

West Somerset Council &  
Sedgemoor District Council

**Hinkley Point C Joint  
Supplementary Planning  
Document**

Statement on Consultation

SPD/Issue

Issue | 28 October 2011

This report takes into account the particular instructions and requirements of our client.

It is not intended for and should not be relied upon by any third party and no responsibility is undertaken to any third party.

Job number 210482

# Document Verification

# ARUP

<b>Job title</b>		Hinkley Point C Joint Supplementary Planning Document		<b>Job number</b>		210482	
<b>Document title</b>		Statement on Consultation		<b>File reference</b>			
<b>Document ref</b>		SPD/Issue					
<b>Revision</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Filename</b>	HPC_SPD_Consultation_Statement_Issue_2011-10-28.docx				
Issue	28 Oct 2011	<b>Description</b>	Statement on Consultation prepared to support the adoption of the Hinkley Point C Supplementary Planning Document by West Somerset Council and Sedgemoor District Council.				
			Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by		
		Name	Tim Durant	Mark Smith	Mark Smith		
		Signature					
		<b>Filename</b>					
		<b>Description</b>					
			Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by		
		Name					
		Signature					
		<b>Filename</b>					
		<b>Description</b>					
			Prepared by	Checked by	Approved by		
		Name					
		Signature					
<b>Issue Document Verification with Document</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>							

## Contents

---

	Page
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Purpose of the Consultation report	1
1.2 What is the Hinkley Point C Supplementary Planning Document?	1
1.3 Structure of this report	2
<b>2 Policy and Guidance</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1 Town and Country Planning Act 2004 Regulation Requirements	3
2.2 Statement of Community Involvement	3
<b>3 Consultation Activity Summary</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1 Early Engagement	5
3.2 Other related consultation activities	6
3.3 Formal SPD consultation activities	9
<b>4 Consultation Responses</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>5 Adoption of the SPD</b>	<b>15</b>

## Appendices

### Appendix A

Table of Main Comments and Responses

### Appendix B

List of Respondents to Consultation

### Appendix C

Schedule of Consultee Comments, Responses and Proposed Changes

# 1 Introduction

---

## 1.1 Purpose of the Consultation report

This document sets out how West Somerset Council and Sedgemoor District Council (hereafter referred to as the Councils) have involved the community and stakeholders in the preparation of the Hinkley Point C Project Supplementary Planning Document (HPC SPD). In doing so this Report on Consultation sets out how the Councils have complied with Regulations 17(1)b and 18(4) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

These regulations require that Local Authorities prepare a statement setting out the following:

- i. the names of any persons whom the authority consulted in connection with the preparation of the SPD;
- ii. how those persons were consulted;
- iii. a summary of the main issues raised in those consultations; and
- iv. how those issues have been addressed in the SPD.

## 1.2 What is the Hinkley Point C Supplementary Planning Document?

The current Hinkley Point C nuclear power station proposals, as consulted upon by the promoter, are for the construction of two European Pressurised Reactor (EPR) units producing 3,260MW. This represents future low carbon generating capacity well in excess of the combined output of the existing Hinkley Point B units (1,320MW). The power station and associated on-site nuclear waste storage facility, together with some associated development required to construct the station, would be located in West Somerset. The majority and remaining elements of the associated development required to construct the station would be located in neighbouring Sedgemoor. Based on the consultation proposals of the HPC project promoter, the anticipated and considerable scale of infrastructure required to enable the construction of the station would include a temporary jetty, the refurbishment of Combrich Wharf, a bypass at Cannington, Park and Ride sites, freight management facilities and accommodation for construction workers, who in the main are anticipated to be from outside the local area.

Given the scale of the HPC project proposals, the opportunities for positive local benefits as well as the potential for significant impacts on local communities, the Councils consider it beneficial to prepare supplementary advice in line with the national and local policy framework.

It is expected that the HPC project promoter, EDF Energy, will submit a Development Consent Order application for the power station, waste storage facility and associated development to the Major Infrastructure Unit (MIU) during October 2011.

In this context, the SPD is also intended to fulfil the following roles:

- to guide the HPC project promoter and other developers with an interest in the project when preparing proposals, with a focus on associated development;
- to form a material consideration during the assessment of any HPC project related Town & Country Planning Act applications submitted by the HPC project promoter or other developers;
- to inform the positions adopted by the Councils in their Local Impact Report(s) submitted to the MIU; and
- to set out local matters and planning approaches that do not conflict with NPS policy and guidance and which the MIU may consider both important and relevant to its decision-making.

### 1.3 Structure of this report

The remainder of this consultation report is structured as follows:

- Section 2 – outlines the planning policy framework that underpins the consultation process;
- Section 3 – details the consultation activities which informed and have ultimately shaped the final version of the SPD;
- Section 4 – presents the main comments received, the Councils response to these representations, and the changes that have been made to the SPD as a result; and
- Section 5 – sets out the adoption process for the SPD and further Council consultation activities relating to the HPC project.

## 2 Policy and Guidance

---

### 2.1 Town and Country Planning Act 2004 Regulation Requirements

When preparing Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), Local Authorities must have due regard to the provisions of regulations 17(1) b and 18(4) of the *Town and Country (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004*.

Regulation 17(1)b states that when preparing an SPD a statement should be prepared which specifies the following:

- i. *The names of any persons whom the authority consulted in connection with the preparation of the SPD,*
- ii. *How those persons were consulted,*
- iii. *A summary of the main issues raised in those consultations,*
- iv. *How those issues have been addressed in the SPD*

Regulation 18(4) dictates that “...a local planning authority shall not adopt an SPD until-

- a. *They have considered any representations made in accordance with paragraph (2); and*
- b. *Have prepared a statement setting out-*
  - i. *A summary of the main issues raised in these representations, and*
  - ii. *How these main issues have been addressed in the SPD which they intend to adopt.*

This Statement on Consultation outlines how these regulations have been met for the preparation of the HPC SPD. A Table of the Main Comments and Responses, which also sets out the changes that have been made to the SPD, is introduced within Section 4 of this report and a copy of the Table is provided at Appendix A1.

### 2.2 Statement of Community Involvement

Councils have a duty to prepare a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), in which they outline how the community will be involved in the planning process, which sectors of the community will be involved, at which point in the process they will be engaged and methods for their involvement. Therefore when preparing a SPD and the means for consultation, due regard should be given to the contents of the relevant SCIs.

