you it just isn't going to work.	89472-1577-13272			/	
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	you are aware that in our view the short period of the Stage 2 'Preferred Proposals' consultation and the timing of the consultation over the summer holiday period, has placed a considerable burden on the authorities and has placed tight constraints on our ability to engage with our communities on this nationally significant infrastructure proposal, and take the proposals through a democratic process.	89181-1577-1804			/	
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	We believe that the approach taken by EDF for their Stage 2 consultation does not accord with the guidance of the IPC that states "the overriding intention of the legislation is to ensure that detailed matters are consulted upon and solutions or mitigation negotiated with the local community, landowners, statutory consultees and local authorities before submission of the application for development consent to the IPC" - paragraph 8 - IPC's guidance note 1 (Revision 1) on Pre- Application Stages - March 2010.	89181-1577-3452			/	
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	Individuals and communities are expressing concern about the lack of listening, the lack of response to detailed questions, and the insensitivity of the proposals which integrate poorly into local places.	89181-1577-4320			/	
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	The general dismissal and the comprehensive underplay of negative impacts (compounded by a tendency to consider elements, not the whole of the project) has been a significant matter for councils and their communities and is not accepted.	89181-1577-4528			/	

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	Current proposals are not evidenced-based.	89181-1577-5446			/	
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	Many of our communities have found it impossible to evaluate the impacts on their homes, towns and villages. Due to these significant deficiencies and concerns with the stage 2 consultation material, the local communities and the Councils consider that there is a need for further public consultation on worked up, amended or new proposals.	89181-1577-7602	/			
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	Description: Authorities are given insufficient time to fully evaluate and comment on the Stage 2 proposals such that these proposals are not consistent with policy and/or vision. Chief Executive Officers and Leaders issued request for extension to EDF. This request was turned down by EDF.	89182-1577-1888			/	
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	- Concern about the elements of the project where the Stage 2 consultation has been the one and only chance for input.	89183-1577-7330	/			
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	CONSULTATION IMPLICATIONS 9.1. The responsibility of consulting both statutory consultees and the general public rests with the developers under the new Planning Act (in this case EDF). EDF have submitted a Statement of Community Consultation document to the IPC detailing how they will go about this process and the Scrutiny Committee discussed this in depth. However, given the significance of the proposals on our community, it is right and proper for the Council to supplement that process and support the community through this new and challenging process. Various pieces of work are underway to do this and ultimately the Council will report on the adequacy of the promoter's consultation within its Local Impact Report	89184-1577-7415			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	you are aware that in our view the short period of the Stage 2 'Preferred Proposals' consultation and the timing of the consultation over the summer holiday period, has placed a considerable burden on the authorities and has placed tight constraints on our ability to engage with our communities on this nationally significant infrastructure proposal, and take the proposals through a democratic process.	89185-1577-28			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	We believe that the approach taken by EDF for their Stage 2 consultation does not accord with the guidance of the IPC that states "the overriding intention of the legislation is to ensure that detailed matters are consulted upon and solutions or mitigation negotiated with the local community, landowners, statutory consultees and local authorities before submission of the application for development consent to the IPC" - paragraph 8 - IPC's guidance note 1 (Revision 1) on Pre-Application Stages - March 2010.	89185-1577-1676			/	

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	Individuals and communities are expressing concern about the lack of listening, the lack of response to detailed questions, and the insensitivity of the proposals which integrate poorly into local places.	89185-1577-2543			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	That the proposed approach to mitigation is wholly inadequate and is dismissive of local impacts and lacks a genuine approach to understand and tackle the scale of disruption and impact on local people and places through investment programmes and tangible action. If the approach to suppress and under-predict impacts is retained then the Council will have no choice but to formally object to the proposal as a whole.	89186-1577-3481			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>Scrutiny Recommendation</p> <p>Following the meeting of Scrutiny Committee on 10th September, Members overall supported the Hinkley C project, but felt that aspects of the Stage 2 consultation and detail of EDF's proposals had been inadequate.</p> <p>The Committee agreed to recommend to Cabinet that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Council's response to the consultation should highlight the gaps and issues identified so far - which include transport, tourism and accommodation; - Officers should continue their impartial, co-operative and constructive work with EDF to establish the evidence base and assist in refining options and proposals; - The Council and its partners should fully explore appropriate mitigation and compensation measures with EDF prior to their planning submission. 	89195-1577-4617			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	It is not clear whether consultation sessions with high priority 'hard to reach' groups; school age students; and parents have occurred and how these have shaped the interventions proposed within the Construction Workforce Development Strategy.	89210-1577-5973			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	1.1 The vast majority of transport-related comments raised by the County Council during the Stage 1 consultation process have not been addressed in the Stage 2 documentation.	89220-1577-59			/	

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>Somerset County Council</p> <p>Technical Response to EDF Stage 2 Consultation</p> <p>Topic: Environmental Assessment - Rights of Way</p> <p>Rights of Way</p> <p>1. Executive Summary</p> <p>The proposals for the rights of way network across and in the vicinity of the main site need to be reviewed in line with the advice given to the developer previously by the rights of way staff. Maps showing clear proposals need to be provided to Somerset County Council (SCC).</p> <p>2. High Level Response</p> <p>EDF Response to Stage 1 Concerns</p> <p>There do not appear to be any changes made to reflect the comments made in the Stage 1 consultation.</p> <p>Adequacy of Consultation and Process</p> <p>a) Overall robustness of approach, methodology & baseline assumptions</p> <p>The robustness of approach is poor and disappointing given the time rights of way officers have spent previously providing professional advice to EDF. EDF have carried out path surveys (of their own volition) and have arrived at assumptions about use of rights of way, which rights of way officers do not support.</p> <p>b) Adequacy of stakeholderscommunity involvement</p>	89238-1577-0			/	
Otterhampton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>Introduction</p> <p>In developing this response great attention was paid to the views of the residents. A public meeting was held on 5th August in the village hall in Comwich when more than 150 people crammed into the room (many were turned away because of the lack of space) and challenged EDF representatives on the company's proposals. On 19th August 85 residents attended a session of the Hinkley Point Community Support Programme in the village hall to further examine the proposals. Finally a questionnaire on the proposals for Comwich was sent to every household and produced a 50.14% return. A team of residents read almost 9,000 pages of information on the EDF Consultation website and the information gained enabled the Parish Council to better understand the issues and informed this submission.</p>	89265-1577-3250			/	

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	<p>a) Possible Consultation Failures.</p> <p>The Parish Council believe EDF's Consultation may be inadequate on the Comwich proposals, due to failing the Government's code of practice on consultation with regard to the following key criteria -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Being clear about what is being proposed. - Being clear as to the expected impacts and benefits of the proposals. - That consultation should take place at a stage when there is scope to influence the policy outcome. - Consultation responses should be analysed carefully. - The burden of consultation should be kept to a minimum. <p>b) Inequalities Due To Consultation Process.</p>	89270-1577-2601			/	
Otterhampton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- EDF's Stage 2 Consultation is inadequate and has failed with regard to their Comwich proposals.	89272-1577-3518			/	
Otterhampton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>b. Consultation should take place at a STAGE when there is SCOPE to influence the POLICY outcome.</p> <p>c. Consultation responses should be ANALYSED CAREFULLY.</p>	89274-1577-907			/	
Otterhampton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	5.1 It appears that EDF may also have failed to analyse consultation responses carefully. (HM Governments key consultation criteria)	89274-1577-3131			/	
Otterhampton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>6.7 The Stage One consultation report Summary, July 2010 states - 'There was broad public support for the plans to upgrade Comwich Wharf and provide a freight logistics facility'</p> <p>6.8 Please note there was still no mention of Comwich as a site for a road freight depot.</p> <p>6.9 The Parish Council feels this may not be a careful analysis of the responses.</p>	89274-1577-5731			/	
Otterhampton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>The Parish Council are clear - EDF - by not complying with most of the governments key criteria on consultation –</p> <p>By ignoring District Council advice that - at the Stage Two consultation no 'new' options should be incorporated –</p> <p>Are conducting an inadequate and failed consultation with regard to the Comwich proposals.</p>	89277-1577-1547			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[1.2.4] When will EDF start being a good neighbour and actually ensure the needs and views of the local people are taken into account? The evidence to date is that they have not done this at all.	89289-1577-3230			/	

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	Many of the issues raised during the Stage 1 consultation relate to lack of information provided at that stage, and EDF's response has in the main been that the detail would be provided at Stage 2. As described elsewhere in this response, many of the issues raised remain unresolved and SPC have provided details of the questions that remain unanswered. It is not necessary therefore to provide a line by line critique of the Stage 1 Consultation Report. There are however a few key points that need to be highlighted.	89291-1577-138			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	How can EDF demonstrate that they have adhered to these guidelines when they have ignored local requests for the removal of the proposed on-site campus and the need for road improvements and flood mitigation measures in the immediate vicinity of the site?	89291-1577-876	/			
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[7.2.6] Local people have been asking for a hotline for ages but this has not been provided. Will EDF establish this immediately, given that work on site has now been going on for many months?	89293-1577-15457	/			
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	1) Failure to create a clear and easily accessible website. Although it is relatively easy to locate the EdF standard questionnaire (with its limited set of questions on e.g. landscaping and the site boundary) it is much more difficult to discover how to make more substantial and detailed comments. The section of the EdF website which contains the consultation documents is firstly difficult to locate and then extremely difficult to navigate. 2) The Freepost address for postal comments also did not encourage confidence of delivery, since it made no mention of either EdF or Hinkley Point. What is the likelihood that all of these comments will have arrived with such a general address - "Freepost Consultation Response" - and no postcode?	89452-1577-2224			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	3) Lack of engagement with the population of Bridgwater, with virtually no public meetings.	89452-1577-2974			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	5) Reluctance to engage effectively with the residents of Cannington, at one point preferring to hold one-to-one sessions with residents rather than an open public meeting at which the strength of local feeling could be effectively registered.	89452-1577-3340			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	7) Inadequate facilities for accessing and studying the relevant documentation at the EdF offices in King Square, Bridgwater.	89452-1577-3869			/	

