

Schedule of Responses – Appendix H.1

Issues Beyond the Scope of the 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)
South West Strategic Health Authority	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The South West Strategic Health Authority supports a sustainable approach to energy production, including measures to reduce demand, increase energy efficiency and develop local renewable energy systems. We acknowledge the role of nuclear power in providing part of the United Kingdom energy requirements.	8711-1579-572			/	A number of consultees throughout the consultation process offered both positive and negative comments on the need for new nuclear power and whether other sources such as renewable technologies are more appropriate to meet United Kingdom (UK) energy needs. These consultees also raised various issues around the cost, safety, security, and waste management of nuclear power stations.
Bristol City Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	Bristol City Council is minded to object to the proposal to locate an additional Nuclear Energy generation power station on the Hinkley site and has serious concern on a number of issues, including the following; - inefficient and poor use of resources in face of alternative and safer sources of energy; - constraint placed on the effective delivery of alternative renewable energy to the energy network in the Hinkley Point area; - impact of the proposed use on the environment of the Severn Estuary with in-combination effects which could not be mitigated (see technical note attached).	8712-1579-510			/	The need for new nuclear The Government's policy on the need for new nuclear power stations is set out in the National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6) ⁽¹⁾ designated on 19 July 2011 (see also the Issues Beyond the Scope of Consultation – Nuclear Energy and Principal of Development – National Policy topic response). EN-6 states that the Infrastructure Planning Commission should assess applications for new nuclear power stations on the basis that the need for such infrastructure has been demonstrated. Therefore, EDF Energy's application for development consent has not addressed the need for new nuclear in detail. EN-6 was developed following extensive public and stakeholder consultation by the Government and has been subject to parliamentary scrutiny and approval by the House of Commons. EN-6 has identified a number of sites potentially suitable for new nuclear power stations, following extensive studies of candidate sites. Hinkley Point is one of the sites identified in EN-6.
Bristol City Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	It is also understood that the site may, at a future date, be licensed to store high-level nuclear waste for over 100 years. There are potential risks associated with such storage for the local population, including Bristol residents, and an acceptable solution to the storage of high-level nuclear waste should be agreed and implemented before additional reactors are built.	8712-1579-1114			/	Consistent with Government policy, EDF Energy believes there is a strong case for new nuclear development. The challenges of energy security and climate change pose enormous threats to society, and both the previous and current governments have recognised the importance of tackling these challenges and have set out a course for transition to a low carbon economy.
Bristol City Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	1. Inefficient and poor use of resources and constraint on access to the energy network The proposal prevents the use of the site for other cheaper forms of renewable energy in the Hinkley Point area, such as wind energy, prevents access to the national grid of cheaper and renewable forms of energy and inhibits the development of alternative options in the area.	8712-1579-1612			/	Electricity is central to this transition, and is likely to be even more important in the future as it could provide a

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Bristol City Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	<p>2. Impact on the proposal on the environment of the Severn Estuary</p> <p>The proposals will result in the potential for adverse effects on the integrity of the Severn Estuary SAC, SPA and Ramsar, the River Wye SAC and the River Usk SAC, either alone or in combination with other plans and projects. These effects would occur through potential impact on water resources and quality, species and habitat loss and fragmentation, coastal squeeze and disturbance (noise, light and visual).</p> <p>The Appraisal of Sustainability identifies that there is the potential for significant negative in-combination effects if the two nuclear power stations and any of the Severn tidal power schemes are developed, to the extent that it may not be possible to fully mitigate such effects. The information contained in the Stage 1 consultation report is not sufficient to conclude that the proposal is unlikely to have an adverse effect on the integrity of the identified</p> <p>European sites. The Stage 1 consultation report does not refer to other proposals in the Severn Estuary area that should also be taken into account in an in-combination assessment, such as proposals for port expansion at Bristol Port, wind turbine development and proposals, and Waste management and energy generation proposals in the Avonmouth and Severnside area.</p> <p>Whilst the Appraisal of Sustainability summary key findings for Hinkley Point suggest that mitigation of 'alone' impacts are likely to be possible, the HRA carried out for the NPS states that the effectiveness of such measures could only be ascertained through HRA at the project level.</p> <p>Clarity is required on the potential of mitigation for such proposals in-combination, and the assessment of 'the imperative reason of overriding public interest' required to justify the inclusion of the site in the Nuclear Energy National Planning Statement, and its pursuit through the proposed application.</p>	8712-1579-1987	/			<p>means of enabling low carbon transport and heating, as long as there is a means of generating low carbon electricity when and where it is needed.</p> <p>Nuclear power is the most affordable, large-scale, low carbon generating technology⁽²⁾ currently available that can provide secure supplies of electricity</p> <hr/> <p>Notes:</p> <p>(1). National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6) (Volume 1), July 2011, DECC website: http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/meeting_energy/consents_planning/nps_en_infra/nps_en_infra.aspx</p> <p>(2). Nuclear Paper 2 - Reducing CO2 emissions - nuclear and the alternatives, (paragraph 4.4, page 21) Sustainable Development Commission (SDC), 5 March 2006: http://www.sd-commission.org.uk/data/files/publications/Nuclear-paper2-reducingCO2emissions.pdf</p>
Countryside Council for Wales	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>CCW welcomes and supports the strong efforts made by DECC and its associates in undertaking this HRA process and, in particular, the commitment to considering strategic siting assessment and the assessment individual site nominations. In respect to Imperative Reasons of Overriding Public Interest (IROPI), it is not the remit of CCW to consider issues of energy security, human health and public safety and CCW therefore has no comment to make in respect of these matters. CCW notes and, in principle, supports the justification given in respect of combating climate change.</p>	87820-1579-873			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Countryside Council for Wales	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	It is noted that the IROPI chapter (Chapter 7) refers only to sites designated under European Directives and not to associated Ramsar Sites. As a matter of policy, Ramsar Sites are afforded the same degree of protection as other European sites. Under Article 2 of the Ramsar Convention 'If a human induced change to the ecological character of a Ramsar Site, has occurred, is occurring or is likely to occur, under Article 3.2 it is the obligation of the Party concerned to report this without delay to the Ramsar Secretariat. CCW would suggest that the issuing of an IROPI statement in respect of the new nuclear power programme (which includes nominated sites in or around Ramsar Sites e.g. the Severn Estuary) might constitute 'likely occurrence of human induced change'. CCW would welcome confirmation that the Ramsar Secretariat has been informed of this matter.	87820-1579-1456			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Opposed to nuclear power. Hinkley this may not be developed.	88900-1579-7207			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Do not need nuclear to fill an energy gap. Need to establish renewable energy sources Climate change and impact of nuclear on this. Low carbon is a myth.	88900-1579-7373			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Radiation	88900-1579-7581			/	
Tractivity 62130	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	1) I am supportive of the proposal to develop the land adjacent to the existing Hinckley Point A and B power stations for a further nuclear power station;	8752-1579-534			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Our group strongly objects to the building of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point, or elsewhere, on several important grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - health risk to the local population; - health risk to a much wider population in the event of a serious accident or act of terrorism; - that dangerous nuclear waste from the reactors will be stored on site for at least 160 years and having at present no ultimate repository site to be sent to; - and on the basis that these risks do not need to be faced as there is no need for nuclear power. 	88940-1579-98			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>"Much of the evidence about health risk from radiation is post-Chernobyl, which ICRP entirely ignores in formulating its advice. A substantial book full of evidence suggesting that this oversight might be foolish is free to download at http://www.euradcom.org/publications/chernobylinformation...htm. See also http://www.llrc.org/health/subtopic/russianrefs.htm and a new book just published in the Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences (see http://www.nyas.org/Publications/Annals/Detail.aspx?cid=f3f3bd16-51ba-4d7b-a086-753f44b3bfc1). This latest one includes a review of studies of the deaths attributed to Chernobyl fallout in Europe; they total nearly 1 million up to 2005.</p> <p>The ICRP approach treats radiation as if it were homogeneous. That's like regarding all poisons as if they were of equal toxicity, weight for weight. "How much poison do you think would kill you?" asks the idiot. "Well it depends what poison you're talking about", says any half-way intelligent person. In terms of radiation exposure, the idiot question is "What dose is safe?", and the intelligent answer is "that depends; where is the radiation coming from? .. is it a source stuck on my DNA? ... is it stuck in my lymph nodes? is it delivering all its energy into a tiny bit of me and leaving all the rest unirradiated?"</p> <p>The nub of the issue is that there are some kinds of radiation exposure which it is valid to regard as uniform, homogeneous, well-averaged, evenly distributed in the body (however many synonyms one needs). Examples are x-rays and cosmic rays.</p> <p>But there are other kinds of exposure which are never evenly distributed, so that all their damage is concentrated into microscopic volumes of tissue. Hot particles are one example and there are many others. In these circumstances, the CERRIE committee advised in 2004, the very concept of dose may be meaningless at the cellular and molecular level.</p> <p>So there is a massive caveat that should be posted on any expression involving the word "dose". One of the main reasons the nuclear establishment sticks to using dose is for the administrative convenience of lumping all kinds of exposure together. Well that's just not scientifically valid.</p>	88940-1579-1017			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Here, http://www.llrc.org/wobblyscience/subtopic/singtonsaspirin.htm, is an example of the kind of nonsense scientifically illiterate journalists spout because they don't understand these caveats.</p> <p>If you want to see the history of how the radiation protection community got stuck in the "average dose" model, look at www.llrc.org/switcheroo.htm. ICRP has recently admitted</p> <p>[http://www.llrc.org/health/subtopic/icrpabdicates.htm] that their risk model cannot be used for post-accident exposures.</p> <p>By inescapable extension neither can it be used for routine releases of the same radio-isotopes, and operators can't use it to demonstrate compliance with regulations expressed in terms of numbers of cancers per year, which is what they're actually required to do. The big questions are "Where will they get their advice in future? Will it stand up under scientific examination?" The nuclear lobby may be able to dupe the occasional journalist and some of the public but the investors and the courts are another matter. If operators go ahead in spite of the evidence there will be huge bankruptcies on the asbestos model (only far larger).</p> <p>The idea has been put forward that fear of radiation is a greater risk than radiation-induced diseases. What WHO and IAEA have in fact said about the fear factor is in the Report of the Chernobyl Forum (where they were the lead agencies). The report cites (4) a small number of studies where "Chernobyl exposed" populations had higher rates of "mental health symptoms, medically unexplained physical symptoms and subjective ill-health". The mental health symptoms were "mostly subclinical and did not reach the level of criteria for a psychiatric disorder", but they had "important consequences for health behaviour, specifically medical care utilisation and adherence to safety advisories." In other words, these people took up a lot of time at the advisory centres set up to help them.</p> <p>Big surprise then. Doctors call them "the worried well". Their subjective and subclinical presentations are no basis for dismissing the increases in clinical diagnoses of conditions such as cancers, congenital malformation, stillbirth, cataracts, and so on and on reported by many workers in the affected territories. One of these scientists observes "We have seen, since the accident, clear and diverse effects of irradiation in plants over time ... we bear in mind that these late effects in plants could not be related to 'radio-phobia'." (5) The radio-phobia thing is just absurd, unscientific spin. "</p>	88940-1579-3228			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Various authors and groups have described how it is possible to meet our future energy needs without resorting to nuclear power. These included the report of the 2003 Energy Review which came down strongly against nuclear power. (Personal information removed) said that we would be mad to go down that route.</p> <p>The Sustainable Development Commission in their 2008 report "Is nuclear power the answer?" endorsed that view, saying that for example UK carbon reduction would be a mere four percent even if all nuclear generation was replaced. They contended that a concerted programme of renewable energy supported by sufficient energy conservation measures would have the net effect of providing all our needs.</p>	88960-1579-26638			/	
Cannington Women's Institute	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>(Editor's note: see pdf provided separately. Not entered into database - two pages with map and several photos)</p> <p>The members of The Cannington Woman's Institute Feel Strongly that we should write to you.</p> <p>Our Village is Cannington Somerset, which is 6 miles from Hinkley Point.</p> <p>While we have no objection what so ever to the new power station (we have lived with Hinkley for the past 40 years) we wish to make the following statements.</p> <p>The village is about to be ruined; in Fact is it will be Destroyed by the plans that EDF (a French Company) have proposed for our village to enable the new build at Hinkley Point. Enclosed is a map of their current proposals. (Note CAN A,B,C and D)</p>	8765-1579-0	/			
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>1.2. Greenpeace believes that new nuclear power is inadequate, unnecessary and dangerous. It is inadequate because it offers too little, too late in terms of climate change. It is unnecessary because we can reduce emissions and keep the lights using better technologies instead. It is dangerous because of the intractable problems of radioactive waste and nuclear weapons proliferation.</p> <p>1.3. Consequently we do not agree with EdF's assessment that "there is a strong case for new nuclear development in the UK." Indeed, if the government meets its energy efficiency and renewable targets, new baseload electricity generation capacity will be needed until the period beyond 2020. By this point other, more effective and global applicable low carbon technologies than nuclear will be close to commercialisation (1).</p>	8766-1579-332			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	EdF should be honest by telling the public that there is no environmentally acceptable and proven 'solution' for the disposal of high level radioactive wastes and spent fuel. There is no disposal site operational anywhere in the world for spent fuel, as Areva (the supplier of Edfs reactor) has noted (10). Government assertions that a solution exists are therefore deeply misleading.	8766-1579-5431			/	
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	1.13. Given the huge dangers posed by spent fuel to both people and the local environment, EdF's actions in this respect are entirely unacceptable. On this basis alone are grounds for the development process for Hinkley Point C should be stopped.	8766-1579-6274			/	
Tractivity 705	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 against the development in any form. I see no mention of the nuclear waste aspects in this form. Too hot a topic to raise? Under no circumstances should "hot" waste be kept on site other than the minimum possible "cooling pond" period commensurate with safe transportation. Logic and economics dictate that once such a facility exists it will continue to be used until a problem occurs. Logic and economics also suggest that for each site to have a long-term storage area does not make sense. The Hinkley one could become a common shared facility. I have been unable to find any mitigation discussion of this horrendous risk area.	9465-1579-6613			/	
Tractivity 727	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below It may be advisable for the long term, to encourage the building of a wind farm near the site. I would be in favour of this, should it come before a planning committee! Otherwise, how soon can you start?	9485-1579-5740		/		
Tractivity 740	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I strongly believe that the proposals are necessary and that the power station must be built. It is vital both locally and nationally	9498-1579-5742			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 759	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Pleased with whole scheme. Shame it will take so long to get underway.	9517-1579-5989			/	
Tractivity 761	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below It is of paramount importance that Hinkley Point C be built without further delay.	9519-1579-5740			/	
Tractivity 766	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I hope you never get your plans approved as in this day and age there must be plenty of ways to generate electricity without the danger and disruption brought by nuclear	9524-1579-7311			/	
Tractivity 771	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I look forward to seeing Hinkly Point ?C? being built. This should have started years ago!	9529-1579-6478			/	
Tractivity 784	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? This power station must not go ahead nuclear is harmful to everyone and not required considering all the other methods of generating electricity	9542-1579-129			/	
Tractivity 784	Public	Stage 2	4. Any other ideas or comments? definatly NO to all of the above. bridgwater is to far from the hinkley site think of the carbon footprint save a lot of money by not building the power station	9542-1579-1732			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 784	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below THIS PROPOSAL SHOULD NOT GO AHEAD EDF SHOULD BE A RESPONSIBLE ENERGY PROVIDER AND STAY AWAY FROM NUCLEAR. BE CREARTIVE AND THINK OF THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN THE ENVIRONMENT THEY ARE ABOUT TO DESTROY	9542-1579-6811			/	
Tractivity 792	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I personally welcome the news that a new, modern, efficient reactor will be built to solve our future energy needs as I don?t agree with covering all our green space with wind turbines, which are unsightly and appear to be inefficient and unreliable. Several reactors around our coastline, safely contained in such a way as to prevent, for example, terrorists crashing aeroplanes into them would be far better - just look at France and their nuclear programme (87% of power from nuclear, I think it is)! However, with the decommissioning of Hinkley "A" could these existing buildings not be refurbished to accommodate a new reactor and turbines, and likewise when "B" is due for decommissioning, in addition to the third "C" reactor? This would almost certainly satisfy the energy demands of most of the south and provide more badly needed local employment.	9550-1579-6392		/		
Tractivity 795	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? NUCLEAR ENERGY is not the answer. have you learnt nothing from the past.	9553-1579-129			/	
Tractivity 795	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below You truely do not want to here them trust me.	9553-1579-6730			/	
Tractivity 812	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below good for somerset we are willing to help in any way we supported the previous application	9570-1579-6751			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 817	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 strongly against your proposals, particularly regarding COMBWICH.	9575-1579-5803	/			
Tractivity 821	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below For a cost of 1.5% of your total build, you could make all the vociferous opposition to your plans go away. It is very short sighted to dismiss the dedicated road, and everyone knows that you do this onyl to save money- your excuses are ill founded- I quote Arup, advisers to sedgemoor DC. This will also ensure little oppostion to the build of a D and E station	9579-1579-7693			/	
Tractivity 825	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I approve of the plans for the supply of power to this country.	9583-1579-5837			/	
Tractivity 831	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Whole concept is a nightmare. We are an island with wind and wave power avilable - use it!!	9589-1579-5765			/	
Tractivity 863	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Generally satisfactory. Don?t want electricity cuts!	9621-1579-6090			/	
Tractivity 890	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Looks Ok	9648-1579-5740			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 892	Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments? Evidence is that power is not required in South West. Do not build here (so avoid traffic problems here) Build in Essex, Kent or London where the power is needed.	9650-1579-2419			/	
Tractivity 893	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I understand that we need Hinkley Power station, but at what cost, do we destroy villages like Washford in the process. Will I ever be able to sell my house.	9651-1579-6551			/	
Tractivity 914	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Hinkley ?C? should have provided years ago and is now to be welcomed.	9672-1579-5951			/	
Tractivity 949	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Im in favour of using nuclear energy to generate electricity. The sooner the Government gives its consent the better as far as I?m concerned. I don?t like so-called renewables (expensive, unreliable, not viable without large subsidies).	9707-1579-5728			/	
Tractivity 951	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 Hinkley Point needs extending to ?C? and most people are in agreement. Bridgwater and Cannington are against the congestion that the proposed routes will result in. Could a barrage be built across the Parrett to produce electricity and also carry traffic? There has been a lot of talk about a barrage across the Severn to do this.	9709-1579-6405			/	
Tractivity 952	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? It is a shame it is actually going to be another nuclear site rather than wind, a barrage across the water or some other renewable energy that would last longer than approx 50 years and be more beneficial to the community.	9710-1579-127			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 957	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Poorly conceived, when other options are available.	9715-1579-6728			/	
Tractivity 965	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 NOT happy with all the plans.	9723-1579-5769			/	
Tractivity 969	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I moved here from Birmingham for the beautiful countryside and views. I do not want to live by all this heavy construction traffic and pollution. My daughter is at nursery age - traffic too close to a new school on development.	9727-1579-6059			/	
Tractivity 985	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The proposed arrangement is very much larger than expected - the new ?reactors? are much larger than the existing sites A and B. EDF have taken far more land from the countryside than is necessary. The locality - road system, local infrastructure would not cope with this proposal. I am not impressed with the landscaping proposal - the trees EDF intend to plant will not be big enough to make a significant cover and natural looking landscape. We do not want formal planting and layout here; we enjoy the countryside looking natural as it does at the moment. I am very concerned about the bulldozing of the habitat of many of our wild animals and insects, and the trees and wild plants. I am very disappointed in EDF?s attitude to the local parishioners - they dont act upon our concerns. I am very worried indeed about the proposals.	9743-1579-129			/	
Tractivity 1003	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? I cannot see any problem with the proposed site. The opinion of residents in the surrounding area is as follows. put the new power station etc anywhere you like, but not in my back yard! This attitude stinks!	9761-1579-127			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1003	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below If this proposed power station etc does not get the go ahead, with increasing population we will be heading for total BLACKOUT!	9761-1579-6373			/	
Tractivity 1008	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Nuclear power is the environmental answer to our impending generation shortfall. Any necessary works to enable timely construction should be vigorously pursued. Good luck.	9766-1579-6035			/	
Tractivity 1011	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Nuclear energy is unviable, unsustainable and unjust. To hell with your greenwash. No to Hinkley C. No to Somerset becoming a radioactive dumping ground for the next two centuries. No to new nuclear anywhere - over my dead body.	9769-1579-14535			/	
Tractivity 1018	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below My great great great great great great great great grandchildren will still be dealing with this mess. Not to mention those of the people living near the mines and wherever it gets dumped or shot or dropped. Or indeed yours.	9776-1579-5769			/	
Tractivity 1023	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below The power station is needed urgently and should be developed as soon as possible. The measures planned to minimise disruption etc look fine.	9781-1579-5740			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
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	9784-1579-127			/	
Tractivity 1026	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below See first comment. If it were purely for waste disposal - would be against it. Severn Barage would be best - but there has been a nuclear power station there. While the tourist industry here is important its not the only one, this is a working county not a ghetto for rich retirees and the proposals indicate reasonable effort taken. However living 26 miles away although my travel may be affected its for those living nearby to have the biggest input as long as it is constructive.	9784-1579-6218			/	
Tractivity 1035	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? I do not want a new nuclear power station	9793-1579-129			/	
Tractivity 1035	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? As above	9793-1579-428			/	
Tractivity 1035	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? No power station please	9793-1579-923			/	
Tractivity 1035	Public	Stage 2	9c. Any other ideas or comments? Wind power	9793-1579-4323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1035	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>I have always been against nuclear power of any kind whether for energy or weapons as the long term implications for storage and disposal are horrendous and concerns in respect of possible terrorist attack. We should be spending more time and money on cleaner and more environment friendly means of providing power for homes and businesses.</p>	9793-1579-6065			/	
Tractivity 1036	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>We should be pushing for renewable energy - it should not be necessary to have dangerous, costly, forms of energy.</p>	9794-1579-129			/	
Tractivity 1036	Public	Stage 2	<p>5. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>This won't work on narrow lanes and will make the lives of those who live in local villages a misery for 10 years at least. This is the wrong place and the wrong kind of energy production.</p>	9794-1579-2255			/	
Tractivity 1036	Public	Stage 2	<p>6. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>This is predominantly a rural area which will be devastated by such a road and by the construction of an unnecessary nuclear plant.</p> <p>Our MEP has told us that work is undergoing to use the heat from the world's deserts for global power generation - this is much more sustainable.</p>	9794-1579-3067			/	
Tractivity 1036	Public	Stage 2	<p>Nuclear energy is extremely dangerous, when you consider there is no safe way to dispose of the unspent radiation, is not carbon-free due to the ways the buildings are constructed, only produces a relatively low amount of energy currently (22%) and will take 10 - 15 years to come on stream, when we should be implementing wind, wave, solar, Severn barrage schemes which would be far more sustainable.</p>	9794-1579-7373			/	
Tractivity 1036	Public	Stage 2	<p>The most important imperative against it now is climate change.</p>	9794-1579-8122			/	