The HPC SPD is a joint document prepared by both West Somerset Council and Sedgemoor District Council. Each has its own adopted SCI and therefore it is important to consider the contents of both documents.

West Somerset Council's Statement of Community Involvement was first adopted in November 2007, although a number of amendments were made on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2009. Sedgemoor District Council's Statement of Community Involvement was adopted on 18<sup>th</sup> April 2007. Both SCI's set out an identical process for the production of Supplementary Planning Documents. This process is outlined in Table 1 below.

**Table 1 - Process for consultation on Supplementary Planning Documents set out in the Council's Statements of Community Involvement**

Stage	Activity	Description	HPC SPD Consultation
1	Early Engagement	The gathering of evidence and engagement on the issues the SPD is seeking to address.	Details of these activities are provided within Section 3.1 of this report.
2	Draft SPD	A draft copy of the SPD is published for public consultation.	The Draft HPC SPD was published on 1 <sup>st</sup> March 2011.
3	Formal Consultation	The draft SPD document is placed on consultation for 4-6 weeks inviting views on the proposed strategy and content.	The consultation period on the HPC SPD ran for 6 weeks between 1 <sup>st</sup> March 2011 and 12 <sup>th</sup> April 2011.
4	Consideration of Representations	Representations made on the Draft SPD are considered by the Council in order to determine if any changes to the Draft are required.	This report documents the representations that have been received and how these have, where appropriate, resulted in changes and amendments to the content of the SPD.
5	Adoption	Those bodies/individuals who have made representations are notified of the adoption of the SPD and where copies of the document can be obtained.	Correspondence will be sent to bodies/individuals who have made representations to notify them of the adoption of the SPD.

## 3 Consultation Activity Summary

---

### 3.1 Early Engagement

Prior to the preparation and publication of the Consultation Draft HPC SPD, the Councils were involved in dialogue with EDF Energy and local communities in relation to the emerging HPC project proposals. The promoter of the Hinkley Point C project, EDF Energy, undertook two rounds of public consultation on their proposals during 2009 and 2010:

- Stage 1: Consultation on 'Initial Proposals and Options' 15<sup>th</sup> December 2009 to 18<sup>th</sup> January 2010.
- Stage 2: Consultation on 'Preferred Proposals' – 9<sup>th</sup> July 2010 to 4<sup>th</sup> October 2010.

During these consultation periods the Councils, with support from the Community Council for Somerset (CCS), arranged a series of support events for the local communities. These included:

- Community Support Meetings – which focussed on engaging with the public to help explain the proposals where necessary and understand community views on different aspects of the HPC project.
- Theme Meetings - four targeted theme meetings, dealing with Housing/Accommodation; Transport; Environment; and Community Wellbeing. Representatives of parish councils and other key stakeholders were invited to discuss key elements of EDF Energy's Stage 2 off-site development proposals in more depth. It was hoped that these meetings would help the parishes interpret EDF Energy's proposals and provide advice on how best they could articulate their responses.
- Online Survey Questionnaire - residents were given the opportunity to comment on the EDF Energy Stage 2 off-site development proposals and their links to the long term aspirations for their community through an online survey questionnaire available on the CCS website throughout the July-October consultation period.

All of these support structures were put in place to ensure a good level of understanding was gained on public opinion and reaction to the proposed development at Hinkley Point. Initially, the output from these exercises collectively helped to inform the Councils' joint responses to the EDFE Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultations. Later these consultation activities formed an important component of early engagement informing SPD preparation and on-going dialogue with communities on the HPC project.

Further to the Stage 1 and 2 consultations, EDF Energy have undertaken two further stages of consultation:

- Stage 2 Update: 'Update on and Proposed Changes to Preferred Proposals – 25<sup>th</sup> February 2011 to 28<sup>th</sup> March 2011.
- Stage 2b: 'Proposed Changes to the Preferred Proposals including M5 Junction 24 and Highway Improvements in the Bridgwater Area' – 1<sup>st</sup> July 2011 – to 12<sup>th</sup> August 2011.



The timing of the 'Stage 2 Update' consultation coincided with the formal public consultation on the HPC SPD. The final version of the SPD has been amended to reflect updates to the EDF Energy HPC project proposals where appropriate.

## 3.2 Other related consultation activities

In addition to the formal public community involvement process relating directly to the preparation of the HPC SPD, Sedgemoor District Council has commissioned further consultation activities to inform the preparation of the Local Impact Report to be submitted to the MIU:

- A Call-out Survey;
- A Facilitator Survey; and
- 'Have you say' Questionnaire and Events

The aim of these activities has been to understand the level and nature of public opinion on the wider HPC project and the outcomes have also informed and supported the preparation of the final HPC SPD. The methodologies and key findings for each activity are set out below.

### 3.2.1 Call-out Survey

Sedgemoor District Council commissioned Sedgemoor Direct to ask a set of simple questions to all callers contacting the authority with respect to other issues and services. West Somerset Council decided not to undertake a comparable survey in West Somerset because it was believed that the communities likely to be affected had already demonstrated a strong awareness and understanding of the project.

Upon consent callers were asked four simple questions:

- Do you know about EDF Energy's Plans?
- Have you considered how the plans may affect you?
- Have you any concerns?
- Are you aware of the employment opportunities?

#### *Findings*

1,209 people participated in this telephone survey. Given the population sample size is 58,208, this gives a 95% confidence level with a 3% confidence interval. This is a good level of confidence that the findings are a reasonable representation of the views of the local population at the time.

- 78% of participants stated that they were aware of the proposals for the new nuclear power station at Hinkley. Only 11% stated that they were not aware. A further 11% did not respond to the question.
- 50% of participants said that they were aware of how the development would affect them, much lower than the proportion of participants that were aware of the proposals. 28% stated that they were not aware how the development would affect them.

- Participants were then asked whether they had concerns about the proposed development. Approximately a quarter of people did have concerns, a quarter stated that they did not have concerns and half did not respond to the question indicating a general lack of awareness of the associated development proposals by the general public of Sedgemoor.

