

# Schedule of Responses – Appendix H.1

## *Cannington Bypass 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)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Baseline has been adequately defined but sampling undertaken represents the minimum acceptable. Additional monitoring (during construction and operation) should be undertaken in the study area to determine whether impacts have been adequately assessed and proposed mitigation is effective. A monitoring campaign should be designed taking into account all potential impacts of the development.	89368-591-519			/	<p>Comments on the baseline in respect of the Cannington Bypass Associated Development site were received at the Stage 2 consultation. West Somerset Council and Sedgemoor District Council noted that the baseline had been adequately defined, but that the sampling undertaken represented the minimum acceptable.</p> <p>The background air quality monitoring programme, undertaken to support the air quality impact assessment, commenced on 25 February 2009 and finished on 15 September 2009. This exceeds the minimum recommendation as set out in the <b>Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) Technical Guidance document LAQM.TG(09)</b>, which states that, as a minimum, monitoring should ideally be undertaken over a consecutive six-month period in order to determine the baseline air quality. NO<sub>2</sub> and SO<sub>2</sub> monitoring was also undertaken at a roadside location in order to allow for verification of vehicular exhaust emissions dispersion model output. Full details of the baseline monitoring campaign are provided in <b>15011/TR/00118 Final Air Quality Monitoring Report (2009)</b>.</p>

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 1	The two proposed routes (East and West) are both too close to houses in the village and indeed the westerly route would bring increased noise and pollution into the village caused by the prevailing winds. The Council disputes the figures derived by EDF in their consultation documents, regarding the number of houses affected to the point where the Council feels the figures are round the wrong way!	8746-599-3697			/	Comments were received by Cannington Parish Council, on the Stage 1 Initial Proposal and Options consultation, which raised concerns over possible pollution impacts from the proposed bypass as well as challenging quoted figures on potential houses affected. Since Stage 1 a full assessment of potential air quality impacts has been carried out and is presented within the <b>Air Quality Chapter 10 of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement</b> . The stated number of houses potentially affected within the Stage 1 Initial Proposal and Options consultation was also verified.

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	- Noise and Air Quality - the cumulative impacts with the park and ride construction and operation should be assessed fully.	89202-594-2628	/			Comments on air quality in relation to the Cannington Bypass Associated Development (AD) site were received from Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council at the Stage 2 consultation and related to the requirement to consider the cumulative impacts with the Cannington park and ride construction and operation, and the need to consider potential cumulative effects other than those from road traffic.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Cumulative impacts are inherently assessed where the traffic data includes all elements of the development. There is no cumulative assessment or discussion of other potential cumulative effects (e.g. operational traffic plus demolition/ redevelopment of construction worker sites plus operational emissions from the Main Site).	89368-594-2467	/			<p>The approach to assessing the cumulative air quality impacts associated with the Hinkley Point C (HPC) Project has evolved following Stage 2 consultation. The cumulative impacts of the proposed Hinkley Point C (HPC) Project with other committed and proposed developments are considered in <b>Volume 11 of the Environmental Statement</b>. Interactive cumulative air quality impacts with other environmental topics (e.g. noise, landscape) associated with the HPC Project are also considered <b>Volume 11 of the Environmental Statement</b>.</p> <p>The vehicular air quality impacts on the wider highway network, associated with the operation of the Cannington bypass, have been assessed for all traffic generated by the HPC Project. Therefore the assessment of operational vehicular emissions is a cumulative assessment. No further cumulative effects are considered to arise during the operation of the bypass.</p>

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 1	Is far too close to the village of Cannington that in turn will bring noise, dust and pollution into the village.	8746-593-4119			/	<p>A significant proportion of consultee comments in relation to the potential impact of the Cannington Bypass Associated Development (AD) site were provided at the Stage 2 consultation by Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council. The comments received reflected upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The possibility of significant residual construction dust impacts without the implementation of adequate mitigation;</li> <li>- The use of the updated air quality impact significance criteria published following the Stage 2 consultation, in order to allow the scale of the air quality impacts to be discussed in absolute terms and not the percentage change (as the previous guidance encouraged);</li> <li>- The perceived inappropriate downgrading of construction dust impacts due to their temporary nature;</li> <li>- The need to include PM<sub>2.5</sub> impacts within the assessment of vehicular emissions;</li> <li>- The need for potential beneficial impacts of the bypass to be identified and assessed.</li> </ul> <p>Comments were also received from local residents at both the Stage 2 consultation and the Stage 2 update, requesting that the bypass be constructed in a cutting in order to reduce impacts. Comments received at the Stage 2 consultation also raised the prospect of compensation due to the perceived unacceptable impacts of the bypass.</p> <p>The assessment of potential air quality impacts as a result of the construction and operation of the Cannington bypass AD site, as presented within <b>Chapter 10 of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (ES)</b> submitted with this application for development consent, has determined all associated air quality impacts to be of an acceptable level, i.e. not significant. Proposed management measures that would be employed during the construction phase of the Cannington bypass AD site are outlined in <b>Chapter 10 of Volume 5 of the ES</b>. The significance criteria applied to the assessment of air quality impacts has also been updated to take account of the latest published guidance from Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) as referenced in <b>Chapter 10 of Volume 5 of the ES</b>.</p> <p>Within <b>Chapter 10 of Volume 5 of the ES</b> the construction impacts on air quality are all assessed in line with current published guidelines, in addition to the professional experience of the air quality</p>
Tractivity 942	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments?  The proposed bypass (by EDF) will destroy Brymoor School and with the prevailing winds will cause pollution in Cannington village. ALSO the noise will add to an already high level of road noise. ALSO this will mean TWO lots of construction cokers using Cannington. THE BEST OPTION IS THAT FROM DUNBALL!!!	9700-593-3096			/	
Tractivity 1070	Public	Stage 2	Any additional traffic in the Cannington area will be detrimental to village life, with noise and pollution becoming unbearable.	9828-593-3461			/	
Tractivity 1142	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 concerns about the visual, light, pollution and noise impact of the Cannington by pass on our property and will be seeking adequate compensation to cover the devaluation of our home because of this. This proposed road cuts us off from safe passage to Cannington particularly by foot or cycle and also due to the proposed dead end of our lane going towards Cannington cuts us off from the local footpath and lane network for recreational use on foot or cycle. We have road safety concerns about this road as all cycle and footpaths for the new and existing Hinckly Point road are on the opposite side of the roads to where we live. Kids need to cross to catch the school bus at (Personal details removed). This is already dangerous as the traffic is now, but will get worse. all crossings etc have been put in at the Brymore end. Cannington does extend to Putnell - consider us please.	9900-593-7757			/	
Tractivity 62299	Public	Stage 2	Both the Bypass and park & ride facility will enormously increase the congestion on the dangerous A39 and are far too near residents' homes allowing continuous noise penetration, pollution and lighting annoyance.	9990-593-605			/	
Tractivity 62386	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. The original plans for the Western by pass put the road in a cutting so that it was out of sight and noise and light pollution would be reduced. However, the recent stage 2 plans clearly show the Western by pass being built on an embankment above the field level. This is totally unacceptable. This proposed road is directly in front of my home and 10 other dwellings. You know from discussions with us that we are all appalled at EDFs apparent lack of concern for the people who live on (Personal details removed) and that EDF are prepared to spoil our outlook, create more noise, dust and light pollution. If this road is allowed EDF must be made to put the whole road into a cutting to minimise all the disruptive aspects that this road will bring. We do not want a hedge and fence to disguise the road. Engineers have the skill to plan and build a road through a cutting and should be made to do so.	10049-593-2227			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62457	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	This new by-pass proposed by EDF will destroy farmland and divide Brynmore School in two halves, as well as the increased traffic, noise and air pollution.	10081-593-646			/	assessor. Impacts have therefore been assessed on the basis of the risk posed by the construction site and the proximity of sensitive receptors. Whilst qualitative comments have been made regarding the temporary and likely infrequent nature of these construction (non-vehicular) impacts, the magnitude of these impacts has not been downgraded based upon their temporary nature, rather, best practice mitigation and measures have been proposed to minimise potential impacts to an acceptable level.
Tractivity 62569	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	The bypass will be in close proximity to our house, so the increase in traffic, noise, light and pollution will greatly impact on our daily lives.	10121-593-125			/	Emissions of PM <sub>2.5</sub> from vehicle exhausts have been considered and their impacts determined. The beneficial air quality impacts as a result of the bypass, i.e. the improvements to air quality adjacent to the existing roads passing through Cannington, are also discussed.
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	As you have probably gathered I am very concerned about the elevation of the Western bypass preferred route.  From my window and those of my neighbours we look straight across the field where you propose to build the bypass. The plans show an elevated section across this field which means we will see, hear and smell these vehicles at all hours of the day and night. They will also cause light pollution as they use the road.	10124-593-8840			/	The proposed bypass design incorporates reinforced earth bunds to a height of 2m. The extent of the bunds on the eastern side of the proposed bypass has been increased northwards to provide screening to residential properties on Chads Hill. This may help further reduce the air quality impacts associated with its operation, already assessed as not significant in the absence of either a bund or cutting.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment of construction dust downgrades the potential for impacts because they are temporary. This approach cannot be supported as mitigation may be required regardless of the duration of the activity and residual impacts may still be significant.	89368-593-1478	/			Given that all air quality impacts have been assessed to be of an acceptable level, i.e. not significant, no compensation package is therefore considered to be necessary in relation to potential air quality impacts alone.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Very large impacts are predicted because the baseline is very low in the area where the Cannington Bypass is proposed. Hence the percentage change may be high whereas the numerical change in the concentration (in nanog/m ) is small. Undue weight is given to the discussion of these large impacts. The use of the revised EPUK 2010 guidance will help this discussion focus on the scale of the impact in absolute terms not the percentage change.	89368-593-3994	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Significance as discussed in Section 5 has not always followed the methodology stated which has also been superseded since the EnvApp was written. The temporary nature of construction impacts has been used to justify downgrading of impacts, an approach which is not supported.	89368-593-4560	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The Bypass is considered mitigation of the additional traffic generated because of the development. It is assumed therefore that no mitigation of the predicted impact are receptors near the Bypass is required. This conclusion is not justified, although it is noted that although the impact is predicted to be very large the air quality objectives are still met at receptors close to the Bypass and this also contributes to the improvement in air quality in Cannington itself.	89368-593-5009	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Where changes in air quality are assessed to be Moderate Adverse there is no consideration in the assessment of whether changing traffic routing would adequately mitigate the impact without creating unacceptable impact elsewhere.	89368-593-5488	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The residual impacts section wrongly states that there are no significant impacts when the main assessment states that there are Moderate Adverse impacts on receptors near the new Bypass.	89368-593-6970	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Receptors close to the proposed Cannington Bypass are predicted to experience "very large" changes in long term air quality which are described as "moderately adverse". These impacts are not identified as requiring mitigation because (i) the resulting air quality including the construction traffic is in compliance with air quality objectives and (ii) there will be an improvement in air quality in Cannington centre and this "balances" the negative impact on receptors near the Bypass. This approach is not supported. The negative and positive impacts of the Bypass are not additive; if the negative impacts should be mitigated the positive impact to Cannington centre cannot not be used to negate this requirement.	89368-593-7374	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The significance of dust during construction on human receptors (rather than agricultural receptors) has not been assessed (please also see comments relating to the Air Quality response).	89368-593-11154	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment methodology follows a standard approach but some potentially affected receptors (along Brownings Road) may have not been included. Impacts at these receptors may be greater than stated in the remainder of the assessment. The discussion of impacts emphasises the negative impact of the bypass because although the percentage change is large the air quality in relation to the relevant criteria remains good. Using the updated guidance will allow this assessment to be modified in this way	89374-593-16011	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The residual impacts section wrongly states that there are no significant impacts when the main assessment states that there are Moderate Adverse impacts, albeit at a receptor that is located near to the Cannington Bypass not the Park and Ride site.  Receptors close to the proposed Cannington Bypass are predicted to experience "very large" changes in long term air quality which are described as "Moderately Adverse". These impacts are not identified as requiring mitigation because (i) the resulting air quality including the construction traffic is in compliance with air quality objectives and (ii) there will be an improvement in air quality in Cannington centre and this "balances" the negative impact on receptors near the Bypass. This approach is not supported. The negative and positive impacts of the Bypass are not additive. If the negative impacts should be mitigated the positive impact to Cannington centre cannot not be used to negate this requirement.	89375-593-260	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The negative impact of the bypass is given undue weight because although the percentage change is large the air quality in relation to the relevant criteria remains good. Using the updated guidance will allow this assessment to be modified by the use of professional judgement.	89426-593-2844	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The summary of the impacts wrongly states that there are no significant impacts. This is inconsistent with the body of the assessment which states the impact is moderately adverse and also fails to identify the positive significant impacts to Cannington itself.	89426-593-3222	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Potential beneficial impacts are not identified, assessed or enhanced; this is particularly relevant to the inhabitants of Cannington where positive impacts are likely.	89426-593-3487	/			