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>	9825-1579-9092	/			
Tractivity 1069	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>No one is even trying to promote conservation of electricity. With enough motivation much could be done, although profits would suffer.</p>	9827-1579-7346			/	
Tractivity 1083	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>I think this project is far too big for the local infrastructure of this rural community, in particular, the roads.</p> <p>The proposed power plants are much larger than existing ones at Hinkley with much hotter and more dangerous radioactive waste. There is no current safe way to store this and the plans are to store this at Hinkley for more than 160 years (if the station operates for 60 years. The government has still not found a safe place to store waste from existing power stations.</p> <p>I don?t think we should leave this for future generations.</p>	9841-1579-8086			/	
Tractivity 1091	Public	Stage 2	<p>Aside from the day to day transport/accom. it is concerning from a safety aspect that 2 nuclear reactors are being built in such close succession, having not been done in Britain before. With rising tides, threats of terrorism and unclear waste management - what a terrible legacy for our children?s future.</p>	9849-1579-14733			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1093	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 cost of a serious nuclear accident or incident - Chernobyl style - will not be underwritten by EDF but the community - indeed the European Community has spent manyhundreds of millions on the Chernobyl disaster which was not even within the EC borders. EDF will not pay for the full cost of dealing with nuclear waste - the likely bill for dealing with nuclear waste is far more than the cost of building and running the site through its life - this again is not an acceptable arrangement. EDF will be making profits over a 30 year period and after this far higher costs will be incurred by the community, and in the event of a disaster the community carry the full cost. It is also unacceptable that nuclear sites cannot control radiation risks - as shown by serious health risks to employees and ?hot spots? for cancers near nuclear sites; nuclear industry has managed to deny such links in the same sort of ways the tobacco industry did.</p>	9851-1579-6085			/	
Tractivity 1097	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Sooner Construction starts the better</p>	9855-1579-127			/	
Tractivity 1102	Public	Stage 2	<p>I am opposed in principle to a new nuclear power station on grounds of safety, the environment and sustainability. We have the ability to use significant wave power which is free and safe!</p>	9860-1579-6724			/	
Tractivity 1105	Public	Stage 2	<p>The idea that building new nuclear power stations will significantly reduce carbon emissions is fundamentally flawed and therefore to go ahead with these works in the absence of any Major consents from Central government is inappropriate. Y</p>	9863-1579-2260			/	
Tractivity 1113	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>I am oposed to Hinkley point C, and I endorse the Stogursey Parish Council Response.</p> <p>There seems to be no consideration given to people living in the area. Their environment will be changed beyond all recognition, and their lives will become very miserable living right next to such a monstrosity. It is immoral to impose this on them.</p>	9871-1579-5719			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1119	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>Your proposed EPR reactor is already experiencing serious problems and long delays in France and Finland. According to (Personal information removed), University of Greenwich, "the UK government is in danger of backing a design that could prove unlicensable, unaffordable and unbuildable". If building begins and is stopped, damage will already have been done to this rural area. There are also safety problems to be addressed. As for waste, no answer has yet been found to storing it safely elsewhere yet.</p> <p>How will you pay for all this when your credit rating has been reduced to A and your debts far outweigh your profits?</p> <p>Add the safety problems, the huge costs of building the reactor(s), and the doubt whether the carbon floor price will be adequate. And by the time this white elephant is built, it will be too late to keep our carbon footprint low enough to avoid drastic climate change. Nuclear is a distraction not a solution.</p>	9877-1579-6238			/	
Tractivity 1122	Public	Stage 2	<p>The entire project is in my view unnecessary. There has never been a convincing case for nuclear power, using fission as the basis for generating electricity. The technology is outmoded, the problems associated with waste storage are insoluble and the arguments that it is a ?carbon neutral? operation are false.</p>	9880-1579-8378			/	
Tractivity 1129	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 (Personal information removed), which is the closest part of South Wales to Hinkley Point, I would like to express my total opposition to the building of more nuclear Power stations at this site for three main reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Neither EDF or the Government have answers to the safe management of nuclear waste. If we added the total cost of nuclear waste management and the de-commissioning of nuclear power plants to the unit cost of nuclear power then it would be the most expensive way of producing electricity by far. 2.If just a fraction of the investment into nuclear power was diverted to energy efficiency programmes, micro generation schemes as well as into solar generation,wave generation, tidal generation and thermal ground generation then we would have a long term answer to our energy needs. 3. As someone who has travelled to both Antarctica and the Arctic I am very concerned about sea level rises flooding Hinkley Poin 	9887-1579-5719			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1132	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 do not agree with the proposal to store radioactive waste at the Hnkley site.</p> <p>I agree in general with the proposal to develop Hnkley C as a clean source of energy and in preference to onshore wind farms which are unsightly and can have an adverse effect on wildlife.</p>	9890-1579-6005			/	
Tractivity 1141	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 do not consider that Nuclear power is necessary on practical and moral grounds. Its development takes funding from the development of true renewable energy generation and energy conservation measures. Nuclear waste cannot be disposed of as there is no such place as "away" to put it and it will pose a threat to many generations to come.</p>	9899-1579-7409			/	
Tractivity 1145	Public	Stage 2	<p>I firmly believe that there is no requirement for nuclear power in order to "keep our lights on" therefore I am obviously opposed to the needless destruction of ancient hedgerows and woodland.</p>	9903-1579-164			/	
Tractivity 1145	Public	Stage 2	<p>My view is that the destruction of a unique English coastal environment in order to provide the French economy with unlimited revenues way into the future is a complete travesty.</p>	9903-1579-613			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1145	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 do not think this country needs Nuclear Power as part of its energy mix.</p> <p>Uranium comes from politically unstable places and the mining of it is highly dangerous. It is not therefore a secure source of energy for us.</p> <p>It will do nothing to reduce our Carbon Emissions over the next 100 years.</p> <p>All the revenues from EDF built ERPs will go out of the country to France and ultimately we will be dependent on France to keep these power stations functioning. If EDF goes bust and the french government refuses to rescue them it will be down to the UK government to step in.</p> <p>210 square miles of Concentrated Solar Power Units could provide enough electricity to supply the whole planets requirements. Why should we bother with Nuclear Power Stations using an insecure fuel whose afterlife is riddled with consequences we do not fully understand.</p>	9903-1579-8082			/	
Tractivity 1149	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>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.</p>	9907-1579-5889			/	
Tractivity 1153	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>In a word, farcical.</p>	9911-1579-9431			/	
Tractivity 1159	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>New Nuclear power stations is not the answer to climate change and energy security. It is expensive, dangerous, and diverts our focus on the real answers which is reduction and renewables.</p>	9917-1579-6343			/	
Tractivity 1160	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 proposal is completely inappropriate</p>	9918-1579-5769			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1161	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I hate that there is a nuclear power station being proposed here.	9919-1579-5769			/	
Tractivity 1185	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 the whole process has been thought through very well, the powerstation will benefit the local area and the nation. Nuclear power is the sensible, clean way to generate power. It is much more reliable than windmills, it will buy time to perfect wave technology to obtain power from the sea.	9943-1579-6717			/	
Tractivity 1190	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? I don't agree with any alteration to the landscape. I dont want a nuclear power station built here.	9948-1579-612			/	
Tractivity 1191	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? Do not need any nuclear power, lets have more windfarms. Very dangerous.	9949-1579-129			/	
Tractivity 1191	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Don?t want more nuclear power. We are an island use the natural resources	9949-1579-5819			/	
Tractivity 1192	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I do not believe that a new nuclear power station is the answer to this country?s power requirements.	9950-1579-6109			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1194	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below We have to recognise the need for nuclear power, even though the toxic waste is an awful thing for future generations to cope with. But it would be comforting to know that there will be some positive benefits as well as nuclear ebergery, to compensate (even a little) for the sacrifice of our peace and quiet and destruction of our countryside.	9952-1579-8206			/	
Tractivity 1196	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I accept that we need more electricity production. I accept that the present power station has in general been good for this area over the past, 40/50 years but did cause many problems to the local areas during the building period. I do not feel that the new build has been thoroughly researched in respect of the impact on the whole area. I do feel that a new road direct to Hinkley Point from Dunball although costly would solve almost all problems with one stroke. Bridgwater is more able to cope with the numbers of workers involved than our villages.	9954-1579-9721		/		
Tractivity 1206	Public	Stage 2	4. Any other ideas or comments? Nuclear is a dangerous distraction away from real solutions. We need green jobs in solar, wind and hydroelectric not this dangerous distraction	9964-1579-2180			/	
Tractivity 1206	Public	Stage 2	9a. Any other ideas or comments? We need green jobs in solar, wind and hydroelectric. Nuclear power is a dangerous distraction	9964-1579-4742			/	
Tractivity 1206	Public	Stage 2	10. Any other ideas or comments? This wont make up for the imposition of a new nuclear plant, using an experimental new reactor. Hinkley C should not be built.	9964-1579-5731			/	
Tractivity 1206	Public	Stage 2	11. Any other ideas or comments? This wont make up for the health impacts of a new power station, which will leave us with centuries of radioactive waste	9964-1579-6441			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1206	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 object to the proposals to build a new nuclear power station at Hinkley. This consultation has been designed with leading trivial questions to try to stifle the voice of the public</p>	9964-1579-6948			/	
Tractivity 1213	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>It seems in your as yet unjustified and unconsensual rush to start this development you are leaving important questions and issues ignored. Nuclear energy when considered without bias is unsustainable, unsafe and irresponsible. With long term health consequences and the legacy of waste, it is selfish and unfair to continue down this route. There are other ways to make electricity, there are other, fairer ways of making money. Ways that mean we can both look our grandchildren in the eyes.</p>	9971-1579-9264			/	
Tractivity 1214	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>My views are that new nuclear power is unsafe, untested and not worth the risk. Without a long term plan to deal with nuclear waste the health effects it causes I cannot agree to these proposals. Why risk losing nature and human lives for energy when are better ways to produce energy.</p>	9972-1579-6005			/	
Tractivity 1220	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>Nuclear energy is unethical, unsustainable, unhealthy. It is a crime to leave nuclear waste for future generations to deal with. Only a cold heart hungry pocket and a contemptuous attitude towards humanity and life can produce and then present this as a norm. Hinkley Point stands as an island EDF effectively between the sea and the cut reaches of the Somerset levels. A faultline lies down the Bristol Channel. This only starts to touch on the irrational arrogant belief that we can conquer mother nature, time and time again. And we can only guess at the consequences of climate change.</p>	9978-1579-8205			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1235	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans?</p> <p>Awful.</p> <p>Please keep hinckley in hinckley.</p> <p>Q7 Do you have any other comments?</p> <p>I think your overall plans are disgusting.</p> <p>The local community hear in bridgwater/north petherton will stop you from building your lorry park and park & ride next to our homes.</p>	89501-1579-805		/		
Tractivity 1252	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>We need nuclear power --> big believer in clockwork motors - dont use anything or petrol.</p>	89518-1579-38			/	
Tractivity 1273	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>they are irrellavent to the costs involved</p> <p>Q2 Do you have any comments on our updated accommodation proposals?</p> <p>not needed, nor is the plant</p> <p>Q3 Do you have any comments on our proposed community mitigation and benefits?</p> <p>PR conniving in the face of negative public oppinion. Stop Hinkley C</p>	89539-1579-0			/	
Tractivity 1273	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>Q7 Do you have any other comments?</p> <p>I changed my electricity supplier away from Edf and am encouraging others to do so in protest at the plans. I do not want a nuclear power station built here, or anywhere.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	89539-1579-755			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1274	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? A simple reply to state that I live locally and welcome the development of another low carbon power station. The recent events at Fukushima demonstrates that power stations are well built and accommodate all eventualities. Japan has experienced the worst earthquake on record, need I say any more. Just build it, this country has to many whiners and moaners, if they don?t like it move!	89540-1579-0			/	
Tractivity 1290	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? I support the building of Hinkley C	89556-1579-0			/	
Tractivity 1291	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q1 Do you have any comments on our proposals for the workforce and for employment, skills and business engagement? Please hurry up and build us nuclear power.	89557-1579-0			/	
Tractivity 1292	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q7 Do you have any other comments? I support the building of new power stations. NUCLEAR	89558-1579-0			/	
Tractivity 1341	Public	Stage 2 Update	I am in full support of the project, we need electricity + jobs + local investment + long term benefits to our area. Good luck!	89607-1579-1095			/	
Tractivity 1342	Public	Stage 2 Update	Why can?t the energy industry use wave and wind energy? They only seem to ignore the people who don?t want nuclear power. We are at a time when working in harmony with the earth is what is required not blatantly flying in the face of that requirement for greed!!	89608-1579-570			/	
Tractivity 1342	Public	Stage 2 Update	When the prime need now is for natural and earth friendly living why would you want to fly in the face of this and continue the Nuclear industry? Only ignoring people who object to it and not the few who have been conditioned to object to wind farms!??? I know of no-one who wants nuclear energy except the ignorant or money hungry or those who care nothing for their environment or the planet.	89608-1579-1537			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1350	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>I am opposed to any expansion of any nuclear power for generation of electricity including Hinkley point and Sizewell. The reason. 30 years ago we were told it was safe. Now we are told it is the only environmental way to generate electricity and that another nuclear accident cannot happen with modern developments. We were told that 30 years ago. In 30 years when a tidal wave ploughs up the Bristol Channel (meteorite or landslip off the Canaries) we will be told this once again when the genie has got out of the lamp. The Seven barrage would be cheaper, safer and outlive a nuclear power station.</p> <p>Q7 Do you have any other comments?</p> <p>DO NOT DO IT.</p> <p>If this goes through I will definitely not be using EDF as my supplier anymore and will endeavour to encourage others to do the same. It is all I can do to try and stop the project for the good of future generations.</p>	89616-1579-74			/	
Tractivity 1355	Public	Stage 2 Update	I continue to regard Hinkley Point as a completely unacceptable site for a third nuclear power station. Your revised proposals do nothing to allay my concerns.	89621-1579-1807			/	
Tractivity 1361	Public	Stage 2 Update	I personally believe this is not the right place to construct a new power station. The one in Flamonville is a good distance away from local villages.	89627-1579-1299			/	
Tractivity 1377	Public	Stage 2 Update	Do not chance a major disaster. DO NOT BUILD HPC	89643-1579-1119			/	
Tractivity 189	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>With rising sea levels it could be underwater in a few years. Nuclear power is the wrong way to go.</p> <p>There is an estuary and several rivers with high tidal ranges that could be used to generate electricity cleanly and without dangerous waste.</p> <p>Also it is windy out in the Bristol Channel.</p>	8905-1579-4637			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 205	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 that the nuclear option is the way forward. but I do think that a direct route to Hinkley Point is the best option once the site is completed it could then be returned to it's former uses!	8911-1579-4053		/		
Tractivity 211	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? Not in favour	8916-1579-3622			/	
Tractivity 220	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 believe nuclear power is a good thing although I do not think that the local community should be thrown into turmoil as a result of it.	8922-1579-4759			/	
Tractivity 231	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? In favour, provided the impact on the area is minimised, the current proposals just spread the disruption over a wide area	8932-1579-4565			/	
Tractivity 243	Public	Stage 1	4. Any other ideas or comments? A wind farm would be quicker to construct and less hassle for the villagers.	8939-1579-1082			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 245	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>Hinkley Point C Pre-Application Consultation Stage 1</p> <p>Reference the above proposals I wish to register my extreme dismay and concern. I appreciate that EDF is a commercial concern whose prime motivation is profit, and this is understandable. However, I believe that, in this case, consideration of cost reduction has been totally one sided in favour of EDF. They have chosen the cheapest option with no thought or concern shown towards the cost inflicted on the residents of Cannington, Comwich and Williton villages or the town of Bridgwater. I believe the impact, particularly on the villages, will be devastating. I believe the cost to human suffering and disruption to be far in excess of the cost of routing access across Dunball Wharf and providing accommodation, storage, parking etc. etc. on the Hinkley site itself.</p> <p>Points I heard made at the open exhibition were as follows:</p> <p>â€¢ Dunball would be more costly and possibly add a fu</p>	9341-1579-4805			/	
Tractivity 246	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 totally opposed to the proposals put forward affecting Cannington, Comwich, Williton & Bridgwater. I believe the proposals have been made as the cheapest cost to EDF without any consideration of the cost to the residents & damage done to their villages & way of life. According to the proposals for Cannington C, the first view to anyone arriving in the village would be a site of HGVs, storage, dormitories, parking etc. etc. Does this indicate a village or a commercial/industrial site? Would you like to be met with this view on approaching your place of residence?</p> <p>If access was made through Dunball Wharf and all the above facilities were erected on site, this would obviate the disruption described above as it would be accross virgin ground.</p> <p>I appreciate that this would be a more costly route but offset against this would be cheaper costs in construction of theses facilities in one place, plus the benefit of having your staff o</p>	9342-1579-3693			/	
Tractivity 247	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>No public enquiries so the public have no say. The government should make sure that all proposals are in the best interest of the local community first.</p>	8940-1579-4178			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 249	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? What about the storage of waste? You have not mentioned this. It should be stored on site, not at Cannington Quarry. How many extra lorries would this mean? I accept that if we want power then we need to develop power stations and the Hinkley site, if suitable is as good as any.	8942-1579-4814			/	
Tractivity 259	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? Would like to see an offshore windfarm	8948-1579-3917			/	
Tractivity 263	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? It is clear that the NPS will include Nuclear, that the Siting policy will include Hinkley Point, so now it is a question of ensuring the development minimises disruption to the locals and offers maximum opportunities for employment in the short and long term.	8952-1579-6671			/	
Tractivity 265	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? We don't like it- but guess we'll have to lump it! However, every effort should be made to keep disruption to a minimum.	8954-1579-4306			/	
Tractivity 267	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 totally in favour of nuclear power as part of the mix of energy sources for the future. It will be relatively quick to build and will be 'clean' energy. However, the associated buildings, car parks and freight handling in local villages is completely unacceptable and off absolutely no benefit to the community. To agree to a power station does not mean that you can 'rubber stamp' everything else.	8956-1579-5550			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 269	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 was at junior school in Cannington when the first power station was built and now live in Comwich, so this has been part of my life, my first jon was at Hinkley for McAlpines in 197-. I'm not against nuclear energy hust the impact the extra people traffic etc will have on everyones day to day lives.	8958-1579-3918			/	
Tractivity 292	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? There is a high chance that local support fir the power station will be changed to active opposition if the worker/transport problems are followed	8980-1579-5897			/	
Tractivity 298	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? A great shame that the development was not planned to bring Hinkley C on stream when Hinkley A was stopped.	8986-1579-3413			/	
Tractivity 304	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? It merely compounds the eyesore that is the existing Hinkley Point.	8992-1579-3519			/	
Tractivity 306	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? Proposed development set to totally wreck West Someret, an area of outstanding natural beauty with very little thought or consideration given to the village communities within the county.	8994-1579-3455			/	
Tractivity 314	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? A new station is a necessity. At the end of the day it is all about ways and means. If people are treated fairly and honestly they will react positively. Don't upset them any more than you have too.	9002-1579-4578			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 319	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>Whatever ameliorations offered I object to nuclear power stations until safe permanent waste handling available. (it is NOT, as yet)</p> <p>Some investment in wind and tide generation preferred.</p>	9007-1579-3854			/	
Tractivity 320	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>As the site has been already developed as a nuclear power station some pitfalls are understood about this landscape so it seems resonable to go ahead with development at this location.</p>	9008-1579-4680			/	
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>	9011-1579-5311			/	
Tractivity 332	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 very concerned it is too close to people's homes, the traffic will be horrendous especially when the holiday traffic arrives. The risk to health from leaks, accidents etc is too great and as for keeping radio active spent fuel for 160 years, if its so safe dump it in London by the MPs supporting it. Nuclear power is not the saviour of mankind it creates far greater problems that it solves, we already have the residue of 1 finished power station and 1 "dying" power station on our doorstep we do not want another one and I dread to even think what it will cost the taxpayer</p>	9020-1579-3393			/	
Tractivity 335	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 makes sense to put additional power stations on same site and near a good water access.</p>	9023-1579-3510			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 338	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? We all need electricity and people in the area accept another power station here.	9026-1579-3841			/	
Tractivity 341	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 not convinced of the need for a third NPS at Hinkley Point. I am not happy about the safety record of the present station and remain to be convinced of the safety and reliability of the proposed station. I also feel strongly about the proposal to store nuclear waste on site, for safety and security reasons.	9029-1579-4617			/	
Tractivity 353	Public	Stage 1	4. Any other ideas or comments? i have become more certain edf's ideas are not good at all as more time goes by and more info becomes available .	9041-1579-955			/	
Tractivity 353	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? i think as with most local people there is no problem with whatever happens at hinkley point site as we are all aware of the need for a new station.	9041-1579-4752			/	
Tractivity 354	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 not against the proposal per se - if it needs to happen, then I'd prefer it was in a way that was least impactful on any one village.	9042-1579-4502			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 355	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>Be wary of the ant-nuclear lobby hijacking the proposals affecting bypasses, park and rides etc of the local villages. Most people in the area including myself are pro Hinkley Point and a lot actually work there but the idea of ruining our local villages is not going down well and anti nuclear activists could seize on this to delay things or sway local opinion. My family is particularly affected on Withiel Drive having moved here only a couple of years ago for some peace and quiet only to find that a site 7 miles away will spoil the area and make it hard for us to sell up and move</p>	9043-1579-4606			/	
Tractivity 364	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>Do not listen to Stop Hinkley. Most people will benefit from a new Power Station at Hinkley.</p> <p>The sooner you start the better</p>	9052-1579-3442			/	
Tractivity 365	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Do not build another "Atomkraftwerk" on this site.</p> <p>I was part of the team that excavated the Plesiosaur remains from the slate rock a few years ago. Constructing this will destroy the surrounding environment and further discoveries of English history and heritage.</p> <p>Back in the '80's, a chap called (Personal information removed) worked at Hinkley point site B and told me the horror stories of the events that took place at his place of work. The leaks, fires and the ruptures that occurred at this site and equipment. He also informed me how close Somerset and surrounding areas were almost devastated by the same scenario that occurred at Sellafield and on more than one occasion. Also the contamination of the surrounding Bristol channel was a key factor and will be once again extremely polluted from the pipeline. Sadly (Personal information removed) is no longer with us as he died from Cancer.</p> <p>So placing a "Landscape Buffer" up on this site will make difference to anyone, as the</p>	9345-1579-351			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 366	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>Very positive about the need for a new nuclear power station. Very unsatisfied about the proposals for construction phase in relation to housing of temporary workers and movement of goods and services.</p>	9053-1579-4426			/	
Tractivity 370	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 do not object to the building of a new power station.</p> <p>We do object to the countryside around Comwich & Cannington being totally disrupted - the landscape will be an eyesore with increased noise levels.</p> <p>Most people have chosen to live in a village to enjoy the countryside mainly for its beauty,peace & quiet not to live amongst an industrial site.</p> <p>We feel there must be other alternatives to bypass the villages.</p>	9057-1579-4495			/	
Tractivity 375	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 understand plans for wind power generation in the Hinkley Point area have been stopped in favour of nuclear power. Why can't we have both? We need all the power we can get & the National Grid infrastructure will be there.</p> <p>We have interest in and hold shares in Iberdrola - I'm sure they would want to do both, and probably add tidal power as well, as they do elsewhere.</p> <p>How about it EDF - maybe we could invest in you also!</p>	9062-1579-5449		/		
Tractivity 376	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 feel it is a necessary development for the local area and the country as a whole. I am not opposed to nuclear energy or to Hinkley C.</p>	9063-1579-4400			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 381	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 of Nuclear power as the only form of energy that can provide for our future needs in the volumn necessary for the lifestyle that we live at present. It needs to be safely and sensitivily handled.	9067-1579-5117			/	
Tractivity 383	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? EDF must limit their works until planning consents are agreed following "consultation".	9068-1579-4249		/		
Tractivity 383	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? There is already some concern that a further development, Hinkley D, may follow on immediately from the Hinkley C construction resulting in 15 years of local "misery".	9068-1579-4367			/	
Tractivity 388	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? No one is honest about the amount of CO2 needed to build and maintain a nuclear power station. This total lack of consideration for so many aspects of local proposals is going to makeit 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.	9073-1579-4643			/	
Tractivity 389	Public	Stage 1	2. Any other ideas or comments? i dont rate any of the options as i dont want it in the village in the first place	9074-1579-613			/	
Tractivity 393	Public	Stage 1	3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction? these are ridiculous questions which divert the public from the real issue which is whether we should be building nuclear reactors at all.	9078-1579-878			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 393	Public	Stage 1	6. Please give comments on your preferences and any suggestions about the future use of these facilities. All of these options presuppose that the building will go ahead but many people oppose this and are looking for a legitimate avenue to express these views	9078-1579-2383			/	
Tractivity 393	Public	Stage 1	8. What do you think of our proposals for the use of Combwich Wharf? Not necessary if the project ws abandoned in favour of safer energy options	9078-1579-3349			/	
Tractivity 393	Public	Stage 1	10. Do you have any comments on our proposals in relation to training and business opportunities? Far more training and business opportunities would aris from a proliferation of small scale renewable energy options in the contol of local groups and businesses	9078-1579-3735			/	
Tractivity 393	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 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?	9078-1579-4232			/	
Tractivity 395	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? As you may have gathered by now (if you have bothered to read these comments) I think the proposal is unnecessary and ill thought through.	9080-1579-4768			/	
Tractivity 396	Public	Stage 1	4. Any other ideas or comments? DON'T DO IT	9081-1579-922			/	
Tractivity 396	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 want it , don't do it , leave Williton alone	9081-1579-3768			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 399	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 (Personal information removed). 7/01/2010</p> <p>I object to your proposal to double the nuclear threat to Somerset at Hinkley Point. I am extremely concerned that routine emissions to air [including particulates] and into the marine environment will damage our health and food security. If an accident did occur, the whole SW region and South Wales would be sterilized forever. A small accident at Seascale 50years ago contaminated milk from a wide area, rendering unfit for the food chain.</p> <p>I am appalled that hot irradiated spent fuel will be stored in the open by the estuary for at least 160years, and also that, after 50years, no start has even begun on a"final" repository.We were told that no more nuclear stations would be built before a facility was ready to accept "legacy waste".</p> <p>I object to the loss of public rights of way and a new, private , armed police force over 500acres of Somerset.</p>	9349-1579-3393			/	
Tractivity 400	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>It's not worth the upheaval, the damage to the local environment ,the pollution of air and sea, the massive carbon footprint involved in the construction, the radioactive emissions, the risk of accidents for just 6 percent electricity supply. 25 years decommissioning the site is a very long time - but what about the spent fuel? What are you going to do about that? And where will it go in the long term?....</p>	9083-1579-3467			/	
Tractivity 401	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. We are not in favour of a new nuclear power station being built at all. Especially if it can be seen from our property in Shurton. This construction will blight the area completely.</p> <p>2. The construction is far too large, with two nuclear reactors.</p> <p>3. Health and Safety issues concerns us deeply. i.e target for a terrorist attack. Reactors are a new french design- have these been tried and tested sufficiently?</p>	9084-1579-4794			/	
Tractivity 406	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 totally agree that a new power station is needed at Hinkley I support this. I question the transport and accommodation facilities at Cannington.</p>	9089-1579-4088	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 410	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 full favour of this development and hope that it will go through fairly smoothly: Keeping in mind local thoughts and ideas at all times. My husband worked at the power station for 30 years. I see no threat.	9092-1579-4605			/	
Tractivity 411	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? I would prefer to see a wind farm on the site or some other renewable energy scheme using the tides to create electricity.	9093-1579-4313			/	
Tractivity 415	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 of a new Nuclear Power Station at Hinkley Point, but it should not ruin the local Villages and Countryside during the construction.	9097-1579-4626			/	
Tractivity 422	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 of further development of nuclear facilities at Hinkley Point but am opposed to any further western encroachment along the A39 beyond the existing Hinkley development. Perhaps this would set the absolute boundary at the proposed alternative emergency access road and perhaps, Nether Stowey.	9104-1579-4263			/	
Tractivity 425	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? Do not build this dangerous plant which is not the right solution to our energy needs	9107-1579-3488			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 426	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 object to proposals for the largest U.K nuclear power station due to my concerns over;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > Health risks from radioactive emissions. > Risks of leaks, accidents, terrorism >Highly radioactive spent fuel remaining on site for 160 years plus >No planned repository for onward disposal of this spent fuel >Disruption of local life due to large influx of temporary workers <p>.Nuclear's tiny contribution to combating climate change</p>	9108-1579-3393			/	
Tractivity 429	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>Hinkley Point is a nuclear power station and unless UK inhabitants are prepared to return to the days of candles and power cuts we must accept that nuclear is the way forward. Reluctantly I am in favour of a new power station at Hinkley Point.</p> <p>Having said all of that, I would hate too much of the surrounding countryside to be sacrificed, as we all need the beauty of the landscape to keep us sane.</p>	9110-1579-5590			/	
Tractivity 430	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 accept the need for this and the next nuclear power station at Hinkley Point.</p> <p>I suggest that the current proposals are unnecessarily destructive to local communities.</p> <p>A dedicated road linking the construction site to the A38 would be a positive and practical alternative, especially when linked to the proposed flood defences for Bridgwater. The road would benefit al four stations. It could be part of a long term community legacy, an improved A39 in the next century(or before?).</p>	9111-1579-5871			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 431	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>Despite the undeniable need for cleaner solutions to increasing demand, nuclear power should never be contemplated until completely safe and sustainable solutions are found for disposal of waste.</p> <p>Even then nuclear power stations pose an unacceptable risk to attack from terrorists. If large scale nuclear contamination were to escape from Hinkley, prevailing winds would distribute throughout most of central Britain and beyond, thus endangering the health of millions of citizens now and in the far future.</p> <p>Don't do it.</p>	9112-1579-3393			/	
Tractivity 440	Public	Stage 1	<p>11. Any other comments?</p> <p>As we know all parties are committed to the expansion of the nuclear power supplies there seems little risk involved!</p>	9119-1579-3860			/	
Tractivity 441	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 regret the government's decision to proceed with nuclear power because</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nobody has solved the problem of what to do with high-level waste. Deep disposal is the favoured solution but we have no site identified in the UK. 2. In a world with escalating terrorism, a nuclear power station is a target - which poses a risk to everyone for miles around. 3. The existence of nuclear power stations will probably strengthen our drift towards a police state. 4. Big power stations (6% of national demand) cause a big problem when they go offline, and have to be kept running as much as possible, which may impact the profitability of renewables. 	9120-1579-6202			/	
Tractivity 443	Public	Stage 1	<p>11. Any other comments?</p> <p>Lets stick to wind power already approved for the Bristol Channel. Build a power station somewhere else, we already have 2 - 1 obsolete and 1 functional, that is enough for this area.</p>	9122-1579-3691			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 443	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>Many local people prefer the wind farms, development for which has now been granted for this area. NO MORE POWER STATIONS IN THIS AREA</p>	9122-1579-3905			/	
Tractivity 446	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>New Nuclear power stations are unnecessary, will damage the marine ecosystem of the estuary, become permanent high level radioactive waste dumps virtually for ever, will make the local area a major terrorist target, will cause a health hazard to the local population from the regular radioactive discharges to the environment, are a potential risk to a major release of radioactivity and will do very little to benefit local employment and be too late and too little to do anything to help climate change.</p> <p>You should be investing in the truly sustainable methods of producing clean non polluting renewable energy.</p> <p>I am pleased about your proposal to build wind turbines on the Somerset Levels, an ideal place. What about Turbines in the Bristol Channel, the Severn Tidal Reef and encouraging industry, councils and householders to use solar energy there are millions of south facing roofs.</p>	9125-1579-5093			/	
Tractivity 450	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>As the local population will suffer the</p> <p>1) Inconvenience, it may be a good idea if consideration be given to concessions be made in relation to electricity costs.</p> <p>2) Any further plans for a wind farm nearby would be very unfair although this has been shelved it should stay that way.</p>	9128-1579-4409			/	
Tractivity 453	Public	Stage 1	<p>6. Please give comments on your preferences and any suggestions about the future use of these facilities.</p> <p>The land proposed is beautiful. No building would compensate the loss (Williton) at this time that I can think of.</p>	9131-1579-2401			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 453	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 need more electricity. In my view windfarms are a waste of time, hence I favour nuclear. Work needs to take place but not at the prospect of many years of "blight" to the community.</p>	9131-1579-3406			/	
Tractivity 458	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>Sooner the better for the Country</p>	9135-1579-3397			/	
Tractivity 459	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 to use nuclear power as the viable alternatives all have big problems so why not Hinkley Point?</p>	9136-1579-4014			/	
Tractivity 468	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 don't have a problem with building a new power station but not of the cost of Cannington losing its identity as a medium size village.</p>	9144-1579-3739	/			
Tractivity 473	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>There is already concern that a 2nd development (Hinkley D) may follow on immediately from Hinkley C, causing a total of 15 - 20 years of misery and disruption in the local communities. The area of land purchased for Hinkley C appears larger than required for the construction of just one nuclear power station.</p>	9149-1579-4840			/	