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 welcomed the move to revisit the approach to consultation including the provision of a supporting Consultation Strategy and the authorities acknowledged that improvements have been made from the original SOCC. However, the councils continued to have particular concerns about the approach to the Stage 2 consultation and in particular the details or evidence base provided to explain and justify their preferred proposals.	89295-1577-2521			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>There are other conclusions reached on the Stage 1 consultation where it is important the local authorities understand how the conclusions have been reached, through having access to the EDF Energy database and to specific consultation responses. Therefore in accordance with the open and transparent process of consultation that is expected under the new planning system for nationally significant infrastructure projects, the authorities recommend that EDF Energy make available in full, the database and specific Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultation responses.</p> <p>The authorities consider that compliance with EDF's duties under section 49 of the Planning Act 2008 (duty to take account of responses to consultation and publicity) should include making this database information available to the authorities.</p> <p>The need for full transparency is also reinforced by the Planning Officers Society August 2010 Advice Note on Responding to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects which refers to the Powys County Council published advice entitled 'A briefing note for developers producing a Statement of Community Consultation' in respect of NSIPs which has been commended by the IPC (see http://yyinfrastructure.independent.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/05/Powys-SQCCguide.pdf which highlights Transparency, Disclosure, Fair Interpretation and Publication/Feedback as part of the key principles of proper public engagement.</p>	89295-1577-5043		/		

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 May 2010, the authorities noted that they were encouraged by EDF Energy's acknowledgement that they had failed to adequately engage with 'hard to reach' groups during Stage 1 and that further initiatives would be required for Stage 2. Further suggestions for improvements to the then suggested approach were made. The authorities welcome EDF Energy's additional measures to engage women and young people and would be interested to know how their responses have influenced the nature of the proposals. Whilst the authorities welcome the moves taken by EDF Energy towards engaging better with unemployed groups, given the potential for the project to create employment opportunities and the potential benefits for EDF Energy in terms of reducing reliance on migrant workers, the authorities would welcome further clarification on the objective of creating a focus group and details of what that group is expected to achieve in terms of job creation. The level of engagement and support, particularly in the deprived wards is not considered to be sufficiently robust or commensurate with the scale of the project or the baseline issues locally. It is not clear what the outcome of further commitments to invite faith and voluntary groups to a number of events within their local areas has been; nor proposals for youth centre outreach events which is a cause for concern for the authorities. No information has been made available on engagement with existing overseas migrant communities.	89295-1577-6510	/			
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 not currently clear whether or not EDF Energy is seeking advice from the local tourism sector on how best to approach engagement, nor indeed whether future events will be for providing information or to discuss opportunities for supporting a sustainable future for tourism in the area.	89300-1577-446			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	A key frustration is that over six months of without prejudice debate on Council policy, priorities and alternative sites, the final Stage 2 proposals fail to take into account Council advice. Indeed the proposals seem to have deteriorated in terms of quality over this period, exacerbating concern to the point where there is objection to the submitted proposals.	89307-1577-4925			/	
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 identified 8 major areas where they had concerns about the adequacy of consultation at Stage 1 that need to be addressed (as lessons learnt) as part of the Stage 2 consultation. The authorities were concerned that these lessons learnt were not identified in the Consultation Strategy and the Strategy failed to explain how the concerns raised as part of the Stage 1 consultation would be addressed as part of the Stage 2 consultation;	89318-1577-8313			/	

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 recommended that EDF Energy make it clear that copies of the Stage 2 consultation responses would be made available publicly, for example, logged on a web site, as a transparent mechanism. The authorities believed that such an approach would be in accordance with the open and transparent process of consultation that is expected under the new planning system for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects as advocated by the IPC and CLG;	89318-1577-8831	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Although the authorities welcomed additional initiatives to engage with hard to reach groups we believed that further initiatives would be necessary to reach specific groups that were not sufficiently represented in the Stage 1 consultation process. Four additional initiatives were identified;	89318-1577-9390			/	
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 do not believe that their concerns in the Stage 1 process have been satisfactorily addressed as part of the Stage 2 process. In particular there is an overarching concern that EDF Energy has not communicated the vision and objectives for the integration of the Hinkley Point C development (including associated development) into the physical, social and economic fabric of the area EDF has not effectively responded to the policies and strategies of the local authorities. This is despite this issue being raised on a number of occasions as part of the Stage 1 response and in the period between Stage 1 and the commencement of Stage 2.	89319-1577-3971			/	
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 has provided a system to enable members of the public who respond to the consultation to track how EDF Energy considered their comments and suggestions. This system has been described in EDF Energy's Stage 1 Consultation Report as the EDF Energy Activity Database. The authorities support this initiative but without access to this Database the authorities are unable to check the validity and reliability of the findings of the Stage 1 Consultation and are likely to be in a similar position when EDF Energy release the findings of Stage 2. There are several conclusions reached, as set out in EDF Energy's Stage 1 Consultation Report, where it is essential to check how these conclusions have been reached.	89319-1577-4691			/	
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.	89319-1577-5431			/	

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' suggestions in May 2010: Invite faith and voluntary groups to a number of events within their local areas</p> <p>August 2010 update by EDF Energy: EDF Energy propose to invite representatives of local faith groups to attend meetings of EDF Energy's Community Forum.</p> <p>Authorities' comments September 2010: It is not clear what the outcome of this commitment has been and no information is available on EDF Energy's consultation page. There is no indication of what the faiths of migrant workers might be, or whether there will be a requirement for facilities to meet specific faith needs.</p>	89320-1577-3124			/	
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 clear from the above that EDF Energy has to some extent taken on board previous suggestions made by the authorities and further steps have been taken to broaden the scope of engaging with hard to reach groups. However, the authorities are not in a position at this stage to have confidence in the adequacy or effectiveness of these commitments.</p> <p>Action for example in deprived communities via a focus group, is not considered to be a comprehensive (or necessarily appropriate) response or reflective of the project ambitions for local labour force targets. It has been noted that, other than Sydenham, no engagement has taken place within deprived wards of Hamp, Victoria or Highbridge</p> <p>There are also concerns that the Gypsy and Traveller community in the area will not have been effectively consulted or their needs recognised.</p>	89320-1577-6115		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>Local Strategic Partnership (LSP)- there has been no engagement with the LSP which is considered to be a missed opportunity in view of the wide variety of groups engaged in that partnership.</p>	89321-1577-1631			/	
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 continue to have concerns about this key issue, and would highlight feedback from their own initial community engagement where it has been noted that: "Residents found it hard to engage with the concept of 'community benefits' - many stating that they saw the idea of community benefits as a "bribe" and were therefore reluctant to discuss the idea of community benefits at all, since they did not want it to be assumed that there was anything that could be done to mitigate the unpalatable nature of the off site development proposals. This was particularly the case among residents in EDF's 'inner zone' communities. Some individuals found the whole concept of community benefits to be too abstract to enable engagement." (Hinkley Point 'C' Power Station, Off Site Development Proposals, Community Engagement Programme, Stage 1 Report, June 2010).</p>	89322-1577-1544			/	

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 although supporting the widening of the inner zone to include those living in proximity to the associated development site raised a concern that the inner zone did not include those residents or businesses who live and work along the principal A38 and A39 transport corridors to and from the main site and the associated development sites. The authorities are still concerned that some of the communities that live near to these routes may not have been made aware of EDF Energy's Stage 2 proposals. Additional concerns associated with the awareness of the proposals are set out in section 3.3.2 below.	89322-1577-4124		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	However, this focus of attention has failed to recognise that residents in parts of the middle zone will also be very directly affected by the development during the extended construction phase, particularly those residents who live near to the main transport routes from the associated development sites to the main site. This has become particularly apparent during the Bridgwater consultation events whereby attendance at Council events had been poor.	89323-1577-974		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	It has emerged through the consultation conducted on behalf of the authorities that in many communities there is a significant level of dissatisfaction with the quality of the EDF Energy consultation process. There is understandably a general sense of dissatisfaction with the proposals given their scale and potential for direct impacts upon communities and individuals and it is those with concerns who are most likely to attend and comment upon proposals. A recurring message from people consulted has been dissatisfaction with the quality of engagement in general. In certain areas, shortcomings in relation to consultation have led to distrust of the process and of EDF Energy's intentions and commitment to properly manage and mitigate the effects of development.	89323-1577-3065			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Concerns have been raised regarding how EDF Energy has engaged directly with residents including: Inconsistent approach to setting up meetings with residents; Poor levels of written correspondence in response to requests made; and Comments that the EDF Energy helpline is not always helpful;	89323-1577-4440			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	It has also been noted that EDF Energy has not been open regarding consultation with other groups including statutory stakeholders; Inadequate information has been made available on several subject areas including worker profiles, transport measures and alternative sites considered;	89323-1577-4893			/	

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 absence of many elements of information that were previously requested indicates that the consultation process with the authorities has been only partially effective to this point.	89325-1577-735			/	
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 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	89326-1577-3640			/	
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 the issues identified above at Stage 1, the authorities subsequently commented on emerging proposals in advance of the Stage 2 consultation. The questions raised in May 2010 by the authorities are presented in summary form below. Once again, the issues raised by the authorities continue to be inadequately addressed in many instances underlining concerns about the adequacy of consultation.	89327-1577-44			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	there continue to be a number of outstanding issues, raised by the authorities which have yet to be effectively addressed at Stage 2.	89327-1577-6597			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The above schedules demonstrate that there continues to be a considerable number of outstanding issues, both in terms of what has been previously raised by the authorities and in terms of issues that have emerged through Stage 2. In order for the authorities to have confidence that the EDF Energy proposals are to a standard that will not impact unnecessarily on local communities, it is the essential that these short-comings are addressed more clearly as a matter of urgency. The above points also illustrate the clear benefits of EDF Energy making its consultation tracking and response portal available to the authorities and others, as noted earlier in the Chapter.	89329-1577-11573		/		

