

WEST SOMERSET DISTRICT COUNCIL

**Minutes of the Special Meeting held on 23 September 2010 at 6.30 pm
in the Council Chamber, Williton**

Present:

Councillor E May Chairman
Councillor J A Walker Vice-Chairman

Councillor G S Dowding
Councillor A F Knight
Councillor C Morgan
Councillor S J Pugsley
Councillor K J Ross
Councillor S J Slade
Councillor T Taylor
Councillor K H Turner

Councillor J A M Hill
Councillor B W Leaker
Councillor A J Palmer
Councillor D Ross
Councillor D J Sanders
Councillor S A Stokes
Councillor P A Tipney

Officers in Attendance:

Executive Director (A Dyer)
Monitoring Officer (B Lang)
Planning Manager (A Goodchild)
Group Manager – Customer and Corporate Support Services (W Bass)

C59 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors H J W Davies, J Freeman, P E Humber, M W J Gammon, C M Lawrence, I R Melhuish, D R Seale and R J Webber.

C60 Declarations of Interest

Members present at the meeting declared the following personal interests in their capacity as a Member of a County, Parish or Town Council:

Name	Minute No	Description of Interest	Personal or Prejudicial	Action Taken
Cllr J A M Hill	All Items	Watchet	Personal	Spoke and voted
Cllr C Morgan	All Items	Stogursey	Personal	Spoke and voted
Cllr A J Palmer	All Items	Porlock	Personal	Spoke and voted
Cllr D Ross	All Items	Minehead	Personal	Spoke and voted
Cllr K J Ross	All Items	Dulverton	Personal	Spoke and voted

Cllr D J Sanders	All Items	Minehead	Personal	Spoke and voted
Cllr S A Stokes	All Items	Minehead	Personal	Spoke and voted
Cllr K H Turner	All Items	Brompton Ralph	Personal	Spoke and voted
Cllr J A Walker	All Items	Minehead	Personal	Spoke and voted

In addition all members declared they had been lobbied.

C61 Public Participation

Crispin Aubrey representing the Stop Hinkley Group requested to speak on Item 4 on the agenda relating to the Council's response to EDF's Stage 2 consultation. He asked Members not to support new nuclear development at Hinkley due to the serious health hazards and the unreliability of nuclear power. He advised Members that radioactive waste would be on site for 100 years after the station had stopped generating electricity with no national site identified for storing the waste.

C62 Consultation Response to EDF's Stage 2 Consultation on preferred proposals for a proposed nuclear development at Hinkley Point C

(Report No. WSC 129/10, circulated with the agenda).

The purpose of the report was to seek Member endorsement of the working draft of the Council's response to EDF's Stage 2 consultation on preferred proposals for proposed nuclear development at Hinkley Point C.

The Executive Director advised Members that the response to the consultation would be sent jointly with Sedgemoor District council. He advised Members of the formation of a New Nuclear National Group that had been granted Special Interest Group status and this would raise its profile with Government.

The Planning Manager advised Members that the consultation ended on 4 October 2010. He reminded Members of the Corporate Priorities for 2011/12 relating to the Hinkley development and detailed how the alternative strategy proposed in the draft response would help to achieve the objectives under each priority. The alternative strategy would require collaboration between all interested parties and EDF between 5 October and the end of the year.

Following a presentation by Peter Hulson, Mark Smith and Keith Walker from Ove Arup, the Council's technical advisers, the Environment Lead Member thanked them for their detailed work and clear presentation and he thanked the Planning Manager for his dedication and professionalism. He advised Members that in his view the Stage 2 consultation was wholly inadequate with no Transport Strategy, no consideration about the affect on tourism and no justification for an on site campus. The health and well-being of the local community had not been properly considered and the mitigation proposed was insufficient in view of the strain that would be placed

on local people, the emergency services, the roads and the housing and benefits services.

During the debate the following comments were made:

- There was insufficient evidence to make an informed and robust response
- Request for a guarantee that 40% of local workers would be employed
- The effect on the tourism industry in the short term and its survival in the longer term had not been taken into account
- There would be no legacy benefit from an on site campus
- Lack of affordable homes in West Somerset is such an issue that EDF should do more
- Effective working with Sedgemoor District Council and Somerset County Council was paramount
- EDF had a duty to provide community benefit and compensation
- The IPC would be required to consider whether the disadvantages to the area outweigh the need for new forms of energy

RESOLVED (1) that Council endorse the working draft of the Council's response, presented with the report and agree that delegated powers be granted to the Planning Manager to refine the Stage 2 response following legal input.

RESOLVED (2) that the Council and its partners, working collaboratively with EDF prior to their submission of an application to the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC), resolve the evidence gaps and develop the alternative strategy outlined in the report, which will include transparent consultation with the community.

The meeting closed at 8.00 pm.