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	<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>There are grave concerns about the future of these reactors regarding long term cost, disposal of waste, risk of long term pollution to the local environment if storage facilities malfunction, not to mention the transport issues involved. The lack of balance with renewable energy sources is a considerable concern to me after all the time and effort spent. However I have been quite impressed with presentations so far in the matter. This is a very major long term project for Somerset and the transport issue have yet to be resolved.</p>	9152-1579-8367			/	
Tractivity 477	Public	Stage 1	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>It is most important not to make the monumental mistake of constructing a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point in the first place. It will divert scarce resources from the vital struggle to secure our energy future and save us from the ravages of climate change, without contributing to either of those goals.</p>	9153-1579-706			/	
Tractivity 477	Public	Stage 1	<p>3. Do you have any comments on the strategy for rights of way across the site during and following construction?</p> <p>Leave RoW alone: do not construct this white elephant.</p>	9153-1579-1061			/	
Tractivity 477	Public	Stage 1	<p>6. Please give comments on your preferences and any suggestions about the future use of these facilities.</p> <p>The disruption 5000 contractors will cause fills me with horror. And all for what? A new nuclear plant won't help solve our energy problems or our climate problems.</p>	9153-1579-2717			/	
Tractivity 477	Public	Stage 1	<p>8. What do you think of our proposals for the use of Combwich Wharf?</p> <p>Don't build the power station; don't use the wharf.</p>	9153-1579-3775			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 477	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 should abandon these proposals before it wastes any more money on them. Local people will fight tooth and nail to stop a new nuclear build at Hinkley Point.</p>	9153-1579-3902			/	
Tractivity 477	Public	Stage 1	<p>10. Do you have any comments on our proposals in relation to training and business opportunities?</p> <p>A new nuclear build will bring few jobs to local people; the majority of jobs will go to people from outside the area. Simple, low-tech measures to improve energy efficiency in our homes would provide local jobs for local people, reduce our demand for electricity and make a far greater impact on our carbon emissions than any new nuclear station, and at far less cost to the taxpayer.</p>	9153-1579-4235			/	
Tractivity 477	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 object to proposals for the largest UK nuclear power station due to my concerns over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health risks from radioactive emissions • Risks of leaks, accidents, terrorism • Highly radioactive spent fuel remaining on site for 160 years plus • No planned repository for onward disposal of this spent fuel • Disruption of local life due to an influx of 5,000 male workers • Nuclear’s tiny contribution to combating climate change 	9153-1579-4987			/	
Tractivity 487	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy’s initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>Very much in favour of Hinkley Point C as a Nuclear Power Station.</p>	9162-1579-3526			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 488	Public	Stage 1	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>I am not happy with the plans for a new nuclear power station, and therefore, am not happy about the changes that will devastate this area of the county if a new nuclear power station is built.</p> <p>Should the worst happen, and the power station is built, then as far as possible, following the construction, everything in the surrounding area should be returned to its present state.</p>	9358-1579-346			/	
Tractivity 488	Public	Stage 1	<p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>I would rather not have to see any restoration of the site occurring, as I do not wish to see the construction in the first place.</p>	9358-1579-973			/	
Tractivity 488	Public	Stage 1	<p>4. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>I do not wish to see a new nuclear power station, and therefore I do not wish to put up with any increase in transport and movement of vehicles in the area.</p> <p>I am EXTREMELY concerned at the prospect of hostel accommodation in the area. I strongly believe that there is a conflict in the messages being given to the local residents: on one hand we are being told that the construction of a new power station would provide lots of employment opportunities for local people, yet on the other hand hostel accommodation is needed for approx 700 people. If the construction is truly going to be done by 'local' employees, then NO hostel accommodation will be required at all. I do not believe EDF's claims to increase local employment.</p>	9358-1579-1424			/	
Tractivity 488	Public	Stage 1	<p>8. What do you think of our proposals for the use of Combwich Wharf?</p> <p>I don't like any of the options, as I don't want a new power station constructed.</p> <p>I suppose that the least worst option is to use the wharf at Combwich as this would mean the shortest distance for transporting materials by road.</p>	9358-1579-5045				