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	Addressing the lessons learnt from the Stage 1 Consultation: progress has been made however there continues to be insufficient detail in relation to what is proposed and what the long term legacy issues for the authorities' areas will be. Particular concern relates to the emergence of new proposals that were not presented at Stage 1 (for example the fabrication and other facilities at Combwich Wharf) and therefore have only been subject to one round of consultation;	89329-1577-13539			/	
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 recommend that EDF Energy make it clear that copies of the Stage 2 consultation responses are made publicly available, for example, logged on a web site, as a transparent mechanism. The authorities continue to believe that such an approach would be in accordance with the open and transparent process of consultation that is expected; Further explanation of the process and specific steps to engage with hard to reach groups: Although the authorities welcome additional initiatives to engage with hard to reach groups we believed that further initiatives will be necessary to reach both hard to reach groups and minority groups, including members of the future migrant workforce where possible;	89329-1577-14069	/			
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 welcomed the proposed extension of the "inner zones" where consultation would be most intense, to cover residents living in the vicinity of all the possible development sites as well as the main site. The authorities were concerned that the level of consultation planned for the 'inner zone' settlements was not applied equally to those resident or businesses who live and work along the principal A38 and A39 transport corridors to and from the main site and the associated development sites. This recommendation remains in plan in particular in relation to communities at Stockmoor Village.	89329-1577-18068			/	
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 selection and implementation of the obligations and requirements to mitigate and compensate for the harm will be informed by the views expressed by stakeholders including the local authorities and the residents within the affected areas.	89418-1577-9648	/			

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 approach to engagement should be set out in a Community Engagement Strategy to be agreed with the local authorities, which should confirm the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Geographical scope of the engagement. As well as consultation around the main site and associated development sites it will also be necessary to engage with those resident or businesses who live and work along the principal A38 and A39 transport corridors to and from the main site and who live and work in the vicinity of the associated development sites. - The techniques to be used and how regularly the techniques will be used. For instance if a community forum is to be established then it will be necessary to explain how frequently it will meet and the matters that will be discussed. - A set of key performance indicators that are measurable with targets agreed with the local communities and the local authorities. EDF would be expected to regularly monitor the project against these indicators and inform the local communities on whether the agreed targets are being reached. In situation where targets are not being achieved additional mitigation or compensation measures or penalties should be discussed and agreed with the local authorities and local communities that are affected. 	89422-1577-2010	/			
Tractivity 62846	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>From your Stage 2a documents: "EDF Energy will respond to specific requests for additional meetings or consultation events where these are appropriate and necessary. At this stage in the consultation process, we do not intend to hold further stakeholder workshops and focus groups." The Stogursey hamlet residents made specific requests for an additional meeting/consultation event - emphatically not a 'drop-in' - in relation to EdF's mitigation/property support proposal. They made these requests individually, at the Community Forum, through the Parish Council, and twice through (Personal details removed) with his support. The residents clearly regarded this meeting as both appropriate, necessary and relevant to their most serious concerns about the impact of the development and yet EdF have consistently refused to meet them. Does the company regard itself as the only body to decide what the legitimate needs of its neighbours may be? I would prefer a written reply please. Better yet, a meeting arranged for the hamlet residents at which they can have their questions answered and the information made general knowledge</p>	89648-1577-0			/	
Tractivity 62898	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>There are several other discrepancies between both booklets, but as they are not Cannington related, I don't feel I'm best placed to highlight as such. However each document seems to have their own agenda, which is why I believe that both publications may be uncertain.</p>	89658-1577-2197			/	
Tractivity 62906	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>My partner and I have attended nearly all of your public consultations and are glad to have done so. We gained a much better insight into the plans for this site and feel speaking about the issues with your staff very helpful.</p>	89661-1577-1328			/	
Tractivity 62907	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>We know you are not god; you can't do everything, but please put yourselves in our shoes, and think how you would like to be treated,</p>	89662-1577-2611			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62911	Public	Stage 2 Update	Although EDF have obviously listened to many observations made at the public consultations, it is my opinion that they have not gone far enough particularly with the concerns of the majority of residents regarding transport on the A39 from Bridgwater through to Williton, Cannington which will take the brunt of all through traffic and villages on the C182 road to Hinkley Point.	89663-1577-4605			/	
Tractivity 62916	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	I now find, however, that my MEP is being met with similar disrespect to that levelled against me and having spoken to (Personal details removed) secretary, I gather that he is unimpressed by this arrogance.	89667-1577-971			/	
Tractivity 62916	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	At this juncture, I have to place on record that my recent experiences of EDF have resulted in a complete breakdown of confidence in the company.	89667-1577-2178			/	
Tractivity 62916	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	I refer to (Personal details removed) letter of 10th August, where he makes an unwarranted accusation that t have supplied EDF with a letter of fraudulent origins. Moreover, (Personal details removed) has admitted that EDF made a recording of their telephone call to me on 30th July without alerting me to this action or requesting permission. you will know that this was an illegal act. The letter is actionable and will be dealt with accordingly, meanwhile, I await your personal written apology for EDF's threatening conduct. I have reported this matter to the police and herewith give notice that if it is EDF's intention to 'put the frighteners on' and deter (Personal details removed) from raising concerns about EDF's activities, then It will be to no avail. In the absence of your personal reply, I do have the option of asking (Personal details removed) at Channel 4 News to ask you, on camera and on mike, for a credible explanation as to your deafening silence and your manager's actions.	89667-1577-2947			/	
Tractivity 62916	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	EDF can ill-afford to alienate loyal Somerset-born employees who are fully committed to nuclear power station expansion in the locality.	89667-1577-6600			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62922	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>EDF Energy published a notice in the West Somerset Free Press on 18 February 2011 of its Consultation on Plans for a New Nuclear Power Station at Hinkley Point C.</p> <p>In my opinion insufficient time is being allowed between the publication of the proposals (stated to be on 25 February 2011) and the public exhibitions 26 February 2011 to 5 March 2011.</p> <p>I also feel that the consultation period of marginally over 4 weeks is too short.</p> <p>I would draw attention to the Government's Code of Practice on Consultation, in particular to the Criterion in this Code that states "Consultations should normally last for at least 12 weeks with consideration given to longer timescales where feasible and sensible."</p> <p>The proposed timescales for this Consultation are quite inadequate for many civil organisations, and others, to arrange to attend the public exhibitions, and to consider and formulate a response to material changes and additional information since the close of the Stage 2 consultation.</p> <p>I wish to request that the Code of Practice on Consultation be followed, and that your client therefore amends the dates of the consultation accordingly.</p>	89668-1577-0		/		
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.	89675-1577-2286			/	
Tractivity 62952	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>It is not worth my while to point out a whole list of objections here as they mainly remain the same as in my previous submissions before.</p> <p>your lack of readiness as demonstrated in these woefully thin consultation documents taken with your aim to submit an application to the IPC before you achieve any sign of completeness shows instead your readiness to cut corners and compromise quality - a recipe for disaster.</p>	89681-1577-1845			/	
Tractivity 62953	Public	Stage 2 Update	Community Engagement: Set up an Office in Stogursey for people to get face- to face responses on any problems!	89682-1577-1477		/		
Tractivity 62953	Public	Stage 2 Update	EdF Energy - every time a new proposal is mooted, it gets worse for us, your nearest neighbours. Please consider us and do some more thinking to help us bear the next 10 years - and remember that consultation does not mean telling us what you plan to do - it should be a two-way process.	89682-1577-3137			/	