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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment methodology follows a standard approach but some potentially affected receptors (along Brownings Road) may have not been included. Impacts at these receptors may be greater than stated in the remainder of the assessment. The discussion of impacts emphasises the negative impact of the bypass because although the percentage change is large the air quality in relation to the relevant criteria remains good. Using the updated guidance will allow this assessment to be modified in this way.	89426-593-16824	/			
Tractivity 62930	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	We live in the most picturesque and tranquil part of connington, and we are very lucky indeed.  We are both semi-retired after working for years in business, and we are deeply upset with this proposal for the western by-pass.  With this new road, it will bring a high volume of traffic, pollution dust from the prevailing south west winds, noise and block our wonderful views & scenery.	89673-593-140			/	
Tractivity 62958	Public	Stage 2 Update	Given that the prevailing wind is south westerly, the fact that your proposal does not place the road within any significant cutting for the majority of its length, it is inevitable that a dramatic increase in noise, dust and visual pollution will occur, particularly the former.  This will have a severe detrimental effect on our quality of life.	89685-593-598			/	
Tractivity 70648	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	Having regard to the volume of traffic which it would carry, day and night, anyone living in the area would be severely affected by noise, light and fume pollution.	89766-593-3319			/	
14	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	Both the Bypass and park & ride facility will enormously increase the congestion on the dangerous A39 and are far too near residents' homes allowing continuous noise penetration, pollution and light annoyance.	89803-593-602			/	
30	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	Proposed Western Bypass  If built, this road will badly affect the lives of everyone in this village, not least, those most affected in the immediate vicinity, As the predominant wind comes from, a westerly direction, it will carry noise, fumes and dust pollution across most of the village. The existing A39 bypass causes enough noise disturbance to half of the village and if the proposed bypass goes ahead, the village will be virtually surrounded with constant traffic noise for the greater part of the day and night.	89819-593-440			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
34	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	Both the Bypass and park & ride facility will enormously increase the congestion on the dangerous A39 and are far too near residents' homes allowing continuous noise-penetration,-pollution and lighting annoyance.	89823-593-657			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 362	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference A road to the west is less likely to be used and your proposal document does not take account of wind direction when assessing the impact of the road on residents	9050-592-1068	/			Comments on with regard to air quality methodology in relation to the Cannington Bypass Associated Development (AD) site, were received from Sedgemoor District Council (SDC) and West Somerset Council (WSC). This occurred at the Stage 2 consultation and primarily related to the need to include the pollutant PM <sub>2.5</sub> and non-work related construction worker trips within the assessment of vehicular emissions. It also concerned the appropriateness of including all roads within the ADMS Roads model plane at an elevation of 0m, and the request for consideration within the air quality assessment of the observed lack of decrease in background pollutant concentrations over the past few years. SDC and WSC also recommended the use of updated air quality impact significance criteria published following Stage 2.  Emissions of PM <sub>2.5</sub> from vehicle exhausts have been considered within the <b>Air Quality Chapter of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (ES)</b> submitted with this application for development consent, and their impacts have been determined. Non-work related trips of construction workers have also been considered, and the trips generated have been included in the traffic flows used to inform the assessment of vehicular emissions during the construction and operational phases.  The ADMS Roads model does not allow for the inclusion of cuttings. CERC have advised that future versions of the model may allow cuttings to be considered. Receptors immediately behind a cutting may experience lower concentrations than if the road was at grade, but other receptors further from the road may well experience relatively higher concentrations due to the cutting. However absolute concentrations at those receptors further from the bypass would not be as great as those immediately behind the cutting. This is due to increased pollutant dispersion and dilution over the increased distance, and therefore the impacts would be expected to be relatively less. As the predicted concentrations are not close to exceeding the Air Quality Objectives at these receptors locations, there is therefore less sensitivity at these locations. Inclusion or exclusion of a cutting is therefore not a material consideration to the modelling exercise or the rating of impact significance,
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The Noise and Air quality assessment makes no specific reference to whether (or how) the analysis takes into account the large volume of HGV, LGV and PSVs associated with the HPC construction traffic.	89231-592-9502	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	observations relating to the air quality assessment at this site are the same as those in presented in Section 5,	89368-592-214			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The methodology used is commonly used for this type of assessment but has been updated (July 2010) since the EnvApp. The update should be used for future work.  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No assessment of very fine particles (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) has been included beyond the identification of assessment criterion.</li> <li>No assessment of the non-work related construction worker trips (i.e. people in the worker accommodation travelling around when not travelling to or from work) or operational traffic has been undertaken but a commitment to include it in the submission to the IPC is made.</li> </ul>	89368-592-917	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Future changes in air quality are estimated using Government guidance and assumes that concentrations will decrease with time as reductions in vehicle emissions take effect. This assumption is not supported by air quality measurements in most locations and this potential fault in the method is not discussed. Additional monitoring would assist in this matter.	89368-592-1738	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	When modelling traffic emissions all roads have been assumed to be at an elevation of 0m, i.e. all roads are at the same level. This assumption is valid in most cases where the road is approximately at local ground level, but is not valid when the road is in cutting or elevated. It is stated in the EnvApp that the assumption would overestimate pollution levels. This conclusion is not supported or referenced and pollution concentrations may well be higher (or possibly lower) than predicted.	89368-592-3018		/		<p>and the approach taken to include the bypass within the model domain at a height of 0m is considered valid.</p> <p>The lack of observed decreases in ambient NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations over recent years in some locations has been discussed in the <b>Air Quality Chapter of Volume 5 of the ES</b>. In order to take account of uncertainties regarding trends in NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations over time, the approach taken within the ES has been to undertake a worst-case sensitivity test whereby no reduction in vehicle emission rates or background concentrations over time has been assumed. This is in addition to the standard assessment methodology, where the currently published guidelines have been followed (i.e. vehicle emission factors and background concentrations reduce in future years).</p>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The modelling of the Cannington Bypass does not take account of the plans for it to be in cutting. Cuttings will tend to reduce dispersion of pollutants around the road and so receptors immediately behind a cutting may experience lower concentrations than if the road was at grade, but other receptors may well experience higher concentrations. This depends on the relative geometry of the road, cutting and wind direction. This aspect is not considered in the assessment.	89368-592-3518		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Identification of the benefits to Cannington centre are not adequately assessed or discussed.	89368-592-4440	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment methodology follows a standard approach but the assumptions relating to the road being in cutting lead to an inadequate assessment of potential effects. The impact is stated moderate adverse but considers that this is offset by the improvement in air quality within Cannington and hence does not propose mitigation.	89426-592-2513	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment methodology follows a standard approach but some potentially affected receptors (along Brownings Road) may have not been included. Impacts at these receptors may be greater than stated in the remainder of the assessment. The discussion of impacts emphasises the negative impact of the bypass because although the percentage change is large the air quality in relation to the relevant criteria remains good. Using the updated guidance will allow this assessment to be modified in this way.	89426-592-16824	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There is no assessment of the cumulative effects of the car park and the road traffic. Car park emissions should be included in the ADMS modelling.	89426-592-17331		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There is no assessment of very fine particulate matter (PM25).	89426-592-17579	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Wester bypass - please put it into a cutting for Withiel Drive to Rodway. The present plans show an elevated section across the field in front of my house. This will cause noise and dust pollution and light pollution at night.	10124-595-8359	/			The main comments of the consultation related to Cannington Bypass Associated Development (AD) site. Further comments were received at both the Stage 2 and Stage 2 update consultations from a consultee and Cannington Parish Council, requesting that the bypass be partially constructed within a cutting. Another consultee queried at the Stage 2 update consultation the prospect of compensation owing to the potential dust impacts associated with the construction of the Cannington Bypass AD site submitted with this application for development consent.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Baseline has been adequately defined but sampling undertaken represents the minimum acceptable. Additional monitoring (during construction and operation) should be undertaken in the study area to determine whether impacts have been adequately assessed and proposed mitigation is effective. A monitoring campaign should be designed taking into account all potential impacts of the development.	89368-595-519	/			Comments with regard to air quality mitigation for the Cannington Bypass Associated Development (AD) site were received from Sedgemoor District Council (SDC) and West Somerset Council at Stage 2. These were primarily related to clarification of measures to mitigate any potential air quality impacts.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There is no commitment to mitigation during construction, only a list of possible measures. Hence it is not possible to establish if the impacts predicted during construction will occur. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Shipping emissions are not quantified and so no mitigation is proposed.</li> </ul>	89368-595-2104	/			Proposed management measures that would be employed during the construction phase of the Cannington bypass AD site are outlined in the <b>Air Quality Chapter of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (ES)</b> . A more thorough description of these management measures (along with details of roles and responsibilities, environmental audit reporting and dust complaint investigation procedures), is provided within the supporting <b>Associated Developments Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)</b> .
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The Bypass is considered mitigation of the additional traffic generated because of the development. It is assumed therefore that no mitigation of the predicted impact are receptors near the Bypass is required. This conclusion is not justified, although it is noted that although the impact is predicted to be very large the air quality objectives are still met at receptors close to the Bypass and this also contributes to the improvement in air quality in Cannington itself.	89368-595-5009			/	The proposed bypass design incorporates mitigation in the form of reinforced earth bunds to a height of 2m. The extent of the bunds on the eastern side of the proposed bypass has been increased northwards to provide screening to residential properties on Chads Hill. This may help further reduce the air quality impacts associated with its operation, already assessed as not significant in the absence of a bund.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The impact of the Bypass is then assessed as negligible to slight adverse and not requiring mitigation. There is no justification for this in the assessment other than the implied judgement that they are temporary and therefore not in need of mitigating.	89368-595-6291	/			The fugitive dust and PM <sub>10</sub> impacts associated with construction of the bypass have been assessed to be minor (please see the <b>Air Quality Chapter of Volume 5 of the ES</b> ). With the implementation of the dust management and mitigation measures outlined in the supporting AQMP, potential impacts will be further

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Residual effects from construction are identified as minor. This is contingent on adequate mitigation to which there is no commitment in the EnvApp; mitigation relies on the EMMP and its adequate implementation.	89368-595-7161	/			reduced. No compensation package is therefore considered to be necessary in relation to potential dust impacts.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	strong contractual mechanisms need to be in place to ensure this. In particular, dust control for human receptors needs to be specified in the mitigation.	89368-595-12252			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There is no commitment to any mitigation so the impacts could be greater than that predicted.	89426-595-3125	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There is no commitment to any mitigation so the impacts could be greater than that predicted.	89426-595-17482	/			
Tractivity 62930	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	If planning permission is granted, has anyone considered compensation owing to the noise & dust of the construction of the new road?	89673-595-534		/		
Tractivity 62958	Public	Stage 2 Update	1) If you must build a bypass then at least put the part of it which will be directly in line with our properties into a cutting which will conceal traffic, lessen noise and visual impact, and reduce dust pollution from the prevailing westerly wind.	89685-595-2332	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Residual effects should be monitored in some cases. This is not discussed in the EnvApp.	89368-596-2373	/			<p>Comments on air quality monitoring received from Sedgemoor District Council, and West Somerset Council in relation to the Cannington Bypass Associated Development site, were received at the Stage 2 consultation and related to the monitoring of residual air quality effects.</p> <p>An air quality monitoring programme will be implemented at all of the HPC offsite associated development sites. The monitoring plan will be implemented throughout the duration of work activities that have the potential to produce emissions or dust that could negatively impact upon the air quality and amenity value of sensitive receptors in the vicinity of the site.</p>



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	There is a historic landfill site known as 'Field No 8191, Manor Farm' just to the west of the roundabout at the southern end of the eastern bypass. The information on our files indicates that waste soil has been deposited at this location. This will need to be investigated further under PPS 25.	88830-609-1707	/			At Stage 1 two Cannington bypass proposals were put forward for the potential location of the proposed Cannington Bypass, one passing to the east of Cannington and one to the west. The location was finalised at Stage 2 as being to the west of Cannington.  The Environmental Appraisal presented at Stage 2 presented a desk-based baseline assessment which included a review of an Envirocheck Report for the site, a walkover survey, review of geological maps and local maps of SSSIs and RIGs and referenced information obtained from both the Ordnance Survey (OS) maps and the Environment Agency website.
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	5. A historic map search for the two options for a Cannington by-pass route both indicate the likely presence of in-filled ponds. Whilst the presence of in-filled ponds would not be by any means insurmountable for either route, appropriate investigation of the pond in-fill for the chosen by-pass route will be necessary to determine the extent of any contamination in the fill material (pg 176, pdf pg 193). This is because some of the pond in-filling could have been unregulated, pre-dating the Control of Pollution Act 1974.	87960-609-204	/			The baseline assessment identified any historical or current land uses on the proposed development site and within the surrounding area that may pose a potential contamination risk.  As part of the Environmental Appraisal, distances were given for the location of potentially contaminative land uses surrounding the site based on the proposed development site boundary at that time. As part of the <b>Baseline Section of the Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter in Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (ES)</b> the distances have been reassessed where necessary based on revisions to the proposed development site boundary. All distances stated within the ES are from the nearest proposed development site boundary to the identified land use.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The information sources that have been used to assess the baseline ground conditions are those that would normally be expected and include: an Envirocheck Report for the site, a walkover survey, reference to geological and Ordnance Survey (OS) maps of the area, review of the Environment Agency website and a review of local maps of SSSIs and RIGs. In addition, the report states that historical OS maps and planning held by Sedgemoor District Council were also viewed	89369-609-886			/	After finalisation of the proposed bypass route at Stage 2, the historical maps were reviewed as part of the baseline assessment presented in <b>Volume 5 Chapter 12 of the ES</b> . One historical pond was identified within the proposed development site. As this was a small pond located within the corner of a field it was targeted intrusive investigations were not required in this area. However, if any contamination is identified within this area as part of construction works this will be dealt with under the Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (EMMP) as described below.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Sampling will be required if potential contamination is identified during the construction activities or if it is intended to re-use soils during the construction work.	89369-609-2217	/			The landfill (Field No. 8191, Manor Farm) is known to have accepted only inert materials and therefore there is no significant evidence that hazardous gas generation would pose a risk to the proposed development site. It is also located greater than 250m
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	An outline of the scope, timing and duration of intrusive investigation works are not provided.	89369-609-2570	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The Cannington Park Quarry has been designated as a County geological site, but is not listed as a Regionally Important Geological Site.	89369-609-5334			/	from the boundary of the proposed western route of the Cannington Bypass and therefore no further investigations will be undertaken in this area.  At Stage 2 intrusive investigations had not been undertaken at the proposed development site. Investigations have since been undertaken in October of 2010. The findings of the intrusive investigations are presented within the <b>Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter in Volume 5 of the ES</b> . The factual intrusive investigation reports will be available to review by stakeholders as <b>Appendices to the ES</b> . The investigations are in accordance with relevant guidance and include the reporting of ground conditions and the collection and analysis of soil and groundwater samples. At the time of the intrusive investigation BS10175:2001 was the current guidance available regarding the methodology of undertaking intrusive investigations. This guidance has since been reviewed and was re-issued in March 2011.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	While paragraph 3.7.63 of Volume 3 of the EnvApp states that it is considered unlikely that contaminated soils had been used as infill material in the pond feature, there is no data provided within the EnvApp to prove this. A ground investigation may be required to prove this, as the presence of contaminated material may impact upon the proposed development.	89369-609-6336	/			The intrusive investigations did not identify the presence of any peat and as such it is not considered to pose a risk to construction works.  The Environmental Appraisal submitted at Stage 2 presented a preliminary Conceptual Site Model (CSM) that did not consider potential new sources of contamination during the operation of the proposed development site. As part of the submission of <b>Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter of Volume 5 of the ES</b> potential new sources of contamination are now identified for these phases of work. The CSM is designed to be indicative and not exhaustive although <b>Chapter 12 Volume 5 of the ES</b> does provide a more comprehensive list than presented at Stage 2.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Although the EnvApp provides details of the location of the potentially contaminative land uses surrounding the site, it is not clear exactly where the distance has been taken from (i.e. is it from the centre of the site or from the edge of the southern site boundary?). This is important in order to identify potential ground contamination associated with such sites and the impact it may have on the proposed development	89369-609-7501	/			Gas monitoring undertaken as part of the intrusive investigations of the proposed development site indicate that there is no risk from the landfill to the Cannington Bypass route. Results of the gas monitoring are presented within an Appendix to the ES available to the stakeholders. A gas risk assessment is presented within <b>Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater of Volume 5 of the ES</b> .  In accordance with standard good practice an
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	BS 10175 is currently being revised and the new version is due to be released in September 2010. However, the definition of the conceptual site model remains similar to that above.	89369-609-9534			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The conceptual site model is adequate, although not exhaustive.	89369-609-10049	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment of residual effects is reasonable based on the evidence provided.	89426-609-3777			/	Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (EMMP) has been developed for implementation during the construction of the proposed development and this will be submitted as part of the DCO Application. The EMMP details the potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures to be implemented and associated monitoring requirements.  The EMMP outlines the commitment to routine testing of soils for comparison with the appropriate thresholds/acceptability for re-use criteria, as well as tracking and recording of material placement and ensuring any identified unsuitable materials and/or contaminated soils will be removed and/or remediated and validated as appropriate. Details on how these measures will be implemented will be provided in the site-specific management plans which will be adopted during the construction of the proposed development and this will be submitted as part of the DCO Application. The EMMP details the potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures to be implemented and associated monitoring requirements.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The presence of peat beneath the site may give rise to differential settlement which may result in a more complex design. Therefore, a ground investigation will be required prior to construction to determine the lateral and vertical extent of the peat horizons. In addition, foundations will need to be designed to withstand potential settlement.	89426-609-4763	/			The Environmental Appraisal presented at Stage 2 of the consultation process provided an initial assessment of potential impacts as details of the proposed development (e.g. designs, plans etc) were in the early stages of development. Following intrusive investigations a full assessment of the significance of the potential impacts associated with land contamination during the construction, operation and removal/reinstatement of the proposed development site has been undertaken as part of the impact section presented as <b>Volume 5 of the ES</b> .

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Consultation responses, in particular, details of any site investigations or reclamation schemes that the Environment Agency or local authorities are aware of should be included.	89369-617-1704			/	At Stage 2 intrusive investigations had not been undertaken at the proposed development site. Investigations have since been undertaken (in October of 2010). The findings of the intrusive investigations including relevant risk assessment (human health, phytotoxic, ecotoxic, built environment and controlled waters) are presented within the <b>Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter (Chapter 12 of Volume 5) of the Environmental Statement (ES)</b> . The factual intrusive investigation reports will be available in <b>Appendices to the ES</b> .