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 488	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 totally against the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point. Some of my reasons are, I admit, due to 'nimby-ism' as I don't want to see my local area devastated by the construction process, and to witness the inevitable havoc that the construction would wreak on the environment and social structures in the area. Actually, I wouldn't want to wish these sort of effects on any community.</p> <p>I also have concerns about the safety of the running of a nuclear power station. Despite EDF's platitudes that nuclear energy is much safer now than it has ever been, having lived in the vicinity of Hinkley Point for 30 years, I am been made aware of some 'scares' that have occurred on the site, and the efforts made to prevent them being widely known about. There is always an inherent risk in power generation using nuclear energy.</p> <p>I am told that a similar design is being constructed by EDF in Finland, and is already well b</p>	9358-1579-5905			/	
Tractivity 489	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 do not believe that there is a need for the development of nuclear energy in the UK. The cost of construction and decommissioning the plant, processing the fuel and then the waste are unsustainable. There is a need for improved domestic and industrial building design incorporating improved energy efficiency along with producing heat and/or power from renewable resources. This would reduce the need for large scale energy production.</p> <p>I am opposed to the proposal for the following reasons;</p> <p>Nuclear fuel is finite and non-renewable</p> <p>Nuclear waste is extremely hazardous and long lived</p> <p>There is no satisfactory plan to deal with nuclear waste</p> <p>The construction of another power station would destabilise a settled community</p> <p>The proposed reactor is new and unproven</p> <p>The installation of such a reactor in Finland is overdue and already significantly over budget</p>	9163-1579-3469			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 496	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? Really needed, ideal location, can't start soon enough.	9169-1579-4470			/	
Tractivity 497	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? New Nuclear Power Station- necessary. But people should be more important in your consideration than councils, who are self-serving when financially embarrassed.	9170-1579-4949			/	
Tractivity 499	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? I am very much in favour of Hinkley C; the new reactors are obviously needed for security of electricity supply in the future. However, I am concerned at the amount of land that will be needed during construction, it is a much larger area than anyone had envisaged. This has obviously upset many of the local residents (Personal details removed) who will be adversely affected. I think they had assumed that the work and hostel would be in the distance rather than on our doorstep	9172-1579-5372			/	
Tractivity 500	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? Is it really necessary?	9173-1579-3917			/	
Tractivity 501	Public	Stage 1	Why another one, haven't we paid our debt to the Nuclear age we have two stations already. This is not a good reason for another one. The site is double the size of whats already there, the noise pollution will be substantial, you are building on historic, beautiful countryside of scientific interest and natural beauty.	9174-1579-4913			/	
Tractivity 503	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? Support project provided whole community gains	9176-1579-4615			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 508	Public	Stage 1	I find it sad that both developments of this new reactor (France and Finland) have met with such cost and non conformity problems. If it can not be supervised so that the correct concrete mix is used or that the pipe is not in the right place it does not bode well for Europes largest reactors. Who remembers none stainless bolts in B station fueling m/c or the wrong rubber on the exiter plynth/ stores thought it cheaper!	9180-1579-4365			/	
Tractivity 510	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Nuclear power, to me, is a necessary evil. If a new station is to be built, two points would sweeten the pill. A) All facilities required during construction, must be temporary and removed as soon as construction is complete, returning the land to its orginal state, with the exception of the landscape buffer on the southern boundary. B) A 10% discount on energy bills for all households in West Somerset and Sedgemoor area wuld help to reduce nimby uprow. I live in Burnham, so look across Bridgwater Bay at the Hinkley Point eyesore, spoiling the beautiful view of the hills anmd coast of the Quantockss, Brendons and Exmoor. I spend a lot of my leisure time on that side of the bay and hope to move house over there in the near future, so I have a vested interest in this development.	9182-1579-7223			/	
Tractivity 511	Public	Stage 1	I am in favour of a new power station.	9183-1579-3680			/	
Tractivity 512	Public	Stage 1	Get on with it as, unfortunately, we need this reactor.	9184-1579-4032			/	
Tractivity 514	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? Fully support the ongoing development of Hinkley Point.	9186-1579-4620			/	
Tractivity 515	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 support the ongoing development at Hinkley Point.	9187-1579-3694			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 521	Public	Stage 1	<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>Although I have responded to the questionnaire, in some cases on the assumption that Hinkley C goes ahead, I am opposed to the plan for a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point for the following reasons.</p> <p>1. Whatever the reactor type, nuclear power continues to pose unacceptable short-term and long-term risks to our health and safety. Among the most intractable of these is its legacy of radioactive waste, for which no agreed disposal option or location has yet been agreed. This in itself makes Hinkley C an unsustainable choice for meeting this country's energy demand.</p> <p>2. Its contribution towards combating climate change (because it produces less carbon dioxide than fossil fuels) could be satisfied by alternative means, essentially a mixture of energy efficiency measures and an increasing use of renewable power. These could also be implemented quicker than Hinkley C, which is unlikely to be operating, given typical delays on very large projects, before 2020. By that time, for example, the UK government</p>	9360-1579-3631			/	
Tractivity 523	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 understand that a power station is needed OK. But to disrupt a village 25 - 30 miles away with a road from Williton to the site not more than a country lane that carries holiday traffic is to say the least barmy. Where has democracy gone in this country?</p>	9194-1579-4862			/	
Tractivity 524	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>In principle not opposed to a nuclear power station as long as safety is treated as paramount and proved to be adequate before construction begins.</p>	9195-1579-4092			/	
Tractivity 528	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>This country needs energy sources and they must be somewhere. We already have a nuclear site at Hinkley - it has to be an obvious choice for the new power station.</p>	9199-1579-5097			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 534	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 do not object to the power station, but why do you have to destroy our village to do it?	9204-1579-3673			/	
Tractivity 539	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? Not in favour of this development. I am dubious about the benefits of new nuclear and concerned about its huge environmental impact and risks which cannot be fully contered. It is a short-term measure with long term negative consequenses. I am not a climate change denier. I would like to see more government support for renewables and greater emphasis on reduction in energy consumption.	9208-1579-6734			/	
Tractivity 540	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'm very positive about the project, I think it is the way forward. Providing EDF meeting the people and explain what will happen and not let rumours circulate to frighten them.	9209-1579-4806			/	
Tractivity 544	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? I think the 2 x UKEPR's pressurised water reactors are too big a project for the local Somerset community infrastructure. I am not in favour of nuclear power. I see it as potentially dangerous, remembering Chernobyl in 1986 - fallout from Chernobyl fell on sheep pasture in Wales - where sheep are still restricted from selling as meets. It is also dangerous to our health (evidence of increased cancers in Burnham-on-Sea). However, if the IPC does give permission I think one reactor would be more suitable to our local rural community.	9213-1579-5874		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 547	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>Concerns about health risks.</p> <p>Risk of leaks, accidents and terrorism.</p> <p>What happens to nuclear waste?</p> <p>Major disruption to roads and village life?</p> <p>Noise/Traffic.</p> <p>Whether this is sufficient contribution to climate change to justify its existence.</p>	9216-1579-4731			/	
Tractivity 563	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>Construction is required ASAP as from insider knowledge, the existing Hinkley B station is struggling to meet demand, and is already beyond its sell-by date.</p> <p>As a home owner living along side this building project, I would look to EDF to consider a compensation package, to reflect the potential loss of property value that could arise from this prolonged massive construction.</p>	9232-1579-3895	/			
Tractivity 582	Public	Stage 1	<p>12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?</p> <p>Very good. the sooner the better and then get on with Hinkley D!</p>	9251-1579-4723			/	
Tractivity 590	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 NO objection whatsoever in the building of a new nuclear energy plant at Hinkley Point.</p>	9256-1579-4139			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 593	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>Renewable Energy will provide much needed employment and carbon savings; far in excess of that provided by a handfull of nuclear power stations that are NOT low carbon when taking into account the whole - life carbon emissions from mining ore, refining it, transportation, construction with tonnes of concrete/steel and managing/monitoring the waste/processing for 100's years.</p>	9259-1579-4232			/	
Tractivity 594	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>I have chosen not to answer the above question because I do not think you have chosen the best options to accommodate the two power stations you wish to build. However regardless of the time factor it would take or the cost to EDF you should proceed with the bridge across the River Parrett noth of Bridgwater.</p> <p>For years you have known that known that we have a need to increase our nuclear power output to meet ever growing demands in this industry, yet you are in a rush to literally bulldoze through our village to access your site without a thought for village life.</p> <p>With the daily prophits EDF wold be making from the power stations within a short time the payback would be reached.</p>	9260-1579-1342			/	
Tractivity 594	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>If the correct infrastructure for Cannington and the surrounding areas are not satisfactory to our needs then this whole monstrosity should as (Personal information removed) suggested will quite easily be built at Sizewell. So why oh why dont you take it there?</p>	9260-1579-5638			/	
Tractivity 597	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 all know we need a new power station to keep the lights burning - Why Hinkley I ask myself!!! Why did you buy/rent 250 acres first of all, then move the goal posts and acquire another 200 acres - Both existing Hinkley sites don't sit on any where near that amount. Worry about selling my house during construction of your site.</p>	9263-1579-5323			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
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!	9271-1579-5434			/	
Tractivity 608	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? The sooner a start is made the happier I shall be. The Country is in desparate need of new forms of enery supplies. Wind farms are a joke!	9367-1579-4942			/	
Tractivity 614	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 generally strongly in favour.	9278-1579-4554			/	
Tractivity 621	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 of the proposals.	9285-1579-3616			/	
Tractivity 661	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? I realise that the county needs extra power be it by nuclear or any other sources and having two stations constructed in this area in the past with minimal disruption as oppoased to the development of Hinkley C	9325-1579-4159			/	
Tractivity 664	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? It is needed, need employment get on with it.	9327-1579-3790			/	
Tractivity 666	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? The sooner work starts the better for the community and the country.	9329-1579-3612				

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 671	Public	Stage 1	<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>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.</p>	9334-1579-5416			/	
Tractivity 515	Public	Stage 1	In Favour of Hinkley Point C but doesn't like dumbing down of document	9372-1579-15			/	
Tractivity 23207	Public	Stage 1	<p>I appreciate that the re-routing via Dunball would be a more costly exercise but offset against this would be cheaper costs in construction of these facilities in one place, plus the benefit of having your staff on site instead of depending on them arriving from 5/6 various locations. However, I believe the biggest benefit would be the goodwill extended from the locals. Overall there is little opposition to the nuclear plant. The opposition is to the damage done to our villages and lifestyles. If the nuclear plant can only come to fruition in line with your proposals, WE DO NOT WANT IT & you will get no support from the villagers. I am sure the strength of this message must have been conveyed to you by your agents who conducted the exhibition in Cannington.</p> <p>Please, please, please, reconsider taking the route across Dunball Wharf. If you disagree with my views, then what about backing up your judgement? Buy my property, at an obvious inflated price, to enable me to purchase elsewhere without loss, so that I can still see out my days as I had hoped and planned. I consider my property to be a reasonable four bedroomed home. I am sure it would be most suitable for you to accommodate one of your senior site managers who undoubtedly will be looking for accommodation close to Hinkley.</p>	9380-1579-3373		/		
Tractivity 50717	Public	Stage 1	In general I feel a new power station would be beneficial to the area. I feel nuclear power is something we need to push forward and from an employment perspective the opportunities should be exciting for local people. I am however, from a selfish point of view concerned about the direct impact the development would have on our family. We live on Stogursey Lane, in a house approximately half a mile from Nether Stowey.	9389-1579-423			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 50885	Public	Stage 1	<p>My name is (Personal information removed) I'm 12 years old and I feel very strongly against building a new nuclear power station. Here are my reasons why:</p> <p>My first reason is that no one will want to look at a gigantic, ugly building. It will also ruin the view when people are walking in the hills.</p> <p>My second reason is that you will have to build a jetty for when you bring in the stone. Also with all the ships coming in it will make the channel busier and it would put more pollution in the water. I love swimming at Shurton Sands and so does my mum and granny so we properly won't be able to swim in the sea because of all the ships. Also we might not be able to get there as the power station will be right a long the cost.</p> <p>My third reason is the radioactive waste because you will have to leave it for 160+ years and it will have a big effect on our next generations. As they will have to clear it up and it will affect the world they live in.</p> <p>My fourth reason is the people living by Hinkley because they most properly don't want another gigantic power station put right next to them. As there is a person that I know who lives next to Hinkley and believe me it's very noisy and not a nice thing to look at.</p> <p>My fifth reason is that more workers will be coming in and it will disrupt the local villages and local people with more people coming. House prices will go up and the villages will be made bigger which many people like me will not like.</p> <p>My sixth reason is the accidents that may occur and leaks that could flow into the sea. The accidents could be lethal may be even life threatening!</p> <p>My seventh reason is that you have nowhere to put the radioactive fuel when you are done with it. So it will just sit there on top of the ground while it cools down.</p> <p>So please don't build the new Hinkley Point for the sake of the future and all the reasons that I've stated.</p>	9394-1579-0			/	
Tractivity 50899	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Even if Britain replaced all its existing nuclear reactors this could only deliver a 4% cut in carbon emissions at some time after 2025.</p> <p>6. I do not believe nuclear power can be delivered in Britain without some form of state subsidy.</p> <p>I think we can meet our energy needs and reduce our carbon emissions by energy saving and increasing our renewable energy sources.</p>	9396-1579-1362			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62115	Public	Stage 1	So long as security and safety rules are strictly enforced no objections in principle to a new station.	9410-1579-0			/	
Tractivity 62128	Public	Stage 1	1. I object in principle because a return to a nuclear new build programme: (a) is not necessary since current plans for more electricity from gas, wind, CHP, solar PV, micro-generation, incineration, bio, energy efficiency/conservation etc. are sufficient to solve any energy gap problems and nuclear becoming available at, say, 2019/20 is far too late;	9415-1579-17			/	
Tractivity 62128	Public	Stage 1	(f) it can do only a very little - latest estimate of 4% - in helping towards cutting the UK's carbon emissions and in itself, from uranium mining to daily operation and final decommissioning, it is more 'medium to low' in carbon footprint NOT 'low'; (g) also, adding to (f), it will seriously damage chances of the UK meeting its carbon emissions targets (and therefore bring very nasty climate chaos to future generations if global warming exceeds the dreaded two degrees level) since its enormous demand for financial, employment, materials, and other resources investment will starve such needed investment into renewables, especially wind, solar, hydro and energy efficiency; (h) It does not pass the vital modern planning tests of sustainability (uranium is a limited resource, power stations have limited life, and radioactive waste is dangerous virtually forever) and environmental compatibility (stations are an enormous scar and eyesore and big disruption of local life and especially wildlife - think of the 'wind farm' refusal's bats on site?);	9415-1579-845			/	
Tractivity 62129	Public	Stage 1	we realise the country needs more energy and the government is hell bent on fast tracking nuclear power plants, maybe this is the right thing or not, my concerns are the way that EDF and local counsels are going about it, take the proposed development sites hear at Williton	9416-1579-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	<p>NII + Veracity - Overview and Summary</p> <p>This Case Study considers the management of the particularly hazardous wastes at Sellafield and the text indicates;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not only NII's failure to ensure that the problems are dealt with; but also - The NII's 'lack of veracity' concerning the matter <p>The 'lack of veracity' is of particular importance in this context as the original issue arose during a Planning Hearing.</p> <p>Due to the revision of Planning Law - and the need for the public to rely on officialdom to - the lack of rigour displayed by the NII is a matter of great concern.</p>	89484-1579-4258			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	<p>Unfortunately the following pages are extremely tortuous.</p> <p>They are concerned with the evidence that I gave to a CCC Waste Planning Framework meeting in November 2008.</p> <p>At this meeting I quoted a (July 2008) NII Newsletter to indicate that, not only were the NII concerned about the state of critical safety equipment at the Sellafield site; they were also concerned that the NDA might not be allocated sufficient funds by Government to carry out the necessary refurbishments.</p> <p>Despite the fact that I was directly quoting NII documentation, the NII representative at the Hearing said that my evidence was false.</p> <p>When a formal minute of this statement was available - in the form of a note prepared by a CoRWM observer - I immediately wrote to the (Personal information removed) (HSE), who are responsible for the NII, to make a complaint.</p> <p>(Personal information removed) - responded to my (30th Dec '08) letter on (22nd Jan '09). The further 'misrepresentations in (Personal information removed) letter only served to compound the original problem of the misrepresentation at the CCC Planning Hearing. I therefore almost immediately sent a response (on 27th Jan '09).</p> <p>On 5th March 2009 (Personal information removed) sent a response to this (27th Jan '09) letter. I was quite astonished to find that this letter had 10 "fibs" in just one side of A4. I spent a great deal of time compiling a 36 page document outlining the basis of my assertion that the (5th Mar '09) letter had 10 "fibs" in it.</p> <p>On the 8th July 2009 I had a meeting with (Personal information removed) in which I provided him with a copy of my analysis of his (5th Mar '09) letter.</p>	89484-1579-4847			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			<p>He said that he would get back to me to demonstrate that I was in fact misinformed.</p> <p>Four months later, and less than a week before the (9th Nov '09) nuclear announcement, (Personal information removed) wrote to me to say that the issues that I raised had been reviewed. He supplied no documentary support.</p> <p>(Personal information removed) invited me to a meeting, however at the same time - for whatever reason - the Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM) had seen fit to alter their original note of the CCC Planning Hearing such that it no longer provided an accurate report of the meeting.</p> <p>I requested that the NII resolve this situation - but they did not deem it appropriate.</p> <p>Things had quite clearly moved from the sublime to the ridiculous. Given that the very basis of my original complaint was now a bone of contention I felt that a meeting with the NII would be problematic.</p> <p>(Personal information removed) had taken hand-written notes at the Planning Hearing which match the original CoRWM note (ie that the NII had 'negated my evidence.)</p> <p>The fact that my evidence was correct, was confirmed by an article in the Times in (Nov '09) - and its subsequent confirmation by the NDA.</p> <p>This issue is not a matter of pedantry. At the Sellafield site there is an ever-present risk of a radionuclide release that would be generate radioactive fallout that could result in two million fatal cancers. During 2009 there were two emergencies on the site and the (Personal information removed) stated in October that the risks at Sellafield were 'far to high'.</p> <p>The fact that the NII saw fit to misrepresent their views at a Planning Hearing is a matter of very serious concern. The fact that this initial problem has been exacerbated by a serious of highly misleading letters - plus the extraordinary decision by CoRWM to revise a meeting note - such that it no longer provides an accurate account of what was actually said - is truly bizarre.</p> <p>At a Planning Hearing, the Inspector relies almost 100% on the regulator being reliable. Given that the current consultation is in the context of a Planning Process - and that the commencement of the NII's misrepresentation was at a Planning Hearing; EdF have failed to provide assurance that the safety of workers and the public would be protected if EdF EPR nuclear reactors were to be built at Hinkley.</p>					

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	10 July 2009 - Letter to HSE outlining problems with veracity of NII + implications that this has for the Planning Process	89484-1579-8862			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	Analysis of (Personal information removed) 5th March Letter	89485-1579-106			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	(Personal information removed) (Personal information removed) Letter of 5th March 2009 Ten Misrepresentations	89486-1579-0			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	Annex ONE - Text of 5 March 2009 NII Letter Letter from (Personal information removed) to (Personal information removed)	89488-1579-27			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	APPENDIX TWO Letter from the (Personal information removed) of the Planning Inspectorate To (Personal information removed) (17th April 2009)	89488-1579-4216			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	APPENDIX THREE Sellafield Loss of Coolant Incident In Liquid High Level Waste Tanks 1st April 2009	89488-1579-6682			/	

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	APPENDIX FOUR Sellafield and The Hazard Presented by Liquid High Level Wastes	89489-1579-0			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	APPENDIX FIVE UK nuclear advisory group scrapped after warning of safety risks, insiders claim Monday 16 February 2009 16.16 GMT	89489-1579-5873			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	APPENDIX SIX Comparison of NII Newsletter Text on 'Highly Active Storage Tanks' July 2008 - need for replacement 'with utmost urgency'	89489-1579-11541			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	APPENDIX SEVEN Sellafield and Funding Problems Contract Journal Weds 10th June 2009	89489-1579-14121			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	3 Nov 2009 - Request to CoRWM to Correct 2nd Version of (Nov '08) CCC Note (Personal information removed) - E-mail to CoRWM (3rd Nov 2009) Sent to (Personal information removed) Re: CoRWM Note of (Nov 2008) CCC Hearing + Regulatory Views on my Evidence	89489-1579-23063			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	NII Concerns Over the Safety of the Sellafield Site	89489-1579-27395			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	The Regulators + the Planning Process	89489-1579-28720			/	