Of the 300 people who said they had particular concerns:

- Half stated that their concern was traffic. Particular areas where there were concerns about increased congestion were the areas around Junctions 23 and 24 of the M5, Bridgwater, A39, Minehead Road, Cannington and Combswich.
- Concerns were also raised about the increase in HGVs and the speed of vehicles.
- 21 people commented on the proposed bypass; half of these objected to the bypass or its proposed route, and the other half supported the bypass and stated that it needed to be implemented first.
- A fifth of respondents stated that their concern related to a fundamental distrust in the safety of nuclear power generation, a number of the respondents specifically referred to the need to learn lessons from Fukushima.
- Eight people commented on the proposed workers accommodation. Seven expressed concerns in relation to its location, impact on traffic, the impact on property values and its legacy use after construction is completed. One person stated that they supported the proposed accommodation.
- Five people raised concerns about the location and number of pylons due to the impact on the wider local landscape.
- Five people identified the potential positive impact of new jobs but they all expressed concerns about whether these would go to local people.

### 3.2.2 Facilitator Survey

Sedgemoor District Council in collaboration with the Community Council for Somerset (CCS), undertook semi structured interviews with residents using trained facilitators in the three wards of Hamp, Sydenham and Victoria in Bridgwater. The interviews focussed on these three wards in particular, due to the lack of participation so far and the need to engage with and record the views of harder to reach groups within these communities. The survey sought to make these communities aware of the proposals, and to encourage feedback on views about the possible impacts of the associated development works in Bridgwater.

#### *Findings*

83 people participated in the semi structured interviews survey. There was an even split of the gender of participants: 39 were female, 40 were male and no gender was recorded for 3 participants. Almost half of participants were aged 20-44 years but there were representatives from all age groups.

- Three quarters of participants stated they were aware of the Hinkley Point C project.
- The remaining quarter said that they were not aware of the project.

- When asked if they were aware of the associated developments that will have to take place in and around Bridgwater to facilitate the development of the main site, only 30% people stated that they were aware.

Participants were asked to state any concerns they had about the proposals.

- By far the most common concern related to traffic congestion. 32 of participants stated that this was a concern. Specific locations mentioned were the A39 from the motorway, Bath Road, Bristol Road, Taunton Road, Sydenham area, Junction 24 and Bridgwater town centre.
- There were concerns for the safety of children and users of the college from increased traffic.
- Seven people commented on the positive increase in jobs but many expressed concerns that these won't be available for local people. This was expressed by people across the board under the age of 65 years.
- Six people expressed concerns about building on existing recreational facilities.
- Four people stated that more affordable housing would be required to ensure local housing, including private rented accommodation, did not become unaffordable to local people.
- Half the participants said they were happy with the Council's suggested permanent housing alternatives to construction worker campus accommodation (as proposed in the Consultation Draft SPD). Only one person said they were not happy and the rest did not reply.

### 3.2.3 'Have your say' Questionnaire and Events

Members of the Major Project Team at Sedgemoor District Council, occupied a vacant shop in the Angel Place shopping centre on two consecutive Fridays and Saturdays, 13/14<sup>th</sup> May and 20/21<sup>st</sup> May. The event was organised as the Major Project Team had identified confusion in the local community about what was happening at Hinkley. It was also considered to be an opportunity to raise awareness and seek feedback regarding the Community Fund of £20 million currently being offered by EDFE.

At the drop in days, members of the public were approached and asked if they knew about the Hinkley Point C proposals. Those who wished to do so responded to a short questionnaire. A number of questionnaires were given out for people to fill out in their own time and return.

There had also been requests from the public for a shorter survey that could be done without a facilitator; therefore the form was also put online at the same time.

#### ***Findings***

181 people completed the 'Have Your Say' Survey, with respondents representing all parts of the Sedgemoor District.

The age profile of the respondents to the 'Have Your Say' Survey is older than the participants in the Facilitator Survey. Three quarters of respondents were aged 45 or older, whereas less than half the participants in the Facilitator Survey were in this age group.

- Almost four fifths of respondents were aware of the Hinkley Point C proposals, consistent with the findings of the Call Out Survey and the Facilitator Survey.
- A lower percentage of people said they were aware of the proposed ‘associated developments’, however, over half were still aware of these proposals.
- Half of respondents stated that traffic congestion was a concern; a fifth of people commented on the Bridgwater bypass.
- Thirteen percent of respondents stated that they were specifically concerned about congestion in Cannington.
- Thirteen percent of people commented on the impact on jobs. Most comments related to the positive impact of creating jobs with several people commenting that it was important that these could be taken by local people.
- Eleven percent of people said that they were concerned about safety as a result of the nuclear power station or objected to nuclear power.
- Seven percent of people said that they were concerned about noise, particularly associated with traffic.
- Six percent of people expressed concerns related to housing. Comments included concerns about campus accommodation with the preference being for greater integration with the existing population, as well as people who stated they would prefer the accommodation to be provided at the power station site.

### **3.3 Formal SPD consultation activities**

#### **3.3.1 How were the public and stakeholders consulted?**

A formal 6-week consultation period for representations to be made on the Consultation Draft HPC SPD commenced on Tuesday 1st March 2011 at 9:00am and ended on Tuesday 12th April 2011 at 5:00pm. The Draft Sustainability Appraisal and Appropriate Assessment (Habitats Regulations Assessment) Screening reports were also published for consultation for this period.

Table 2 sets out how individuals and organisations were made aware of the consultation and where hard and electronic versions of the document were made available. Written representations on the Consultation Draft documents could be submitted on the Limehouse online consultation portal, via email or by post.

**Table 2 - Formal Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Activities.**

Activity	Description
SPD Published	<p>Hard copies of the Consultation Draft SPD, Sustainability Appraisal, Appropriate Assessment Screening And Feedback Forms were made available at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• West Somerset Council offices, Williton</li> <li>• West Somerset Customer Care Centre, Minehead</li> <li>• Williton Library</li> <li>• Sedgemoor District Council offices, Bridgwater House</li> <li>• Bridgwater Library</li> <li>• North Petherton Library</li> <li>• Nether Stowey Library</li> </ul>
Consultation Notices	Consultation Notices were published in the West Somerset Free Press and Bridgwater Mercury
Press Releases	Press releases resulted in articles in the West Somerset Free Press and on the South West Business website.
Consultation letters	Letters were sent to statutory bodies and members of the public who have signed up for Local Development Framework consultation updates for both Councils.
Website	The Consultation Draft SPD, Sustainability Appraisal, Appropriate Assessment Screening and Feedback forms were made available on the West Somerset and Sedgemoor websites. A link was provided to the Limehouse online consultation portal.