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment provides no consideration of cumulative effects.	89369-612-15260	/			Following intrusive investigations a full assessment of the significance of the potential impacts associated with geology and land contamination during the construction, operation and removal/reinstatement of the proposed development site has been undertaken as part of the impact section. The cumulative impacts of identified individual impacts for geology, land contamination and groundwater are presented as <b>Chapter 12 Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (ES)</b> . The <b>Methodology Section of Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter in Volume 5 of the ES</b> includes information on the methodology for assessing cumulative impacts. Full details of the overarching methodology for assessing cumulative impacts as part of the EIA are presented in <b>Volume 1 Chapter 7 of the ES</b> .

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The report states that Estuarine Alluvium often contains high organic matter content and / or peat. Depending on the quantity of the peat that is present there may be implications associated with ground instability and differential settlement during site development. In addition, due to the high organic matter content and the presence of peat, hazardous gases may be present in the ground beneath the site which may have implications during site development. The peat deposits may also be of archaeological importance. These issues have not been discussed in the assessment of significant effects.	89369-611-4157	/			Following intrusive investigations a full assessment of the significance of the potential impacts associated with land contamination during the construction, operation and post operation of the proposed development site has been undertaken as part of the impact section presented in <b>Chapter 12 Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (ES)</b> . The <b>Methodology Section of Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter in Volume 5 of the ES</b> includes information on the methodology for assessing the significance of impacts. Full details, including a table showing the criteria for each significance level is presented within <b>Volume 1 Chapter 7 of the ES</b> .
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Any pollution releases associated with the land uses identified in the surrounding area will have a greater impact if they are located adjacent to the site boundary than those located further away from the site boundary where migration may be inhibited by ground conditions.	89369-611-7927			/	The intrusive investigation has not identified any significant contamination therefore a detailed remediation/reclamation strategy is not considered necessary for this site. However, small/minor, localised areas of slightly elevated contaminants and Made Ground will be suitably dealt with in accordance with procedures identified under the EMMP and more specifically, the MMP and SWMP.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The preliminary CSM identified the potential sources of contamination associated with existing and historical land use at the site and surrounding area. It also considers potential new sources of contamination during the construction works, but it does not consider potential new sources of contamination following development.	89369-611-9716	/			Ground gas monitoring has been undertaken as part of the intrusive investigations at the proposed development site. The results are not indicative of the presence of significant concentrations of ground gases, and observations made during the exploratory investigations were not suggestive of the presence of potential anthropogenic or naturally occurring sources of gas generation (e.g. peat). Due to the absence of structures which may pose a risk of hazardous ground gas build up (i.e. buildings or other enclosed spaces) within the proposed development, and the absence of any identified sources or evidence of elevated ground gas concentrations, it is considered that no ground gas risk is posed to any phase (i.e. construction, operation or legacy) of the proposed development.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	While criteria are presented to qualify the importance and sensitivity of receptors, and also the magnitude of the impacts, there appears to be no table presented within the Section to qualify the assessment of the significance of impacts.	89369-611-12826		/		

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The operation phase impacts are described as No impact on geology and Minor Adverse impact on contaminated land. This however assumes that there no or only limited contaminated soil remaining on site following the construction phase.	89369-611-14994		/		<p>The adherence to legislative requirement and adoption of standard good practices has been assumed as part of the impact assessment and are not considered as formal mitigation within the context of the EIA. Given the adoption of these measures no significant impacts associated with geology and land contamination have been identified during the construction, operation and legacy phases of the proposed development and therefore no formal additional mitigation is considered to be required.</p> <p>During the operation of the proposed development site operational infrastructure (e.g. hardstanding cover, controlled sealed drainage systems and foul and surface water interceptors) will be incorporated into the design. This infrastructure will help prevent impact to the underlying soils, but again these measures are considered to be part of the design and are not considered formal EIA mitigation.</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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There is then a comprehensive review of UK legislation and guidance relating to the assessment of contaminated land and the significance of geological resources (Sections 3.7.4 to 3.7.36).	89369-610-10781			/	The baseline assessment submitted as part of the Environmental Appraisal at Stage 2 was based solely on desk-based information available at the time. At the time of the Stage 2 consultation details of a potential site investigation could not be clarified.  A full intrusive site investigation was undertaken at the proposed development site in October 2010. The works included soil, soil leachate and groundwater sampling and analysis. The results and associated risk assessments are presented within the <b>Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter in Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (ES)</b> .
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Table 3.7.1 details the criteria used to assess the importance and sensitivity of the Geology and the Contaminated Soils and identifies four categories of sensitivity and importance from "High" to "Very Low". These sensitivity criteria are generally considered adequate.	89369-610-11161			/	As part of the production of the <b>Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter in Volume 5 of the ES</b> the table and criterion have been reviewed and revised in line with topic specific requirements. Details of the methodology and tables detailing topic specific magnitude, value and sensitivity and site specific assessment criteria are presented in the <b>Methodology Section of Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter in Volume 5 of the ES</b> . This section also includes information on the methodology for assessing the significance of impacts. Full details, including a table showing the criteria for each significance level is presented within <b>Volume 1 Chapter 7 of the ES</b> .
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Table 3.7.2 describes the criteria used to determine the magnitude of effect. In this instance, while the concept of change is used with regards to geology, it is not clear what 'change' to geology may represent</li> </ul>	89369-610-11436	/			The Environmental Appraisal submitted as Stage 2 did not consider potential new sources of contamination during the operation of the proposed development site. As part of the submission of <b>Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter of Volume 5 of the ES</b> potential new sources of contamination are identified for this phase of work. <b>Chapter 12 Volume 5 of the ES</b> provides more comprehensive details than presented at Stage 2.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	It is further noted that geological change is a natural phenomenon which may be accelerated in certain circumstances, for example, through erosion etc. For contaminated land one aspect of a high magnitude impact is described as "very significant change to the extent that UK legislation is contravened leading to prosecution of the responsible party". In some instances, this may be possible, for example if, during the construction works a spillage were to occur from a Contractor's fuel store. In many cases, however, contaminated land may arise as a result of historical legacy and it is difficult to determine who the responsible party would be.	89369-610-11651			/	The intrusive investigation has not identified any significant contamination therefore a detailed remediation/reclamation strategy is not considered necessary for this site. However, small/minor, localised areas of slightly elevated contaminants and made ground will be suitably dealt with under the appropriate management plan.



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	CONDITION: During construction, no development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for prevention of pollution during the construction phase has been approved by the Local Planning Authority.  REASON: To prevent pollution of the water environment.	89090-613-4242	/			In the UK, it is an expectation that construction and operational sites are subject to a number of 'standard' health and safety, infrastructure and environmental control requirements which ensure legal compliance and the adoption of standard good practices/control measures. These will be adhered to/adopted for the proposed development.  The intrusive investigation has not identified any significant contamination therefore a detailed remediation/reclamation strategy is not considered necessary for this site. However, small/minor, localised areas of slightly elevated contaminants and made ground will be suitably dealt with under the appropriate management plan.
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	CONDITION: If, during development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present at the site then no further development (unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority) shall be carried out until the developer has submitted, and obtained written approval from the Local Planning Authority for, an amendment to the remediation strategy detailing how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with.	89092-613-299	/			The adherence to legislative requirement and adoption of standard good practices has been assumed as part of the impact assessment and are not considered as formal mitigation within the context of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Given the adoption of these measures no significant impacts associated with geology, land contamination and groundwater have been identified during the construction, operation and removal/reinstatement phases of the proposed development and therefore no formal additional mitigation is considered to be required.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Many of the construction impacts can be mitigated by standard good working practice via an Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan.	89369-613-13301			/	During the operation of the proposed development site operational infrastructure (e.g. hardstanding cover, controlled sealed drainage systems and foul and surface water interceptors) will be incorporated into the design. This infrastructure will help prevent impact to the underlying soils, but again is not considered formal EIA mitigation.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	We have provided consideration of the EMMP framework in Section 4.3 of this report, and the potential effectiveness of mitigation should be reconsidered in the light of this.	89369-613-13441	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Additional mitigation measures for protection of construction workers to prevent exposure to hazardous ground gases associated with peat underlying the site.  Mitigation measure such as good standard working methods which will be adopted via and EMMP must be validated/audited as happening on site.  Mitigation measures such as dust and particulate emissions at the site boundary must be in place during the construction works to prevent exposure to human health.	89426-613-4292	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	A detailed ground investigation and quantitative risk assessments are required prior to construction to assess any potential contamination exposure risks to site occupants and future site maintenance workers, if any contamination is identified than a reclamation strategy report will be required in order to detail how any remediation works will be validated and monitored.	89426-613-5113	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Sampling will be required if potential contamination is identified during the construction activities or if it is intended to re-use soils during the construction work.	89369-614-2217	/			In accordance with standard good practice an management plan has been developed for implementation during the construction of the proposed development and this will be submitted as part of the Development Consent Order Application. The plan details the potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures to be implemented and associated monitoring requirements.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The construction phase residual impacts are described as having a Negligible adverse impact on geology and a minor adverse impact on contaminated land. This, however, assumes that the construction phase mitigations are correctly implemented and without checks and audits this is unlikely to be sustained.	89369-614-14686	/			The plan outlines the commitment to routine testing of soils for comparison with the appropriate thresholds/acceptability for re-use criteria, as well as tracking and recording of material placement and ensuring any identified unsuitable materials and/or contaminated soils will be removed and/or remediated and validated as appropriate. Details on how these measures will be implemented will be provided in the site-specific management plans which will be adopted during the construction
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment provides no consideration of monitoring.	89369-614-15348	/			The plan and other documents set out requirements for validation and independent checks (e.g. audits) to ensure that the stated management and monitoring requirements are being implemented in the appropriate manner.

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Incorporating the site investigation results would provide increased confidence in the findings.	89369-615-2472	/			The route of the Cannington Bypass had not been finalised at Stage 2 and as such no intrusive investigations of the proposed route had been undertaken. Upon finalisation of the proposed route, intrusive investigations have subsequently been undertaken to support the desk-based baseline information presented in the Environmental Appraisal. The factual report providing full details of the intrusive investigations will be available for review by the stakeholders and is presented as an <b>Appendix to Volume 5 Chapter 12 of the Environmental Statement.</b>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 275	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 horrified to see that your proposals for a bypass so severely compromise Brymore School. The building of new and fast road, so close to the residential accommodation provided at the school for 200 people would seem to fly in the face of national government Safer Routes to School initiatives. It is essential that the students continue to have good safe pedestrian access to Cannington for recreational and curriculum purposes. This would be bad enough, but the unique offer of Brymore School is the running of a school farm. They only own 30 acres and your proposal to purchase 20 of them will cause considerable damage to the curriculum provided at the school. The proximity of these acres to the school is essential as the agricultural element is a closely integrated element of the whole school curriculum. Please reconsider your plans.</p>	8964-442-3391	/			<p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy presented the first outline proposals for the Cannington bypass. At Stage 1 consultation EDF Energy explained that its favoured option around Cannington was a route to the west of the village. However it also presented an alternative route around the east of the village at Stage 1 consultation. Consultees were asked for their comments on each. At the same stage, two other alternatives (the outer western route and a 'no bypass' option) were presented as options that had been considered and discounted.</p> <p>A number of statutory consultees provided comments regarding the alternative bypass routes. Comments received at Stage 1 consultation expressed concerns that both the eastern and western options were too close to residential properties in the village, with the western option potentially resulting in increased noise, dust and pollution. However, a number of respondents also suggested that the western bypass would have less impact on the local ecology as it was located a good distance away from any protected habitat sites. The western route was ultimately considered to be the preferred option by many statutory consultees because of the smaller land take and the location was considered beneficial from a landscape perspective.</p> <p>Comments from the general public were divided. However, slightly more people felt that the eastern option would cause less disruption and had the potential to leave a flood barrier as a future legacy for Cannington. There were also a number of respondents concerned about the potential impact of the western route on Brymore School. However, those in favour of the western bypass felt it would affect fewer dwellings and be the shorter and more direct route.</p> <p>At Stage 2 consultation EDF Energy presented its preferred bypass route as the western option which would run approximately south to north commencing at the existing western roundabout on the A39 southern bypass and ending at the C182 (Rodway) north of Cannington.</p> <p>The process of arriving at the preferred route was informed by the comments received at Stage 1, as well as a series of preliminary environmental assessments and the decision was made by evaluating and comparing the relative merits of each</p>
Tractivity 62209	Public	Stage 1	<p>Relief Road</p> <p>With reference to the above, I would point out that the building of a by-pass is essential before construction of Hinkley 'C' starts. I very much hope an Easterly route will be chosen (through more open country and away from the Quarry)</p> <p>You will appreciate my concern from my address. This road is unlit, with a poorly maintained footpath and inadequate speed controls (not taken far enough to the N. to include Grain Store traffic.) At peak times crossing the road is already difficult.</p> <p>I hope this matter will be given priority before construction begins.</p>	9429-557-0		/		
Tractivity 231	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Cannington bypass options</p> <p>Box ticked: East of the village</p> <p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>The eastern route could be modified to commence at Sandford Corner ( Wembdon Turning from A39) with little increase in length, no affect on residential areas, and elimination of an accident black spot (Sandford Corner)</p>	8932-557-1261		/		
Tractivity 62237	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	<p>An additional concern is that this new road not only duplicates some 300m of the existing shorter road (and therefore cannot be considered cost effective by EDF energy) but is far straighter. My fear is that traffic would have a tendency to travel at much greater speeds along this new route. The present highway already poses difficulties to the daily logistics of my agricultural vehicles when entering/exiting the small drive of my home. Consideration to the safety and transportation of my young children to and from school is also sought as I believe that this new road would heighten the dangers above.</p>	8780-557-962	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Eastern route option -Flood Risk  The majority of this proposal is in flood zone 3B and 3A and is likely to pose the greatest engineering challenge for construction, subject to it passing the sequential and exception tests. This option requires a full FRA which highlights the vulnerable nature of this site and how multiple watercourse crossings and surface water disposal issues will be dealt with.	88830-1741-296	/			option.  The outer western route was discounted at Stage 1 consultation following analysis of traffic modelling, which demonstrated that although the journey time for drivers travelling from Bridgwater would be less using the outer western bypass, drivers would perceive the route as being longer and this would deter them from using it. This would mean that drivers would be likely to continue driving through Cannington to access the Hinkley Point C site. Furthermore, the baseline environmental assessments indicated that the route could pass through some sensitive areas of historic importance.
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	The eastern bypass option also passes within 300 metres of a licensed groundwater abstraction at Rodway Farm. This abstraction is licensed for domestic usage, measures should be taken to ensure that this abstraction will not be affected by construction works or by the finished development.	88830-1741-2004	/			The eastern bypass was discounted at Stage 2 because it was a longer route which would result in greater loss of high quality agricultural land and affect on a greater number of properties. The road would also require elevating to reduce vulnerability to flooding this would result in a greater environmental impact in terms of landscape character due to the high tranquillity of the area and limited built development in the vicinity. Finally, the eastern route would have crossed minor and major aquifers, at low depth, increasing the potential for contamination.
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	It is considered by Sedgemoor District Council that the eastern route would significantly impact on the landscape character of the area, particularly as a greater amount of land will be affected and the proposed road would need to be elevated to reduce the liability of flooding.	88350-1741-1387	/			The western route was selected for the following reasons:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the western route is the shortest route option, thereby minimising the amount of land take. In terms of noise and air quality, the route would have an impact on fewer properties than a 'no bypass' or the alternative routes;</li> <li>although the western route would result in the loss of some landscape features, including hedgerows and trees, it is considered that the loss of these features can be satisfactorily mitigated compared with the other options;</li> <li>groundwater is at a greater depth relative to the alternative options, minimising the potential for pollution due to ground contamination;</li> <li>ground conditions are preferable to the other options and would preclude the need for pre-loading;</li> <li>the western route would cross fewer watercourses</li> </ul>
Tractivity 184	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference  there is insufficient room to provide a bypass east of the village. it would be more appropriate to provide a bypass on the west of the village after the existing bypass.	8901-1741-1467	/			
Tractivity 187	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference  Less impact on village, less populated area, mostly farmland that would be less disrupted than local population and school close to western proposals.	8903-1741-1706		/		
Tractivity 205	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference  I feel that if the bypass is built on the east of the village on the flood plain, then this might cause problems in later years, as the water will have to go somewhere if it does flood towards the houses and they are flooded, EDF will not want to pay to rectify the damage or pay the additional insurance premiums!	8911-1741-1220		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 212	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: East of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference Less impact on residential areas Western route could entail the removal of a vast amount of newly planted trees which if left to mature will benefit local wildlife and help to reduce global warming.	8917-1741-1066		/		and particularly would not cross Cannington Brook, which is identified to be a sensitive ecological feature in the area; <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>the habitats along the western route are largely of limited biodiversity value and the route would not cross any designated sites; and</li><li>the western route would minimise any amenity impacts of the centre of the village and would have a lesser impact than any alternative routes.</li></ul>
Tractivity 225	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference A bypass to the east of the village would cause problems due to the risk of Cannington Brook flooding, this area being flood zone 3a, and flooding having occurred in the recent past. Damage having been caused to housing.	8927-1741-1110	/			Finally, EDF Energy understands that may people would prefer a Bridgwater bypass and believe that this should be provided instead of the western Cannington bypass. EDF Energy do not consider a Bridgwater bypass is necessary to mitigate the impact of Hinkley Point C construction and a full response to these comments can be found in the <b>Transport - Transport Strategy - Northern Bridgwater Bypass</b> section of this report.
Tractivity 242	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference I think the eastern bypass would be a lot quieter for the village.	8938-1741-1930		/		More information on the decision making process and relative merits of each the route option can be found in the <b>Alternative Site Assessment</b> document, appended to the <b>Planning Statement</b> .
Tractivity 249	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: West of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference To the East would open the development floodgates and the higher speed proposal would be twice as noisy (60 mph is much noisier than 40!!) but the West proposal is planned too close to the village. Why not make it from the roundabout but slightly west of Brymore School land.	8942-1741-1342	/			
Tractivity 353	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference i think this is best because most traffic will come from the bridgwater direction. also this will not affect the village with any flood risk.	9041-1741-1174		/		
Tractivity 360	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference I do not believe either route is the correct one but since another option is not included in your tick box questionnaire I am opting for the least intrusive and most likely to be used. You completely ignore the effects of the prevailing south westerly winds in your initial attempts to quantify the effects of noise, air and dust pollution on local residents. If you take account of these it is evident that the eastern route is the better of two bad options. The A38 into Bridgwater is already congested at rush hour making the town impossible to access without queueing. When your 3000 (50%) 'local' employees (ie travelling for 90 minutes or less!) are using the route it will be gridlocked.	9048-1741-1292		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 369	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference If we have to have a bypass, west of village is sensible option as part of the existing bypass would be used and it is the cheaper, shorter route. Totally against a road to the east because:- it would have to be elevated and cause an eyesore: it would lower the value of property: restrict existing views: cause noise, dust, pollution and because of flooding issues here could create more flooding problems.	9056-1741-1082	/			
Tractivity 370	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: West of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference The east road crosses natural wetland with dykes, because of this the road will be longer & built up. This will disrupt natural habitat & we may lose some wildlife. The road would be in a very open area so that noise levels would not be absorbed. This would cause a constant drone of traffic for the villages	9057-1741-1069	/			
Tractivity 466	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Avoids adverse affect on Brymore School. I understand earthworks for east bypass would be useful re flood defence	9356-1741-3359		/		
Tractivity 569	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: West of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference Please give reasons for your preference East route will cut up many agricultural holdings and the flood plane is very vulnerable	9238-1741-1073	/			
Tractivity 575	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Please give reasons for your preference The existing bypass is already and a west bypass would not relieve this. Also the east side is less developed, so least traffic noise disturbance for residents as well getting Hinkley traffic away from the other A39 traffic earlier.	9244-1741-1809		/		
Tractivity 581	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Please give reasons for your preference The western route is uncomfortably close to Brymore College and *local farms and the bulk of the traffic from the east would need to use the existing by-pass to reach the western route. The eastern route affects fewer houses and spoil from the construction site could be used to provide as embankment against flood possibility.	9250-1741-1843		/		