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	Extracts from my (Dec '09) 'EP' Response Lack of Rationale for Exclusion of Radionuclides	89490-1579-1996			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	APP - Independent on Sellafield MOX Plant - Oct 2001 (212) "Economic benefits" outweighed Mox plant concerns"	89490-1579-9701			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	App - (Personal information removed) on Reasons for Exclusion of Radiological Issues from this Consultation - (E-mail exchange) E-mail from (Personal information removed) to (Personal information removed) 18th November 2009 Re: EPP - H1 - Current Cons on Risk Assessment	89491-1579-0			/	
Tractivity 62172	Public	Stage 1	APP - EA (Aug 2009) - Poss Political Influence on Site Characterisation 4.4.7 Issue 7: Characterising the site adequately (page 79)	89491-1579-8964			/	
Tractivity 62206	Public	Stage 1	I object to proposals for the largest UK nuclear power station due to my concerns over: 1) Health risks from radioactive emissions 2) Risks of leaks, accidents, terrorism 3) Highly radioactive spent fuel remainnig on site for 160 years plus 4) No planned repository for onward disposal of this spent fuel 5) Disruption of local life due to large influx of temporary workers 6) Nuclear's tiny contribution to combating climate change 7) Our world is in such a mess due to decisions made that are extremely short-term eg. finance, housing, energy investment, etc. - we need as caring, responsible human beings to turn to alternative sources of energy eg. tidal wave, solar - as is already happening successfully around the world and put the investment into creating a world for the future - and also solve the problem of the current nuclear waste that we need to dispose of safely!	9428-1579-37			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62218	Public	Stage 1	<p>I oppose your proposal for new nuclear build at Hinkley on the following grounds:-</p> <p>a) numerous studies have shown increased levels of cancer and infant deaths downwind of Hinkley and in Burnham-on-Sea.</p> <p>b) The problem of nuclear waste is on-going - we cannot leave this legacy for our grandchildren.</p> <p>c) While I am concerned about global warming I feel renewables and energy efficiency, not nuclear, must be the way forward.</p>	9433-1579-0			/	
Tractivity 62220	Public	Stage 1	<p>Unless accompanied by stabilisation, and reduction, of population, the project will be futile. It is noted it is to supply several million homes - not industry which has been decimated -hence maintaining the status quo.</p> <p>Historically the station should never have been built in this location. Along with alternatives it provided the necessary physical requirements but the deciding factors in its favour were that the locale was sparsely populated - so weak opposition, few affected in the event of mishap and rural land was cheaper. It had no relevance to areas of high demand hence calling for extensive network of transmission towers. These features still exist, aggravated by the new project.</p> <p>Continuing destruction of England's environment and beauty is at stake and this type of development belongs to areas which are already wrecked and urbanised. Also energy wastage needs to be investigated along with alternatives and conservation. We must have power but at comensurate cost and much usage is fatuous, invented and merely geared to profit.</p> <p>I am one of your customers and have lived for 16 years directly opposite Hinkley. I do not enjoy its sinister and brooding outline - blot on the Quantock Hills - and have no desire to see it grow worse.</p>	9434-1579-0			/	
Tractivity 62225	Public	Stage 1	<p>I would like to register my disapproval of your plans to construct and operate "Hinkley" C. There are too many risks associated with nuclear power. The local area will be severely impacted by traffic during construction and operation. The economics of nuclear power is expensive; nuclear waste is not manageable. There are no opportunities for local public enquiry into the proposal.</p>	9435-1579-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62227	Public	Stage 1	There was also Government announcement this weekend about a wind farm to be located in the Bristol Channel - Why would the temporary mooring of a cruise ship cause more environmental damage than this? We request that you provide an assessment showing the difference in environmental impact re the cruise ship being temporarily located at Hinkley point versus the environmental impact of new build and carbon footprint of workers travelling to site daily by motorized vehicles or of construction of wind farm?	9436-1579-5138			/	
Tractivity 62239	Public	Stage 1	- Nuclear's tiny contribution to combating climate change	9438-1579-410			/	
Tractivity 62239	Public	Stage 1	- As a French citizen I feel concerned as you trying to build an EPR in Flamenville.	9438-1579-470			/	
Tractivity 62239	Public	Stage 1	This project is unnessecary, dangerous and a waste of time,money and space. I found it strange that the EPR project in Finland was not mentioned anywhere in the document, between the 3000 problems already encountered, the delay of about 3 years and the budget that has nearly doubled from the inital 3 billion euros.	9438-1579-557			/	
Tractivity 62337	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	I do understand that nuclear power is necessary and believe that the Hinkley site is probably suitable as we already have a site here. However I am concerned regarding the effects the actual build will have on those of us who live closest to the site	10017-1579-97			/	
Tractivity 62352	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	4) As Finland has rejected the proposed EDF reactor design as unsafe ve are expecting the IPC to follow suit.	10029-1579-3113			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62355	Public	Stage 2	<p>Many people are concerned at the impact it will have on our area for many years to come. I can understand their fears. The roads in our area were never built to take so much traffic. It is a real problem in Summer, with all our visitors.</p> <p>The sad truth is that if we do not start soon there will be a shortage of power for the future. So many people just flick on a switch, with out any thought as to where it comes from, or indeed how it is made.</p> <p>Many just do not care but they will be the first to scream, if they had to sit in the dark for hours on end and wait for their turn of the electricity.</p> <p>I have lived in countries were this is quite normal but young people in this country are so use to computers, Ipods etc, that they just to not understand that if we, as a nation do not want to go backwards, then forwards is the Nuclear age.</p> <p>Again there are factions that would have Wind Farms plastered across the land. OH! Gods. I would rather have ten blocks at Hinkley, than those things. Some people I have discovered would have us back in some Medieval Disney World, rather than a bright future.</p> <p>Others are already trying to grab some of the money in one form or another but there is so much talk of where do we build the Hostels the Car parks etc?. Nobody wants them in their back yard. As a Company I think you must be running in circles, trying to please everyone and any one.</p>	10031-1579-125			/	
Tractivity 62410	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>We fully understand the needs for power in the future, but until other option are exhausted such as Tidal i/e a Severn barrage, Solar and Wind have all been explored then the dangers of disposing of Nuclear waste and the terrible consequences of any accident at a Nuclear power station, no building should be allowed,</p>	10053-1579-1292			/	
Tractivity 62411	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>I am writing to you with my concerns for the building of the new Nuclear Power Station at Hinkley Point. Let me first of all say that I am not against the new Power Station itself but the way that EDF plan to ruin the surrounding villages with their plans on how this station is to be built.</p>	10054-1579-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62434	Public	Stage 2	<p>I hereby object to the entire planning application submitted by EDF as its a chapter of lies and false statements made in public meetings and in so called consultations.</p> <p>I do not object to the provision of Hinkley 'C' station as there is a real need for more power sources. However, the prospect of Hinkley 'D' and all these problems starting all over again causes some concern. I note with interest that EDF has been very careful not to mention the proposed 'D' station.</p>	10067-1579-2535			/	
Tractivity 62449	Public	Stage 2	<p>In doing so I would stress that I am very pro-nuclear and recognise the need for new nuclear power stations to ensure the UK has a diverse capacity to ensure security of supply.</p>	10075-1579-156			/	
Tractivity 62449	Public	Stage 2	<p>The UK has needed new nuclear build for the last 20 years or more and although more ageing nuclear plants are due to close in the next few years, that must not be used as an excuse for ignoring due process, meaningful engagement and over riding the concerns of local communities about how their environments will be affected.</p> <p>General</p>	10075-1579-560			/	
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. 	10075-1579-1401			/	

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	<p>Politicians extolling the virtues of empowerment of communities, 'The Big Society' where we the people make decisions locally - all verbal garbage.</p> <p>Hinkley C will not reduce the nations carbon emissions, it merely replaces Hinkley A which is undergoing decommissioning.</p> <p>Few disagree that we need to keep the lights on, few disagree that we need more nuclear power stations, what we do disagree with is the cost, not in financial terms but in the loss of quality of our lives.</p> <p>That there will eventually be a Hinkley D station is not in doubt. There will be decommissioning eventually of all these power stations so now is the time to get the infrastructure right.</p>	10083-1579-354			/	
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	I/we are in favour of further UK Nuclear Power station development and the continuation of the nuclear industry but not at any cost to people & the environment.	10091-1579-347			/	
Tractivity 62475	Public	Stage 2	A quick note in support of your proposals - I'm sure it's the right thing for the company and the area. Just try and do a bit better than Finland & Flamanville as I gather all is not going smoothly - massive delays, litigation and cost overruns are not what we want or need.	10092-1579-41			/	
Tractivity 62476	Public	Stage 2	The sooner you start construction the better. All delay is costly, and the hesitation of the company is beginning to make people think that you will never get down to it. This is a bandwagon. Once it rolls people will jump on board, including (Personal information removed) who is beginning to realise the immense cost in Government subsidy that is delivered to the wind energy lobby with very indifferent results.	10093-1579-28			/	
Tractivity 62477	Public	Stage 2	<p>I am a strong support of the Hinkley Point C proposal because it offers enormous benefits to the South West and to the UK economy as a whole:</p> <p>1. Britain needs sustainable independent electrical power generation, only nuclear power can meet the countries needs without a return to the greenhouse emissions of coal fired power stations.</p>	10094-1579-110			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62477	Public	Stage 2	4. Nuclear power in the UK is based about a first class safety culture that will continue to keep us clear of radiological accidents.	10094-1579-934			/	
Tractivity 62504	Public	Stage 2	For many years, EDF (and its predecessor British Energy) have spent large sums of money, courting local and national politicians with promises of solutions to climate change, energy, employment, social and local economic problems. It should be noted that none of the claimed benefits of the proposed nuclear development are quantified, nor is there any indication of how these 'wishful thinking' side-effects are to be monitored or assessed. There is no opportunity to question environmental and social degradation occurring in communities for the complete nuclear power cycle.	10097-1579-1620			/	
Tractivity 62504	Public	Stage 2	There are serious decisions that have to be made about how we meet future energy and climate change needs with great opportunities for the future, BUT, they need to be based on certainty, not by risking all on some mythical or magic potion.	10097-1579-7100			/	
Tractivity 62524	Public	Stage 2	First of all let me say that I am not against nuclear energy and have no objections to another plant being built at Hinkley Point.	10101-1579-178			/	
Tractivity 62531	Public	Stage 2	The proposal by EDF, 20 years later, to revive the Hinkley C plan is a retrograde step. The world has moved on and it is now possible to clearly see a future energy supply which does not rely on either fossil fuels or uranium.	10104-1579-410			/	
Tractivity 62531	Public	Stage 2	3. There are viable alternatives to a nuclear route, as evidenced for example by research carried out for the No Need for Nuclear campaign (www.noneedfornuclear.org.uk) and by the government's own projections to 2050 ("2050 Pathways" at www.decc.gov.uk). Both of these show nuclear being retired from the UK energy mix soon after 2030, with no new build.	10104-1579-1337			/	
Tractivity 62554	Public	Stage 2	I am opposed to the construction of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point on various grounds, ranging from local to global.	10114-1579-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62554	Public	Stage 2	Globally, I believe the nuclear industry is one of the "dinosaurs" of the post war period of large scale works, such as tower blocks and huge urban motorways. These were always particularly unsuitable for our small, densely populated islands.	10114-1579-1347			/	
Tractivity 62554	Public	Stage 2	We live in uncertain times, threatened by such things as rising sea levels and international terrorism. We should be setting an example to the world by phasing out our nuclear industry and investing in other, smaller scale, perhaps more local technologies - if possible led and directed locally rather than by big corporations.	10114-1579-1663			/	
Tractivity 62554	Public	Stage 2	I know there are many people who have worked for a long time in the nuclear industry and are understandably reluctant to recognise that times have changed. I remember myself when clean, cheap electricity was promised and it was all new and exciting. But that was the 1950's, This is the twenty-first century.	10114-1579-1994			/	
Tractivity 62576	Public	Stage 2	I wish to record my strong objection to the forthcoming new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point. Nuclear power is inefficient, environmentally lethal and has the potential to kill or maim millions.	10127-1579-0			/	
Tractivity 62578	Public	Stage 2	1. What are your views on the proposed arrangement and landscaping of the Hinkley Point C site? What exactly do you mean by "arrangement"? If you mean the building of a nuclear power station, then I am totally against it when we have enough wave and wind power together with geothermal energy in this country to serve us well, without running the risk of this terrorist-target accident waiting to happen.	10129-1579-175			/	
Homes and Communities Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The Homes and Communities Agency does not have a specific policy stance in relation to nuclear power stations, but we will support the government's position on this issue. In the draft National Policy Statement, Hinkley Point was identified as a potentially suitable site for a new nuclear power station. Assuming that the site is included in the final version, we will have no objections in principle to the development of the nuclear power station.	10191-1579-216			/	
Royal Mail	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Royal Mail Group is aware of proposed development at Hinkley Point C and has no issues in principle with the proposal.	10198-1579-2281			/	

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	<p>That EDF Energy be informed that the National Park Authority raises no objection to the proposals in principle; however:</p> <p>1. There are concerns about the likely levels of traffic from the west and that the details and Transport Strategy do not provide reassurance that the impacts of that traffic on the local environment can be mitigated successfully, and</p> <p>2. There is a need to demonstrate that lighting at the Williton Park and Ride site and the Hinkley Point C site itself are the minimum necessary for the safe operation of the sites and that the lighting is designed to prevent spillage from those sites in the interests of ensuring that dark skies of the Exmoor National Park, one of its special qualities, is not affected.</p>	10209-1579-3791	/			
South Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	<p>South Somerset District Council accepts the development of Hinkley Point C is in line with Government policy for creating a balanced supply for energy and may provide the UK with 6% of the national energy supply, and therefore is a critical part of the overall energy generation capability of the country.</p>	10210-1579-499			/	
Bristol City Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	<p>Bristol City Council is minded to maintain its objection to the proposal to locate an additional nuclear power station on the Hinkley Point site and has serious concern on a number of issues, including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - inefficient use of resources in face of alternative and safer sources of energy; - constraint placed on the effective delivery of alternative renewable energy to the energy network in the Hinkley Point area; 	10214-1579-891			/	
Burnham-on-Sea & Highbridge Town Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>(Editor's note: see pdf provided separately. Not entered into database - 1 page with 1 map)</p> <p>(Editor's note: response from email and attachments)</p> <p>(Editor's note: text from email dated 01/10/2010)</p> <p>Subject: Stage 2 proposals - response from Burnham on Sea and Highbridge Town Council</p> <p>Please find attached the response from Burnham on Sea and Highbridge Town Council to the above.</p> <p>(Editor's note: text from first attachment)</p>	10220-1579-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			<p>Stage 2 Consultation on Preferred Proposals for Hinkley Point C</p> <p>Please find below the observations of Burnham on Sea and Highbridge Town Council following extensive consultations and meetings around the EDF Hinkley Point stage 2 consultations.</p> <p>In coming to this view, members have;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Received two presentations from EDF representatives, one in December 2009 when (Personal information removed) attended the full Council meeting to outline the stage 1 proposals , and one in August 2010 from (Personal information removed), again at the full Council meeting, about the stage 2 proposals. On both occasions members asked a great many questions. - Members have also visited the two exhibitions held in Burnham on Sea, and the Town Council has been able to send a representative to some, although not all, of the "themed" meetings arranged by the Community Council for Somerset. - Those members of the Town Council who are also members of Sedgemoor District Council have attended a great many in-depth information-sharing meetings, and one of our members is also a member of the Hinkley Point Stakeholder Committee. <p>The Town Council's policy on energy production is to support in principle all means of renewable energy and the Town Council is therefore broadly in support of a nuclear build at Hinkley Point. Such support is of course subject to due consideration of any application through the planning procedure, which we understand is likely to be via the Infrastructure Planning Commission, or its successor body. One of the key issues will be an assurance regarding the safety of the type of nuclear build proposed.</p> <p>However, members believe it is essential that despite the obvious economic benefit that the development would have for Sedgemoor and the neighbouring areas, the impact of such a development upon the local community should be taken into consideration. The following observations are very much linked to the community of Burnham on Sea and Highbridge, and the surrounding villages to the north of the Sedgemoor District.</p> <p>Community issues</p>					
Burnham-on-Sea & Highbridge Town Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>Yes, it is true that "clean" electricity is a benefit that will be enjoyed by the whole community, but there appears to be very few other tangible benefits for the long-term future of our residents.</p>	10220-1579-13068			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The Council wishes to make it clear that in principle they are not opposed to the proposed build at Hinkley Point and can see some benefits to the village in the form of local trade and employment.	10221-1579-17044			/	
Nether Stowey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	whilst the Parish Council welcomes and supports the development of the proposed Hinkley C Power Station, it has real concerns about the strategies outlined in the Stage 2 Consultation documents and the way in which the consultation process is proceeding.	10226-1579-312			/	
Nether Stowey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>1.4 Nether Stowey has a long standing and positive connection with the Hinkley Point power stations and the Parish Council has previously welcomed the proposed development of Hinkley Point C as a significant and positive investment in the area.</p> <p>1.5 However, in its response to the Stage 1 Consultation the Parish Council indicated that it believed that any project of this size would inevitably bring with it pressures and challenges for local communities, including Nether Stowey, which if not addressed would have a detrimental impact on the area. The Parish Council wishes to ensure that these pressures are recognised and addressed before the project proceeds.</p>	10226-1579-2820			/	
Spaxton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We continue to support the construction of Hinkley C but our greatest concern is the impact on road traffic unless you construct a Bridgwater bypass from M5 J23 to the Hinkley access road.	10231-1579-220			/	
Weston-super-Mare Town Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>It is in the public interest that new nuclear power stations should have a role to play in the country's energy mix along with other low carbon sources.</p> <p>We must invest in nuclear power if our future energy needs are to be met and as Hinkley Point already has a nuclear power station it should be made available to meet our new energy needs.</p> <p>This would reduce our reliance on fossil fuels and greatly reduce our carbon foot print and create much needed employment in our area. Both social and economic benefits will be gained provided all environmental issues are addressed.</p>	10238-1579-76			/	
Weston-super-Mare Town Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	If we are to ensure our future energy needs are met we must adopt a nuclear energy policy. We cannot, in the future, become reliant on sourcing our energy needs from foreign countries. Self sufficiency for our future energy must be given top priority in order that our country can compete with the rest of Europe.	10238-1579-945			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Hinkley Point Site Stakeholder Group (A+B) Sites	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	6) There is little opposition to the Power Stations (A+B) and to say 18 months ago little to a new station (C) but there is now such a groundswell of opposition to the ill thought out and slipshod way this consultation has taken place that we fear this has done nothing but to play into the hands of the 'Anti' brigade. As (Personal information removed) said " you have sowed the wind now you will have to reap the whirlwind"	10255-1579-3449			/	
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	1.2 Greenpeace believes that new nuclear power is inadequate, unnecessary and dangerous. It is inadequate because it offers too little, too late in terms of climate change. It is unnecessary because we can reduce emissions and keep the lights using better technologies instead. It is dangerous because of the intractable problems of radioactive waste and nuclear weapons proliferation. 1.3 Consequently we do not agree with EdF's assessment that "the development of new nuclear power will be essential in delivering" climate change targets, meeting future energy demand and helping to keep electricity bills down. Indeed, if the government meets its energy efficiency and renewable targets, no new baseload electricity generation capacity will be needed until the period beyond 2020. By this point other, more effective and global applicable low carbon technologies than nuclear will be close to commercialisation.(1)	10260-1579-581			/	
Forum 21	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We are opposed to the proposal for a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point for the reasons contained in the attached position statement.	10262-1579-189			/	
Forum 21	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Overall, the conclusion of Forum 21 is that any benefits obtained by the local area from the construction and operation of Hinkley C, such as increased employment and income to local businesses, will be far outweighed by the negative effects on the local and wider environment, both in the short and longer term.	10262-1579-11493			/	
Bloor Homes Ltd	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We support the expansion of Hinkley Point Power Station in principle. It is an opportunity to provide a range of local jobs during construction as well as In the longer term. The operation of Hinkley Point C will also make a significant contribution to the overall power needs of the UK and in turn support long-term economic growth.	10269-1579-1692			/	
Babcock International Group	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	A quick note in support of your proposals - I'm sure it's the right thing for the company and the area. Just try and do a bit better than Finland & Flamanville as I gather all is not going smoothly - massive delays, litigation and cost overruns are not what we want or need.	10270-1579-41			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Federation of Bridgwater Practices	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Though this particular consultation is limited to the proposed nuclear facility and associated access works, it must be remembered that there will be associated developments having an equally long lasting impact on the area for many years to come, such as the proposed major overhead power lines and the 2 EDF Wind Farms at East and West Huntspill, only a few miles inland. The proposed Wind Farms will not only offset EDF carbon emissions, but will also generate an additional profit for the company at the expense of the local vistas.	10271-1579-3166			/	
West Somerset Strategic Partnership	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	At a recent meeting of the West Somerset Strategic Partnership, a presentation was received by West Somerset Council's Planning Manager on the latest situation regarding the new nuclear power station. The following points were discussed and noted by the Partnership: 1. It was felt that EDF are offering very little to the local community apart from education and skills training. 2. There could potentially be an impact on housing - how would you deal with this? 3. Although opportunities are there to benefit small businesses in the district, how will these be gained? 4. Many views were expressed - some for and some against nuclear energy.	10274-1579-38			/	
Tractivity 1169	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	We need electricity provide it.	10279-1579-6880			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	d) A resurgence of nuclear power will endanger this country, not be its salvation and add to the problems of plutonium proliferation and waste management.	89469-1579-6502			/	