During the 6 week consultation period, Parish Councils were provided briefings on the purpose and content of the HPC SPD and West Somerset Council and Sedgemoor District Council held six public consultation events across the two districts. The table below shows the number of attendees and key issues raised at each event. While specific feedback on the SPD was received, more general issues relating to the HPC project and the EDF Energy 'Stage 2 Update' consultation were also raised.

**Table 3 - Key Issues raised at the Public Consultation Events**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Key Issues</b>	<b>No. of Attendees</b>
West Somerset Council office, Williton	<p><b>Accommodation and Transport</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Location of the onsite campus accommodation including its size and impacts on the surrounding villages.</li> <li>• Issues around the preferred location of the Park &amp; Ride facility and what long-term legacy benefits this could have for the local community.</li> <li>• Queries about to what extent are the Councils able to influence the HPC project proposals.</li> </ul>	14
Victory Hall, Stogursey.	<p><b>Traffic and Accommodation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns over the distribution and volume of traffic that will be moving to and from the site.</li> <li>• Movement of materials both by water through the temporary jetty, Comwich wharf and by road.</li> <li>• Security issues and concerns about the impact of the temporary campus in this rural area.</li> </ul>	42
Bridgwater College, Cannington	<p><b>Transport and Communication</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about transport impacts and highway safety. Sedgemoor District Council urged to propose that a Bridgwater bypass is provided. The approach in the SPD was not considered strong enough.</li> <li>• The proposal for construction worker accommodation at Cannington Court set out in the SPD was not considered acceptable.</li> <li>• Impacts on quality of life resulting from Cannington bypass and Park &amp; Ride proposal.</li> </ul>	75
Otterhampton Parish Hall, Comwich	<p><b>Transport (lack of details), environmental impact, monitoring &amp; enforcement.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns over lack of clarity from EDF Energy on the amount of usage of the wharf and associated operational hours and type.</li> <li>• Concern about the cumulative effects of the HPC project proposals on the rural environment, including the impacts of road and water-borne traffic and the size of the proposed laydown area.</li> </ul>	42

Location	Key Issues	No. of Attendees
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some concerns and doubt over who will monitor operations and enforce action on any breaches of licence and ensure correct emergency procedures are in place and adhered to.</li> <li>• Support was expressed for the approach at Comwich set out in the Draft HPC SPD.</li> </ul>	
Sedgemoor Auction Rooms, North Petherton	<p><b>Transport and loss of Green Wedge to development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns over volume of traffic and junction capacity to be able to accommodate additional vehicular movements.</li> <li>• Concern regarding landscape impact and loss of green wedge resulting from development of Park &amp; Ride and freight management facility and/or proposed Bridgwater Gateway development.</li> <li>• Some concerns raised regarding flow of information about proposals to community.</li> </ul>	23
Bridgwater & Albion Rugby Club, Bridgwater	<p><b>Transport cumulative impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns over traffic congestion when considering cumulative effect of HPC associated developments together with long term 'other' developments</li> <li>• Concern regarding potential rat-run usage and impact on the Crandon Bridge / Silver Fish junction.</li> <li>• Some concerns raised regarding the agreement for and starting of HPC preliminary works before a full Development Consent Order consent is granted - eg. the cumulative effects of preliminary works and potential for abortive work.</li> </ul>	15
TOTAL		211

## 4 Consultation Responses

---

Further to the feedback received at the consultation events, which were used to introduce the Consultation Draft SPD, the Councils received written representations by post, email and online via the Limehouse consultation portal. A total of 105 organisations and individuals made written representations on the Consultation Draft SPD. A full list of organisations and individuals that made representations is provided at Appendix B1.

Following a review of the representations, the following matters were identified as the main issues to be addressed during the finalisation of the HPC SPD:

- **Role of the Local Development Framework** – EDF Energy responded to the consultation, raising overarching comments on the role and purpose of local planning guidance and the policy basis underpinning the SPD. Representations emphasised that National Policy Statements EN-1 and EN-6 are the primary basis for decision-making by the MIU. The Final Draft version of the SPD was revised to include statements clarifying the role of the SPD within the National and Local policy framework. A further representation was received from EDF Energy on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2011 recommending that text specified in the Inspector’s Report on the Sedgemoor Core Strategy should be incorporated in the SPD, to ensure consistency and clarity on this matter.
- **Nuclear Safety** – Consultees raised concerns about the safety of nuclear power stations, often referring to the Fukushima incident. In some cases arguments about emergency planning were used to justify proposals that a Bridgwater northern bypass should be provided.
- **Construction Working Hours** – Consultees identified that the Consultation Draft SPD does not deal with construction working hours, which will have important implications for quality of life for residents located close to the main site, associated development sites, or along the main routes.
- **Consultation** – Comments raised about consultation on the Draft SPD included: difficulty in obtaining copies of the SPD; confusion resulting from the SPD consultation coinciding with the EDF Energy ‘Stage 2 Update’ consultation; and (iii) the excessive length of the document; and technical language.
- **Transport, Bridgwater Northern Bypass** – Many consultees promoted a Bridgwater northern bypass as the principal means for mitigating the impacts of the HPC project in Bridgwater, Cannington and along the A39/C182 transport corridor to the site.
- **Hinkley Point Main Site** – Comments are supportive of the approach set out in the Draft SPD and seek to further highlight concerns about the development including: the importance of a landscape buffer; the need to protect residential amenity; and the potential impact upon Public Rights of Way in the local area. Consultees also refer to the potential for enhancement of habitats and ecology as part of a restoration plan for the temporary construction area and suggest a phased roll-back of the southern boundary of the site, enabling restoration and access to land closest to residential development at the earliest possible date.