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 50878	Public	Stage 1	Sixth, and finally, I am struck by the fact that, where the questionnaire offers a choice between two or more options, the options are confined to those which would be fully acceptable to EDF. A very clear example of this is the questionnaire's treatment of the options for the Cannington bypass see my response to question 5 above. In particular, the questionnaire (besides making no reference to a bypass from Dunball) fails to air the possibility of "the outer western route" Even on EDF's own showing this is a possible and indeed a viable option, and many people in Cannington might have voted for it in preference to the other options if they had been given the chance. The fact that EDF does not like it is not of itself a good reason for excluding this possibility (or for excluding the possibility of a Dunball bypass).	9393-1741-15921		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The Transport Appraisal presents the options of an eastern and western bypass for Cannington. The authorities are concerned that EDF's preference for the western option is not supported by a robust and detailed technical appraisal of these two options and any other options that should have been considered. For instance an option further to the west which was shown in earlier consultation does not feature in EDF's assessment.	89311-554-1787	/			
Tractivity 62455	Public	Stage 2	Not surprisingly (Personal details removed) again took the opportunity to express the opinion that the western outer route should be provided instead.	10079-1741-2839		/		
Tractivity 701	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? If a bypass for Cannington is approved then an outer Western Bypass would be preferable as fewer properties would be affected and Brymore School grounds could be left untouched. It could also be connected to a Northern Bridgwater Bypass, thus alleviating Bridgwater/Cannington of extra traffic congestion.	9461-559-3332		/		
Tractivity 1001	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? An Eastern bypass would give an opportunity to take all traffic direct to site (see attached letter)	9759-559-2890		/		
Tractivity 1042	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? You are trying to get out of the problem by the cheapest option only an eastern bypass will work.	9800-559-2727		/		
Tractivity 1044	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Bypass on the Eastern side would provide access options for a link to Dunball	9802-559-2940		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1081	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? No I think that an eastern bypass would be best and even better if linked to a Bridgwater bypass from the A38 north of Bridgwater.	9839-559-4362		/		
Tractivity 1117	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Prefer Eastern Route	9875-559-2971		/		
Tractivity 1170	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? I think the bypass should be to the east as it will affect fewer people and if at all anyone and take the road up to the existing road at Combwich.	9928-559-3341		/		
Tractivity 222	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: East of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference Although a road to the east of Cannington will be the more expensive option, it will provide more long term benefits. Such a road, being elevated, will provide a useful flood barrier and will be well situated if and when the Government decide to build a new bridge over the river Parrett and connect to the M5 more directly. The western route will effectively cut off Brymore School.	8924-559-1475		/		
Tractivity 261	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: East of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference Most of the traffic will be coming from the east, I presume, and this would be the logical side for a bypass.	8950-559-978		/		
Tractivity 272	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: East of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference Less dwellings in close proximity than western route. Does not cross any private drivers or minor roads therefore causes less inconvenience to residents living down size roads and does not interfere with Brymore School.	8961-559-925		/		
Tractivity 326	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Far less disruption to village if east route is chosen.	9014-559-1461		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 342	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: East of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference The land to the east is flat and uninteresting and disruption for locals will be minimised.	9030-559-1714		/		
Tractivity 380	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference My preference is that there is no new road built. But as this has already been decided by EDF the only clear choice is East to keep the disasterous traffic conditions and noise levels as far away from Shurton as possible	9066-559-1952		/		
Tractivity 381	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference East of the village is a shorter route for transport from the motorway junction.	9067-559-1623		/		
Tractivity 466	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Avoids adverse affect on Brymore School. I understand earthworks for east bypass would be useful re flood defence	9356-559-3359		/		
Tractivity 492	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Providing the east road does not act as a dam for any flood water.	9165-559-1138		/		
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	5.7 Alternatively, if a bypass must be considered on the western side of Cannington, it is urged that an alternative route be looked at that passes around the western side of the School, avoiding the School grounds and immediately adjacent farmland, which would then substantially reduce both disturbance and health and safety risks to the pupils, staff and parents.	10242-554-12659		/		
Tractivity 1138	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Firstly, EDF have not made any provision for the increased traffic along the A39 from Bridgwater to Cannington which is already a busy road where there have been several accidents over the years. Secondly, we believe the Eastern bypass would have affected fewer properties. Thirdly, a temporary road dedicated to Hinkley Point traffic from the M5 at Dunball (north of Bridgwater) would render a western bypass unnecessary. Finally, the Western Bypass route goes over Brymore School Lane which is lined with mature trees and, as we understand, is in a National Heritage park.	9896-41-3216		/		

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	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>I feel that if the bypass is built on the east of the village on the flood plain, then this might cause problems in later years, as the water will have to go somewhere if it does flood towards the houses and they are flooded, EDF will not want to pay to rectify the damage or pay the additional insurance premiums!</p>	8911-676-1220	/			<p>At the time of the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy proposed two search areas, to the east and west of Cannington respectively, as potentially suitable locations for the provision of a bypass. An initial assessment of flood risk issues relating to both proposed bypass routes was carried out following feedback regarding flood risk concerns, from key statutory consultees, including the Environment Agency, during the Stage 1 consultation. Using a sequential approach in line with planning guidance as outlined in Planning Policy Statement 25 (Department for Communities and Local Government Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25): Development and Flood Risk, 2010), it was identified that there were significant flood risk issues relating to development of the eastern bypass route compared with the western bypass route.</p> <p>EDF Energy acknowledged the risk associated with the eastern bypass route, which was also identified by both statutory consultees and the public during the Stage 1 consultation. The combination of these concerns and the assessment undertaken by EDF Energy was key to the selection of the western bypass route as the preferred option for incorporation in the Stage 2 consultation. On this basis, specific concerns regarding flood risk to the village of Cannington as a result of the impact of the eastern bypass were addressed through its removal from the proposals, and they were therefore not addressed in any further detail at subsequent stages of consultation.</p> <p>The flood risk aspects of site selection is provided in the <b>Overarching Flood Risk Assessment Report (OFRAR)</b> which has been submitted with this application for development consent and covers all of the associated development sites. The <b>OFRAR</b> also highlights specific PPS25 issues which relate to this site.</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 and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	<p>2.3.13 The proposals for the preferred alignment of the Cannington Bypass from the existing roundabout on the A39 Southern Bypass to Rodway Road (C182) remain unchanged but the proposals now include a number of measures to address previous concerns regarding pedestrians, noise and ecology.</p> <p>2.3.14 In terms of flood risk, the proposed route is currently a green field site and lies within Flood Zone 1.</p>	89865-672-11249	/			<p>The current land use along the route of the proposed Cannington bypass is primarily greenfield agricultural land. It is a requirement of the planning process that the design of the Cannington bypass development does not have a negative impact on the wider area; this was incorporated into the proposals prior to and following the Stage 2 consultation.</p> <p>At Stage 1 it was identified that the proposed bypass was located in an area at low risk of flooding. However, to confirm this situation and to understand the potential interaction between the Mill Stream (running alongside the access road to Brymore School) and the proposed bypass, detailed hydraulic modelling was carried out prior to and following the Stage 2 consultation. Previous studies and best practice guidance were used to inform the development of the model. The results of the hydraulic modelling were provided within the Flood Risk Assessment reviewed by key statutory consultees (including the Environment Agency) as part of the Stage 2 consultation.</p> <p>Following comments, regarding flood risk and drainage received from consultees at the Stage 2 consultation, further work was carried out to refine the hydraulic modelling. As part of the investigation, it was found that there is a limited flood risk to land at the point where the proposed bypass and the Mill Stream watercourse cross over (<b>Cannington Bypass Flood Risk Assessment</b>). However, the design of the bypass is such that it is raised above the worst-case scenario model maximum flood water depth during extreme events. To ensure that water continues to be conveyed along the watercourse and thereby causes no increase in flood risk downstream of the bypass, further work was carried out following the Stage 2 consultation to address comments regarding the wider flood risk. EDF Energy has developed the design to provide a series of appropriately-sized box culverts through the proposed bypass to ensure that it would not increase the flooding impact to the village of Cannington. These box culverts would comprise a 2.1m wide by 1.2m high box culvert along the current alignment of the Mill Stream and additional twin 1.0m wide by 0.6m high box culverts built into the left bank.</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 222	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: East of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference  Although a road to the east of Cannington will be the more expensive option, it will provide more long term benefits. Such a road, being elevated, will provide a useful flood barrier and will be well situated if and when the Government decide to build a new bridge over the river Parrett and connect to the M5 more directly. The western route will effectively cut off Brymore School	8924-677-1475	/			At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy proposed two search areas, to the east and west of Cannington respectively, as potentially suitable locations for the provision of the Cannington bypass. An initial assessment of flood risk issues relating to both of the proposed bypass routes was carried out following feedback from the consultation. Using a sequential approach in line with planning guidance as outlined in Planning Policy Statement 25 (Department for Communities and Local Government. Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25): Development and Flood Risk, 2010), it was identified that there were significant flood risk issues relating to development of the eastern bypass route compared with the western bypass route. EDF Energy acknowledged the risk associated with the eastern bypass route and this was key to the selection of the western bypass route as the preferred option for incorporation in the Stage 2 consultation.
Tractivity 62414	Public	Stage 2	By avoiding the western bye pass there would be no need for E.D.F to put any floodwater into Cannington Brook, as the eastern bye pass would drain off down stream from the village. Which in wet times is prone to flooding. There are approximately 300 homes in Cannington, which already have problems with insurance.	10055-677-1551	/			The flood risk aspects of site selection is provided in the <b>Overarching Flood Risk Assessment Report (OFRAR)</b> , which has been submitted with this application for development consent and which covers all of the associated development sites. The <b>OFRAR</b> also highlights specific PPS25 issues which relate to this site.
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	Included within the grounds of the School are a number of lakes emphasising the complexity of the drainage within the general area.	10242-677-8528			/	At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy presented the western bypass as its preferred route, meaning it would no longer be considering the eastern route. On this basis, specific concerns regarding flood risk to the village of Cannington as a result of the impact of the eastern bypass were addressed through its removal from the proposals, and they were therefore not addressed in any further detail at subsequent stages of consultation.
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Issue: The drainage strategy is incomplete  Comment: We would expect to see more SUDS conveyance techniques used to deal with water quality and quantity before it gets to the balancing ponds. We expect more micro drainage outputs with future submissions, showing the pre-development and post-development run-off rates and required attenuation volumes.	89085-677-67	/			The current land use along the route of the proposed bypass is primarily greenfield agricultural land. It is a requirement of the planning process that the design of the development does not have a negative impact on the wider area and this has been incorporated into the proposals prior to and following the Stage 2 consultation. Issues associated with flooding and additional drainage into the Cannington Brook were raised as specific concerns by consultees during the Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultations.
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	We would recommend that the highway drainage from the bypass road and the park and ride is linked together with the Flood Alleviation Schemes.  Action: Further details on the drainage strategy to be submitted	89085-677-808	/			Due to the natural topography (surface features) of the site, the alignment of the bypass is characterised by low points near the southern and northern extent with a high point approximately midway (in the vicinity of the cutting). As a result of these features, the surface water drainage network is divided into two catchment areas so that surface water can drain by
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The operational phase mitigation describes how in the first instance vegetated drainage systems should be adopted to control surface water discharges. Although where these systems are impractical conventional drainage systems should be adopted with provision to control and treat pollutants  This is an appropriate level of mitigation and is in accordance with best practice for controlling pollution to controlled waters.	89370-677-3347	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	- There is no evidence that the specific drainage requirements at the cutting section has been considered.	89408-677-14488	/			<p>gravity. As part of a sustainable drainage system (SuDS) scheme, the rate of discharge of surface water from the bypass to the local watercourse network is restricted to a greenfield run-off rate. In order to attenuate the surface water prior to its off-site discharge, a series of measures were incorporated including filter and carrier drains along the length of the route and two balancing ponds. If the overall proposals are approved, there will be an on-line balancing pond at the northern extent of the route and an off-line balancing pond at the southern extent of the route. Both balancing ponds have been designed to accommodate a storm with a 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) plus an allowance for climate change (see the <b>Cannington Bypass Flood Risk Assessment</b>, which has been submitted with this application for development consent, for further detail).</p> <p>At the time of the Stage 2 consultation it was anticipated that the surface water drainage from the southern extent of the proposed bypass would discharge into a proposed new Flood Relief Channel (FRC). EDF Energy does not propose to construct the new FRC as part of the application for Development Consent. It is proposed that the surface water drainage would discharge into the existing highway drainage ditch at the greenfield run-off rate. The discharge of surface water at the greenfield run-off rate is designed to ensure that there is no increase in flood risk as a result of the proposed development.</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	<p>Eastern route option</p> <p>-Flood Risk</p> <p>The majority of this proposal is in flood zone 3B and 3A and is likely to pose the greatest engineering challenge for construction, subject to it passing the sequential and exception tests. This option requires a full FRA which highlights the vulnerable nature of this site and how multiple watercourse crossings and surface water disposal issues will be dealt with.</p>	88830-675-296	/			<p>At the time of the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy proposed two search areas, to the east and west of Cannington respectively, as potentially suitable locations for the provision of a bypass. An initial assessment of flood risk issues related to both of the proposed bypass routes was carried out following feedback from the consultation. Using a sequential approach in line with planning guidance as outlined in Planning Policy Statement 25 (Department for Communities and Local Government- Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25): Development and Flood Risk, 2010), it was identified that there were significant flood risk issues related to development of the eastern bypass route compared with the western bypass route.</p> <p>EDF Energy acknowledged the risk associated with the eastern bypass route which was also identified by both statutory consultees and the public during the Stage 1 consultation. The combination of these concerns and the assessment undertaken by EDF Energy was key to the selection of the western bypass route as the preferred option for incorporation in the Stage 2 consultation.</p> <p>The flood risk aspects of site selection is provided in the <b>Overarching Flood Risk Assessment Report (OFRAR)</b>, which has been submitted with this application for development consent and which covers all of the associated development sites. The <b>OFRAR</b> also highlights specific PPS25 issues which relate to this site, along with key planning documents.</p> <p>At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy presented the western bypass as its preferred route, meaning EDF Energy would no longer be considering the eastern route. On this basis, specific concerns regarding flood risk to the village of Cannington as a result of the impact of the eastern bypass have been addressed through its removal from the proposals, and were therefore not addressed in any further detail at subsequent stages of consultation. The current land use along the route of the proposed bypass is primarily greenfield agricultural land. It is a requirement of the planning process that the design of the development does not have a negative impact on the wider area and this was incorporated into the proposals prior to and following the Stage 2</p>
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	<p>Western route option</p> <p>-Flood Risk</p> <p>This route is all within flood zone 1. Due to its size an FRA is required providing details on surface water disposal and any local ditch/watercourse crossing design details.</p>	88830-675-2553	/			
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>This route could pose a flood hazard to the village. By building this road it could act as a flood barrier by keeping the water in the village in times of flood. The village floods on a regular basis and we enclose photos that show evidence of this happening. Appendix C.</p>	8746-675-4594	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	<p>In addition, the authorities consider that more detailed consultation is required with Sedgemoor District Council. Discussions are also required around potential long term sustainability benefits or impacts of the by-pass options including:</p> <p>a)Flood risk management for Cannington;</p>	88060-675-2299	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	<p>Hydrogeology, Hydrology, Drainage and Flood Risk</p> <p>It is noted that further studies are proposed in relation to Hydrogeology; Hydrology, Drainage &amp; Flood Defence. The completion of a Flood Risk Assessment (approach to be agreed with the Environment Agency) is considered to be a priority study. Depending on the location and design, there is potential for the bypass to either exacerbate flood risk, or serve as a flood risk management structure with legacy benefit.</p> <p>An understanding of what is possible to secure enhancements to existing flood defences on the Parrett and for the village as a whole is also required, if the western option were to be considered the preferred route.</p>	88340-675-2422	/			