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. Furthermore, none of you have a clue, neither do you care about us human beings, our mental and physical health, our financial situation, our way of life, freedom, human rights, our right to enjoy our homes and gardens, which we have all worked very hard during our lives to attain. Local residents are very very upset, very worried, and very angry because our lives will be ruined. We feel that EDF do not care about us because there are few of us.	89683-1577-2260			/	
Tractivity 62955	Public	Stage 2 Update	N.B. Not everyone has the ability to express themselves well in response to a consultation; these residents need to be considered too.	89683-1577-2877			/	
Tractivity 62983	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	We refer to the issue of (Personal details removed) admission that the Cannington Park & Ride is now being considered as a permanent fixture (see question 5). In fact, (Personal details removed) went on further to express the fact that any of EDF's proposals could change markedly from the position taken at Stage 2a in the submission to the IPC. How are we expected to have any trust in an organisation that is constantly "moving the goalposts" and in consequence, what has been the point of all these consultation processes? These possible changes would be Machiavellian in the extreme and only confirms that local residents are being duped into acquiescence, only to be possibly faced with totally different proposals in the future. This is a totally unacceptable way for EDF to behave and we are very angry about this.	89689-1577-5061			/	
Tractivity 62989	Public	Stage 2 Update	The consultation documents that I have looked at are very 'locally' orientated, and I would appreciate learning when wider regional issues will be included in your consultation?	89690-1577-700			/	
Tractivity 62998	Public	Stage 2 Update	Complaints line needed as well as help line.	89692-1577-2414			/	
Tractivity 63003	Public	Stage 2 Update	EDF are not listening and not acting like a good neighbour.	89693-1577-2703			/	
Tractivity 63032	Public	Stage 2 Update	I asked a subsequent question some time ago concerning compensation for the road building disruption following answers from the Highways Agency and Somerset District Council. I have not received a reply.	89705-1577-0	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Exmoor National Park Authority	Local authority	Stage 2 Update	The latest consultation document seeks to provide more information on some of these matters and, while there are further comments set out below, the previous concerns still apply to the proposals. The following are officer comments which have been viewed and commented upon by Committee Members, however, because of the short the time period to respond, it has not been possible to report the proposals to the Planning Committee.	89736-1577-2326			/	
Holford Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Holford Parish Council urges EDF Energy to address the issues outlined above and refine further its proposals before application for consent is made.	89750-1577-2364			/	
Withycombe Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	I am sending this information because for some reason you are sending out papers to 'Withycombe Raleigh Parochial Church Council' in Exmouth Devon!	89760-1577-296	/			
Miller Turner Investments	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	A number of meetings have been held between Miller Turner and EDF and revised proposals have previously been discussed. It is therefore disappointing that the proposals have not been amended accordingly. Based on the proposals contained within the latest consultation document Miller Turner have no alternative but to continue to register an objection.	89762-1577-4486			/	
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	2 In so far as the changes have not addressed the comments made in the Stage 2 Consultation Response submitted on behalf of the Estate, the Estate's comments still stand.	89767-1577-232			/	
4	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	<p>So far I have been extremely unimpressed with EDF' s so-called consultation which has done little more than offer people options of how the area will be turned into a giant construction site affecting hundreds of people.</p> <p>Local opposition has not been to the idea of new nuclear, but to the plans of what EDF intends to do to the countryside and villages. There have been some incredibly well attended public meetings voicing dissatisfaction with the EDF proposals including one in Cannington - a fairly pro-nuclear village.</p> <p>Since Hinkley Point A began decommissioning in 2001 local communities have become used to a much more involved way of consultation. In fact, the way HPA went through its EIAD process to obtain permission to decommission was highly praised by the Health and safety Executive and used as a "communications blueprint" for other sites throughout the UK that have since entered decommissioning.</p> <p>EDF has so far asked people to choose on options without any explanation of how those options were arrived at and my feeling is I am trying to be railroaded into agreeing to something when I don't like either options - and certainly don't know the rationale behind them.</p>	89793-1577-233			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
5	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	To sum up this, sixth flaw, therefore: I feel that consultation is not true consultation if it excludes all the options which EDF does not itself favour.	89794-1577-9623			/	
6	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	Thank you very much for your letter of 15 December and for the full information you have provided. Can I just be sure that I have understood one point correctly? It seems from your letter (and in particular your sixth and, ninth paragraphs): (a) That,, on the question whether consultation has been carried out satisfactorily, the IPC will - not consider representations from individual members of the public. If this is right, it follows that my concerns about the consultation can be raised only with" EPF itself or with the 'Somerset County Council Have I got this right? It seems a pity if so, but of course it would "have to be accepted,	89795-1577-41			/	
6	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	(b) That, on the other hand, however, the IPC will consider representations from, individual: people (once the IPC has accepted the application) on the demerits of the proposal or individual aspects of it.	89795-1577-691			/	
6	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	In these respects the consultation, is not a genuine consultation at all. Its spuriousness happens in these instances to have been revealed by some unguarded statements in the longer document. Quite clearly, however, these instances must cast a doubt over the genuineness of the whole consultation exercise. If the decisions are shown to be pre-empted in these cases, they may well have been pre-empted in others as well. Incidentally, it is of course the inclusion within the questionnaire of options to vote against these various "requirements" which causes the difficulty which I have: identified as the fourth flaw above. The fact that all such votes are shown by the longer document to be wasted votes makes this flaw, if anything, still worse.	89795-1577-6410			/	
7	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	The consultation which EDF is at present carrying out seems to me to be seriously flawed in a number of respects. I have raised with EDF the flaws which seem to me worth raising with them, but I doubt whether they will be able or willing to do anything about these.	89796-1577-332			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
10	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	In brief, I complain of EDF's activities in this part of Somerset and in particular the village of Combwich (Editor's notes: information redacted) It is a widely held view here that the EDF consultation process is, in short, a notification of an imposition of a nuclear power station and infrastructure with no right of protest. (Editor's notes: information redacted) and we see landgrab and site clearance at minimum cost being EDF's priority, while villagers concerns are being ignored.	89799-1577-350	/			
11	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	In brief, I confirm that, 2 months ago, I was given first hand and detailed information regarding EDF's proposals for Combwich Wharf and the adjacent lorry park and freight terminal, by a professional who is involved in the project. EDF have been told that "it is an impossible dream". I am informed that (Editor's note: information redacted) have said that "it cannot be done" and that they, are making provision to transport virtually 100% of freight by road. Accordingly, what does this say for EDF's conduct and their claims of an open and transparent consultation?	89800-1577-95			/	
14	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	We are pleased to note that EDF no longer propose an accommodation campus or any freight facilities in Cannington. Unfortunately however a Park & Ride Western Bypass still appears to be on their agenda in the second stage consultation. Our community did not invite (EDF) or their infrastructure proposals for Hinkley Point C into our village.	89803-1577-0		/		
16	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	At the outset, I wish to make it clear that I am not objecting to the proposed nuclear plant, but to the roughshod manner in which they are treating the community. This I firmly believe is solely down to their choice being based on cheapest option open to EDF, with total disregard of the cost to the local community.	89805-1577-241			/	
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.	89805-1577-3676			/	
16	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	According to reports, Highbridge, Burnham and Weston are begging EDF to establish their campuses close to these locations. Bridgwater and South West do not want them. EDF refuse to listen to public opinion.	89805-1577-3927			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
16	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	PLEASE ENSURE WHEN FINAL DECISIONS ARE TAKEN THAT EDF ACCEPT THEIR RESPONSIBILITIES TOWARDS THE COMMUNITY.	89805-1577-4942			/	
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	12. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below - 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.	89806-1577-11704	/			
18	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	I have responded to EdF's stage 2 consultation. I now hope that the following views will be taken into account, as I feel that-the concerns of Stogursey village, which neighbours the site, are being overlooked by EdF.	89807-1577-176	/			
21	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	I think the timescale and lack of information on the second stage proposed development is seriously flawed and should be turned dow	89810-1577-1155			/	
24	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	We, therefore, very much hope that you will bear in mind the fears and concerns of all the residents of Combwich to the invasion of our small community when considering and making a decision on these proposals by EDF.	89813-1577-1170			/	
33	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	EDF have failed to keep to the governments own guidelines and have therefore failed the consultation process. THEy MUST GO BACK TO THE DRAWING BOARD .	89822-1577-3456		/		
35	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	In my opinion its consultation has lacked openness, honesty and transparency - three critical measures in any engagement. I raised the poor quality of the consultation with the local MP as long as December 2009. EDF's proposals appear to have been poorly thought out in many instances and asking the public to choose between two options is not a consultation. How were those options arrived at? What were the other alternatives? Why was that site chosen? Where is the research to justify that option?	89824-1577-2436			/	

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	3. The County Council recognises the progress which has been made on a number of key issues and matters raised within the Council's response to the second stage of consultation. However, there are still a number of outstanding issues which require urgent attention and there is a lack of information included within the consultation document. As a result, it is difficult to provide detailed comments or any commentary on specific proposals.	89843-1577-2300			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	4. Despite the Council working closely with EDF, it is apparent that key documents have still not been provided and there is a lack of depth, justification and evidence to support both the substantive proposals and the changes identified in the consultation. This has limited our ability to provide guidance and constructive feedback to this consultation. This, in turn, gives rise to a concern that the community have also not been able to engage effectively on issues relating to the impacts of the proposals and how these should be addressed.	89843-1577-2745			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.4 Page 17 Community Engagement: EDF have informed SPC that a community liaison officer will shortly be appointed as an interface between EDF and the local residents. It is essential that this individual is located within the parish to enable them to quickly and easily visit residents who have a problem.	89871-1577-8693			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	Links into the community safety and socio-economic areas should not be underestimated, with coordinated service delivery into deprived communities, communicating project-wide issues and engaging hard to reach groups in project development and delivery.	89876-1577-8160			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	The Councils support the positive statement within the document that confirm that the EDFE "communication teams in Bridgwater will engage with the local community throughout the project, and will be available for the community to contact should they have any questions in relation to the project". Nevertheless the Council have a number of concerns with the community engagement undertaken by EDFE to date. A significant shift in approach and methods of engagement will be required to ensure that future engagement initiatives are more responsive and sensitive to local community issues.	89890-1577-15630			/	