- **Hinkley Point Accommodation Campus** – Consultees state that no justification has been provided for the accommodation at the main site. Support is expressed for the approach in the Consultation Draft SPD (which seeks to limit the size of a campus to a maximum of 100 bedspaces), although some suggest there should be no accommodation at the site. Local residents are concerned about the socio-economic effect of a large influx of migrant workers on a small rural community, as well as the landscape impacts and noise and light disruption from the campus itself.
- **Landscape and Ecology** – Natural England and the Quantocks AONB recommended that there should be a separate section on ‘Protection of the Natural Environment’, rather than dealing with these issues in the Tourism section of the SPD, commenting that the natural environment and landscape should be protected for its own sake.
- **Williton Accommodation** – The proposed approach set out in the Consultation Draft SPD was viewed by some consultees to be contrary to the designation of Williton as a rural centre in which limited development is encouraged. Some stated that there should be no greenfield development and that if construction worker accommodation is provided in Williton, it should be in refurbished buildings that are not currently used, or at stalled development sites (as proposed by EDF Energy at Stage 2a). Reference is also made to the fact that EDF Energy has removed proposals for accommodation in Williton following public consultation.
- **Cannington Court Accommodation** – The Councils received a large number of representations stating that Cannington Court is not an appropriate settlement for construction worker accommodation for a range of issues that include: security; lack of parking; and the interaction of students and construction workers.
- **Williton Park & Ride** – The Consultation Draft SPD referred to the proposal for a Park & Ride to the west of Williton at Mamsey Lane. Consultees expressed support for the alternative location for this facility, Smithyard Terminal, set out in the EDF Energy ‘Stage 2 Update’ consultation, which is also linked to highway improvements at the Washford Junction.
- **M5 Junction 24 Park & Ride and Freight Management Facility** – Objections were raised to the EDF Energy proposals for a Park & Ride and freight management facility on the greenfield site to the southwest of the Huntworth roundabout. The main concerns raised were impact on the landscape, loss of the green wedge between North Petherton and Bridgwater; and traffic congestion. Consultees proposed that a Bridgwater northern bypass should be provided to prevent the need for this development at the southern boundary of Bridgwater. References were also made to the proposed Bridgwater Gateway development, which was also opposed.

The Councils’ responses to these main issues raised, together with changes to the SPD that have resulted from comments are set out in a table at Appendix A1 of this report.

A full schedule of consultee comments, the Councils’ responses and changes to the SPD is provided at Appendix C1.

## 5 Adoption of the SPD

The Consultation Draft HPC SPD was amended to take account of representations received and a Final Draft version has been advanced through the Councils' committee processes to ensure Councillor approval of the document. The Final Draft SPD together with tables setting out the main issues raised during consultation, recommended responses and proposed changes, was presented at the meetings set out in Table 4.

**Table 4 - Council Meetings for Adoption of SPD**

<b>Council Meetings</b>	<b>West Somerset Cabinet / Sedgemoor Executive</b>	<b>Full Council</b>
West Somerset	Wednesday 5 <sup>th</sup> October 2011	Thursday 13 <sup>th</sup> October 2011
Sedgemoor	Wednesday 5 <sup>th</sup> October 2011	Wednesday 12 <sup>th</sup> October 2011

Councillors suggested a number of amendments to the SPD that have been incorporated into the final version of the document that was presented to the Leader and Portfolio Holder of each Council for final approval.



## **Appendix A**

### **Table of Main Comments and Responses**

## A1 Table of Main Comments and Responses

This table provides a summary of the main consultation comments received, together with the Councils' recommended responses and proposed changes to the Hinkley Point C Supplementary Planning Document (HPC SPD). Please note that the section, paragraph, box and figure references refer to those in the Consultation Draft SPD (unless otherwise stated). Where the insertion of new text is recommended here, the exact wording may differ in the final version of the SPD due to editorial changes.

Subject	Nature of comments	Recommended Response	Proposed Change
General – Nuclear Safety	(i) Comments raise concerns about the safety of nuclear power stations, often referring to the Fukushima incident. (ii) In some cases arguments about emergency planning are used to justify proposals for a Bridgwater northern bypass.	<p>(i) A separate regulatory process is in place to ensure the safety of nuclear power generation and waste installations, although the Councils acknowledge that planning policy and decisions will have implications for the safe operation of stations and capacity to respond to emergencies. It is proposed that this issue is addressed through the introduction of new text in section 2 of the SPD, 'Purpose of the SPD'.</p> <p>Also of relevance are the arrangements for management of nuclear waste. From 6<sup>th</sup> April 2010, the Environment Agency became responsible for regulating the disposal of radioactive waste from nuclear sites under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2010 (EPR). The Agency also regulates certain aspects of keeping and use of radioactive sources on nuclear sites (under the Radioactive Substances Regulations).</p> <p>The Councils are aware that the Environment Agency received two environmental permit applications in July 2011 from the HPC project promoter. These relate to discharges and disposals for radioactive waste and operation of the standby power supply systems. Once</p>	<p>New text to be incorporated into Section 2, 'Purpose of the SPD':</p> <p><i>“Ensuring the safety of nuclear power installations is the responsibility of the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) through its Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR). The ONR regulates nuclear safety under licences, with conditions covering the design, construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning of nuclear installations. This SPD is not therefore directly concerned with ensuring the safety of a new nuclear power station, although it is recognised that approaches set out in the SPD could have implications for safety.”</i></p>

Subject	Nature of comments	Recommended Response	Proposed Change
		<p>consultation commences, copies of the permit applications will be made available for inspection at Council offices in Williton, Minehead and Bridgwater.</p> <p>(ii) Please also refer to the response below on the Bridgwater northern bypass. It is expected that incident and emergency requirements will form part of a robust assessment of strategic transport options for the HPC project.</p>	
General – Construction Working Hours	<p>Consultees raise that the SPD does not deal with construction working hours, which will have important implications for quality of life for residents located close to the main site, associated development sites and along the main transport routes.</p>	<p>The approach to be taken on Construction Working Hours in the SPD must be guided by the role of planning policy relative to other regulatory processes. National planning policy in 'Planning and Pollution Control' (2004) advises that "The planning system should focus on whether the development itself is an acceptable use of the land...Planning authorities should work on the assumption that the relevant pollution control regime will be properly applied and enforced. They should act to complement but not seek to duplicate it." With respect to environmental impacts such as noise, the Control of Pollution Act 1974 (COPA) s60 empowers local authorities to serve a notice imposing requirements as to how construction work is to be carried out (e.g. in terms of days and hours at work). Noise emitted from construction sites or from vehicles or machinery in the street can be deemed a Statutory Nuisance under the provision of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (EPA) Part III.</p> <p>NPS EN-1 does confirm that mitigation for impacts such as dust, odour, artificial light and noise may include administrative measures: e.g. '...limiting operating times, restricting activities allowed on the site and implementing management plans', meaning that restrictions on construction working hours may be</p>	<p>Recognising the importance of working hours at the main site and associated developments sites as an important issue, the Councils propose to include a new Project-wide Issues section on Construction Working Hours to the SPD. It is also proposed that the following bullet point is included in section 10 of the SPD 'Planning Obligations', which sets out measures to mitigate the impacts of the development:</p> <p><i>"Planning conditions specifying construction/operational working hours and management plans to ensure that disturbance to residents, businesses and wildlife is kept within acceptable limits. The Councils will also seek to retain Statutory Nuisance powers under the Environmental Protection Act 1990."</i></p>

