Dear Sirs

The Planning Inspectorate,
Bristol.

Re: HPC Project - Non Material Change 3 - Main Development Site.

Our objections to the modifications required for the HPC Project are as follows:-

1. The modification concerns storage of spent nuclear fuel for a very long period of time. This breaks new ground in the nuclear power industry and could, in the long term, be potentially extremely hazardous. Therefore any modification requires great care and should not be treated as a relatively minor item. Consideration should be given to condition and location of the new type of storage, and to the added difficulty of handling and transport after such a long period of time. It should not be swept under the carpet and left for future generations to resolve.

2. The application in section 1.1.4 refers to “a number of small changes” and goes on to say “Changes would be almost imperceptible from viewpoints outside the site”. This is clearly not the case. After the reactor building and turbine hall the Interim Spent Fuel Store is one of the largest buildings on site and is located next to the West Somerset coastal path. An increase in size in excess of 50% is not small or imperceptible and is a material change. The application goes on to use such phrases as “modest adjustments.....Changing slightly..... Increasing slightly... minor amendments “. The whole document appears to try and deceive the non technical reader into believing that this is an insignificant application, even within the title using “Non – Material Change”. This is a material change and should be processed accordingly.

3. The original DCO process was both lengthy and complex. It now seems the credibility of this process is being eroded. Three non material changes, with more in the future, this early in the construction programme are not acceptable. The local population and many other interested parties are being given the impression that the planning process is being circumnavigated. The perception that EDF can do what they like after the granting of the DCO is rife.

4. The consultation period was very low key with advertisements in two local papers. These are headed Non Material which are misleading. A presentation by EDF at a local meeting omitted to mention the ILFS until directly questioned by a local councillor. At a subsequent meeting EDF repeatedly stated that the DCO had been granted. They seemed to imply that the result of this application was a foregone conclusion as a Non material change.

We hope that we have conveyed our objections in an intelligible concise way but would be pleased to provide more explanation if required.

Yours faithfully

Peter Farmery

Richard Cuttell

West Hinkley Action Group