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	e) Nuclear power stations take far too long to build and it is grossly unfair to expect local rural communities to put up with it for so many years, particularly as cities are the ones that consume so much of the electricity. We should not be paying the price here in Somerset for governments' failures to manage population growth that is driving increased demand or their short-sighted energy policies. Besides, in December 2009, the government admitted it 'has not made any long-term projections of electricity demand/supply'. DECC is still working on scenarios. It's madness to endanger populations through nuclear build before you've even assessed if taking such risks are needed. These proposals, therefore, are grossly premature.	89469-1579-6660			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	f) It will not contribute to a reduction in CO2 when you factor in the emissions from construction, mining of fuel, waste disposal and decommissioning, etc. whilst, at the same time, be dangerously polluting. I do not consider it rational to consider new nuclear build's dubious contribution to reducing CO2 in the air when carbon dioxide is allowed to continue to be produced commercially around the world for use in the carbonation of fizzy drinks, for example. In the USA alone, over 77 million tons of carbon dioxide are manufactured commercially each year. There is heavy irony in the huge scale of deliberate CO2 manufacture. The Coco Colas of this world are allowed to continue emitting CO2 yet I am expected to believe that new nuclear power stations are a positive contribution to the climate change issue. I will only start to take the threat from CO2 seriously when its commercial production is banned globally. Irrespective of that, EDF have not accurately depicted the full picture to substantiate their view that the EPRs you are proposing are a low carbon option. Much more detail is required to allow in depth scrutiny beyond the level of emission during operation. The claim that these specific power stations are low carbon needs to be justified.	89469-1579-7399			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	ii) Hinkley is the wrong location and the timing of such proposals is wrong. The site is only deemed appropriate because a nuclear power station requires access to cooling water. The nuclear energy generation programme is a proven failure: solutions to the problems of toxic waste have not materialised, the vulnerability of existing installations are being ignored as are the existing health problems and a long term waste repository hasn't been built - a major, costly project in itself. Until the existing problems have been solved and a waste repository built whether above or below ground, no new nuclear build should even be considered. There is NO justification for it in terms of meeting future energy needs. And being a rural location, other intrusive development is not acceptable either. Hinkley served its purpose. Hinkley A and B both need to be decommissioned and the buildings taken down. The power lines that so blot the landscape removed. End of story except for the toxic legacy that will pose a risk for years to come. You shouldn't be adding to it.	89471-1579-0			/	

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	2.1.5 of your Sustainability Evaluation claims: 'As the most affordable low carbon option available, nuclear power has a major role to play in the UK's future energy mix'. This claim must be substantiated as two government departments' own figures contradict it - Cabinet Office Energy Review page 197, DTI Options for a Low Carbon Future, Occasional Paper No 1, page 19.	89472-1579-7168			/	
Tractivity 62486	Public	Stage 2	<p>a) Nuclear as an Illusory Solution to Climate Change</p> <p>(Personal information removed) of the Open University, and former member of the Government's Committee on Radioactive Waste Management (CoRWM), has commented:</p> <p>"[Nuclear power] would provide the illusion of a solution to the problems of global warming and energy security which required no fundamental changes in production or consumption. It is this business-as-usual aspect of nuclear that is its most insidious characteristic.... The danger is that by focusing on nuclear we refrain from recognizing the scale of the challenge we face and shirk our responsibility for dealing with it". (49)</p> <p>It is vital that institutional and financial resources are not diverted away from genuine climate solutions. Given my long standing involvement with Friends of the Earth, including fifteen years as part of the National FoE Energy team, this is a matter that I feel strongly about.</p> <p>b) Nuclear Subsidies and Public Spending Cuts</p> <p>In August 2010 it was reported that:</p> <p>"all the intellectual spare capacity in the government is focused on the deficit and the budget cuts, and there is very little capacity left to look at other political priorities" (50)</p> <p>It was reported that this was having a particularly severe impact on DECC (the Department of Energy and Climate Change).</p> <p>In July 2010, the Daily Telegraph reported that: "KPMG says nuclear power 'won't happen'".(51) The article discussed a study by KPMG for RWE npower which states that new reactors will not be built if the Government maintains its commitment not to provide taxpayer support. The study says it is still uneconomic for utility companies to invest the billions of pounds required in new reactors under the current financial framework. (52)</p> <p>This suggests that in order for Hinkley C to be built, EdF must receive public subsidies. This subsidy is being sought against a backdrop of cuts of up to 40% in Public Spending. (53) As I live in Hackney, which is an extremely impoverished area, public spending cuts will affect our neighbourhood quite acutely. If Nuclear New Build were to be subsidised then the level of cuts that boroughs such as Hackney will experience will be even worse.</p>	89478-1579-2285			/	

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	The South West RDA supports EDF's investment in new nuclear at Hinkley Point C. We are keen to continue working with EDF, the IPC, relevant local authorities and business to ensure that the benefits of this investment are secured for local communities, the wider functional economic area and the UK.	89055-1579-993			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	1.23. Given the scale of the development proposed, there is clearly an opportunity for the development at Hinkley Point to result in a positive transformation in Somerset. However, the County Council and other affected Local Authorities will have a vital role in working with the developer constructively to ensure that the impacts that arise from the development are properly mitigated and that a positive legacy is derived, not least for Somerset's economy.	89196-1579-13774			/	
Bridgwater Town Council	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The Town Council are supportive of nuclear new build at Hinkley Point but consider it essential that local issues are resolved in favour of the local communities of which Bridgwater as the 'host' town is the key settlement.	89263-1579-353			/	
Bridgwater Town Council	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- The Town Council and the community are generally supportive of nuclear new build at Hinkley Point	89264-1579-67			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	There is an unseemly haste to build these new facilities, and much is being made of the CO2 reduction. Whilst this is laudable, there must be a balance between the benefits for the nation and the untold misery for local residents.	89288-1579-7872			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We have serious concerns, mostly about the nuclear aspect of the proposal to build at Hinkley, but we also object to the development in terms of the serious effect it will have on the local environment and amenities.	89447-1579-620			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62871	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>I am the chap who said about the Clockwork motor at the (Editor's note: one word illegible) school.</p> <p>The clockwork motor works in all conditions. I have a clockwork motor driven model boat, gets the engine flooded in water, sea and fresh water. I have had to leave it all night.</p> <p>In 1963 we had a high pressure system for nearly 3 months, no wind all this time. Wind generators to me are stupid masses, don't care what you think.</p> <p>If you generate electricity you need something that will do it all the time not when the sun shines or the wind blows. The oil, coal and everything else which you burn should not if possible, too many people on this earth.</p>	89651-1579-0			/	
Tractivity 62945	Public	Stage 2 Update	and in any events, nuclear power is not controllable in a way of other generating modes. ie nuclear cannot switched off when electricity is not needed.	89677-1579-632			/	
Tractivity 62952	Public	Stage 2 Update	There is no need for nuclear power. And your plans do not address the issue of radiological contamination on the Hinkley C site as cited in the Green Audit analysis.	89681-1579-2677			/	
Tractivity 62952	Public	Stage 2 Update	I have no confidence that you can fund this project either considering the level of debt EDF has, or that you are fit to run nuclear power stations considering you failed to spot the serious failings until recently in 34 of your plants in France and the difficulties constructing EPRs in Finland and at Flamanville that are running over time and over budget. Therefore, your increased Community Fund offering, that will only benefit some, not all, fails to even begin to compensate people for the lives that are going to be ruined.	89681-1579-2846			/	
Tractivity 62989	Public	Stage 2 Update	In general terms I have been supportive of Nuclear power generation as part of a low carbon mix. However the current Japanese nuclear crisis has given rise to a concern.	89690-1579-52			/	
Tractivity 63013	Public	Stage 2 Update	Living in an area which has the full downwind from the direction of Hinkley Point being south west of it I do not want another power station to replace the existing defunct one. There are 10,000 people who live here and 9,000 in nearby Street besides all the big towns and the villages affected by winds from Hinkley! I do not know of anyone in the area who does want it unless they are very ignorant of the care of the planet or very into greed at the expense of the health of people and planet.	89697-1579-147			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 63013	Public	Stage 2 Update	In a time where we have to consider our planet and its delicate balance it is not expedient to be shoving more nuclear power plants into it's or our faces. This question should not even be being asked. Why not use wind and wave energy both of which we have in plenty? The west side of our country also has many earth tremors all the time so do not even consider it.	89697-1579-1833			/	
Tractivity 63013	Public	Stage 2 Update	Why is it when we have a chance to get away from these dratted power stations and use wind powered turbines people even have the audacity to consider flying in the face of a more wholistic harmonic lifestyle and want to build another. Greed and arrogance have the chance to be replaced at this moment please do not flout that responsibility! Anything with the potential of being a health hazard should not be considered at any cost!	89697-1579-2563			/	
Tractivity 63014	Public	Stage 2 Update	I write to object to the continued use of Hinckley Point for radioactive nuclear power - it is, in my opinion, past it's sell by date.	89698-1579-0			/	
Tractivity 63014	Public	Stage 2 Update	Aging power stations mean and increased risk of radiation leaks & whilst we are not on fault lines as in Japan, nonetheless nothing must be taken fro granted in these changing times. There are other ways of obtaining power e.g. wind & water & perhaps time to see how little electricity is really necessary especially in the light of the current recession - switch off not on.	89698-1579-896			/	
Tractivity 63034	Public	Stage 2 Update	I am writing to object to another reactor being built at Hinkley. I am also in favour of the existing plant being shut down indefinitely. We do not need nucleur power for energy. The dangers have been exposed more than once in history, as well as in the recent past. There are plenty of natural alternatives available for our energy needs. Also, we as a nation need to cut down our consumption. The big corporations are responsible for most of the waste of our resources.	89706-1579-0			/	
Nether Stowey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	1.4 Nether Stowey has a long standing and positive connection with the Hinkley Point power stations and the Parish Council continues to welcome the proposed development of Hinkley Point C as a significant and positive investment in the area.	89752-1579-968			/	
Nether Stowey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	1.3 Nether Stowey has a long standing and positive connection with the Hinkley Point power stations and the Parish Council welcomes the proposed development of Hinkley Point C as a significant and positive investment in the area.	89752-1579-12200			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
33	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	There are other places in England that are just as suitable as Hinkley point. Also let's not forget that the nuclear reactor that is planned has not yet been tried and tested. We are allowing a foreign nation to come over here and practice on us. We should wait until Flamanville is up and running before we commit to this new technology. If it all goes wrong it will be us that will pick up the bill.	89822-1579-3606			/	
35	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	these much needed new nuclear stations should not be built with apparent disregard to the feelings of local communities with companies putting forward fabricated timescales to try and push ahead with planning issues. The UK has needed new nuclear build for the last 20 years or more and although more ageing nuclear plants are due to close in the next few years, that must not be used as an excuse for ignoring due process, meaningful engagement and over riding the concerns of local communities about how their environments will be affected.	89824-1579-343			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	2. As we have previously indicated to EDF, the County Council supports the development of proposals that would result in the security of energy supply through a diverse mix of low carbon power generation infrastructure, including nuclear power. Specifically, the Council has expressed support for new nuclear development at Hinkley Point. However, this support is conditional upon the development not resulting in unacceptable impacts on the residents, businesses and environment of the County and, positively contributing to local job creation and the County's future economic wellbeing.	89843-1579-1708			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	<p>6. Finance Comments (Section 151 Officer)</p> <p>6.1 Both the National Policy Statements and the EDF Stage One Consultation proposals place a significant impact on the resources of the Council. This has been mitigated by entering into a Planning Performance Agreement with the developer (EDF Energy) and other local authorities (Somerset County Council and West Somerset District Council).</p> <p>6.2 While the Planning Performance Agreement provides a means of mitigating this impact, it is noted with regret that requests to central government to provide funds directly to support were declined and this would have been the council's preferred method.</p> <p>6.3 A key issue for the authority will be the projected impact of labour into the locality and the pressure this will place on already limited budgets and constrained services. Particular concerns centre on escalating costs for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Legal and procurement services - Economic development services - Housing - Leisure and recreational services - Health services - Tourism services - Translation services - Community safety - Environmental Health - Harbour master functions 	88890-1583-30267			/	<p>Some consultees questioned the cost and funding arrangements for new nuclear power stations⁽¹⁾.</p> <p>The Government has been quite clear that it is for private companies to bring forward and pay for new nuclear power stations, including the cost of decommissioning and managing the long term radioactive waste and spent fuel that will arise from generating low carbon electricity at these power stations.</p> <p>EDF Energy has set out an outline statement as part of this application for development consent on how it will fund the construction and operation of the Hinkley Point C (HPC) development in the Funding Statement. In addition, EDF Energy has submitted a detailed plan for both the decommissioning and management of waste and spent fuel that will arise from the Project (Environmental Statement, Volume 2 in its application for development consent. Any potential nuclear operator has to have a Funded Decommissioning Programme agreed by the Government before they can use a site covered by a Nuclear Site Licence. Through this agreement EDF Energy must, by law, ensure that sufficient funds are set aside to cover the costs of decommissioning and managing the waste and spent fuel from HPC.</p> <p>However, it is not the role of the Infrastructure Planning Commission to ensure that any project as a whole is funded adequately. It is up to the board and shareholders of any company or partnership proposing a development to raise sufficient funds to proceed with that project.</p> <p>Although the nuclear industry, along with many others, are calling for both reform of the way the electricity market operates and a recognition that the cost of carbon emissions must fall on the polluter, this is in line with the Government's statement on 18 October 2010, which said: <i>'...there will be no public subsidy for new nuclear power. To be clear, this means that there will be no levy, direct payment or market support for electricity supplied or capacity provided by a private sector new nuclear operator, unless similar support is also made available more widely to other types of</i></p>
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.	88890-1583-32544			/	

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	Govt previously rejected Hinkley C due to investment required.	88900-1583-7309			/	generation.’ Some consultees questioned the effect of safety measures on cost and financability. Safety is of paramount importance to EDF Energy. The reactor design to be built, the EPR, has been undergoing extensive assessment by the UK’s safety regulator for several years. The full costs of construction, operation and decommissioning are taken account of in deciding whether to build the power station.
Tractivity 851	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below I would like to know: 1) What arrangements will be made to cover de commissioning costs at the end of Hinkley Point C?s useful life? 2) What guarantees are there that taxpayers/consumers will not be required to subsidise any costs (building, operating, decommissioning) of Hinkley C!?	9609-1583-5730			/	Notes: (1) Statement on Energy Policy by Chris Huhne (Written Ministerial Statement), 18 October 2010, DECC website: http://www.decc.gov.uk/en/content/cms/news/en_s_tatement/en_statement.aspx
Tractivity 874	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below The general theme throughout these proposals appears to be one of cost and urgency which are interlinked. The sooner the project is up and running, the sooner EDF will se a return on their investment. If these are the primary concerns, what ranking does safety have? A rushed job is quite often a botched job!	9632-1583-8061			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1093	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 cost of a serious nuclear accident or incident - Chernobyl style - will not be underwritten by EDF but the community - indeed the European Community has spent manyhundreds of millions on the Chernobyl disaster which was not even within the EC borders. EDF will not pay for the full cost of dealing with nuclear waste - the likely bill for dealing with nuclear waste is far more than the cost of building and running the site through its life - this again is not an acceptable arrangement. EDF will be making profits over a 30 year period and after this far higher costs will be incurred by the community, and in the event of a disaster the community carry the full cost. It is also unacceptable that nuclear sites cannot control radiation risks - as shown by serious health risks to employees and ?hot spots? for cancers near nuclear sites; nuclear industry has managed to deny such links in the same sort of ways the tobacco industry did.</p>	9851-1583-6085			/	
Tractivity 1119	Public	Stage 2	<p>13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below</p> <p>Your proposed EPR reactor is already experiencing serious problems and long delays in France and Finland. According to (personal details removed), University of Greenwich, "the UK government is in danger of backing a design that could prove unlicensable, unaffordable and unbuildable". If building begins and is stopped, damage will already have been done to this rural area. There are also safety problems to be addressed. As for waste, no answer has yet been found to storing it safely elsewhere yet.</p> <p>How will you pay for all this when your credit rating has been reduced to A and your debts far outweigh your profits?</p> <p>Add the safety problems, the huge costs of building the reactor(s), and the doubt whether the carbon floor price will be adequate. And by the time this white elephant is built, it will be too late to keep our carbon footprint low enough to avoid drastic climate change. Nuclear is a distraction not a solution.</p>	9877-1583-6238			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1137	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>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.</p>	9895-1583-6234			/	
Tractivity 1145	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 do not think this country needs Nuclear Power as part of its energy mix.</p> <p>Uranium comes from politically unstable places and the mining of it is highly dangerous. It is not therefore a secure source of energy for us.</p> <p>It will do nothing to reduce our Carbon Emissions over the next 100 years.</p> <p>All the revenues from EDF built ERPs will go out of the country to France and ultimately we will be dependent on France to keep these power stations functioning. If EDF goes bust and the french government refuses to rescue them it will be down to the UK government to step in.</p> <p>210 square miles of Concentrated Solar Power Units could provide enough electricity to supply the whole planets requirements. Why should we bother with Nuclear Power Stations using an insecure fuel whose afterlife is riddled with consequences we do not fully understand.</p>	9903-1583-8082			/	
Tractivity 198	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 don't think you'll do it without massive public subsidy and a government tolerant of all the delays you'll encounter.</p>	8907-1583-3583			/	
Tractivity 301	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>If intention is to build in the village will schools/surgery/policing be extended? Who will finance this? (Williton)</p>	8989-1583-3012	/			

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	<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>There are grave concerns about the future of these reactors regarding long term cost, disposal of waste, risk of long term pollution to the local environment if storage facilities malfunction, not to mention the transport issues involved. The lack of balance with renewable energy sources is a considerable concern to me after all the time and effort spent. However I have been quite impressed with presentations so far in the matter. This is a very major long term project for Somerset and the transport issue have yet to be resolved.</p>	9152-1583-8367			/	
Tractivity 549	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>There appears, from recent national newspaper reports, doubts about the funding of the projects by EDF!</p>	9218-1583-5356			/	
Tractivity 50899	Public	Stage 1	<p>6. I do not believe nuclear power can be delivered in Britain without some form of state subsidy.</p>	9396-1583-1505			/	
Tractivity 62128	Public	Stage 1	<p>(b) as previously, it will be hellishly expensive and need big subsidies from public funds at both the development and decommissioning ends, plus price-fixing daily operation;</p>	9415-1583-376			/	
Tractivity 62304	Public	Stage 2	<p>The cost could well be shared with such a combined exercise between government agencies and Electricite de France.</p>	9993-1583-5042			/	
Tractivity 62410	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>Could it be that approval will or has been given because EDF say they are not looking for any government investment in this project.</p>	10053-1583-1613			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62531	Public	Stage 2	2. Its economics are still unreliable, including an entirely new reactor design with no operating track record and steadily rising capital costs. If the venture fails then the government/British taxpayer will be left to pick up the pieces, as happened for example with a near-bankrupt British Energy, now a subsidiary of EdF, in 2003.	10104-1583-999			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	c) We will be paying for the phenomenal cost of constructing, maintaining and decommissioning nuclear power stations directly in our electricity bills and payments from taxes to the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and for protection from terrorism. It will not be cheap and certainly not 'affordable' as EDF state. Cabinet Office and DTI data show that our fuel bills will be higher with nuclear generation. We were spun this line when our earlier power stations were built. It doesn't wash this time round. You need to demonstrate how this will be 'affordable' and by how much in comparison to other technologies, with projected costs over the long term.	89469-1583-5841			/	