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 Councils have a major concern that there has been only a partial response provided to local communities to the concerns they raised at Stage 2 and EDFE have not come forward with the full range of measures and initiatives to address stage 2 community issues. The Councils understand that the response to Stage 2 will be set out within the Consultation Report to be submitted with a development consent application and the Councils are concerned that this will not provide sufficient opportunity to engage with local communities on the detailed solutions and mitigation measures proposed to address their concerns, as advised by the IPC (Guidance Note 2).</p> <p>The Councils also believe it is essential that communities and key stakeholders are engaged on the design, development and delivery of infrastructure, facilities, services and/or partnerships required to mitigate and compensate for the impacts of the project.</p>	89890-1577-16221			/	
38	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2 Update	<p>In the absence of (Personal details removed) personal replies to my letters of 25th March 2010 and 25th August 2010 - copies attached - I asked (Personal details removed) to follow these up on my behalf. Given that your (personal details removed) requested my earlier letter through his senior management team, only he can respond to the issues I have raised in it. In particular, I refer to the penultimate paragraph which covers all aspects of concern raised and where I wrote "There are two aspects here. One is my concern for personal safety and the other relates to the proposed unjustified imposition of a commercial venture upon a rural community when there are viable alternatives. With respect Monsieur, I do not believe that you would condone or support either situation were your parents, or grandparents at risk."</p> <p>I now find, however, that my (personal details removed) is being met with similar disrespect to that levelled against me and having spoken to (Personal details removed) secretary, I gather that he is unimpressed by this arrogance. Accordingly, would you see that (Personal details removed) responds with his dedicated reply forthwith?</p>	89907-1577-53			/	
43	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2 Update	<p>In brief, I complain of EDF's activities in this part of Somerset and in particular the village of Combwich where I live. It is a widely held view here that the EDF consultation process is, in short, a notification of an imposition of a nuclear power station and infrastructure with no right of protest. EDF are behaving like fascists and we see landgrab and site clearance at minimum cost being EDF's priority, while villagers' concerns are being ignored.</p>	89912-1577-383			/	
44	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2 Update	<p>Accordingly, if this information is correct, where does this leave the consultation process and EDF chief (Personal details removed) claim that EDF are fully committed to it?</p>	89913-1577-1344			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 292	Public	Stage 1	<p>4. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The process so far has been arbitrary and non-consultative about the widest range of options. EG:</p> <p>1. Why these location options and no others?</p> <p>2. Why NO information about consultation process in Williton? No flyers to all households, no prominent advertisements, no timely local paper coverage. Danesfield School presentation on 05.12.09 was only known about because a private individual found out and publicised it on telegraph poles.</p>	8980-881-1239	/			
Tractivity 62366	Public	Stage 2	<p>(personal details removed). EdF (personal details removed) referring to Cannington has stated that 'The nature of Cannington is that of a very pleasant rural village and we want to respect that.' I suggest that he does his homework on Stogursey (and takes a proper tour of the village). If he does, he will find that this charming village retains its Norman pattern of housing and has a magnificent Norman Abbey Church and a number of other historical and cultural assets. Indeed, it has even more than Cannington which needs to be protected. All this is at risk of degradation and disruption as a result of EdF's ignorance or unwillingness to take account of the quality of the immediate locality where it proposes siting its power stations. This is apparent at EdF open days, where ill informed EdF consultants show that they have not done adequate studies. The response to points made by us seems to be to warn us that the lights will go out if EdF does not get its way. It has become increasingly clear that the profit motive is paramount for EdF and I hope that the IPC, or whatever supersedes it, will curb the steamroller approach of EdF, which so threatens the wellbeing of the parish of Stogursey.</p>	10040-383-396			/	
Tractivity 62583	Public	Stage 2	<p>This letter, written on behalf of my wife and myself, sets out our response to the questions raised in EDF's Pre-Application Consultation, Stage 2, about your preferred proposals. We confine our response to general matters and matters which affect the Cannington area. We feel that comment on proposals affecting other places should be left to those who are directly affected by them.</p> <p>I have held back the letter so that it can refer to the results of a questionnaire sent by the Parish Council to all those who are on the electoral roll in Cannington. These results became available today and references below to "Cannington voters" are to those who responded to this questionnaire.</p>	10134-1574-65			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Joint Nature Conservation Committee	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	JNCC has responsibility for the provision of nature conservation advice in the offshore area. 'Offshore' is defined as beyond 12 nautical miles (nm) from the coastline to the extent of the United Kingdom Continental Shelf (UKCS). Within territorial limits (less than 12 nm) nature conservation advice is the responsibility of the relevant country agencies these being: Natural England (NE), Countryside Council for Wales (CCW), Scottish Natural Heritage (SNH) and the Council for Nature Conservation and the Countryside (CNCCNI). This development proposal is not located within the offshore area and does not have any potential offshore nature conservation issues therefore JNCC does not have any comments to make on the consultation.	8695-1576-183			/	
Devon County Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	EDF Energy Issues and Options Further, to the recent public consultation, we have had a look through the 'Initial Proposals and Options' Document for Hinkley Point C and agreed not to send a formal response to this consultation - as most of our queries/questions pertain to the current consultation regarding the Nuclear National Policy Statement.	8713-1576-0			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	We are encouraging the developer to engage all communities across the area, including hard to reach groups and to develop the proposal in ways which positively address the issues raised above. It is too early in the process to be able to advise on how this will be addressed and whether it can be achieved, but the Council will be focussed on ensuring we do everything possible to ensure this is an integral consideration on local impacts.	88900-1576-1652			/	
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 would also encourage EDF to detail options at the earliest opportunity and that when documenting preferred options at the Stage 2 consultation no 'new' options should be incorporated.	88040-1576-4795		/		
Tractivity 992	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 support the views contained in the response document prepared by Stogursey Parish Council.	9750-1576-6380			/	
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.	9907-1576-5889			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1303	Public	Stage 2 Update	As a general comment on the whole document, these are only words, the real thing will probably be far removed from proposals and expectations, particularly where time and money are concerned.	89569-1576-368			/	
Tractivity 1335	Public	Stage 2 Update	This consultation has been rushed, and there was little notice before the public events. The plans may change further before submission - will you be consulting on further refinements?	89601-1576-929			/	
Tractivity 416	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? I hope EDF take in to consideration the views of local communities, not just local government/councils! I hope edf's motives are not just financial?	9098-1576-3766			/	
Tractivity 612	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? Just to ensure that local people are taken into account at all times.	9276-1576-4734	/			
Tractivity 62583	Public	Stage 2	This letter, written on behalf of my wife and myself, sets out our response to the questions raised in EDF's Pre-Application Consultation, Stage 2, about your preferred proposals. We confine our response to general matters and matters which affect the Cannington area. We feel that comment on proposals affecting other places should be left to those who are directly affected by them. I have held back the letter so that it can refer to the results of a questionnaire sent by the Parish Council to all those who are on the electoral roll in Cannington. These results became available today and references below to "Cannington voters" are to those who responded to this questionnaire.	10134-1576-65			/	
Bristol Water	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Bristol Water would appreciate continued inclusion in EDF's list of consultees as proposal proceeds.	10202-1576-985	/			
Hinkley Point Site Stakeholder Group (A+B) Sites	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	To conclude, it is realised that the existing SSG is not on the consultation list but it is considered that they represent the populous surrounding the existing Power Stations. It is therefore considered that our views and concerns and, May I say, considerable experience in dealing with the general public on Parish, District and County levels are relevant.	10255-1576-4231			/	
Tractivity 1169	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Site not near my residence too many people have views on what does not really concern them.	10279-1576-409			/	

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 2	We would expect the application to demonstrate how it builds on best practice from other nationally significant infrastructure projects, for example in respect of skills and transport. This should draw on examples from across the world including, but not limited to, EDF's experience of developing nuclear projects in other countries. We consider that developing a close and mutually beneficial relationship between the project, the local community and the environment will be critical to its lasting success. The application should also clearly set out how the project's long-term economic legacy will benefit the locality and wider economic area.	89055-1576-2808	/			
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	Description: That the widest possible range of the Community have not been able to access the information, are not aware of the proposals and have not been able to express their views during the Stage 2 consultation.	89182-1576-2227			/	
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	The Council's Community Support and Engagement programme is designed to assist as residents, groups of residents and Town and Parish Councils within the community in accessing the information available, aware of the proposals and are able to express their views. That EDF fail to address local impacts through comprehensive mitigation and compensation. The Council responds to the Stage 2 consultation, works collaboratively with its partners between the end of the Stage 2 consultation and the submission of the application to the IPC, submits a full and robust response to the IPC when submitting its response on whether or not the consultation process has been adequate, submits a full and robust Local Impact Report and finally represents the Council during the examination of the application by the IPC	89182-1576-2447			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	10.1 An equalities impact assessment will be required from the developer. A fuller programme of engagement with hard to reach groups including specific action in deprived wards is required. Work with existing migrant communities is also an area where action is required.	89186-1576-14452			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Plans including resource plans for engagement with the hard to reach groups, outreach services and community development will be required.	89186-1576-17819			/	
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 encouraged that the EDF will engage regularly with the local community through the construction period although require further details on the approach and scope of the consultation.	89422-1576-1807			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62989	Public	Stage 2 Update	The consultation documents that I have looked at are very 'locally' orientated, and I would appreciate learning when wider regional issues will be included in your consultation?	89690-1576-700			/	
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,	89756-1576-205			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	From our discussions to date, we believe that there is a need for more proactive community engagement by EDF, especially members of the community who do not have access to a computer and also "hard to reach" groups. Effective engagement and communication with the local community (over and above key stakeholders) is needed to ensure the full capture of information and ensure community cohesion.	89863-1576-785			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	The Councils wish to register their dissatisfaction with EDFE's response to this issue. EDFE state that "we consider it would be disproportionate to hold specific events for 'hard to reach/hard to hear groups' as we are not consulting on the project as a whole". The Councils refer to page 4 of EDFE's consultation document that states that the proposed changes set out in the document "...could result in new or significantly different impacts on people living in the vicinity of any of the our proposed development sites". Given the significance of the proposed changes the Councils consider that it is essential that the appropriate consultation methods and initiatives are used to reach all community groups, including 'hard to reach/hard to hear groups' that are likely to be subject of significant impacts as a result of the Proposed Changes proposals.	89877-1576-11344			/	
Tractivity 62366	Public	Stage 2	(personal details removed). EdF (personal details removed) referring to Cannington has stated that 'The nature of Cannington is that of a very pleasant rural village and we want to respect that.' I suggest that he does his homework on Stogursey (and takes a proper tour of the village). If he does, he will find that this charming village retains its Norman pattern of housing and has a magnificent Norman Abbey Church and a number of other historical and cultural assets. Indeed, it has even more than Cannington which needs to be protected. All this is at risk of degradation and disruption as a result of EdF's ignorance or unwillingness to take account of the quality of the immediate locality where it proposes siting its power stations. This is apparent at EdF open days, where ill informed EdF consultants show that they have not done adequate studies. The response to points made by us seems to be to warn us that the lights will go out if EdF does not get its way. It has become increasingly clear that the profit motive is paramount for EdF and I hope that the IPC, or whatever supersedes it, will curb the steamroller approach of EdF, which so threatens the wellbeing of the parish of Stogursey.	10040-383-396			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62583	Public	Stage 2	<p>This letter, written on behalf of my wife and myself, sets out our response to the questions raised in EDF's Pre-Application Consultation, Stage 2, about your preferred proposals. We confine our response to general matters and matters which affect the Cannington area. We feel that comment on proposals affecting other places should be left to those who are directly affected by them.</p> <p>I have held back the letter so that it can refer to the results of a questionnaire sent by the Parish Council to all those who are on the electoral roll in Cannington. These results became available today and references below to "Cannington voters" are to those who responded to this questionnaire.</p>	10134-1574-65			/	
Wembdon Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	<p>The Stage 2 consultation proposals have a more detrimental effect on the village of Wembdon than the Stage 1, as this has moved a large proportion of the construction worker accommodation into Bridgwater and in so doing significantly increases the amount of traffic using the A39 and the Bridgwater Northern Distributor Road (BNDR).</p> <p>The current updated consultation proposals continue to fail to address in any meaningful way any of the issues raised by ourselves in earlier consultations.</p>	89921-1577-834			/	
Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's	Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	<p>This should be considered an Interim Response for Sedgemoor District Council, submitted to meet the deadline set for statutory consultees. We are confident that this response will reflect the current views of Councillors, as it takes account of recent discussions at Member briefings and the recommendations of the Sedgemoor Special Council held on Monday 25th July 2011.</p> <p>Sedgemoor Members will, however, have a further opportunity to consider and endorse the response at an Executive committee meeting on 3rd August 2011 and the Scrutiny meeting on the 10th August 2011 and it is our intention to provide any revisions and updates to the response by the 12th August deadline for the local community.</p>	89955-1577-668			/	
Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's	Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	<p>The Councils wish to register two concerns in relation to the consultation programme. Firstly, the timing of consultation meant that the Proposed Changes J24 & Highways consultation documents were published prior to the close of consultation on the SOCC with the Local Authority. The Planning Act 2008 requires the applicant to consult the Local Authority/s on their draft SOCC for a period of 28 days (section 47(1, 2 & 3)) and have regard to the response in finalising the SOCC (section 47(5)). By publishing the Proposed Changes J24 & Highways consultation documents for 'informal' consultation prior to receiving feedback from LAs on the SOCC, the extent to which the consultation information and process could be altered was diminished.</p>	89958-1577-812			/	