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	It is considered by Sedgemoor District Council that the eastern route would significantly impact on the landscape character of the area, particularly as a greater amount of land will be affected and the proposed road would need to be elevated to reduce the liability of flooding.	88350-675-1387	/			consultation. Issues associated with flooding and additional drainage into the Cannington Brook were raised as specific concerns by consultees at the Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultations.  At the Stage 1 consultation EDF Energy identified that the proposed western bypass was located in an area at low risk of flooding; however, to confirm this situation and to understand the potential interaction between the Mill Stream (running alongside the access road to Brymore School) and the proposed bypass, detailed hydraulic modelling was carried out prior to and following the Stage 2 consultation. Previous studies and best practice guidance were used to inform the development of the model. The results of the hydraulic modelling were provided to key consultees, including the Environment Agency and the Somerset Drainage Board Consortium as part of the Stage 2 consultation.
Tractivity 205	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference  I feel that if the bypass is built on the east of the village on the flood plain, then this might cause problems in later years, as the water will have to go somewhere if it does flood towards the houses and they are flooded, EDF will not want to pay to rectify the damage or pay the additional insurance premiums!	8911-675-1220	/			Following on from comments, regarding flood risk and drainage, received from statutory consultees (including the Environment Agency) during the Stage 2 consultation, further work was carried out to refine the hydraulic modelling. As part of the investigation, it was found that there is a limited flood risk at the point where the bypass would cross over the Mill Stream watercourse (see the <b>Cannington Bypass Flood Risk Assessment</b> ); however, the design of the bypass is such that it is raised above the worst-case scenario model predicted maximum flood water depth during extreme events. To ensure that water continues to be conveyed along the watercourse and so that there is no increase in flood risk to property downstream of where the bypass would be located; further work was carried out following the Stage 2 consultation. EDF Energy has developed the design to provide a series of appropriately-sized box culverts through the bypass to ensure that the bypass would not increase the flooding impact to the village of Cannington. These box culverts would comprise a 2.1m wide by 1.2m high box culvert along the current alignment of the Mill Stream, including a mammal shelf, and additional twin 1.0m wide by 0.6m high box culverts built into the left bank. At Stage 2 consultees had expressed concerns regarding the proposals for an underpass and the implications this would have on flood risk and drainage, close to the main drive for Brymore School. Following further work, the underpass was removed from the proposals presented by EDF Energy as part of the Stage 2 Update consultation.
Tractivity 225	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference  A bypass to the east of the village would cause problems due to the risk of Cannington Brook flooding, this area being flood zone 3a, and flooding having occurred in the recent past. Damage having been caused to housing.	8927-675-1110	/			
Tractivity 353	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference  i think this is best because most traffic will come from the bridgwater direction. also this will not affect the village with any flood risk.	9041-675-1174	/			
Tractivity 466	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference  Avoids adverse affect on Brymore School. I understand earthworks for east bypass would be useful re flood defence	9356-675-3359	/			
Tractivity 569	Public	Stage 1	East route will cut up many agricultural holdings and the flood plane is very vulnerable	9238-675-1227	/			
Tractivity 62299	Public	Stage 2	The park & ride facility, taking into consideration the huge size still proposed is of major concern for the nearby properties, as is the risk of flooding.	9990-675-818	/			
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The village has a natural asset with Cannington Brook running through part of it and the Council do not want it spoilt. All water drains downhill from the Quantock Hills and surrounding area to this brook. The proposed park and ride area is in close proximity to the brook and there is concern with regard to pollutants and flood water running off the proposed western bypass and the park and ride which could ruin the natural habitat of the brook.	10221-675-5196	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	2.5 The underpass is due to be constructed on a site noted for high water table, with ramps leading down into the underpass from either end, with the result that it is likely the underpass will not only collect water but over the course of time soil and cow manure will also build up, which it will be impossible to remove other than by hand due to height restriction. The assumption is it will be the responsibility of the School to ensure this is cleaned regularly, increasing staffing costs.	10242-675-5592	/			Due to the natural topography (surface features) of the site, the alignment of the bypass is characterised by low points near the southern and northern extent with a high point approximately midway (in the vicinity of the cutting). As a result of these features, the surface water drainage network is divided into two catchment areas so that surface water can drain by gravity. As part of a sustainable drainage scheme, EDF Energy would ensure that the rate of discharge of surface water from the bypass to the local watercourse network is restricted to a greenfield run-off rate. In order to attenuate the surface water prior to its off-site discharge, a series of measures have been incorporated into the surface water drainage design including filter and carrier drains along the length of the route and two balancing ponds. There would be an on-line balancing pond at the northern extent of the route and an off-line balancing pond at the southern extent of the route. Both balancing ponds have been designed to accommodate a storm with a 1% annual exceedance probability plus an allowance for climate change ( <b>Cannington Bypass Flood Risk Assessment</b> ).
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Flood Risk Management: The drainage strategy for this site needs to be developed further to ensure a sustainable approach has been taken within this area. It should also ensure that impact on third parties does not occur.	89069-675-5938	/			
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	There must be enough storage provided to allow for the 1 in 100 year storm plus an allowance for climate change.	89085-675-421	/			
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Proposals should incorporate details showing the amount of impermeable area on site and how the required size of balancing ponds will be accommodated on site.	89085-675-646	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Secondly, the authorities are concerned that the only environmental issue considered by EDF Energy associated with construction of the by-pass is the impact on the flood plain. There is no comprehensive assessment of the transport and environmental impacts associated with a Bridgwater bypass, including a flood risk assessment, which could demonstrate that any disbenefits from the bypass are offset by gains elsewhere.	89311-675-4949			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Design measures to ensure that surface water drainage flows are restricted to green field run-off rates is considered of critical importance if flood risk in the Cannington area is not to be increased. The incorporation of sustainable drainage measures such as balancing ponds, swales and filter drains etc. will therefore be encouraged.	89366-675-7582	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	However, this chapter suggests that flood risk posed to the proposed alignment is low, this needs clarification.	89370-675-6103	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The alleviation of flood risk effects are separated making understanding clearer.	89370-675-9360			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Regional Flood Risk Appraisals and Strategic Flood Risk Assessments should be used in conjunction with local development plans to identify sites suitable for each development type. This may be more problematic with development such as the Cannington bypass, where other determining factors may dictate the route. Particularly with respect to the residential developments, at a local level the Sequential Test should be applied to the whole planning area, as there may be other lower risk sites that are more satisfactory for development.	89408-675-2503	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The following concerns have been identified with respect of the flood risk study report for Cannington Bypass: - There is no evidence of consultation with Environment Agency as well as the Somerset Drainage Boards Consortium.	89408-675-13386	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	- Confirmation is required with regards to a permissible discharge agreement.	89408-675-13618	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	- There is no evidence that the specific drainage requirements at the cutting section has been considered.	89408-675-14488	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment does not fully consider the risk of flooding caused by fluvial sources as the crossing of Mill Stream is not investigated fully.	89426-675-7392	/			
Tractivity 62983	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	There is also the consideration of added flood risk on both sides of the hill between the A39 and the road to Hinkley.	89689-675-6171	/			
13	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	There is a flood risk; and the current A39 southern Cannington by-pass will be compromised by the installation of a roundabout to allow access to this area.	89802-675-713	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	The Indicative Layout Plan for the bypass shows a number of surface water lagoons along the alignment and the site-specific Flood Risk Study describes how the volume and peak surface water runoff from the new highway will be managed to prevent a risk of increased flooding in the area. SCC is satisfied the proposals are adequate.	89865-675-11654			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 542	Public	Stage 1	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?  1. Miles from site and will make risk of flooding worse.	9211-575-2920			/	
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	In the context of the off-site associated development, the Environment Agency believes that section 4.22.10 of draft EN-01 makes it clear that the sequential (and exception test where appropriate) are required to be applied. In general, we endorse this approach so that the associated development is treated in the same consistent way as any other local development proposal submitted to the Local Planning Authority. We will require to see the evidence that the sequential test has been incorporated within the process.  Any development site over a hectare or in food zone two/ three will require an appropriate site specific FRA.	88820-420-2075	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	<p>Eastern route option</p> <p>-Flood Risk</p> <p>The majority of this proposal is in flood zone 3B and 3A and is likely to pose the greatest engineering challenge for construction, subject to it passing the sequential and exception tests. This option requires a full FRA which highlights the vulnerable nature of this site and how multiple watercourse crossings and surface water disposal issues will be dealt with.</p> <p>This site does however offers the opportunity for legacy benefits in the form of an enhanced tidal protection to some areas due to road acting as de facto defence embankment. This option needs to be investigated further to identify the extent of these benefits.</p>	88830-678-296	/			At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy proposed two search areas, to the east and west of Cannington respectively, as potentially suitable locations for the provision of a bypass. An initial assessment of flood risk issues relating to both of the proposed bypass routes was carried out following feedback from the consultation. Using a sequential approach in line with planning guidance as outlined in Planning Policy Statement 25 (Department for Communities and Local Government. Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25): Development and Flood Risk, 2010), it was identified that there were significant flood risk issues related to development of the eastern bypass route compared with the western bypass route. EDF Energy acknowledged the risk associated with the eastern bypass route, and this was key to the selection of the western bypass route as the preferred option for incorporation in the Stage 2 consultation. On this basis specific concerns regarding flood risk to the village of Cannington as a result of the impact of the eastern bypass have been addressed through its removal from the proposals and are therefore not addressed in any further detail.
Tractivity 341	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>The west option is preferable in terms of environmental impact of the two proposal options.</p> <p>However, the best option of all would be a road from Dunball/M5 Junction 23, across to Combwich. This can also form a flood defence for Bridwater.</p>	9029-678-1459	/			Comments were also raised, by the public, during the Stage 1 consultation regarding the consideration of a Bridgwater bypass, rather than either of the Cannington eastern and western routes; however EDF Energy has not pursued this option further (please see the <b>Bridgwater Bypass Study</b> appended to the <b>Transport Assessment</b> ).
Tractivity 581	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>The western route is uncomfortably close to Brymore College and *local farms and the bulk of the traffic from the east would need to use the existing by-pass to reach the western route. The eastern route affects fewer houses and spoil from the construction site could be used to provide as embankment against flood possibility.</p>	9250-678-1843	/			The current land use along the route of the proposed bypass is primarily greenfield agricultural land. It is a requirement of the planning process that the design of the development does not have a negative impact on the wider area and this has been incorporated into the proposals prior to and following the Stage 2 consultation. Issues associated with flooding and additional drainage into the Cannington Brook were raised as specific concerns by consultees at the Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultations.
Tractivity 618	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>Shorter route and away from flood plain.</p>	9282-678-1567			/	At the time of the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified that the proposed bypass was located in an area at low risk of flooding; however, to confirm this situation and to understand the potential interaction between the Mill Stream (running alongside the access road to Brymore School) and the proposed bypass, detailed hydraulics modelling was carried out prior to and following the Stage 2 consultation. The results of the hydraulic modelling were provided within the Flood Risk Assessment reviewed by key consultees (including the Environment Agency) as part of the Stage 2 consultation.
Tractivity 62414	Public	Stage 2	<p>By avoiding the western bye pass there would be no need for E.D.F to put any floodwater into Cannington Brook, as the eastern bye pass would drain off down stream from the village. Which in wet times is prone to flooding. There are approximately 300 homes in Cannington, which already have problems with insurance.</p>	10055-678-1551	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
								<p>Following comments, regarding flood risk and drainage, received from consultees during the Stage 2 consultation, further work was carried out to refine the hydraulics modelling. As part of the investigation, it was found that there is a limited flood risk at the point where, if the proposals were approved, the bypass would cross over the Mill Stream watercourse (see the <b>Cannington Bypass Flood Risk Assessment</b> which has been submitted with this application for development consent, for further detail). However, the design of the bypass is such that it is raised above the predicted maximum flood water depth during extreme events. To ensure that water continues to be conveyed along the watercourse and so that there is no increase in flood risk downstream of the bypass, further work was carried out by EDF Energy following the Stage 2 consultation. EDF Energy has developed the design to provide a series of appropriately-sized box culverts through the bypass to ensure that the bypass does not increase the flooding impact to the village of Cannington. These box culverts would comprise a 2.1m wide by 1.2m high box culvert along the current alignment of the Mill Stream, and additional twin 1.0m wide by 0.6m high box culverts built into the left bank.</p> <p>Due to the natural topography (surface features) of the site, the alignment of the bypass is characterised by low points near the southern and northern extent with a high point approximately midway (in the vicinity of the cutting). As a result of these features, the surface water drainage network is divided into two catchment areas so that surface water can drain by gravity. As part of a sustainable drainage scheme, EDF Energy would ensure that the rate of discharge of surface water from the bypass to the local watercourse network is restricted to a greenfield run-off rate. In order to attenuate the surface water prior to its off-site discharge, a series of measures have been incorporated, including filter and carrier drains along the length of the route and two balancing ponds. There would be an on-line balancing pond at the northern extent of the route and an off-line balancing pond at the southern extent of the route. Both balancing ponds have been designed to accommodate a storm with a 1% annual exceedance probability plus an allowance for climate change (see the <b>Cannington Bypass Flood Risk Assessment</b> for further detail).</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	We have tidal flood model (2006) and fluvial pre-feasibility model for Cannington Brook. This can be made available on request.	88830-673-966	/			Following on from comments received during the Stage 2 consultation, further work was carried out to refine the hydraulic modelling. The results of the hydraulic modelling were provided to key consultees, including the Environment Agency and the Somerset Drainage Board Consortium, along with copies of the modelling files.
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Modelling: Hydraulic modelling was not submitted consequently we have not been able to assess this work. We will need to see this information in order to assess flood risk management proposals.	89069-673-6165	/			At the time of the Stage 2 consultation it had been anticipated by EDF Energy that the surface water drainage from the southern extent of the proposed bypass would discharge into the proposed new Flood Relief Channel (FRC). Due to the reduction in the size of the proposed Cannington park and ride facility and the subsequent change in the layout presented at the Stage 2 Update consultation, it was no longer required to construct a new FRC to mitigate the impact of the proposed development as the new layout retained the existing FRC in its entirety.
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	We are pleased to see that NNB GenCo are proposing to provide the Cannington Flood Alleviation Scheme (FAS) for the village. This proposal scheme was the favoured option in the Environment Agency pre- feasibility study undertaken in 2006 within this area. Please note that this proposal needs to be re-appraised in light of the additional development proposed i.e. park and ride scheme and bypass road. We need to see a design justification regarding the layout of the proposal including the justification for a culvert (i.e. why all other options are not possible).	89084-673-170	/			It is proposed that the surface water drainage would discharge into the existing highway drainage ditch at the greenfield run-off rate. The discharge of surface water at the greenfield run-off rate is designed to ensure that there is no increase in flood risk as a result of the proposed development.