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>EDF is a French company. Profits will go to France. Where is the security in that for the UK?</p> <p>Will the French government bail you out when you run into financial difficulties like British Energy? Your debts are mounting and your credit rating is plummeting. Your business model probably does not protect you from the effects of the campaign to boycott EDF as a result of your proposals for new nuclear build. It does not protect you from customers leaving you for ethical reasons when they look into the dreadful conditions of miners extracting your fuel abroad just as clothes shoppers boycott companies that use sweatshops overseas. There will come a time when customers have even more choice to select their energy suppliers they see not only as a good ethical choice but by choosing renewable sources or increasingly becoming self-sufficient in energy themselves. Who will be your customers in the future? As companies see the trends they will offload the nuclear arms of their businesses to remain viable concerns. What would you do? Sell off and to who, if no-one will buy?</p> <p>I don't see you here for the long haul. The taxpayer will pay for this eventually but our economy may not be strong enough.</p> <p>You claim you will 'improve the UK's security by reducing reliance on imported energy'. The fuel is imported, so where is the security in that? Fuel also comes from very unstable countries such as Niger... again, hardly secure. As mentioned before, Al Qaeda are targeting these uranium mines. You need to prove your case that these proposals will improve our energy security, not just make a statement as though it is a fact.</p> <p>Is this a 'lessons will be learnt afterwards' or 'make it up as we go along' scenario?</p>	89472-1583-5411			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>4. Nuclear economics and moral hazard</p> <p>There is mounting evidence that any new development at Hinkley will get through, financially speaking, by the skin of its teeth. There is therefore a risk that the project will not be built at all, or may end up half-built and abandoned, due to the complex nature of financing nuclear projects. If the project is started, with the involvement of numerous local, national and international companies, but then runs out of funding part-way, this would have a profound effect on the local communities and would draw the UK government into a decision about a rescue or bale-out. Local contractors, pending any such decision, would remain unpaid and businesses, who may have invested heavily in plant and other resources, might go to the wall, with disastrous effects on the local economy and individual households.</p>	89448-1583-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			<p>EdF last month recorded a debt of 56 billion Euros compared to last year's debt of 30 billion and against a profit of just 1.7 billion this year. They are a highly leveraged company and their credit rating has consequently been reduced from AAA to A. The loans to pay this 'mortgage' are not from the French government, as this would foul EU competition law, but must be found on the open market. The current sale of the company's UK energy distribution arm will meet just 5 bn Euros of their debt, but may simultaneously jeopardise their credit rating further as the relatively 'safe' distribution section of the enterprise has vanished, leaving more risky nuclear production as a greater proportion of the business.</p> <p>Moreover, EdF must also set aside funds to pay for repairs and maintenance to its ageing fleet of French reactors. Nuclear generation in France is approaching its nemesis. Of EdF's nuclear power stations, 37 will be 30 years old by 2015, each requiring a three month outage for inspection prior to licensing for their last ten years of operation. For their life to be extended for a further ten to 20 years thereafter they will have to be upgraded at an estimated cost of 500 Million Euros each - or replaced with 20 new build EPRs by 2020.</p> <p>European Pressurised Reactor in crisis</p> <p>These risks are compounded by difficulties experienced with the current building of two single EPR reactors at Olkiluoto in Finland and Flamanville in France. The Olkiluoto project, run jointly by the EPR manufacturer Areva and the Finnish power utility TVO, has run into scandalous numbers of construction mistakes, about 3,000 in a count taken last year and recorded by Greenpeace Sweden. It is three years overdue and a vicious legal fight is ongoing between the two major constructors over whose fault this is. If TVO loses the battle the company is likely to go bankrupt. The Flamanville project is two years over its expected construction schedule. The cost of building a single EPR is now estimated by EdF at 5 billion Euros, up from 3 billion originally (3). (personal details removed)puts the figure even higher, at an alarming and potentially crippling £6 billion per reactor, or 7 billion Euros. That would put the cost of Hinkley C at roughly £12 billion.</p>					
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>The Roussely Report could offer no effective answer to the EPR's potentially financially fatal complexity, however, other than to try and learn from the errors at Olkiluoto and Flamanville.</p> <p>Adding to EdF's financial worries is the company's expensive £12 billion investment in the ageing fleet of British Energy reactors, of which more than a quarter are currently off-line, including their flagship and newest reactor Sizewell B. This has now been under repair for more than six months since its original breakdown in mid-March.(5)</p>	89448-1583-4230			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
43	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2 Update	Moreover, black propaganda abounds, for instance, it is being spread abroad that the Chinese have bought out the EDF company, together with their astronomical debts! This said, it is beyond my comprehension as to why a foreign (or any) company with a reported £34 billion debt is seen as all powerful and allowed to bully the powerless unhindered.	89912-1583-1247			/	
44	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2 Update	I have since learnt from a separate power station source that the coalition government have agreed to fund all of this preliminary work -including the refurbishment of the Wharf -with taxpayers' money,	89913-1583-1138			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Homes & Communities Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	- Policy stance: The HCA does not have a specific policy stance in relation to nuclear power stations, but we will support the Government's position on this issue. The consultation on the draft National Policy Statement (NPS) for nuclear power generation was published in November 2009 and closed on 22 February 2010. The Government is now considering the consultation responses and will publish a formal response document later in 2010, together with the final version of the National Policy Statement. In the draft NPS, Hinkley Point was identified as a potentially suitable site for the deployment of new nuclear power stations by the end of 2025. Assuming that the site is included in the final version, we will therefore have no objections in principle to the development of the nuclear power station.	8694-1581-187			/	EDF Energy's application for development consent does not contain a detailed argument on whether nuclear power is needed in the UK as this is set out in the Government's National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation. In 2008 the Government White Paper on Nuclear Power ⁽¹⁾ made the case that it is in the public interest that new nuclear power stations should have a role to play in the future electricity generating mix for the UK alongside other low carbon sources. Following this the first draft National Policy Statement on Nuclear Power Generation was published, which set out the ten sites, including Hinkley Point, which the Government deemed to be potentially suitable for the deployment of new nuclear power stations before the end of 2025. This national policy statement was published for consultation in November 2009 as part of a suite of draft National Policy Statements for Energy.
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Unable to challenge under IPC process	88900-1581-7270			/	In May 2010 the newly-elected Coalition Government confirmed that it would continue to allow nuclear as an important part of the energy mix ⁽²⁾ . The Coalition Programme for Government was clear, as both the industry and previous government had been before them, that there should be no subsidy for new nuclear. It would be up to private companies, such as EDF Energy, to finance and build new nuclear power stations.
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	National Policy Statement New technologies could be used to generate power. NPS - Low carbon?	88900-1581-12627			/	In October 2010 the Department of Energy and Climate Change published a revised draft National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation. The revised draft again listed Hinkley Point as one of eight sites potentially suitable for the deployment of new nuclear power stations before the end of 2025, but two other sites in Cumbria were removed from the original list. The revised draft was subject to public consultation and parliamentary scrutiny. The Government had intended to designate this national policy statement in Spring 2011. This was delayed as a result of the events in Japan in March 2011 which devastated the north-eastern coast of the country and seriously damaged the nuclear power station at Fukushima. Following the publication in May 2011 of an interim report ⁽³⁾ into the lessons for the UK by the Chief Inspector of Nuclear Installations, approval versions of the six National Policy Statements for Energy, and the response to the consultation on the revised drafts, were published on 23 June 2011. On 18 July 2011 the House of Commons debated and
Tractivity 892	Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments? Evidence is that power is not required in South West. Do not build here (so avoid traffic problems here) Build in Essex, Kent or London where the power is needed.	9650-1581-2419		/		
Tractivity 912	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Good location	9670-1581-5752			/	
Tractivity 1065	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 lack of cohesion in the planning of improvements to the local infrastructure- the flood relief scheme, the long term development of the A38 and A39 road and EDF's proposals means "local pain" for "national gain". EDF, local and national government together with the European Union should conduct a fundamental review of these linked issues. The review would produce a "win win" result for most involved including the host communities to Hinkley Point.	9823-1581-6821			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1300	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	On television today (20th march 2011) EDF's Chief Executive stressed the need to have the humility to deal with facts and to have leadership. Our local Councils keep quoting the mantra " EDF have not provide us with the facts" on which they can work.This is especially true when dealing with queries about questions on the possibility of a northern by pass or haul road. We deserve to have the facts on which EDF's assertions about the time such works would take are based on. Local EDF representatives claim these options are out because they would take too long and it is not the cost of these proposals that is the critical factor. It is not the local communities fault national and international decision takers have taken so long to get to this point. We should not be punished because of other people's inertia.	89566-1581-3848			/	approved the six National Policy Statements for Energy then on 19 July 2011 Chris Huhne, Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change, designated these national policy statements under the Planning Act 2008. Further information on national policy can be found in the Planning Policy and Legislation chapter of the Environmental Statement submitted with this application for development consent.
Tractivity 247	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? No public enquiries so the public have no say. The government should make sure that all proposals are in the best interest of the local community first.	8940-1581-4178			/	Notes: (1) Meeting the Energy Challenge: A White Paper on Nuclear Power, January 2008, National Archives: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+http://www.berr.gov.uk/files/file43006.pdf (2) Coalition Programme for Government, May 2010, page 17: http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/sites/default/files/resources/coalition_programme_for_government.pdf (3) Japanese earthquake and tsunami: Implications for the UK Nuclear Industry http://www.hse.gov.uk/nuclear/fukushima/interim-report.pdf
Tractivity 258	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 facilities should always be located on isolated locations many miles from centres of habitation, particularly small centres where the logistics of the exercise mean that the communities will be swamped in ways that can barely imagine. Look for offshore islands remote from population centres. Scotland offers almost unlimited opportunities.	8947-1581-4537			/	
Tractivity 259	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? Would like to see an offshore windfarm	8948-1581-3917			/	
Tractivity 292	Public	Stage 1	9. What are your views on EDF Energy's general approach to community benefits and do you have any specific suggestions about what should be included in the package? Generally, the approach to present a virtual fait accompli and to placate some with beans and baubles - how about subsidising the National Grid to hide transmission pylons?	8980-1581-5000			/	
Tractivity 319	Public	Stage 1	12. Do you have any other comments about EDF Energy's initial proposals for the development of a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point? Whatever ameliorations offered I object to nuclear power stations until safe permanent waste handling available. (it is NOT, as yet) Some investment in wind and tide generation preferred.	9007-1581-3854			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 393	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 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?	9078-1581-4232			/	
Tractivity 401	Public	Stage 1	1. We are not in favour of a new nuclear power station being built at all. Especially if it can be seen from our property in Shurton. This construction will blight the area completely. 2. The construction is far too large, with two nuclear reactors. 3. Health and Safety issues concerns us deeply. i.e target for a terrorist attack. Reactors are a new french design- have these been tried and tested sufficiently?	9084-1581-4794		/		
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.	10059-1581-750			/	
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.	10097-1581-58			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	The Health & Safety Executive's concept of 'tolerability' to describe "a willingness to live with a risk so as to secure certain benefits and in the confidence that it is being properly controlled" cannot be met. The risks are too great, there are no benefits and the public could never say now that they had confidence that the nuclear industry was being properly run, controlled (or supervised by government bodies charged with the oversight of that industry) when all around serious accidents happen. Ministers have publicly said government departments aren't 'fit for purpose'; the Rural Payments Agency bungle everything to the point that even my own MP described it recently as a "shambles" and that an improvement from "appalling to merely disastrous" would be welcome (Western Daily Press 28 July 2010); Defra comes in for constant criticism, the Inland Revenue have unrepentantly cocked-up the taxes of millions of people and the Financial Services Authority completely failed to understand what the banks were up to prior to the credit crunch let alone prevent it. The list of incompetencies is endless, so, if Justification is affirmed allowing nuclear build to go ahead, it would be a travesty. When one moves from government departments and public agencies in general to those specifically involved in the nuclear industry, the picture is alarming:	89471-1581-6813			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	EdF refers extensively in the introduction to its Preferred Proposals ("Preferred Proposals: Explanation and Assessment, July 2010") to government policy on energy and nuclear power. Particular reference is made to the draft National Policy Statements which were issued in 2009, one of which specifically covers nuclear issues. A number of statements from these NPS's are quoted to demonstrate both government support for new nuclear build and the suitability of the Hinkley Point site in particular. The coalition government elected in May 2010 has since announced that these NPS's will be re-issued in a revised form and a new national consultation will be held. It is expected that publication of the revised policy statements will happen during October 2010. EdF can therefore no longer confidently rely on the statements of government policy it quotes in support of nuclear power and the Hinkley C proposal.	89447-1581-3143			/	
43	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2 Update	Moreover, black propaganda abounds, for instance, it is being spread abroad that the Chinese have bought out the EDF company, together with their astronomical debts! This said, it is beyond my comprehension as to why a foreign (or any) company with a reported £34 billion debt is seen as all powerful and allowed to bully the powerless unhindered.	89912-1581-1247			/	
Tractivity 464	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? I accept that it is not EDF's preferred way forward but the idea that DECC are consulting on their siting proposals at the same time as EDF is proposing and requiring acceptance of preliminary works makes the whole question of consultation a farce!	9141-1577-6220			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 529	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>All future energy should be hydro generated. There is unlimited potential in the UK.</p>	9200-142-3010			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Forestry Commission	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	I confirm that Forest Enterprise in the Peninsula Forest District has no specific comment on the proposals at this stage as it appears that none of the options physically affect our land holding in the West Somerset, Devon or Cornwall areas covered by this office. I understand that you are also in contact with my colleague (personal details removed) from the Forest of Dean District and his comments should be considered as well as our own.	8696-1580-124			/	<p>There were a number of comments received at all stages of consultation from consultees, both individuals and organisations, who stated they had no preference on the proposals or who felt they would not be affected by the development.</p> <p>EDF Energy accepts the stated opinion of these consultees, which did not preclude them from taking part in later stages of the planning process. As well as the four periods of consultation undertaken by EDF Energy on its proposed development, there will be a further opportunity for individuals and organisations to make representations to the Infrastructure Planning Commission as part of the examination process.</p>
Office of Rail Regulation	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Thank you for your letter of 12 November 2009, in which you enclosed supporting documentation regarding the consultation on the Hinckley Point C development. We have reviewed the information supplied to us and have no comments to make at this stage.	8702-1580-0			/	
Mid Devon District Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	I confirm that Mid Devon District Council does not wish to comment on the stage 1 pre-application consultation in connection with the proposed nuclear power station Hinkley Point C.	8709-1580-0			/	
North Dorset Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	I refer to your Pre-Application Consultation Stage 1 Document Consultation on Initial Proposals and Options, November 2009. NDDC has reviewed the submission and does not consider that there are likely to be material impacts upon the interests of this district in terms of landscape, traffic or other development / operational matters arising from works at Hinkley C.	8714-1580-58			/	
Dorset County Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	I am grateful that Dorset CC was consulted by EDF Energy on the Initial Proposals and Options for Hinkley Point C Nuclear Development. I confirm that I have no comments to make on the Stage 1 consultation.	8725-1580-58			/	
East Devon District Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	I can advise that East Devon District Council has not responded to the consultation exercise.	8744-1580-175			/	
IBM (UK) Ltd	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Given that this stage of your consultation programme covers mainly the statutory aspects of the development, we don't feel that it would be appropriate for us to respond at this stage.	8759-1580-169			/	
Tractivity 499	Public	Stage 1	4. Any other ideas or comments? Any other ideas or comments? I live in Nether Stowey, so will not be directly affected	9172-1580-1912			/	
Tractivity 499	Public	Stage 1	6. Please give comments on your preferences and any suggestions about the future use of these facilities. Please give comments on your preferences and any suggestions about the future use of these facilities. I have no particular preference for one proposal over any of the others.	9172-1580-3510			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 499	Public	Stage 1	<p>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?</p> <p>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?</p> <p>No preferences as I am not directly affect</p>	9172-1580-4110			/	
Joint Nature Conservation Committee	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>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 (<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).</p> <p>This development proposal is not located within the offshore area and from the information provided there does not appear to be any potential offshore nature conservation issues, therefore JNCC does not have any comments to make on the consultation.</p>	10192-1580-203			/	
Scottish and Southern Energy Pipelines	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>I am writing to confirm that SSE Pipelines Ltd do not have any comments to make regarding the Stage 2 Consultation: Preferred Proposals for Hinkley Point C Nuclear Development.</p>	10207-1580-114			/	
Dorset County Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	<p>Thank you for consulting Dorset County Council on the Preferred Proposals for Hinkley Point C Nuclear Development.</p> <p>I confirm that we have no comments to make on the documents.</p>	10218-1580-51			/	
North Dorset District Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	<p>Thank you for forwarding copies of the preferred proposals and results of initial consultation round. North Dorset District Council notes the contents but remains of the view that the project will not result in material impacts upon the interests of this district.</p>	10219-1580-0				
Health Protection Agency	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>STAGE 2 UPDATE CONSULTATION: 25 FEBRUARY TO 28 MARCH 2011 - S42(1)(a) AND/OR S42(1)(b) AND/OR S42(1)(aa) PLANNING ACT 2008</p> <p>Thank you for your letter of 23 February 2011 and the Pre-Application Consultation document regarding the Stage 2 Update Consultation for Hinkley Point C.</p> <p>I wish to inform you that the Health Protection Agency has no additional comments to make at this Stage of the Consultation.</p>	89720-1580-0			/	