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	Secondly, the deadline for responses from statutory consultees (28th July) has been scheduled to end only 13 days after the commencement of the formal consultation stage on 15th July, which should more appropriately follow the publication of the SOCC on 14th July. The Council understands that EDFE were seeking to provide all stakeholders with early sight of the consultation documents through the 'informal' consultation stage from 1st July to 14th July, but consider that statutory consultees as well as the local community and general public should be given until the 12th August to respond. Acceptance of consultation responses from statutory consultees submitted up to 12th August would ensure compliance with the provisions and intent of the Planning Act 2008, in particular the minimum 28 day consultation period prescribed by the Planning Act 2008.	89958-1577-1559			/	
Miller Turner Investments	Consultee with an interest in land	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	- The previous lack of robust highway data has still not been addressed and therefore no assessment of the proposals at Junction 24 can be undertaken. It is understood that considerable evidence has been made available to the County Council and Highways Agency although this has not been made available publicly. This is a fundamental flaw in the consultation process. All available information, including a summary of discussions with the relevant highway authorities should be published to enable public scrutiny prior to submission of the application to the IPC.	89948-1577-1394		/		
Tractivity 63086	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	I read with disgust the item in your publication by (Personal information removed) "Energy at the heart of the community" on the proposed build at Hinkley Point. He has given an indication that all is well in the area of Bridgwater and the villages in the surrounding area. True he and representatives of EDF have talked to the residents of towns and villages in the area but has not listened to the replies. The power station is not the issue, the local infrastructure is.	90057-1577-0			/	
Tractivity 63086	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	It is also noted that a notice of planning application for Hinkley C and the associated works has been published in the Times News Paper. Perhaps not a publication widely read in this area. Perhaps EDF were hoping that the local yokels would not be aware of it and that there is a limited time for response. A copy is being circulated via email and hard copy to all residents in the surrounding area	90057-1577-2081			/	

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	Again in the Mercury of 26th, (Personal information removed) is quoted as saying 'We are pleased with the council officers' recommendation and are grateful for the support shown for our proposals'. See Somerset County council's release below. Is the Board of EDF aware of the damage this constant drip of misinformation and confused signals is doing to their reputation locally? We are tired of all the contradictory statements and of the delays in getting direct answers to our direct questions. Please give us some definitive statements backed by sound research. Your local management is losing (perhaps I should say 'has lost') credibility with local people. If the local management is representative of the quality of top EDF management, then you can imagine our concern at EDF's ability to safely manage years of construction at Hinkley C concurrent with the operations at Hinkley B.	90074-1577-5274			/	
Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's	Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	<p>The Councils have consistently emphasised the importance of engaging 'Hard to Hear' groups in Bridgwater and do not agree with EDFE's conclusion that it is not necessary or proportionate to hold further consultation events for this purpose. Communities in Bridgwater will be amongst those most affected by the HPC project, yet evidence suggests that understanding of the proposals amongst residents is relatively limited. Direct consultation led by Sedgemoor District Council indicates that while the majority of respondents in Bridgwater are aware of the HPC proposal, less than half are aware of the associated development proposals (The survey work is ongoing and the results will be published to support the Councils' Local Impact Report/s). This means that a large proportion of Bridgwater residents and businesses could have limited knowledge of the potential scale of transport movements proposed, where these movements are likely to be concentrated and the implications this could have for the environment and their daily routines. The Councils therefore disagree with the statement in EDFE's response to comments on the draft SOCC that '...we consider it would be disproportionate to hold specific events for 'hard to reach/hard to hear' groups at this limited, focussed stage of the consultation as we are not consulting on the project as a whole.'</p> <p>This is an issue which remains and does need to be resolved. The Councils are welcoming of the measures proposed by EDFE to invite ward Members for Bridgwater to attend the HPC project Transport Forum, enabling Members to provide input based on their local knowledge and to represent the interests of the local community.</p>	89958-1576-11026		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 706	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below As you have probably realised by our responses we are not happy with your latest proposals. It seems you started with outrageous proposals, watered them down and hoped everyone would think you were doing them a favour. PLEASE REASLISE THAT NOT EVERYONE HAS ACCESS TO A COMPUTER AND IS NOT ABLE TO REPLY TO YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE	9466-1574-6907			/	Receiving and analysing feedback from the local community and general public at each stage of consultation has been a critical part of EDF Energy's production of its consultation proposals and, ultimately, its DCO application. Questionnaires at each stage of consultation have been a core part of the strategy to encourage people to respond (see Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report) and, as such, have themselves been the subject of consultation comments.
Tractivity 866	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below The questions do not deal with many of the real issues such as road improvements proposed bus routes from Williton to site, overlap between work starting and completion of the Cannington bypass and I consider the whole paper very vague.	9624-1574-6055			/	Throughout all stages of consultation, the comments about the questionnaires mainly focused on the phrasing and ordering of questions, the contextual information provided, and the process for completing and returning the forms. The on-line and printed questionnaires were designed to be an accessible way for people to respond to the consultations, although there were also other feedback options available such as letters and the consultation freephone line (see Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report). Printed copies of the questionnaires were made available at the public exhibitions, the EDF Energy Bridgwater office and on request via the freephone hotline. These could be completed and returned at the exhibitions or using a freepost address. In addition, electronic versions were available to be filled in on-line or on laptops provided at the public exhibitions. Some consultees said they had had difficulties in using the electronic version and EDF Energy ensured that the alternative feedback channels were clearly advertised, as it was anticipated that different people would prefer to give feedback in different ways. Although some respondents had difficulties with the electronic feedback, many responses were received via the electronic version of the questionnaires at each of the stages.
Tractivity 867	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below The whole questionnaire is leading and the stage 2 consultation document is very short of detail making it very hard to form a true picture of the proposals.	9625-1574-6170			/	Staff were available at all the exhibitions and in the EDF Energy Bridgwater office to assist members of the public with completing questionnaires. The questionnaires were designed to be read in conjunction with the consultation documentation, and/or the accompanying summary document, from each stage of consultation. The key questions from
Tractivity 904	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below There is no mention of what you are planing for Combwich in this Questionnaire . Why have you not mentioned the fact that you want to build fabrication facilities in combwich is this a deliberate ploy to deceive people how can you have a successful consultation without making all the facts easily accessible. your information has been erroneous and misleading.	9662-1574-6203	/			
Tractivity 963	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Proposals for Combwich and Cannington strongly contested on grounds of flood risk, noise and light pollution, road safety, access for emergency vehicles and quality of life for residents. THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS SO SMALL THAT MANY PEOPLE WILL BE UNABLE TO SEE TO COMPLETE IT. ALSO EVEN TODAY MANY PEOPLE ARE NOT COMPUTER LITERATE AND THERE APPEARS TO BE NO OPTION TO COMPLETE AND SUBMIT A HARD COPY- JUST ANOTHER INSTANCE OF EDF'S INADEQUATE CONSULTATION	9721-1574-6854				

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 982	Public	Stage 2	9a. Any other ideas or comments? No map 9b. Bridgwater and Albion Rugby Football Club site, College Way (site BRI-C) for up to 150 places? Box ticked: No opinion 9b. Any other ideas or comments? As above	9740-1574-3874			/	the questionnaires were reproduced in the consultation documents, as well as on the public exhibition boards, to make the process as clear as possible. Therefore, although some consultees were concerned about the context provided only in the questionnaires, it was never intended that they be standalone documents. Instead, it was made clear how people could access information on the proposals at each stage of consultation. At Stage 1 the consultation questions were arranged based on the structure of the summary document and covered the proposals at the main Hinkley Point C site and associated development sites. Some consultees felt that instead they should have been ordered by their perceived level of importance. At each stage EDF Energy has tried to order the questions in logical and easy-to-use a manner as possible.
Tractivity 982	Public	Stage 2	9c. Any other ideas or comments? No map	9740-1574-4172			/	The open-ended phrasing of most of the consultation questions was intended to encourage responses from consultees on specific areas without leading the consultee in their views. The questions throughout the stages nevertheless received some criticism for being vague or leading. EDF Energy does not accept this assessment of the questions, which were successful in eliciting relevant feedback on key areas of the proposals. However, EDF Energy acknowledges that it is a difficult balance to focus people's attention to certain areas without anticipating what their main issues would be. Recognising that not everyone would wish to respond to specific questions, comment boxes were provided several times in each of the questionnaires for people to provide any other comments they might have. As well as responding to particular questions, a lot of respondents also chose to use this way of providing whatever further comments or queries they had.
Tractivity 982	Public	Stage 2	10. Any other ideas or comments? No map	9740-1574-4758			/	
Tractivity 982	Public	Stage 2	11. Any other ideas or comments? No map	9740-1574-5344			/	
Tractivity 1026	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Apart from the removal of text when you try to move down this questionnaire. Would prefer Severn Barrage but in short term use of an existing nuclear facility makes sense. Less Co2	9784-1574-127			/	
Tractivity 1026	Public	Stage 2	4. Any other ideas or comments? You cannot click back in these without deleting your entry. It is rumoured some workers may come to Butlins in Minehead - good we need the money here unlike some Nimbys.	9784-1574-1661			/	
Tractivity 1037	Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments? The phrase 'increased traffic movements over a prolonged but temporary period of time?' is used - the lives of local residents will be greatly affected for a long time. The second sentence is a dismissive statement. Traffic congestion is bad enough now without the added pressure from a park and ride facilities and the freight logistics facilities furnishing the needs of Hinkley C. The existing road network cannot cope. They are ordinary roads not highways in the now generally accepted definition of the word.	9795-1574-2535			/	At Stages 1 and 2, the questionnaires included tick box options in addition to comment boxes. There was some criticism over the choice of titles for boxes available to consultees, some of whom felt they were being restricted in getting their views across, although there was no obligation to respond to every question in order to submit a response. As a result of comments from Stage 1, a new 'don't know' tick box was included as an option in every question asked at