Subject	Nature of comments	Recommended Response	Proposed Change
		<p>utilised. Based on this guidance, it is considered appropriate for the SPD to raise Construction Working Hours as an important issue for the project, given the large number of sites involved and predicted high volumes of traffic between these.</p> <p>Linking to WSC Local Plan policies on Pollution Impacts (PC/1 &amp; PC/2) and SDC Core Strategy policies on Residential Amenity (D16), the SPD can make it clear that the Councils consider planning conditions restricting construction working hours an important mechanism for preventing disturbance to people and wildlife. However, it would not be appropriate to specify acceptable working hours in advance of an application and the confirmation of environmental assessment information and other related mitigation measures (e.g. acoustic screening).</p> <p>As an additional measure for sites in Sedgemoor, SDC Core Strategy policy D3: Sustainable Construction and Reducing Carbon Emissions in New Developments requires a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) where it is considered there are likely to be considerable adverse environmental effects during construction. Consideration should also be given to registration with the Considerate Constructor Scheme.</p> <p>With respect to Statutory Nuisance under the EPA 1990, NPS EN-1 states that 'the IPC can disapply the defence of statutory authority, in whole or in part, in any particular case, but in so doing should have regard to whether any particular nuisance is an inevitable consequence of the development.' The SPD will confirm that the Councils consider the retention of</p>	

Subject	Nature of comments	Recommended Response	Proposed Change
		Statutory Nuisance powers would provide an important mechanism for investigating complaints and taking enforcement action.	
3 - Consultation	Comments raised included: (i) difficulty in obtaining copies of the SPD; (ii) confusion resulting from the SPD consultation coinciding with the EDF Stage 2a consultation; and (iii) excessive length of the document; and technical language.	<p>(i) Consultation for the SPD was undertaken in full accordance with national regulations and the Council's respective Statements of Community Involvement, with copies made available at Council offices, libraries and by post if requested. Comments could be made on-line, by email, post or at one of the public meetings.</p> <p>(ii) The Draft SPD document was prepared prior to the publication of the EDFE "Update to and Proposed Changes to Preferred Proposals" consultation. The purpose of the two sets of documents was clearly stated. Feedback received from the consultation has provided the Councils with a strong steer on the views of local communities.</p> <p>(iii) Officers have sought to strike a balance between making the SPD easy to understand, while also covering a range of complex issues presented by the HPC project.</p>	The Councils will ensure the final version of the SPD is straightforward to read. A glossary of terms and abbreviations used in the document will also be provided. The 'Consultation' section of the document will be updated to reflect the public consultation that has been undertaken.
6.4, Box 8 – Transport, Bridgwater Bypass	Many consultees promoted a northern Bridgwater bypass as the principal means for mitigating the impacts of the HPC project in Bridgwater, Cannington and along the A39/C182 transport corridor to site.	The SPD will be revised to include more explicit reference to the Bridgwater Northern Bypass as a strategic transport option that the Councils consider should be assessed. NPS EN-1 advises that if a project is likely to have significant transport implications, the applicant should undertake a transport assessment, using the NATA/WebTAG methodology stipulated in Department for Transport guidance. This process should involve a comparison of strategic transport options including bypasses and 'on-line'	The Somerset Future Transport Plan refers to the Bridgwater Northern Bypass option and it is proposed that the text below, together with explanatory supporting text, is incorporated into the SPD.  <i>"Any new major highway proposals should be justified by a full New Approach To Appraisal (NATA) assessment. For example, the need for and (if required)</i>



Subject	Nature of comments	Recommended Response	Proposed Change
		<p>highway improvements through Bridgwater. Somerset County Council and the District Councils have reached a shared position that an assessment of this type should be completed before the Councils take a formal view on whether the Bridgwater Northern Bypass is required.</p> <p>As EDF Energy has not consulted the authorities on a complete NATA/WebTAG assessment, Sedgemoor District Council Executive took the decision on 24<sup>th</sup> August 2011 to advance its own study working with the Highways Agency, Somerset County Council and West Somerset Council.</p>	<p><i>route of a Bridgwater Northern Bypass should be established by a NATA type assessment, including an option based on the improvements needed in Bridgwater if the bypass were not provided. The preferred route for the Cannington bypass should also be justified through a NATA assessment. Appraisals should address potential impacts raised during consultation, such as the potential severance effect to Brymore School of the western bypass option at Cannington.</i></p>
6.5, Box 16 – Landscape & Ecology	Natural England and the Quantock Hills AONB comment that the natural environment and landscape should be protected for its own sake and not only in connection with the tourism economy.	The SPD will be refined to include a separate ‘Project-wide Issues and Approaches’ section entitled ‘Protection of the Natural Environment’. This will utilise some of the existing contextual text on SACs, SPAs, SSSIs and local designations. The approach text will set out where habitat mitigation and compensation requirements arising from the HPC project could be aligned with existing strategies, such as the Quantock Hills Management Plan and Sedgemoor Green Infrastructure Strategy.	The SPD will be refined to include a separate ‘Project-wide Issues and Approaches’ section entitled ‘Protection of the Natural Environment’.
7, Box 19 – Hinkley Point Main Site	Comments are largely supportive of the approach set out in the draft SPD and present a number of concerns around the main site development: (i) the	To respond on each of these subjects in turn: (i) The SPD does not specifically refer to the provision of a landscape buffer, but does emphasise the need for visual impact assessments and the agreement of a master plan with the local community. (ii) The approach and supporting text refers mainly to visual impacts so does not list other potential impacts such as noise and	<p>Box 19 and supporting text to be amended and strengthened in line with comments. In particular, the following new bullets should be added or incorporated within existing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘To avoid or minimise visual, noise, dust and light disturbance by utilising</li> </ul>