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 (DPTAC)	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	DPTAC is not able to provide views on these types of documents and would advise that you consult with local disability groups or access groups in the area concerned, who are more likely to be affected by your proposals, and who could offer more relevant comments on issues such as this.	89722-1580-432			/	
The Office of Rail Regulation	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	The Office of Rail Regulation (ORR) has no comment at this stage.	89723-1580-203			/	
Scottish & Southern Energy Pipelines	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Ref: Hinkley Point C Nuclear Development - Stage 2 Update Consultation: 25 February to 28 March 2011 - S42(1)(a) and/or S42(1)(b) and/or S42(1)(aa) Planning Act 2008 I am writing to confirm that SSE Pipelines Ltd do not have any comments to make regarding the Stage 2 Update Consultation: Update on and Proposed Changes to Preferred Proposals.	89729-1580-0			/	
South West Water	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Stage 2 updated consultation: Preferred proposals for Hinkley Point C nuclear development - S42 Planning Act 2008 Thank you for your letter dated 23 February 2011. I can confirm this proposal is not within South West Waters region, therefore we have no comments.	89730-1580-0			/	
Fulcrum Pipelines Limited	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Subject: FW: Hinkley Point C Project, Stage 2 Please find attached our response. We have an &box that any future requests can be sent to, this is manned by a number of people so your request can be dealt with as soon as possible. Ref: Hinkley Point C Project, Stage 2 We can confirm that Fulcrum Pipelines Limited do not currently have any existing pipes or equipment on or around the above site address, however Fulcrum Pipelines Ltd would recommend that you contact ourselves prior to construction, so that we can undertake the necessary checks for any Fulcrum Pipelines equipment in the proposed vicinity of your works. Please note that other Gas Transporters may have plant in this locality which could be affected by your proposed works. Fulcrum Pipelines will not be held responsible for any incident or accident arising from the use of the information associated with this search. The details provided are given in good faith, but no liability whatsoever can be accepted in respect thereof. If you have any future requests for information about our plant, please email these to us at FPLplantprotection@fulcrum.co.uk. Deborah Turner can be contacted on 01709 844407 if you require any further assistance or information.	89731-1580-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Northern Gas Networks Ltd	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>(Editor's note: text from email dated 24/02/2011)</p> <p>Subject: Removal from mailing list</p> <p>Mr Waterhouse</p> <p>I have been given you name as the person to contact regarding getting deleted from an edf mail-out. We are currently still getting information on the nuclear side of the business which we no longer require.</p> <p>eg we received today the Stage 2 update consultation 25Feb - 28 Mar</p> <p>We would be grateful if you could remove Northern Gas Networks from your database</p> <p>Many thanks</p>	89732-1580-0			/	
The Gas Transportation Company Limited	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>Subject: NRSWA Not Affected Email Response - Proposed Nuclear Development - Hinkley Point C</p> <p>Re: Stage 2 Update Consultation: 25th February to 28th March 2011 - S42(1)(a) And/Or S42(1)(b) And/Or S42(1)(aa) Planning Act 2008 - Proposed Nuclear Development - Hinkley Point C</p> <p>Thank you for your enquiry concerning apparatus in the vicinity of your proposed work.</p> <p>GTC/ENC can confirm that we have no apparatus in the vicinity but please note that other Gas Transporters/Electricity Distributors may have and that you should ensure that all transporters/ distributors have been consulted.</p>	89733-1580-0			/	
North Devon Council	Local authority	Stage 2 Update	<p>Subject: Re: Hinkley Point C: Stage 2 Update Consultation</p> <p>Thank you for the consultation documents associated with the updated Stage 2 consultation on Hinkley Point C, Proposed Nuclear Development.</p> <p>On behalf of the Local Planning Authority at North Devon Council we have no additional comments to register further to those submitted at previous stages of the consultation process.</p> <p>(Editor's note: text written on attached compliment slip)</p> <p>Please note that the area you refer to is not within the district of North Devon Council.</p>	89739-1580-0			/	
Mid Devon District Council	Local authority	Stage 2 Update	<p>Proposal: Stage 2 Update Consultation, new nuclear power station</p> <p>Location: Hinkley Point C</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Mid Devon District Council on the refinement of your proposals at this pre-application stage. I confirm that this Council does not have any objections or comments to make upon the proposals.</p>	89740-1580-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Vale of Glamorgan Council	Local authority	Stage 2 Update	Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 (as amended) Planning Application No.: 2010/00073/SC2 (our ref) Location : Hinkley Point, Somerset Proposal: Proposed nuclear power station I refer to the above matter and your letter of the 23rd February 2011, and I can advise that this Council has no additional comments to make.	89743-1580-0			/	
North Dorset Council	Local authority	Stage 2 Update	Subject: Stage 2 Update Hinkley Point C Thank you for consulting North Dorset District Council on the proposed changes to the above. We have no comments to make with respect to the issues raised by these changes.	89744-1580-0			/	
Compton Bishop Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	The Parish of Compton Bishop is located at the foot of Mendip some 12 miles north east of Hinkley Point. The Parish Council is of the opinion that the development of Hinkley C will not have a direct impact on this community, provided all safety guidelines are robust and implemented.	89749-1580-50			/	
MOD Safeguarding Department	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Subject: FW: 20110411-MOD response to Stage 2 update preferred options consultation-U (Editor's note: text from email dated 11/04/2011) Please accept my apologies for the delay in responding to you on the above consultation. Attached is a letter confirming the safeguarding position of the Ministry of Defence (MOD) with respect to the amended preferred options relating to aspects of the onshore development for the Hinkley Point C scheme. (Editor's note: text from attachment) MOD Safeguarding - Site(s) Outside Safeguarded Area(s) Proposal: Stage 2 - preferred proposals for Hinkley Point C nuclear power station Location: Hinkley Point Power station and associated support sites Grid Ref: 321345, 146138 Planning Ref: Thank you for consulting the Ministry of Defence (MOD) on the above proposed development. I can confirm that the sites identified in this submission are outside designated statutory safeguarding zones and as such the MOD has no safeguarding objections to this proposal.	89774-1580-56			/	
The Food Standards Agency	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Thank you for inviting us to comment on the above updated consultation. I can confirm that we have not comment to make as part of this exercise.	89775-1580-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Bridgwater Swimming Club	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	I am writing to let you know that I am no longer Membership Secretary for the above Club	89776-1580-0			/	
South Gloucestershire Council	Local Authority	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvmnts	Technical Officers have reviewed the revised proposals involving use of the Somerfield site at Junction 24 for a park and ride and freight management facility, plus the various highway improvements in Bridgewater and have no comments to make.	89922-1580-178			/	
Bristol Water Plc	Statutory Consultee	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvmnts	Thank you for sending me details of the proposed changes to the proffered proposals including M5 Junction 24 and highway improvements in the Bridgwater area. I should like to inform you that Bristol Water has no comments on this proposal.	89936-1580-34			/	
Ministry of Defence	Statutory Consultee	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvmnts	Thank you for consulting Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) on the above proposed development. This application relates to a site outside of Ministry of Defence safeguarding areas. We can therefore confirm that the Ministry of Defence has no safeguarding objections to this proposal.	89940-1580-665			/	
The Crown Estate	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvmnts	Thank you for the above Pre-Application Consultation, on which the Crown Estate has no comments.	89942-1580-245			/	
North Dorset District Council	Local Authrotiy	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvmnts	I can confirm that North Dorset district Council has no observations to offer regarding the proposed changes.	89943-1580-28			/	
South West Water	Statutory Consultee	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvmnts	I confirm that as South West Water does not serve this area we have no comment to make with regard to the proposal.	89944-1580-215			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
The Civil Aviation Authority	Statutory Consultee	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvmnts	Hinkley Point C Nuclear Development - Stage 2 Update Consultation Thank you for your recent correspondence relating to the proposed Hinkley Point C nuclear power station development. You sought Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) input in respect of the 'Update on and Proposed Changes to Preferred Proposals' document. 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.	89945-1580-567			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 300	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>When this original plant was constructed, I understand that all preparations were contained within the immediate area. Why can not this plan of preparation be repeated</p>	8988-1582-3702	/			In 1990, planning consent was granted for a single Pressurised Water Reactor on land within the proposed Hinkley Point C site. Construction did not proceed due to commercial factors and different circumstances prevailing at that time. This was in relation to the relative economics of nuclear power and other forms of generation, as well as less concern at that time over climate change. Nevertheless, the planning process examined the suitability of the site in detail and the Inquiry Inspector, Michael Barnes QC, recommended to the Secretary of State that consent should be granted, subject to conditions.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>The principle of development for a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point C is driven fundamentally by national policy, as set out in draft National Planning Statement EN-6. This policy document lists Hinkley Point C as a site, following the Strategic Siting Assessment, as being potentially suitable for the deployment of a new nuclear power station by the end of 2025 (para. 5.1.1).</p> <p>The development of new nuclear capacity at Hinkley Point C does benefit from the precedent of a previous Inspector's recommendation that consent should be granted. In 1990, the Public Inquiry summary report by Michael Barnes QC examined four main issues relating to: (i) the need for major new generating capacity; (ii) economic and associated matters and government policy; (iii) safety and the effect on health of the proposed Pressurised Water Reactor (PWR); and (iv) the local and environmental effects of the proposed PWR. The report concluded that the Secretary of State for Energy should grant conditional consent under s36 of the Electricity Act 1989 for the extension of the Hinkley Point nuclear power stations by the construction of an additional PWR generating station.</p> <p>It should be recognised that the proposals of the CEGB in the late 1980s differed in many respects to the proposals that are currently the subject of consultation by EDF Energy. The main differences are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One reactor was proposed by CEGB with different technologies (PWR) compared to two reactors by EDF Energy with UK EPR nuclear reactor technology. The scale and visual impact of the current proposals are therefore greater than the proposals of the 1980s. • The current proposals require the high level radioactive waste to be stored on site for at least 160 years. The storage of this type of waste on site for this length of time was not a feature of the 1980s proposals. • Any proposals for supporting infrastructure, training, skills development and procurement were backed up through funding from government. This included a commitment to provide a Bridgwater bypass which was considered necessary to mitigate the traffic impacts within Bridgwater. The current proposals are being taken forward by the private sector with no guarantee of funding for essential supporting infrastructure and for training and skill development initiatives. 	89333-1582-5384			/	<p>EDF Energy believes this is an important indicator of the suitability of the site for new nuclear development. The information from this original inquiry provided relevant information that helped to inform the Environmental Statement which accompanies EDF Energy's application for development consent. The Environmental Statement has of course been based on up to date assessment of the baseline and potential impacts of the development. There has been many changes since 1990; for example the proposed development today is for two Pressurised Water Reactors.</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	<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>	88080-1584-145	/			<p>EDF Energy is required by the Planning Act 2008 and related regulations to submit certain documents to the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) with its application for development consent. For a full list of all of the documents that have been submitted with the application, see the List of Application Documents. This includes, amongst other documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • this Consultation Report, which provides information on EDF Energy's pre-application consultation activities; • a draft of the proposed Development Consent Order, which provides a full description of the development for which development consent is sought; • an Environmental Statement, which documents the findings of the environmental impact assessment carried out to identify the likely significant environmental impacts arising from the Hinkley Point C Project and establish appropriate measures to mitigate adverse impacts; • Design and Access Statements, which describe the design principles and concepts of the development, access to the development, and an appraisal of the physical context of the development in relation to its use; and • a Planning Statement, which provides a description of the proposals, an overview of relevant policy and an assessment of the proposals against the policy position.
Bristol City Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	Please note that we are very interested to see the content of the Environmental Statement once completed and would appreciate advance notice of when it will be available to the public.	10214-1584-272			/	<p>Together, these documents outline and justify the proposals and assess the likely significant environmental impacts arising from the proposals.</p>
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.	10217-1584-180	/			<p>Somerset County Council commented at Stage 1 consultation that EDF Energy should submit a Transport Assessment that assesses all of the associated development options that have been taken forward and rejected. EDF Energy has submitted a Transport Assessment, which assesses the transport impacts of the proposals.</p> <p>The application documents have been arranged in accordance with the structure set out in the IPC's electronic index of application documents.</p>
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- The Agency would expect the submission to be accompanied by a Waste Management Plan.	89169-1584-1871	/			<p>Subject to acceptance of the application by the IPC, the IPC will make all of the application documents</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The following key recommendations are made: - Reorganise documents to make them more accessible.	89244-1584-5022	/			available on its website.
Marine Managment Organisation	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>Marine licence requirements</p> <p>From 6 April 2011, there will be a new system of regulatory control for certain activities in the marine environment. This is detailed in the Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 and secondary legislation.</p> <p>A marine licence will be required for any non-exempt works in the marine environment. In relation to this development, this may include the cooling water infrastructure, fish recovery and return system, flood defences and the refurbishment of Combwich Wharf.</p> <p>The MMO will be responsible for determining marine licences in English waters. However, where a project requires development consent from the Infrastructure Planning Commission, the aspects which would require a marine licence may be included in the application for development consent. The Infrastructure Planning Commission may then deem a marine licence to have been issued.</p> <p>The MMO understands that you intend to ask for marine licences to be deemed by the Infrastructure Planning Commission instead of applying directly for marine licences from the MMO. In this event, you will need to include draft marine licences with your application to the Infrastructure Planning Commission.</p> <p>To get the draft marine licences, you will need to provide the MMO with details of the activities to be included. You will need to include all relevant sections of the environmental statement and report to support the assessment under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010.</p> <p>You will also need to provide this information to the bodies the MMO would ordinarily consult with and provide copies of their responses to the MMO.</p> <p>The MMO will then consider the proposals and create an appropriate draft marine licence. This will be sent to you for inclusion with your application to the Infrastructure Planning Commission.</p>	89716-1584-1916			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	- Measures for carbon emission minimisation and to enable local climate change adaptation.	89890-137-12573	/			

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	In terms of the transmission infrastructure required to accommodate the proposed development, the Agency provided a formal response to the National Grid consultation on the proposed overhead electricity lines on the 14th December 2009.	88860-1585-4586			/	EDF Energy received a range of comments in relation to the proposals being brought forward by National Grid on their Hinkley Point C Connection Project which, in some cases, was confused with EDF Energy's proposals.
Friends of Quantocks	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	a) Further enhancement of existing pylons/cables between Hinkley C and Bristol. Please may I have some more detail of this? Does this mean higher or bigger pylons and what form of enhancement to the existing cabling? b) A new route to convey the additional power would also be required. Exactly what form would this take - over ground/under ground? If over ground what would the anticipated exact route be?	8767-1585-350			/	Respondents commented on the route options being proposed by National Grid in close proximity to the Hinkley Point C site and as part of the wider connection project. Some sought further information on these routes and design details for the towers (pylons). Comments were also received on the use of overhead lines or underground cabling and in relation to any loss of power caused by long distance transmission of power generated at HPC.
Tractivity 1005	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Where do you propose the bypass to go: I want to know the exact path of your proposal in writing to me before agreement. I also want to know the exact path of where you will be putting the new power line around Bridgwater/Near Petherton.	9763-1585-3547			/	Consultees commented on the relationship between EDF Energy and the National Grid proposals including ensuring consideration of the proposals by EDF Energy. Other consultees commented on the construction impacts of the National Grid works including the requirement for construction workers, transport routes/movements and phasing of construction.
Tractivity 1037	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 not opposed to nuclear power and construction of Hinkley c but I consider EDF are making too many demands in the Dunball/Puriton/J23 area. 1) The Park and Ride and freight logistics facility at Dunball, using greenfield sites and increasing traffic. 2) The National Grid/ Hinkley C Connection Project involving a new overhead line of much larger pylons. 3) EDF Energy Renewables decision to submit a planning application for wind turbines in the same landscapes as the large pylons required to distribute the power generated at Hinkley C.	9795-1585-8300			/	One consultee felt that EDF Energy had pre-judged the National Grid proposals by assuming the lines would be constructed on time and would be overhead. Another suggested that EDF Energy could subsidise National Grid to hide the transmission pylons.
Tractivity 1362	Public	Stage 2 Update	We understand that National Grid will be dealing with the transmission issues. How much power will be lost by transmission long distances which we understand is to be the fate of much of the power to be generated at Hinkley Point?	89628-1585-1896			/	EDF Energy has a connection agreement with National Grid to provide a connection for the Hinkley Point C power station to the transmission network. A number of route corridors for the connection have been identified and consulted upon by National Grid. In September 2011 National Grid announced its preferred connection option, which will be subject to a separate Development Consent Order (DCO) application.
Tractivity 292	Public	Stage 1	9. What are your views on EDF Energy's general approach to community benefits and do you have any specific suggestions about what should be included in the package? Generally, the approach to present a virtual fait accompli and to placate some with beans and baubles - how about subsidising the National Grid to hide transmission pylons?	8980-1585-5000			/	As such, no further comment is made in this response in relation to National Grid's proposals themselves, including on the various upgrades to lines in the immediate vicinity of Hinkley Point C and in the wider area. Further information on the National Grid related comments can be found on the National Grid consultation website and as part of National Grid's own separate consultation activities.
Tractivity 309	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? We need power but don't drag all workers and equipment through Bridgwater- Work with National Grid- their,400,000 volt line will cause huge disruption as well as hundreds of construction workers- It will only be built as a result of Hinkley.	8997-1585-5520			/	EDF Energy has considered the National Grid

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 352	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? All bases seem to be well covered but there is the separate issue of the new grid line route which has just come on the scene. Not to do with you I know but nevertheless an important part of the big picture.	9040-1585-6073			/	proposals as part of the Cumulative Impact Assessment (Volume 11 of the Environmental Statement) which considers the potential cumulative impact of these proposals both during construction and in operation, together with the HPC Project and also other developments in the area.
Tractivity 406	Public	Stage 1	4. Any other ideas or comments? A) Cannot a road be constructed parallel to the hook V links that go from Hinkley to Dunball Wharf vehicles need to get to these areas to construct pylons. B) 320 mostly male contractors will have a negative impact on the community. Cannington does not have facilities to support this.	9089-1585-890			/	With regard to EDF Energy pre-judging National Grid's decision on options for overhead or underground connections, EDF Energy has only commented on overhead lines in relation to the proposals in the immediate vicinity of HPC where one of two options presently being developed by National Grid is presented indicatively. Additionally, in order to ensure that EDF Energy's consultation and DCO application would not prejudice National Grid's own DCO consultation and subsequent application, EDF Energy's proposals now only include the National Grid substation, as set out in the Stage 2 Update consultation in February 2011. All proposed changes to National Grid's overhead lines and towers including the terminal towers and substation connecting downleads, will be subject to a separate DCO application by National Grid.
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	The super grid power lines to take the increased capacity cross shooting land and straight over the areas granted to BBWA & HH&BWA under the arrangements for the NNR. Upgrades will have to be phased to allow existing station operation meaning continuing disruption and disturbance.	10091-1585-5386			/	In response to the comment received regarding subsidy of National Grid for undergrounding lines, EDF Energy does not feel that it is appropriate to subsidise National Grid for its proposals being brought forward under a separate DCO application.
Exmoor National Park Authority	Local Authority	Stage 2	4.3 There is also the issue of the need for further high voltage overhead cabling to take the electricity from the Hinkley Point C site and connect it with the national grid. It is likely that these cables will go to the south-east or east of the site and not have a material impact on the National Park. The submission papers explain that detailed proposals for the overhead cabling will be the subject of a further consultation.	10209-1585-14070			/	
Cheddar Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	EDF are reluctant to discuss the 'whole' of the project, with separate consultations taking place regarding the National Grid proposals, which are clearly part of the same project.	10222-1585-1400			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[6.4.6] There may be a grid connection at Hinkley Point, but the rest of the National Grid network in the area is not adequate, requiring a new line between Bridgwater and Avonmouth.	89291-1585-7000			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Badgworth Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>This Council is affected by the proposed National Grid transmission route options across the Somerset Levels. Having consulted with other Parish Councils and pressure groups, Badgworth Parish Council has been tasked to highlight on their behalf that your proposal incorrectly presumes an overhead line transmission system from the site. As your document quite rightly states, your DCO application should not pre-judge National Grid's application, it is suggested by inferring that the transmission from the site will be via overhead lines, when this is still under review and by no means settled and agreed, does in fact pre-judge National Grid's DCO application.</p> <p>Once National Grid has completed their consultation, which is now significantly delayed, and may ultimately reveal that an underground or sub-sea option could be the preferred transmission option, the development on the Hinkley Point C site itself may be affected.</p> <p>We therefore ask that the presumption of overhead lines be removed.</p>	89745-1585-365			/	
Highways Agency	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	<p>3.65 A column should be added to Table 7.1 showing the associated vehicle trips linked to the material tonnages, percentage by road and the vehicle payload. The weight of the AILs and National Grid works are not included in the table. Trip rates have been derived for them, therefore it is requested that they are included for completeness.</p>	89840-1585-9116			/	
Tractivity 402	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>Hinkley Point is a site land locked between the Somerset countryside with small roads and the River Parret. The site is not a suitable site to develop unless a road link to the motorway or a rail link is built. The requirement for much enlarged pylon system will ruin the Somerset landscape from Hinkley to Bristol.</p>	9085-25-5009		/		
Tractivity 1037	Public	Stage 2	<p>The National Grid/ Hinkley C Connection Project involving a new overhead line of much larger pylons.</p>	9795-137-8300			/	
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Following a recent meeting with National Grid at our offices, we understand that the current orientation of the proposed sub-station on the new site has been amended. As a result the pylon routes have had to be altered and in the process an option is being shown that will take the route closer to Pixies Mound Scheduled Monument. We have not received confirmation from National Grid about the distances but we consider, from the information provided to date, that this will be too close to the scheduled monument adversely impacting upon its setting. We would ask that this aspect of the scheme is revisited.</p>	88840-226-7641	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	<p>2.2.3 Transmission Infrastructure</p> <p>The details of what works are required to connect the proposed new 400kV substation to existing power lines are very limited and clearly this will require discussion between EDF and National Grid as the project continues. The authorities note that the area of study includes areas which are potentially very close to properties in the Hamlet of Wick. Further consultation with West Somerset Council and Stogursey Parish Council is required as and when more detailed proposals emerge to ensure that these properties will not be significantly affected.</p>	88110-226-0	/			
Tractivity 1005	Public	Stage 2	<p>6. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Where do you propose the bypass to go: I want to know the exact path of your proposal in writing to me before agreement. I also want to know the exact path of where you will be putting the new power line around Bridgwater/Near Petherton.</p>	9763-226-3547			/	
Tractivity 62287	Public	Stage 2	<p>I received the attached drawing at the Stogursey public exhibition from a member of the public. The gentleman (personal details removed) informed me that he would also be making a formal response to the Stage 2 consultation. Hopefully we can join the two parts together! At the exhibition (personal details removed) explained that he had developed a concept for new tower (pylon) configuration which he asks that EDF Energy considers. (Personal details removed) initially spoke to National Grid regarding his concept for the towers, at which point he was also directed to EDF Energy and the proposed on-site overhead lines and towers.</p>	9985-226-48			/	
Greenpeace	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>- What are EdF's plans if proposed new transmission lines to take electricity from Hinkley Point C do not eventuate?</p>	8766-251-7422			/	