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	The eastern bypass option also passes within 300 metres of a licensed groundwater abstraction at Rodway Farm. This abstraction is licensed for domestic usage, measures should be taken to ensure that this abstraction will not be affected by construction works or by the finished development.	88830-618-2004	/			At Stage 1 two Cannington bypass alignments were put forward for the potential location of the proposed Cannington Bypass. The location was finalised at Stage 2 to be to the west of Cannington.  The Environmental Appraisal presented at Stage 2 was a desk-based assessment which included the review of historical and current OS maps. The review identified a historical landfill site located approximately 90m to the north-west of the proposed bypass site at Cannington Quarry ('Putnell Land', occasionally reported as 'Purnell Land'), a former stone quarry. The Environment Agency records indicate that household waste may have been permitted to infill the quarry. However based on a review of aerial photographs and OS Plans and details contained within the Mineral Local Plan (which identified the potential for the quarry to be re-opened), it was considered unlikely that land infilling had taken place.
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	The water filled quarry shown near to the northern end of the Western Bypass option is coincident with the location of a historic landfill feature. The site is called 'Purnell Land' and our records suggest that this site has been used for the disposal of household wastes (ST 25128 40427). Further ground investigation works are required in this area.	88830-618-3024		/		Following Stage 2, this assessment was augmented by observations undertaken during a site walkover and confirmation from the owners of the quarry that no waste has ever been imported to the site. As the quarry lies outside of the proposed development site and no historical landfilling has been identified at the Cannington Quarry site, no further intrusive investigations were considered necessary in this area.  It was confirmed at Stage 2 that four abstraction wells are present within 500m of the selected western bypass route. These include two abstractions associated with Rodway Farm; however the site does not lie within a Source Protection Zone (SPZ). Details of the abstractions obtained from the Envirocheck report presented in <b>the Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (ES)</b> which indicates that the abstractions are for general farming, domestic use, spray irrigation and domestic use. However, the abstraction rates from these locations are not provided.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Section 2.8 identifies four abstraction wells identified within 500m of the route, although the route does not lie within a Source Protection Zone (SPZ). The abstractions are identified as for general farming, domestic use, spray irrigation and dairy use; however the size and scale of these abstractions is not expressed.	89370-618-484		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62340	Public	Stage 2	6. Finally I would add that I would appreciate your assurance that your Ground Water testing has established that the water quality and quantity in the well in my garden is not going to be affected by your works.	10020-626-4388		/		Information on private water abstractions has been obtained from the Local Authority; however, no record of the well identified by a member of the public has been identified. No specific information relating to the well can therefore be provided. However, the EIA provides an assessment of potential impacts to groundwater resources in the area surrounding the proposed bypass development and no significant impacts to groundwater have been identified (see <b>Chapter 12 of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement</b> ).

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Cumulative effects of development with those from other elements of associated development on groundwater are not addressed in Section 3.8 of the EnvApp.	89370-621-4405	/			Following intrusive investigations the assessment of the potential impacts associated with groundwater resources during the construction, operation and legacy phases of the proposed bypass site was undertaken, as presented within the <b>Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter in Volume 5 of the ES</b> . The Section also considered the potential for cumulative effects to occur during the construction, operation and legacy of the proposed bypass site upon groundwater resources. The <b>Methodology Section of Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter in Volume 5 of the ES</b> includes information on the methodology for assessing cumulative impacts. Full details of the overarching methodology for assessing cumulative impacts as part of the ES are presented in <b>Volume 1 Chapter 7 of the ES. Volume 11 of the ES</b> provides an assessment of cumulative impacts to groundwater quality arising from the overall Hinkley Point C (HPC) Project and the HPC Project with other developments within the area which may impact upon groundwater resources.

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment does not take account of the scale of the works nor the proximity and importance of the Principle Aquifer.	89370-620-2035	/			At Stage 2 an initial assessment of potential to impacts to groundwater resources was presented. Subsequent to Stage 2 intrusive investigations have been undertaken and the impact assessment provided within the <b>Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter, in Section 5 of Volume 5 of the ES</b> , has been updated on the basis of site-specific data and a reappraisal of the geological conditions and use of groundwater at the proposed bypass site.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessments of the impacts are considered appropriate. The validity of these assessments would benefit from the use of a quantitative measure as supplied by using the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges assessment methodology.	89370-620-2339	/			In the Stage 2 Environmental Appraisal, the value and sensitivity of the groundwater resource on-site and off-site was assessed as medium. However, the criteria for assessment of value and sensitivity have been reviewed and revised in line with topic specific criteria as part of the Environmental Statement, and the value and sensitivity has been reassessed as being low. This assessment has considered the presence of a small proportion of the whole bypass site overlying the Principal Aquifer. However, where the area of proposed route overlies the Principal Aquifer (corresponding to approximately 17% of the proposed bypass site) there are no abstraction boreholes within 500m. Furthermore, the bypass site does not lie within a Source Protection Zone (SPZ) and is predominantly underlain by Secondary Aquifers (A and B), therefore an assessment of low is considered appropriate.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	At the operational phase it is agreed that the residual impact of surface water discharges to groundwater is Minor Adverse	89370-620-4251			/	The impact assessment provided within the <b>Geology</b> ,