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 187	Public	Stage 1	8. What do you think of our proposals for the use of Combwich Wharf? It must make sense to bring large items by sea. THE ABOVE QUESTION RE CANNINGTON FREIGHT HANDLING IS VERY MISLEADING!! THE MAPS DO NOT CORRESPOND TO THE TITLES... QUESTION IS THEREFORE INVALID AND PUBLIC ARE NOT GETTING OPPORTUNITY TO FULLY COMMENT.	8903-1574-4168	/			Stage 2. A question on Combwich was included on the Stage 2 questionnaire and people had the opportunity to include any comments on proposals at this location, although one respondent felt the wording was too limited.
Tractivity 432	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	This questionnaire does not include questions about the use of Cannington old quarry to deposit waste from the power station excavations. This is in our vicinity and could again lead to increased, noise, dust, exhaust and light pollution on our property. We have concerns about how this infill could affect the water table in our area and the effect on flooding as well as on our septic tanks and their out fall. when the quarry tried to pump out the water all of the local water courses were raised in	9352-1574-9319			/	Where relevant, the questionnaires contained maps/red line development boundary plans to illustrate the location of specific sites. At Stage 1 there was a misprint on the maps for Cannington in question 8, which was brought to EDF Energy's attention following the first Cannington exhibition. This was corrected, and those who had responded to this question were informed of the printing error and given the opportunity to clarify their answer.
Tractivity 26220	Public	Stage 1	I am writing to express my disappointment and unease about some aspects of the consultation questionnaire which EDF have published - both on the website and as a pamphlet (of which we obtained copies when we attended the event at Cannington Village Hall yesterday). It seems to me that this is not constructed in such a way as to elicit people's real views. May I take question 7 as an example of this problem and confine myself for the moment to the Cannington section at the top? What I should actually like to do here is (a) to say that I favour neither of these locations (b) to say that if we are to have one or other then I should strongly favour the first option over thesecond and (c) to give brief reasons for these views I feel sure that I am not alone in wanting to do these things but, as you will appreciate, they cannot be done. If I vote for "neither", I cannot express a preference for one over the other. The only way to express such a preference is to vote for the least worst option, but to do this is to give a wholly false impression - which would no doubt be recorded by EDF as a positive vote in favour of that option. There is no way in which, using the form, I can say what I mean. So far as the giving of reasons is concerned, there is nowhere on the form where this can be done. The same problem affects the rest of question 7 and other parts of the form - e.g., questions 8 and 5 (although in clause 5 there is a small space for the giving of reasons). The fact that the form has not been planned so as fully to elicit people's real views tends to fuel one's misgivings that the consultation is a formal, rather than a real, exercise.	9382-1574-201			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 26220	Public	Stage 1	My wife and I are determined to say what we do think, but I am at a loss to know how to do it. If we don't use the form at all, I suspect that EDF will find it hard to factor our views into their statistics. The best alternative may be to use the form and supplement it with a letter, but this poses the same problem.	9382-1574-1890			/	
Tractivity 50878	Public	Stage 1	I wish to record certain flaws which I have become aware in the questionnaire, which will be the primary means of consultation: First, the "Don't know" option is missing, for no apparent reason, throughout questions 7 and 8.	9393-1574-12211	/			
Tractivity 50878	Public	Stage 1	Second, in question 8, the caption which appears below the plan of CAN-A should appear below CAN-B, and vice versa. When I pointed this out, EDF replied that they were aware of the problem and had taken steps to deal with it.	9393-1574-12442	/			
Tractivity 50878	Public	Stage 1	Third, some of the questions ask consultees to give reasons for their views and provide space in which to do so (e.g., question 5) and others (e.g., questions 7 and 8) do not. I do not see how these differences can be justified.	9393-1574-12671			/	
Tractivity 50878	Public	Stage 1	Fourth, there is what seems to me a serious flaw which I have pointed out to EDF but which, I understand, is not being corrected. It applies to question 5 and to all the sections of questions 7 and 8. The problem in question 5 is that if people vote "Neither", thus voting against both bypass options, they cannot and will not express a Preference for one over the other. Yet if there is to be a bypass, this preference is all-important. If the questionnaire had asked them to rank the various options in order of preference (excluding, obviously, the "Don't know" option) that would have solved the problem. I take as another example the "Cannington" section in question 7. Again, if people vote "Neither", they are not invited, or able, to express a preference between CAN-A and CAN-B. Yet this preference, again, may be all-important. The same point arises in regard to the other sections of question 7 and to all the sections in question 8. The questionnaire is simply not designed to elicit the views which it needs to elicit, and this is a bad piece of consultation. It would, in all cases, have been avoided by asking people to rank the options in order of preference.	9393-1574-12903			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 50878	Public	Stage 1	<p>Fifth, I am disturbed by the way in which the longer document pre-empts many of the decisions on which EDF purports, through the questionnaire, to be consulting. Examples of this are in Table 4.4 in the longer document. Thus (with italics supplied):</p> <p>"EDF requires one or more campuses in Bridgwater"</p> <p>"EDF requires a campus within the CAN-A search area"</p> <p>"EDF requires one campus in Williton"</p> <p>"EDF requires a park and ride facility in each of the following locations ... junction 23 ... junction 24 ... Cannington ... [and] Williton"</p> <p>"EDF requires one freight consolidation facility adjacent to a motorway junction and one facility in Cannington".</p> <p>If EDF "requires" all these things, what is the point of allowing people to vote against them? Yet in every case the questionnaire purports to allow consultees to vote against these requirements. The purpose of this can only be to give a false appearance of leaving open for consultation questions which certainly should have been left open but which have in reality been settled before the consultation takes place.</p>	9393-1574-14091			/	
Tractivity 50878	Public	Stage 1	<p>(Incidentally, it is of course the inclusion within the questionnaire of options to vote against these various "requirements" which causes the difficulty which I have identified as the fourth flaw above. The fact that all such votes are shown by the longer document to be wasted votes makes this flaw if anything still worse.)</p> <p>Sixth, and finally, I am struck by the fact that, where the questionnaire offers a choice between two or more options, the options are confined to those which would be fully acceptable to EDF. A very clear example of this is the questionnaire's treatment of the options for the Cannington bypass see my response to question 5 above. In particular, the questionnaire (besides making no reference to a bypass from Dunball) fails to air the possibility of "the outer western route" Even on EDF's own showing this is a possible and indeed a viable option, and many people in Cannington might have voted for it in preference to the other options if they had been given the chance. The fact that EDF does not like it is not of itself a good reason for excluding this possibility (or for excluding the possibility of a Dunball bypass).</p>	9393-1574-15591			/	
Tractivity 60822	Public	Stage 1	<p>EDF asks three questions covering the first thread about a southern landscape buffer, site restoration post-decommissioning, and maintenance of footpath rights of way. Whilst these questions are about environmental impacts, they don't address ecosystem sustainability in the design of the main power station to last 100 years. Ecosystem economics suggests that scale of use of resources and management of waste should be considered at an early stage in design, not treated as a secondary issue in a strategic environmental analysis. These questions, therefore, appear trivial compared with those concerning the sustainability of the materials used during construction and decommissioning, the impact of energy rejection in the rankine cycle to the Bristol Channel and the management of irradiated waste, and the electricity transformers necessary to permit power transmission to the national grid.</p>	9402-1574-919			/	

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	It is a matter of extreme concern that although the proposed Hinkley 'C' nuclear power station would - necessarily - synthesise radionuclides, these twelve questions do not include any direct reference to the possibility of environmental harm caused by the radioactivity from these radionuclides. It is therefore clear that this document does not fulfil the legal requirement for Pre- Application Consultation on Environmental Impact.	89479-1574-12512		/		
Tractivity 62578	Public	Stage 2	As your online questionnaire fails to let me copy and paste my replies into each of the boxes without the previous one disappearing, here is my response to your questions:	10129-1574-0			/	
Tractivity 62578	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below. Most of your questions here are extremely loaded and have been asked in such a way that they are leading people who haven't read your Masterplan documents (and let's face it how many people have had the time to trawl through all 9000 pages) to think that you're doing them a favour. For example: No 1-you don't actually explain what you mean by "arrangement" but throw in the word "landscaping" and it sounds like you're creating some wonderful garden, then fail to mention all the concrete that's going into building Hinkley and the ugly layers of fencing that will surround it! No 2 - people who haven't read your Masterplan will think this a great idea but the reality is that instead of using the land at Hinkley you're destroying 4 pockets of countryside and ruining other residents' lives in the surrounding area. No 3 - again you come across as being commendable by speeding up the process of building the power station but don't actually say which jetty you're referring to. No 4 - portraying yourselves as being so generous in providing all this accommodation but don't mention at what price for the people of the area. No 5-once again, portraying yourselves as being generous when you're actually going to be causing complete chaos. No 6, 7 and 8 - offering to build a bypass and park-and-ride facilities sounds like you've really thought about traffic but there's no mention of the real impact on the area. No 12 - yet again you fail in your question to mention anything of the real facts about the plans for Comwich purporting to be some kind of heroes for refurbishing the wharf there. You have also failed to mention in any of your questions anything about how people feel about the 120 HGV's that will be thundering through Bridgwater from junctions 23 and 24.	10129-1574-16466			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62584	Public	Stage 2	Noise was briefly referred to by some of the parishioners and particularly by a governor of the local Otterhampton Primary School. This problem cannot be effectively understood by a questionnaire type of enquiry. Anyway, the meaning of a consultation is that those being consulted should be the main questioners.	10135-1574-311			/	
Tractivity 62586	Public	Stage 2	I completed my previous handwritten questionnaire before that appreciation dawned. After a period of reflection I have amended my responses where necessary per the attached questionnaire and added the comments below. In my view EDF have handled this very badly.	10137-1574-1308			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	j) Your online/printed questionnaire is very awkward, leads respondents in ways they don't find natural and does not lend itself generally to facilitate the public's response. Those I know who have tried it report it is very difficult to use. I have looked at it and deemed it unusable.	89469-1574-4145			/	