Subject	Nature of comments	Recommended Response	Proposed Change
	importance of a landscape buffer; (ii) the need to protect residential amenity; (iii) the potential impact on Public Rights of Way; (iv) the enhancement of habitats and ecology as part of a restoration plan; (v) the need for cumulative assessment of impacts in relation to other nearby projects such as the Steart Coastal Management Project; (vi) finally, there is a suggestion that there should be phased roll-back of the southern boundary of the site, enabling restoration and access from the earliest possible date.	dust. Text in the SPD should be amended to refer specifically to the need for such impacts to be avoided and where this is not possible, minimised. (iii) Reference is made to the need to identify improvements to Public Rights of Way, both during the construction stage and as part of a long term strategy for the area. (iv) The Draft SPD approach sets out the need to identify appropriate mitigation measures for impacts on protected species and the reinstatement of natural features. (v) The SPD makes reference to the need for cumulative assessments of visual impacts, and the text should be amended to refer to cumulative assessment of other impact types. (vi) The suggestion that there is a phased roll-back of the southern boundary of the site is a good suggestion that could be included in the SPD.	design and management measures agreed in consultation with local communities.’ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ‘To undertake an assessment of the individual and cumulative impacts of the proposals, including visual, noise, dust, light and traffic impacts.’</li> <li>• ‘Restoration of land used on a temporary basis during the construction phase should, where possible, be phased so that land closest to residential properties is restored and vacated first.’</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
8, Box 21 – Williton Accommodation	(i) The proposed approach is viewed by some consultees to be contrary to the designation of Williton as a rural centre in which limited	(i) The Draft SPD explained that, as one of the three largest settlements in West Somerset, a significant proportion of future housing growth within West Somerset may need to be provided at Williton. The emerging ‘Preferred Strategy’ consultation proposes that, together, Watchet and Williton could be expected to make provision of about 600 dwellings over a 20	It is proposed that the text in Box 21 is amended as follows to provide greater flexibility: <i>“Permanent housing for use by construction workers – The development of permanent housing for use by HPC construction workers would be</i>

Subject	Nature of comments	Recommended Response	Proposed Change
	<p>development is encouraged. (ii) Some state there should be no greenfield development and that if construction worker accommodation is provided in Williton, it should be in refurbished buildings that are currently not used, or at stalled development sites (as proposed by EDF Energy at Stage 2a). (iii) Reference is also made to the fact that EDF have removed proposals for accommodation in Williton following public consultation.</p>	<p>year period. On the basis that housing development is likely to be required in Williton, and with the objective of removing the need for an unsustainable temporary campus development at Hinkley Point, it is proposed that the suggested approach of providing up to 300 bed spaces (approx. 120 dwellings) for construction workers in new permanent dwellings is retained. A minimum of 35% of this housing would need to be made available as affordable housing once it is no longer required for construction workers (see Box 15 'Affordable Housing Approach' in the SPD).</p> <p>(ii) It is accepted, however, that the indication of a specific greenfield housing site in the SPD is not appropriate on the basis that sites are yet to be allocated within the Local Development Framework. The SPD will therefore be amended to refer to a range of potential housing site opportunities in the village, as identified in the Williton Master plan (an evidence base document for the Core Strategy).</p> <p>(iii) It is acknowledged that purpose-built accommodation for construction workers does not form part of EDFE's Stage 2 Preferred Proposals. One of the main aims of the HPC SPD is to promote an alternative accommodation strategy that does not rely on temporary campus accommodation at the main site and which could also provide a legacy of permanent housing in locations where new dwellings required (including Affordable Housing). This approach is very different from EDFE's proposals at Stage 1 for a temporary accommodation campus at Williton of up to 200 bed spaces. The approach in the SPD provides</p>	<p><i>encouraged. <u>Accommodation could be provided in refurbished un-used dwellings, at consented housing sites, and/or new housing developments for 2 and 3 bed dwellings. The accommodation should be made available as permanent housing as a legacy use following the HPC construction phase. Proposals should seek to align with the Williton Masterplan.</u></i></p> <p>The supporting text for Box 21 will be amended to reflect this revision.</p>

Subject	Nature of comments	Recommended Response	Proposed Change
		support for the approach to enabling stalled housing developments set out in the EDFE Stage 2a consultation.	
8, Box 24 – Cannington Court Accommodation	Cannington is not an appropriate settlement for construction worker accommodation for a range of issues: security, lack of parking, interaction of students and construction workers.	<p>Cannington Court was identified as a potential location for a modest amount of construction worker accommodation due to the proximity of the village to the main site and potential for enabling the refurbishment of a Grade I listed building. Sedgemoor DC has received very strong feedback from the local community that this proposal is not acceptable for a number of reasons, including the lack of parking, concerns about security and the interaction of construction workers with students at the College. Bridgwater College also responded to the consultation, advising that a more appropriate use of Cannington Court would be a Management Training Centre.</p> <p>It is proposed that Cannington Court is deleted from the SPD as a potential location for construction worker accommodation, although it should be noted that some construction workers may choose to locate in the village in private sector rented accommodation, latent bedspaces (spare rooms that are let out), purchase of homes and tourism accommodation.</p>	It is proposed that Cannington Court is deleted from the SPD as a potential suggested location for construction worker accommodation.
9, Box 30 – Williton Park & Ride	Support is expressed for the alternative location, Smithyard Terminal, set out in EDFE's Stage 2a consultation, which is also linked to highway improvements at the	During both the EDFE and Councils' consultation processes, community support has been expressed for the alternative proposal of a Park & Ride at Smithyard Terminal, rather than the greenfield site to the west of Williton at Mamsey Lane (WIL-A). WSC has considered this and intend to amend the SPD to reflect the view of the local community on this issue and the benefits of locating the Park & Ride on a brownfield	<p>It is proposed that the approach is amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference will be made to support for both the Smithyard Terminal and Mamsey Lane sites (with Transport Assessment and Strategy caveat), but clearly expressing that the Smithyard Terminal site is the preferred option.</li> </ul>