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Potential construction phase impacts identified are assessed as no worse than of minor adverse significance. The assessment does not take account of the scale of the works nor the proximity and importance of the principle aquifer. The residual construction phase impacts remain unchanged as no mitigation was considered.	89426-620-5510		/		<p><b>Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter, in Section 6 of Volume 5 of the ES</b>, evaluates the potential impacts to groundwater resources as a result of all phases of the development and considers the identified value and sensitivity of receptors and magnitude of potential impacts, which have taken into account the scale and nature of works to be completed. As such, the assessment of potential impacts to the Principal Aquifer from site runoff during the operational phase has been assessed specifically.</p> <p>The ES assumes the adherence to legislative requirements and adoption of standard good practice as part of the impact assessment and this is reflected in the revised assessment of significance. During the construction phase, the proposed works would cause negligible impact to groundwater quality on-site and off-site, and likely negligible to minor adverse impacts to groundwater levels and recharge on- and off-site. Impacts to groundwater quality, levels and recharge during the operational and legacy phases of the proposed development were assessed as being negligible. No specific measures, besides standard good working and design practices for the construction and operation of the proposed bypass site, were therefore identified as necessary for the protection of groundwater resources.</p> <p>At Stage 2 it was considered appropriate to apply the methodology presented within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) to assess the potential impacts of runoff from the operational bypass site to groundwater resources. The methodology is based on the assumption that significant rainwater runoff infiltration will occur to ground. However, the current drainage design proposals comprise two topographical catchment areas (northern and southern), which would drain to existing surface water drainage infrastructure via detention basins. The drainage system, which would discharge surface water from the carriageway and footway pavement and verges, are designed to convey water to these detention features, and as such are not designed to act as significant pathways to ground, and thereby groundwater. Although a minor degree of soil infiltration may occur within soft landscaped areas where slotted filter drains are to be installed, the overall quantity of surface water runoff entering groundwater which may impact upon groundwater quality on the proposed development is negligible, and therefore the DMRB assessment methodology with respect to assessing potential road drainage impacts to groundwater is no longer considered to be of relevance.</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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Although the sensitivity of the whole area is described medium on the basis that there are no existing borehole abstractions from the Principle Aquifer within 500m of the route, the sensitivity of each aquifer would be expected to differ and this general approach should be reconsidered. It is further noted that paragraph 3.8.46 recognises the need to reevaluate the assessment of sensitivity based on the details scheme design.	89370-619-810	/			<p>The impact assessment provided in the Stage 2 Environmental Appraisal, was undertaken in accordance with the methodology outlined in Volume 1 of the Environmental Appraisal.</p> <p>The methodology and impact assessment matrix have been adopted in the ES with full details presented in <b>Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES</b>. The <b>Methodology Section of Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter in Volume 5 of the ES</b> presents the topic specific magnitude, value and sensitivity and site-specific criteria which have been reviewed and revised in line with topic specific requirements and includes reference to the methodology presented in <b>Volume 1, Chapter 7 of the ES</b>.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment methodology provided within Section 2.6 is incomplete as it only provides tables that describe 'sensitivity of receptor' and 'magnitude of effect'. It is assumed that the combination of sensitivity and magnitude required to inform an assessment of impact significance is informed through use of Table 5.4.4 in Volume 1 of the ES, although this is not explicitly stated.	89370-619-1264		/		<p>In the Stage 2 Environmental Appraisal, the value and sensitivity of the groundwater resources on-site and off-site were assessed as medium for the entire proposed bypass development area. The impact assessment provided within the <b>Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter, in Section 12.5 of Volume 5 of the ES</b>, has been informed by site-specific data and a reappraisal of the geological conditions and use of groundwater at the proposed development site. As a result, groundwater resources have been reassessed as being of low value and sensitivity. The bypass scheme design does not involve the introduction of significant quantities of surface water runoff to groundwater as the majority of such runoff would be discharged via detention basins/ponds to existing surface water drainage networks. As such no requirement for the specific appraisal of groundwater sensitivity subdivided by aquifer type was identified.</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Cannington Creamery is located just to the south of the roundabout where the southern end of the Western bypass option would join the existing road network. Cannington Creamery have key licensed groundwater abstractions in this area, these abstractions must be protected from any contamination risk that may result from historic contamination, construction operations or from contaminated runoff from the bypass. Special measures will be required to attenuate runoff to protect groundwater at this location. This should be disclosed early on in the process.	88830-622-3379		/		<p>The adherence to legislative requirements and adoption of standard good practices has been assumed as part of the impact assessment and are not considered as specific formal mitigation within the context of the EIA.</p> <p><b>The Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter in Volume 5 of the ES</b> identifies examples of standard good practice measures and design features (such as hydrocarbon separators and sediment traps) which would be implemented at the proposed development site during the construction, operational and legacy phases to limit the potential for impact to groundwater resources to occur. Given the adoption of these measures no significant impacts to groundwater resources have been identified during the construction, operation and legacy phases of the bypass development therefore no specific formal additional mitigation is considered to be required.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Adoption of an EMMP would be considered a valid recommendation in this situation although details of what the EMMP would address and how the effectiveness of the EMMP would be delivered remains unaddressed. Our observations on the potential effectiveness of the EMMP are provided in section 4.3. For mitigation to be fully effective, the potential scale of the development and the proximity of a principle aquifer need to be reflected within the EMMP.	89370-622-2873		/		<p>As no significant source of contamination has been identified, the groundwater within the proposed bypass site is not considered to pose a risk to human health, deeper groundwater quality or surface water courses close to the proposed development. Therefore a detailed remediation/reclamation strategy is not considered necessary for this site. However, should any previously unidentified contamination be encountered during construction works it will be dealt with in accordance with procedures identified under the Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (EMMP). The EMMP would be agreed with the Local Authorities and Environment Agency prior to the commencement of the proposed bypass development works. The EMMP and subject specific management plans will include appropriate provisions to ensure the protection of the Principal Aquifer underlying the central part of the proposed bypass route alignment.</p> <p>The presence of groundwater abstractions within 500m of the site, including those located at the Yeo Valley Farm (Cannington Creamery), have been identified and considered as part of the impact assessment. However, standard good practice and control measures will be adopted during the construction and operational phases of the development which ensure that the proposed development would not impact the water quality of these abstractions. Given the adoption of such measures the potential impacts to groundwater resources have been assessed as no greater than minor adverse therefore no specific mitigation measures are considered necessary.</p>
Tractivity 62248	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	-b- Quarry in fill - what access would be made? How could this affect us if the green by pass did not happen? Has anyone considered the effect on the water table and land drainage for the area? We have a septic tank whose soakaway could be affected. What associated works would there be?	9369-497-2284		/		<p>As no significant source of contamination has been identified, the groundwater within the proposed bypass site is not considered to pose a risk to human health, deeper groundwater quality or surface water courses close to the proposed development. Therefore a detailed remediation/reclamation strategy is not considered necessary for this site. However, should any previously unidentified contamination be encountered during construction works it will be dealt with in accordance with procedures identified under the Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (EMMP). The EMMP would be agreed with the Local Authorities and Environment Agency prior to the commencement of the proposed bypass development works. The EMMP and subject specific management plans will include appropriate provisions to ensure the protection of the Principal Aquifer underlying the central part of the proposed bypass route alignment.</p> <p>The presence of groundwater abstractions within 500m of the site, including those located at the Yeo Valley Farm (Cannington Creamery), have been identified and considered as part of the impact assessment. However, standard good practice and control measures will be adopted during the construction and operational phases of the development which ensure that the proposed development would not impact the water quality of these abstractions. Given the adoption of such measures the potential impacts to groundwater resources have been assessed as no greater than minor adverse therefore no specific mitigation measures are considered necessary.</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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	No specific commitment to monitoring is provided. It is expected that this will be addressed within the EMMP.	89370-623-4585	/			<p>In accordance with standard good practice an <b>Environmental Monitoring and Management Plan (EMMP)</b> would be developed for the proposed development and will be submitted as part of the Development consent Order (DCO) Application. The actions outlined within the <b>EMMP</b> will minimise the potential for adverse impacts to occur to groundwater resources</p> <p>The results of the groundwater analysis, conducted as part of the intrusive investigations undertaken following the Stage 2 consultation, are not indicative of the presence of a significant source of contamination at the proposed bypass site and the potential impacts are assessed to be of negligible to minor adverse significance, therefore no need for ongoing groundwater monitoring has been identified.</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	38. Following the submission of Stage 2 consultation documents, full geophysical reports for all sites and a statement that trial trenching will be carried out during the consultation process at J24 have been subsequently received by the Council. The Council however, has not been given the necessary statutory minimum time to consider these and have therefore not been taken into consideration.	89192-654-2241	/			A desk-based assessment (DBA), non-intrusive surveys and intrusive site investigations were undertaken to collect site-specific data and establish a robust baseline with respect to the historic environment for the proposed Cannington Bypass.  Comments received at the Stage 2 Consultation from Sedgemoor District Council (SDC) and West Somerset Council (WSC) raised concerns that the baseline surveys at stage 2 were not sufficient to assess impacts as well as that no trial trenching had been included. Requests were made at Stage 2 for full references of baseline documentation to be provided. The DBA sourced data from the Somerset Historic Environment Record and the National Monuments Record and included a review of historic maps and information on previous surveys. A detailed geophysical survey was undertaken over the route corridor to identify potential archaeological features, followed by targeted archaeological trial trenching in order to characterise the nature, date and extent of the archaeological resource along the bypass route as detailed in Chapter 16, volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (ES).
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Geophysical Survey Reports from all sites in particular Cannington By-pass.	89239-654-11781	/			The <b>Baseline Section of the Historic Environment Chapter of Volume 5 of the (ES)</b> provides an overview of the results of the non-intrusive and intrusive surveys and figures showing historic environment assets and features. Since Stage 2 full details are provided in the supporting reports including geophysical survey data and trial trenching results. A fully referenced list of all information sources used to establish the baseline is provided in the chapter and copies of the supporting reports are provided as <b>Appendices to the Historic Environment Chapter of Volume 5 of the ES.</b>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The following sections briefly summarise the baseline information provided in Section 3.12 of Volume 3 of the EnvApp. In summary, we consider that the baseline conditions reported in the document to be deficient in terms of the level of archaeological field evaluation that has been carried out, and is insufficient to assess the impact of the proposed scheme on buried archaeological remains.	89371-654-9944	/			The <b>Historic Landscape Section of the Historic Environment Chapter of Volume 6 of the ES</b> provides details of the Historic Landscape Character designations on the HPC Development Site and describes the historic landscape of the wider study area, extending up to 10km from the HPC Development Site boundary.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	the lack of assessment of impacts upon Historic Landscape Character (HLC), and the fact that the impact upon setting of heritage features has not been completed, is a significant omission, and must be addressed.	89371-654-10351	/			The <b>Setting of Designated Heritage Assets Section of the Historic Environment Chapter of Volume 5 of the ES(Ref: XX)</b> includes a definition of the term "setting" and summarises the current baseline settings of designated assets including Cynwit Castle
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment gathered baseline information from a variety of sources, including the National Monuments Record, Somerset Historic Environment Record, a review of the Somerset Historic Landscape Characterisation, Somerset Record Office and the South West Archaeological Research Framework.  It is considered that reference to these sources is essential to attain a sufficient understanding of baseline conditions.	89371-654-10779			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	In addition, reference is also made to the National Mapping Programme and the Portable Antiquities Scheme.  It is not considered that these are essential sources, however their inclusion is welcome in that they complement the preceding sources, and therefore add to the robustness of the baseline.	89371-654-11198			/	(Cannington Camp) scheduled monument and Brymore School.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	It is considered that the baseline data gathered by these surveys is not sufficient to assess the impact of the proposed bypass.	89371-654-11722	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The report sections 3.12.37 to 3.12.108 provide a comprehensive review of the site description and geology, statutory constraints, and a discussion of the known heritage assets within the study area, by historical period.  It is considered that the background provided is accurate and sufficient to inform the assessment of impacts upon known heritage assets.	89371-654-13431			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Canning bypass has been subject to desk based research, field reconnaissance survey and geophysical survey. The geophysical survey (not included in the EnvApp) has identified numerous potential buried archaeological remains within the route, however no trial trenching has been undertaken to inform the assessment; the EnvApp suggests this as the first stage of mitigation. This is not acceptable; trial trenching must be undertaken to inform the Environmental Statement in order to fully assess the impact upon buried archaeological remains and put in place appropriate mitigation. This is the only site under consideration in connection with Hinkley C where geophysical survey has identified buried archaeological remains, but trial trenching has not been undertaken, or is in the process of being carried out, to inform the ES. No reason is given for this anomalous approach.	89426-654-11668	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- Off-site Proposals- Cannington By-pass (See Appendix 1 for other sites).	10190-662-2121			/	<p>Following completion of the Stage 1 Consultation further informal consultation was undertaken with English Heritage to discuss the scope of assessment of potential impacts on the settings of designated heritage assets beyond the proposed Cannington Bypass development site boundary.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 consultation general comments received from English Heritage, Somerset County Council and Sedgemoor District Council were addressed in <b>Chapter 16 (Historic Environment) of Volume 5 of the ES</b>. These comments noted that geophysical information was submitted following the Stage 2 consultation, and requested that further details on consultation be provided.</p> <p>Potential impacts on Brymore School, the Brymore ride and the Cannington Conservation Area were discussed with English Heritage, Somerset County Council's Historic Environment Service and Sedgemoor District Council Conservation Officer in Bristol in March 2010, and again in May 2011. Details of consultations (formal and informal) are given in the Final Consultation Report.</p>
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Following the submission of Stage 2 Consultation documents a full geophysical report for Cannington By-pass has subsequently been received by this office and therefore not been taken into consideration.	89239-662-8060			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The results of the geophysical survey are not included in the EnvApp, and therefore it is not possible to comment on the sufficiency of the survey	89371-662-12078	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The consultees are as expected, however the document does not provide details of these discussions, the nature of comments received from the consultees or whether these comments have been clearly addressed.	89371-662-12360	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- Off-site Proposals- Cannington By-pass (See Appendix 1 for other sites).	10190-662-2121			/	<p>Following completion of the Stage 1 Consultation further informal consultation was undertaken with English Heritage to discuss the scope of assessment of potential impacts on the settings of designated heritage assets beyond the proposed Cannington Bypass development site boundary.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 consultation general comments received from English Heritage, Somerset County Council and Sedgemoor District Council were addressed in <b>Chapter 16 (Historic Environment) of Volume 5 of the ES</b>. These comments noted that geophysical information was submitted following the Stage 2 consultation, and requested that further details on consultation be provided.</p> <p>Potential impacts on Brymore School, the Brymore ride and the Cannington Conservation Area were discussed with English Heritage, Somerset County Council's Historic Environment Service and Sedgemoor District Council Conservation Officer in Bristol in March 2010, and again in May 2011. Details of consultations (formal and informal) are given in the Final Consultation Report.</p>
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Following the submission of Stage 2 Consultation documents a full geophysical report for Cannington By-pass has subsequently been received by this office and therefore not been taken into consideration.	89239-662-8060			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The results of the geophysical survey are not included in the EnvApp, and therefore it is not possible to comment on the sufficiency of the survey	89371-662-12078	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The consultees are as expected, however the document does not provide details of these discussions, the nature of comments received from the consultees or whether these comments have been clearly addressed.	89371-662-12360	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The issue of the need for a new bypass around Cannington and the impact of this on the existing landscape character of the area, the large number of archaeological deposits that may be affected by such a proposal and the impact of it on the outlying listed buildings like Brymore School need to be fully assessed. We would encourage the proposal to produce a Master plan on transport issues and would welcome the opportunity to be involved in consultation on it. These historic assets have not been indicated on any proposals maps to date. For example the western bypass route is indicated as being taken across the main driveway into the Brymore School site, dissecting the formal tree-lined avenue which we consider to be an important component to the historic building and its setting. Both routes will, therefore, have adverse impact upon historic assets and we therefore ask that the need for a new road in this area must be only be considered if the transport strategy indicates that there is an overwhelming need for one.	88850-656-8724	/			Comments received at Stage 1 consultation from English Heritage and Sedgemoor District Council (SDC) and West Somerset Council (WSC) noted that impacts on the Historic Environment would need to be assessed. Potential impacts on buried archaeological remains within the route corridor were assessed at all stages of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Potential impacts on historic landscape character have also been assessed.  Stage 2 comments from English Heritage, SDC and WSC stated that impacts on Brymore School, and Cynwit Castle should be included, as well as Somerset County Council, SDC and WSC requesting that geophysical information be provided, which they noted was submitted subsequent to Stage 2.
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	In terms of landscape impact some of the road alignment would be set within a cutting which would help to screen the bypass, however, it is important to note that the western route would adversely impact the setting of Brymore School (a Grade II Listed Building).	88350-656-1883			/	The potential impacts on the settings of designated heritage assets beyond the route corridor including Cynwit Castle (Cannington Camp) scheduled monument and Brymore School have also been assessed.  Comments at Stage 2 from SDC and WSC stated that an assessment of impacts on peat underlying the site should be carried out. It was considered that there was no potential for peat underlying the site.
Tractivity 276	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference It is a shorter route and does not impact upon the Grade 1 listed building, Gurney Manor.	8965-656-1108			/	Potential impacts arising from the proposed Cannington Bypass are described in the <b>Assessment of Impacts Section of the Historic Environment Chapter of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (ES)</b> .
Tractivity 506	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Please give reasons for your preference Less disruptive to housing less archaeological impact (probably)	9179-656-1207			/	
Tractivity 62583	Public	Stage 2	13. According to your own figures, the western bypass would damage 28 heritage sites.	10134-656-5496			/	
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	we are very concerned about the impact upon the historic environment on the western side of Cannington by the preferred route. We are surprised that there is no mention let alone assessment of the impact of the route upon Brymore School, other curtilage heritage assets within its grounds, and its setting. We would suggest that this impact should be comprehensively assessed before a route is chosen.	10190-656-8541	/			
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	3.1 The main School site is listed by English Heritage with important architectural interest, surrounding gardens and parkland and entrance drive. The proposal will sever the drive and isolate the lodge from the main building complex.	10242-656-7830			/	

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	- Historic environment considerations need to be fully taken into account, e.g. the impact upon the Brymore school access. This access route is noted as being of "low" importance, however it contributes significantly to the setting of the listed building and as such this category is questioned. The assessment made notes that as that only part of the ride would be lost and there would be a moderate adverse impact.	89202-656-787		/		
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- The information and justification for the route chosen would benefit from being strengthened. In terms of the impact upon the historic environment, there is inconsistency as part of the documentation indicates full information is not yet available (and will be to support the submission to the IPC); another part of the documentation does provide an assessment of impact upon the historic environment. Clarity is needed about whether this is the full extent of the information to be provided or more is to be made available when the application is submitted.  - There is inconsistency in the documentation about whether there are important hedgerows affected by the proposed route.	89202-656-1587	/			

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	<p>Somerset County Council</p> <p>Technical Response to EDF Stage 2 Consultation</p> <p>Topic: Environmental Assessment – Archaeology</p> <p>Archaeology</p> <p>1. Executive Summary</p> <p>Overall the methodology adopted to assess the impacts on the historic environment has produced valid data resulting in a good understanding of the significance of heritage assets impacted by the developments. However, there are some key documents missing, in particular the Geophysical Survey reports from Junction 24 and Cannington By-pass, which are key to assessing these proposals, meaning it is not possible to evaluate the impact on the historic environment on these developments.</p> <p>Following the submission of Stage 2 Consultation documents, full geophysical reports for all sites and a statement that trial trenching will be carried out during the consultation process at J24 have been subsequently received by the Council and have therefore not been taken into consideration.</p> <p>The staged process of Desk Based Assessment, followed by Geophysical Survey and Trial Trenching is a recognised method and each stage has been agreed with Somerset County Council (SCC), so effective monitoring has taken place.</p> <p>The Council asserts that full excavation must take place on all sites identified on the main Hinkley site as mitigation and full assessment of J24 and Cannington By-pass is required to design a mitigation strategy. We understand that preservation of a major historical landscape feature is to take place.</p> <p>The Council understands that legacy will include the publication of all the archaeological data and an archive deposited with the Museum of Somerset; all fully accessible by the public for research. A potential for educational and cultural projects within local schools exists based on the archaeological data (see Legacy comments in section 3).</p> <p>2. High Level Response</p> <p>EDF Response to Stage 1 Concerns</p>	89239-656-0	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>We are unable to assess the significance or impact on historic assets as insufficient information has been submitted within the Environmental Appraisal. All mitigation measures refer to geophysical survey data, which has not been submitted. This is a major concern.</p>	89239-656-3698	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	e bypass route is located within the setting of two Scheduled Monuments, an Iron Age/Roman British Settlement and an Iron Age hillfort, Cynwit Castle, which is also known as Cannington Camp. Policy HE11 advises that planning permission will not be granted for development that would damage or destroy these sites or their settings unless the importance of the proposed development outweighs the national significance of the remains;	89366-656-2142			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The southern portion of the bypass, near the junction with the A39, is located close to a series of Sites of County Importance for Archaeology. Local Plan Policy HE12 advises that planning permission will not be granted for development which would damage or destroy local important archaeological remains, unless the importance of the development outweighs the local significance of the remains;	89366-656-2579			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Brymore School is listed at Grade II. PPS5 advises that where a proposal harms the setting of a heritage asset, planning authorities should weigh any impact against the wider benefits of the application.	89366-656-2983			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual – local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Impact on the setting of the listed Brymore School is not assessed sufficiently. For instance, reference is made to the tree-lined avenue, but it is not clear whether additional planting will be provided to maintain the line of the avenue across the bypass.	89366-656-7997	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The 'unknown' importance ascribed to geophysical anomalies is not sufficient to predict or assess the impact of the scheme.	89371-656-13164	/			