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	<p>5.3 We feel question number 8 in EDF's Stage one questionnaire was poorly worded and could have led to EDF possibly incorrectly interpreting the results to justify having a road freight depot at Combwich under their Stage Two Consultation preferred proposals.</p> <p>5.4 We understand only 472 questionnaires were submitted under the stage one consultation in total.</p> <p>5.5 There were two search areas at Cannington for a road freight logistics site under Stage One options.</p> <p>212 respondents indicated that their preference was for neither site at Cannington.</p> <p>Unsurprisingly</p> <p>211 respondents indicated their preference was for the proposed freight logistics site at Combwich.</p> <p>5.6 Possibly illustrating our understanding of the need for a water borne freight storage site for the large loads, approximately 30 people from Combwich responded to the questionnaire.</p> <p>5.7 Over 200 Combwich residents packed the local village hall to protest at the preferred proposals under Stage Two that are only even now - 23rd August 2010 - becoming apparent by working through the 8,834 pages of the Consultation.</p> <p>5.8 It is clear the 211 respondents were actually indicating a preference for the Combwich PROPOSAL which was as a WATER borne freight logistics site, NOT as a road freight site.</p> <p>6.1 Consultation for the Combwich community did not take place at a stage where there was scope to influence EDF's preferred proposals.</p> <p>6.2 The Parish Council - and (judging by the huge interest) Combwich residents, would like an explanation as how Combwich emerged as the preferred proposal for a road freight logistics and storage area.</p> <p>6.3 What apparent act of presumption by EDF has resulted in this proposal ?</p> <p>6.4 The Parish Council can only imagine that EDF has made a hugely significant error of judgement hopefully accidentally and not deliberately.</p> <p>6.5 Section 4.3.28 of the Stage One Consultation report states - 'Freight handling facilities at Combwich were the most popular option with two thirds of respondents in favour of the proposals'</p> <p>6.6 We suggest a more accurate statement should read - 'Less than 40% of people who responded to the EDF questionnaire were in favour of a WATER borne freight handling facility at Combwich' (472 questionnaires - only 211 in favour)</p>	89274-1574-3431			/	
Otterhampton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>7.0 Despite EDF's commitment to being open and transparent we have yet to see the written comments on the questionnaires, only EDF's interpretation.</p>	89275-1574-0	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd)	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	It is noted that the plans associated with Question 8 of the questionnaire exclude Search Areas J24-A and J24-B and this could be misleading for members of the public who have not viewed the full consultation document.	89435-1574-7768			/	
Tractivity 62983	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	As for Stage 2, we are sending a written response to the 'Update on and Proposed Changes to Preferred Proposals' consultation exercise as the questionnaire once again ignores the wishes and needs of the local communities.	89689-1574-50			/	
5	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	First, the "Don't know" option is missing, for no apparent reason, throughout questions 7 and 8.	89794-1574-2067			/	
5	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	Second, in question 8, the caption which appears below the plan of CAN-A Should appear below CAN-B, and vice versa. As result, the true intentions of consultees who cast a vote for one or the other must be in doubt. When I pointed this out, EDF replied that they were aware of the. problem and had taken steps to deal with it.	89794-1574-2167			/	
5	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	Third, some of the questions ask consultees to give reasons for their views and provide space in which to do so (e.g., question 5) and others (e.g., questions 7 and 8) do not. I do not see how these differences can be justified.	89794-1574-2497			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
5	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	<p>Fourth, there is what seems to me a serious flaw which I have pointed out to EDF but which, I understand, is not being corrected. It applies to question 5 and to all the sections of questions 7 and 8.</p> <p>The problem in question 5 is that if people vote "Neither", thus voting against both bypass options, they cannot and will not express a preference for one over the other. Yet if there is to be a bypass, this preference is all-important. If the questionnaire had asked them to rank the various options in order of preference (excluding, obviously, the "Don't know" option) that would have solved the problem.</p> <p>I take as another example the "Cannington" section in question 7. Again, if people vote "Neither", they are not invited, or able, to express a preference between CAN-A and CAN-B. Yet this preference, again, may be all-important.</p> <p>The same point arises in regard to the other sections of question 7 and to all the sections in question 8. The questionnaire is simply not designed to elicit the views which it needs to elicit, and this is a bad piece of consultation. It would, in all cases, have been avoided by asking people to rank the options in order of preference.</p>	89794-1574-2730			/	
5	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	<p>Fifth, I am disturbed by the way in which the longer document pre-empts many of the decisions on which EDF purports, through the questionnaire, to be consulting. Examples of this are in Table 4.4 in the longer document. Thus (with italics supplied):</p> <p>"EDF requires one or more campuses in Bridgwater"</p> <p>"EDF requires a campus within the CAN-A search area"</p> <p>"EDF requires one campus in Williton"</p> <p>"EDF requires a park and ride facility in each of the following locations ... junction 23 ... junction 24 Gannington [and] Williton"</p> <p>"EDF requires one freight consolidation facility adjacent to a motorway junction and one facility in Cannington".</p> <p>If EDF "requires" all these things, what is the point of allowing people to vote against them? Yet in every case the questionnaire purports to allow consultees to vote against these requirements. The purpose of this can only be to give a false appearance of leaving open for consultation questions which certainly should, have been left open but which have in reality been settled before the consultation takes place.</p>	89794-1574-3918				

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
5	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	<p>In these respects the consultation is not a genuine consultation at all. Its spuriousness happens in these instances to have been revealed by some unguarded statements in the longer document. Quite clearly, however, these instances must cast a doubt over the genuineness of the whole consultation exercise. If the decisions are shown to be pre-empted in these cases, they may well have been pre-empted in others as well.</p> <p>(Incidentally, it is of course the inclusion within the questionnaire of options to vote against "these various "requirements" which causes the difficulty which I have identified as the fourth flaw above. The fact that all such votes are shown by the longer document to be wasted votes makes this flaw, if anything, still worse.)</p>	89794-1574-4993			/	
5	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	<p>Sixth, and finally, I am struck by the fact that, where the questionnaire offers a choice between two or more options, the options are confined to those which would be fully acceptable to EDF. A very clear example of this is the questionnaire's treatment of the options for the Cannington bypass. It offers only two options an eastern bypass and a western bypass. Yet there are at least two other possibilities:</p>	89794-1574-5749			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
6	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	<p>FLAWS AND DEFICIENCIES IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE</p> <p>I wish to record certain flaws which I have become aware in the questionnaire:</p> <p>First, the "Don't know" option is missing throughout questions 7 and 8. .</p> <p>Second, in question 8, the caption which appears below the plan of CAN-A should, appear below CAN-B and vice versa. When I pointed this out, EDF replied that they were aware of the problem and had taken steps to deal with it.</p> <p>Third, some of the questions ask consultees to give reasons for their views and provide space in which to do so (e.g. question 5) and others (e.g. questions 7 and 8) do not. I do not see how these differences can be justified.</p> <p>Fourth, there is what seems to me a, serious flaw which I have pointed out to EDF but which, I understand, is not being corrected. It applies to question 5 and to all the sections of questions 7 and 8.</p> <p>The problem in question 5 is that if people vote "Neither", thus voting against both bypass options, they cannot and will not express a preference for one over the other. Yet if there is to be a bypass, this preference is all-important. If the questionnaire had asked them to rank the various options in order of preference (excluding, obviously, the "Don't know" option) that would have solved the problem.</p> <p>I take as another example the "Cannington" section in question 7. Again, if people vote "Neither", they are not invited, or able, to express a preference between CAN-A and CAN-B. Yet this preference, again, maybe all-important.</p> <p>The same point arises in regard to the other sections of question 7 and to all the sections in question 8. The questionnaire is simply not designed to elicit the views which it needs to elicit, and this is a bad piece of consultation. It would, in all cases, have been avoided by asking people rank the options in order of preference.</p> <p>Fifth, I am disturbed by the way in which the longer document, pre-empts many of the decisions on which EDF purports, through the questionnaire, to be consulting. Examples of this are in Table 4.4 in the longer document. Thus (with italics supplied):</p> <p>"EDF requires one or more campuses in Bridgwater"</p> <p>"EPF requires, a campus within the CAN-A search area"</p> <p>"EPF requires one campus in Williton"</p> <p>"EDF requires a park and ride facility in each of the following locations ... junction 23 ... junction-24 ... Cannington ... [and] Williton"</p> <p>"EDF requires one freight consolidation facility adjacent to a motorway junction and one facility in Cannington"</p> <p>If EDF "requires" all these things, what is the point of allowing people to vote against them? Yet in, every case the questionnaire purports to allow consultees to vote against these requirements. The purpose of this can only be to give a false appearance of leaving open for consultation questions which certainly should have been left open but which have in reality been settled before the consultation takes place.</p>	89795-1574-3475			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
6	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	<p>Incidentally, it is of course the inclusion within the questionnaire of options to vote against these various "requirements" which causes the difficulty which I have identified as the fourth flaw above. The fact that all such votes are shown by the longer document to be wasted votes makes this flaw, if anything, still worse.</p> <p>Sixth, and finally, I am struck by the fact that, where the questionnaire offers a choice between two or more options, the options are confined to those which would be fully acceptable to EDF. A very clear example of this is the questionnaire's treatment of the options for the Cannington bypass: see my response to question 5 above. In particular, the questionnaire fails to air the possibility of "the outer western route". Even on EDF's own showing this is a possible and indeed a viable option, and many people in Cannington might have voted for it if they had been given the chance. The fact that EDF does not like it is not of itself a good reason for excluding it.</p>	89795-1574-6835			/	
Tractivity 212	Public	Stage 1	<p>8. What do you think of our proposals for the use of Combwich Wharf?</p> <p>The above maps for Cannington show incorrect coordinates ie map on left should be South of village adjacent to the A39 and vice versa.</p>	8917-743-3864			/	