Subject	Nature of comments	Recommended Response	Proposed Change
	Washford Junction.	<p>site, linked to planning policy support for transport developments that are designed to limit environmental impacts (Local Plan policy T/3).</p> <p>It remains important that the requirement for a Park &amp; Ride in the Williton area is based on robust transport assessment and strategy for the HPC project. Now that EDFE has consulted on two Park &amp; Ride sites in West Somerset, there is still potential that the WIL-A site at West Somerset could be brought forward in a DCO application. It is the Councils view therefore that the approach in the SPD should refer to both sites and incorporate generic guidance that would apply to any Park &amp; Ride proposal in the Williton Area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should the Smithyard Terminal site be progressed, a bus stop for construction workers should be provided in Williton to prevent unnecessary car trips to the Park &amp; Ride site.</li> </ul> <p>The corresponding supporting text will also be updated.</p>
9, Box 78 – M5 Junction 24 Park & Ride	<p>Objections are raised to the proposal for a Park &amp; Ride and freight management facility on the Huntworth site.</p> <p>The main concerns are impact on landscape and loss of the green wedge between North Petherton and Bridgwater; and traffic congestion. There are calls for the Bridgwater Northern Bypass and some consultees make reference to the proposed Bridgwater Gateway development,</p>	<p>Since consultation was undertaken on the Draft SPD, EDFE have consulted on further proposals that would involve an alternative location for the Park &amp; Ride and freight management facility at the ‘Somerfield site’, which is located to the northeast of the Huntworth roundabout. Taking account of the potential landscape impact of the proposed development, the Councils’ consultation response to EDFE expressed that the Somerfield site would be preferred to the Huntworth site previously identified by EDFE. The Somerfield site is less prominent in views to and from the Quantocks and also benefits from embankments and mature planting that screen the site.</p> <p>It remains important that the requirement for a Park &amp; Ride and freight management facility at M5 Junction 24 is based on robust transport assessment and strategy for the HPC project. Now that EDFE has consulted on two Park &amp; Ride and freight management sites at</p>	<p>It is proposed that the approach be amended to set out support for both the Huntworth and Somerfield sites (with Transport Assessment and Strategy caveat), but expressing that the Somerfield site is the preferred option.</p> <p>The corresponding supporting text will also be updated.</p>

Subject	Nature of comments	Recommended Response	Proposed Change
	which is also opposed.	Junction 24 of the M5, it is possible that either site could be brought forward in a DCO application. It is the view of SDC that the approach in the SPD should refer to both sites and incorporate generic guidance that would apply to any Park & Ride/freight management proposal in the vicinity of Junction 24.	

## **Appendix B**

### **List of Respondents to Consultation**

## B1 List of Respondents to Consultation

---

The following organisations and individuals submitted written responses to the consultation on the Supplementary Planning Document (listed alphabetically by organisation and surname):

Alen, Mrs Annette  
Allen, Miss Zoe  
Allen, Mr Ronald  
Ashworth, Mr James  
Attwooll, Mr John  
Awty, Mrs Jane  
Ayres, Mr David  
Badgworth Parish Council - Mrs C Morris  
Bannister, Ms Valerie  
Beasley, Mrs Janice  
Billingham, Mr John  
Birkenhead, Mr R.M.  
Bolton, Mrs Karen  
Bowen, Mr Brin  
Bowen, Mrs Wendy and Mr Brin  
Boyd, Mr Tom  
Boyd, Mrs Margaret  
Bridgwater Gateway Ltd - Ian Jewson Planning Ltd  
Burlington, Ms Thelma  
Cannington Parish Council  
Cannington Woman's Institute, Mrs Sheila Allen  
Carr, Mrs Christine  
Chant, Mr Les  
Claridge, Mr Graham  
Crabb, Mr Roger  
Cuttell, Mr Richard  
Cuttell, Mrs Helen



David Wilson Homes - Mr David Wilson  
Deakin, Mr Roy  
Douglas, Mrs Elizabeth  
Draper, Mrs Freda  
EDF Energy - Mr Tim Norwood  
Edwards, Mr Simon  
Environment Agency - Ms Louisa McKay  
Farmery, Mrs Elizabeth  
Fitzpatrick, Mr Colin  
Flash, Miss Lesley  
Franks, Mr Martin  
Gibson, Mrs Jenny  
Goss, Ms Susan  
Griggs, Mr Philip  
Hancock, Mr Ron  
Hathaway, Mr David & Mrs Carol Westgate  
Hawley, Mr Grant  
Hemmings, Mr P  
Herold, Mr Timothy  
Highways Agency - Mrs Jacqui Ashman  
Holmes, Mrs Celia and Mr Jeffrey  
Horsfield, Mr Alan  
Howard, Mr Graham  
Howard, Mr Terence  
Howard, Mrs Jean  
Ingles, Mr William  
Innovia Cellophane Ltd - GVA Grimley  
Jackson-Smith, Mr Matthew  
Jansons, Mrs Sarah  
Jones, Mr David & Miss Claire Vaughan  
Jones, Mrs Sue  
Kirkman, Mr Peter

Laird, Mrs Lynda

Langdon, Mrs June

Lucas, Mr John

Lucas, Mrs J

Lunnon, Miss Victoria

Manley, Mrs Janet

Montague, Mr Peter

Natural England - Mr Glen Gillespie

Ng, Mr Alfred

Oates, Mr Peter

Oates, Mrs Barbara

Ostler, Mr Steve

Otterhampton Parish Council

Parry, Mrs Janet

Pattermore, Mr Neil

Pearson, Mr Philip

Pearson, Mrs Trudy

Phillips, Mrs Helen

Pope, Mr George

Pope, Mr George & Mrs Pauline

Pumfrey, Mr Roy

Quantock Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), Ms Emma Jane Preece

Rawe, Mr Jim

Reed, Mr Alex

Rivers, Ms Anne

Robson, Mr Nigel

Sapiano, Mrs Georgina

Scott, Mr & Mrs

Sedgemoor District Council Rights of Way - Mr Andrew Woodward

Skilton, Ms Elizabeth

Slade, Mr Tony

Smoldon, Ms Josephine

Somerset County Council - Mr Patrick Flaherty

Spicer, Mr David

Stanley, Mr Clive

Stogursey Parish Council

Stother, Mr Brian

Stother, Mrs Wendy

Taunton Deane Borough Council - Mr Roger Mitchinson

Taunton, Ms Jane

Taylor, Mr Alexander

Temple, Dr David

The Power Trust

Vennard, Mrs Julie

Webster, Mr Graham

Williams, Mrs Julie

## Appendix C

### Schedule of Consultee Comments, Responses and Proposed Changes

## **C1 Schedule of Consultee Comments, Responses and Proposed Change**

---

This schedule sets out consultation comments received on the Draft Hinkley Point C Supplementary Planning Document (HPC SPD), together with the Councils' recommended responses and proposed changes to the document. Please note that the section, paragraph, box and figure references refer to those in the Consultation Draft SPD (unless otherwise stated). Where the insertion of new text is recommended here, the exact wording may differ in the final version of the SPD due to editorial changes.