Dear Sirs

Re Application for a non-material change to the Hinkley Point C (Nuclear Generating Station) Order 2013

I wish to register my objections to one aspect of this application: the increase in size of the Interim spent fuel store.

The increase in size (79m longer, 8m wider and 5m higher - with a capacity more than twice that originally planned) will mean that this building will be far more visible and therefore significantly more over-bearing than the one originally planned. This negative impact will affect not only those people who visit the shoreline, and walk the footpaths in the immediate vicinity, but will be clearly visible from several vantage points in the county - for instance, from the top of the Quantock Hills, and from the England Coast Path several miles away.

Another objection to the increase in physical size of this store, is that by the very nature of its purpose, even when the power station has finished its productive life and has been decommissioned, this is the one building which will not be able to be flattened or removed from the site. It will remain an unsightly behemoth for eternity.

I understand that EDF are applying for a bigger store as they would now prefer it to be a ‘dry store’ rather than the ‘wet store’ originally planned for. The reasons given by EDF for this change were not very convincing, and leave me with three concerns:

Firstly, the design of the method of storage in the dry store, means that the waste material cannot be transported by road and so cannot be reprocessed, ie reduced in size. This is particularly concerning as at present there is nowhere in the UK for long-term storage of nuclear waste. This means that the HPC waste will have to stay on site until such time as a long-term storage is (if ever) found, and then and join the queue for disposal.

Secondly, the building of this store will have a significantly greater carbon footprint than a smaller store as there will be a significant increase in the amount of concrete (and therefore non-renewable resources) needed. The negative impact this will have on the environment must be taken into account.

Finally, I have a worry that EDF, if it gets the planning approval it seeks and builds a store of much greater physical capacity, may change its mind yet again and decide it has the capacity to store a significantly increased amount of waste (albeit in the ‘wet’ method).

My final concerns are with the manner in which EDF has made this application.

I disagree that an increase in the size of the waste store is a ‘non-material’ change, I believe that there are material changes because the new interim waste store will “present new/different significant effects”, and there would be an “impact . . . on local (businesses and) people”.

I was also unimpressed that in the notice published in the local newspaper, the Bridgwater Mercury, the potentially controversial plan to increase the size of the waste store was not mentioned - just subsumed under the rather bland “redesign of some of the permanent buildings.”

Lastly, EDF did not have the courtesy to inform Hinkley Point’s nearest Parish Council of the application.

I would earnestly ask you to reject the application for the planned changes to the interim waste store.

Yours faithfully

Teresa Miller