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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The report identifies that the construction of the Cannington Bypass would result in permanent direct adverse impacts upon buried archaeological assets within the footprint of the scheme.	89372-656-2119		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual – local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Table 3.7.3 in section 3.7 of the Stage 3 report describes the potential for peat to exist within the study area, however this potential is not discussed in chapter 3.12. Archaeological evaluation in advance of the ES should investigate whether peat is present and if so, evaluate its archaeological potential.	89372-656-3093	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	No mention is made of Cannington Conservation Area itself, and potential setting impacts upon it.	89372-656-3407	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The EnvApp identifies the uncertainty associated with assessment of impacts as a result of the fact that the nature and importance of features identified by geophysical survey is not known.	89372-656-5317	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual – local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The EnvApp identifies the uncertainty associated with assessment of impacts as a result of the scheme and landscape mitigation designs not being finalised.	89372-656-5507	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	In order for an accurate assessment of impacts to be made and to ensure that the proposed mitigation measures are appropriate, the assessment should be conducted once design and mitigation measures are both developed.	89372-656-5666	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual – local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The authorities would expect that trial trenching and assessment of possible peat deposits should be carried out in advance of the ES to ensure that the impacts of the scheme are properly assessed.	89372-656-5887	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	These sections state that residual impacts cannot be confirmed until the importance of archaeological remains is identified.	89372-656-6240	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	We agree that the residual impacts cannot be assessed at the present time.	89372-656-6443	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual – local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	No mention is made of Cannington Conservation Area itself, and potential setting impacts upon it.	89372-656-7009	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	all residual effects should be revisited once evaluation has been completed and mitigation has been agreed.	89372-656-7443	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual – local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	No mention is made of Cannington Conservation Area itself, and potential setting impacts upon it. Given the nature of the Conservation Area, this is an omission.	89372-656-7553	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Impacts upon Historic Landscape Character and setting of off-site heritage assets in general have not been completed due to ongoing landscape mitigation design, and therefore the effects described in the EnvApp may not be an accurate assessment of the impacts of the scheme.	89425-656-12161	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There may be additional residual effects associated with the archaeological importance of peat underlying the site. An archaeological investigation including a 'watching brief' may be required during the construction works, as a result of the archaeological importance of the peat underlying the site.	89426-656-13426	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual – local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	- The use of trial trenching at the Cannington bypass site as a first stage of mitigation is not acceptable or realistic in order to minimise/avoid effects on potential buried archaeological remains; trial trenching must be undertaken to inform the ES in order to assess the impact on buried archaeological remains, identify and put in place mitigation and determine the residual effect. It is noted that the approach to mitigation appears to vary across the project.	89430-656-10873	/			
Tractivity 70648	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	7. According to your own figures, this bypass would damage 28 heritage sites.	89766-656-3009	/			

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	Missing data Geophysical Survey Reports from all sites in particular Cannington By-pass. Trial trenching results from Junction 24 (not available).	89239-308-11765			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The issue of the need for a new bypass around Cannington and the impact of this on the existing landscape character of the area, the large number of archaeological deposits that may be affected by such a proposal and the impact of it on the outlying listed buildings like Brymore School need to be fully assessed. We would encourage the proposal to produce a Master plan on transport issues and would welcome the opportunity to be involved in consultation on it. These historic assets have not been indicated on any proposals maps to date. For example the western bypass route is indicated as being taken across the main driveway into the Brymore School site, dissecting the formal tree-lined avenue which we consider to be an important component to the historic building and its setting. Both routes will, therefore, have adverse impact upon historic assets and we therefore ask that the need for a new road in this area must be only be considered if the transport strategy indicates that there is an overwhelming need for one.	88850-655-8724	/			Stage 2 comments from Somerset County Council (SCC) stated that the overall methodology was valid. The scope and methodology for baseline studies and impact assessment were agreed with Somerset County Council's Historic Environment Service (SCC HES) and English Heritage.  Stage 2 comments from English Heritage and SCC noted an absence of geophysical or trial trench information. A staged process of desk-based assessment, followed by geophysical survey and trial trenching, included after stage 2, was undertaken to determine the nature, date and extent of surviving archaeological remains within the proposed development site boundary. Details can be found within the <b>Historic Environment Chapter of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (ES)</b>
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The cumulative impact of the different forms of off-site development in Cannington will in our view have a significant and potentially detrimental impact on the character of this settlement and in particular upon the character and appearance of the conservation area and its numerous historic individual and groups of buildings. We would ask that the strategy for the off-site development in Cannington is reassessed with the benefit of the historic assets clearly considered as part of this strategy. We would in particular wish for a clear and robust evaluation of the contribution that the water meadows to the south of the village play in contributing toward the character and historic value of this settlement.	88850-655-9756	/			All work was carried out in accordance with published standards and guidance including Somerset County Council Heritage Service's <b>Archaeological Handbook</b> (2009) and the Institute for Archaeologists' (IfA) Standards and Guidance for <b>Desk-Based Assessment</b> (2008) <b>Geophysical Survey</b> (2008) and <b>Archaeological Evaluation</b> (2008).  In the absence of standards or guidance published by the IfA or EH specifically relating to Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) for the historic environment, guidance on assessing the effects of roads schemes on heritage, given in the <b>Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), Volume 11: Environmental Assessment, Section 3, Part 2, Cultural Heritage</b> has been adapted for the <b>Historic Environment Chapter of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (ES)</b> .
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Whilst we understand the need for a by-pass around this settlement,	10190-655-8473			/	
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	No field evaluation of the Cannington by-pass route has been provided. This stage of work is standard practice for an Environmental Statement and would be required in any submission to IPC. The results would help inform impact and cumulative impacts.	10190-655-8946	/			Following West Somerset and Sedgemoor District councils' response to the Stage 2 submission, the methodology was clarified and the difference between "value" and "sensitivity" was clearly defined in the <b>Historic Environment Chapter of Volume 5 of the ES</b> .
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Overall the methodology adopted to assess the impacts on the historic environment has produced valid data resulting in a good understanding of the significance of heritage assets impacted by the developments. However, there are some key documents missing, in particular the Geophysical Survey reports from Junction 24 and Cannington By-pass, which are key to assessing these proposals, meaning it is not possible to evaluate the impact on the historic environment on these developments.	89239-655-165	/			Stage 1 comments from English Heritage stated that impacts on the Historic Environment would need to be assessed. The methodology applied to assess potential impacts arising from construction and operation of the proposed Cannington bypass on the settings of designated assets beyond the route

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	Overall, concerns raised in Stage 1 have been addressed through the assessment process, e/cept in the cases of Cannington By-pass and Junction 24 Park and Ride proposals.	89239-655-1903	/			corridor was carried out in accordance with English Heritage's <b>Draft Guidance on the Assessment of Settings</b> , issued for consultation in July 2010.
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Further finds have been made at Cannington (a possible Bronze Age ring ditch and other, as yet not properly identified, sites) and Junction 24 (a potential prehistoric and Roman settlement of some significance).	89239-655-5012	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The assessment represents the preferred methodology for historic environmental assets and is adequate to inform mitigation strategies, e/cept for Cannington By-pass where the submitted documents are inadequate to assess the heritage assets or the impacts on assets.	89239-655-9337	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Trial trenching should be undertaken prior to planning submission to establish the nature and significance of the archaeological assets and to inform the design of the scheme to enable preservation if necessary or practicable.	89371-655-11851	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The report states that the assessment of impacts upon the setting of heritage assets will be reviewed once plans have been finalised. No assessment is presented with regards to impacts upon the historic landscape; the report states that this will be undertaken once landscape mitigation proposals have been finalised. Geophysical anomalies have been ascribed 'unknown' importance.	89371-655-12585	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	In absence of the completed assessment of the residual effects on the historic landscape it is considered that it would be necessary to update the assessment once proposals have been finalised.	89371-655-12969	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The report should reference IfA and English Heritage (EH) guidance clearly in the text. The bibliography does not refer to any EH guidance and includes reference to three IfA documents relating to archaeological evaluation, excavation and recording of historic buildings. Reference to other relevant documents should be referenced, including but not limited to, IfA guidance on desk based assessment and geophysical survey.	89372-655-459	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Although we accept that the DMRB appropriate in its prescribed form represents an appropriate impact assessment methodology, and represents best practice, Section 3.12.25 describes that the approach adopted is actually an adaptation of the DMRB methodology.	89372-655-886	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	While the adaptation of the DMRB approach is described, the reasons and justification for this are not addressed within the chapter. Furthermore, the particular effect of this deviation on the results of the overall assessment should also be illustrated. For instance, the DMRB 'very high' categorisation of importance is not used, placing Scheduled Monuments and Grade I and II* Listed Buildings in the highest category, rather than second tier according to DMRB (the first tier being reserved for sites of international importance); this may lead to a difference in the reporting of impacts, both adverse and beneficial, compared to DMRB in its original form.	89372-655-1145	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Table 3.12.1 shows the criteria used to determine 'importance', not 'sensitivity, as stated in the title (sensitivity of an asset is based on professional judgement).	89372-655-1812	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The report assumes the magnitude of impact to be high, however is uncertain of the significance of the effect due to the nature and importance of the assets being unknown.	89372-655-2307	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The reasoning behind the assessment of construction effects appears to be sound, based upon the anticipated construction methods.	89372-655-2709			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	the lack of trial trenching means that it is not possible to assess the significance of impacts upon buried archaeological assets. Trial trenching must be undertaken prior to the production of the ES to ensure that effects are fully assessed.	89372-655-2847	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The reasoning behind assessment of operational effects appears to be sound	89372-655-3913			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	However, the report should clarify the nature of the adverse effects identified on Scheduled Monuments and Listed Buildings off-site during the operation of the scheme.	89372-655-3989	/			



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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The EnvApp should not attempt to predict residual impacts on the basis of current knowledge. In the case of off-site assets it may be possible to achieve a Neutral residual impact, however until mitigation has been agreed with EH this is not certain. It may also be possible to achieve a neutral residual impact for some of the buried archaeological remains by preservation in situ, however this would depend on trial trenching informing design at an early stage, as discussed in 6.19.4.	89372-655-6518	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The residual effects that would be realised during operation are considered in paragraphs 3.12.141 to 3.12.133. This identifies no impacts upon buried archaeological remains, and that residual impact upon off-site assets cannot be confirmed until mitigation measures are agreed.	89372-655-7123		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Impacts upon Historic Landscape Character and setting of off-site heritage assets in general have not been completed due to ongoing landscape mitigation design, and therefore the effects described in the EnvApp may not be an accurate assessment of the impacts of the scheme.	89426-655-13039	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The level of assessment currently undertaken is not yet sufficient to meet the expectations for full EIA.	89426-655-13317	/			

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	39. The Council asserts that full e/cavation must take place on all sites identified in the proposals, as full assessment of J24 and Cannington By-pass is required to design a mitigation strategy. We understand that preservation of a major historical landscape feature is to take place and that legacy will include the publication of all the archaeological data and an archive deposited with the Museum of Somerset, all fully accessible by the public for research. A potential for educational and cultural projects within local schools e/ists based on the archaeological data.	89192-658-2861			/	Stage 2 comments from Somerset County Council, Sedgemoor District council and West Somerset Council state that mitigation measures presented in the Stage 2 preferred Proposal would need to be updated following geophysical and trail trench information. Mitigation of all impacts to buried archaeological remains within the route corridor for the proposed Cannington Bypass has since been discussed and agreed with Somerset County Council's Historic Environment Service (SCC HES) and English Heritage (EH), as detailed within the Consultation Report.
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The Council asserts that full e/cavation must take place on all sites identified on the main Hinkley site as mitigation and full assessment of J24 and Cannington By-pass is required to design a mitigation strategy. We understand that preservation of a major historical landscape feature is to take place.	89239-658-1184			/	The agreed mitigation, which will be put into place if the overall proposals are approved, will comprise Preservation by Record. A programme of archaeological investigation and recording would be undertaken on three sites identified for set-piece excavation (SPE) in advance of construction as detailed in <b>Chapter 15 of volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (ES)</b> .
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Mitigation is required as set out in Environmental Appraisal, V3, C4, point 4.12.63.	89239-658-3995			/	The archaeological investigations on site will be followed by a programme of post-excavation assessment and analysis leading to publication of the results in a regional or national academic journal or journals, as appropriate. The EH regional scientific advisor for the South West has been consulted regarding appropriate environmental sampling and sample processing to retrieve palaeo-environmental data on the flora, fauna and environmental background to the excavated archaeological sites.
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Sites within Cannington By-pass route are found to be of designatable significance requiring preservation in-situ.	89239-658-12073			/	No specific mitigation is proposed for impacts to designated sites beyond the route corridor. Woodland planting and scattered trees along the edge of the carriageway will provide screening and reduce the visual impacts. Implementation of the proposed lighting strategy including directional lighting and reduction of glare at night, will minimise the impact of light pollution. Details of the landscape scheme and the lighting strategy can be found in <b>Chapter 15 of volume 5 of the E S (ES)</b> . Details of proposals to mitigate noise, air quality, lighting and visual impacts that could impact on the settings of designated sites are included in <b>Chapter 9, Chapter 10, and Chapter 15</b> , respectively of <b>volume 5 of the ES</b> .
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	do not put forward a clear consistent mitigation strategy across the project (i.e. both the Hinkley Point C Main Site and the Associated Developments) for e/ample the use of trial trenching at the Cannington bypass site as a first stage of mitigation is not acceptable or realistic in order to minimise/avoid effects on potential buried archaeological remains but further is inconsistent with the approach taken on other elements of the project.	89317-658-5120	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The proposed mitigation during construction consists of trial trenching that would inform further archaeological work if required.	89372-658-4398	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Off-site mitigation is identified for Cannington Park, Cynwit Castle and Brymore House, however no details are provided, referring instead the need to agree mitigation with English Heritage.	89372-658-4529	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	No further mitigation is proposed for the operational phase.	89372-658-4719		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The mitigation proposed for on-site assets during construction is not acceptable. Until trial trenching is undertaken, the importance of the anomalies identified by geophysical survey cannot be ascertained. Consideration must be given to preservation in situ by design of important assets; this is not possible if the importance of the assets is only discovered during construction.	89372-658-4784	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The mitigation described in the ES must be appropriate to the importance of the assets that would be affected by the scheme.	89372-658-5167			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Cynwit Castle and Cannington Park, both Scheduled Monuments, have been ascribed a major adverse impact upon their settings. 31 Listed Buildings are identified within the wider area, and moderate to minor adverse impacts are ascribed to those in the vicinity of the scheme; those in the conservation area are considered to experience a negligible effect. The EnvApp suggests that mitigation of impacts upon listed buildings should be agreed with EH, however no suggested approach is given.	89426-658-12550	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Once agreed, all mitigation should be monitored by Somerset Historic Environment Service, and English Heritage as appropriate, to ensure that the stated aims of the mitigation are being achieved, and if they are not, to enable the mitigation to be adapted in the field so as to resolve any inadequacies that are identified.	89372-659-7874	/			If the Hinkley Point C proposals are approved, Somerset County Council's Historic Environment Service and English Heritage will be informed of the proposed start of the set-piece archaeological excavations on the Cannington bypass route. These statutory bodies would be expected to undertake regular monitoring of the set-piece excavation and environmental sampling to ensure the aims of the mitigation are being achieved

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 and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	We note, however, that the results of trial trenching for Cannington Bypass have not yet been provided.	89857-660-687	/			Somerset County council commented at the Stage 2 Update Consultation that results of the trial trenching for Cannington Bypass were not provided. The <b>Baseline Section of the Historic Environment Chapter of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (ES)</b> now provides an overview of the results of the non-intrusive and intrusive surveys and figures showing historic environment assets and features. Full details are provided in the supporting reports including geophysical survey data and trial trenching results. A fully referenced list of all information sources used to establish the baseline is provided in the Chapter and copies of the supporting reports are provided as <b>Appendices to the Historic Environment Chapter of Volume 5 of the ES</b> .

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Quantock Hills AONB Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Baseline Environment: Again, reference is made here to the Quantock Hills AONB being further away than is actually the case. The text refers to the AONB as 10km away - the AONB is considerably closer, particularly in relation to the Cannington South site. Also, the baseline information does not take account of views to the sites from the AONB. The text states that medium and long distance views to the site are 'very limited'. Given the proximity of the AONB and its prominent physical landform, Cannington can clearly be seen from many areas of the nationally protected landscape.	8734-645-7145	/			The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and supporting studies and surveys for the proposed development were conducted for all phases of the proposed development. These were done in accordance with the principles set out by the Landscape Institute (LI) and Institute of Environmental Management Assessment (IEMA) in the Guidelines for LVIA (GLVIA) and guidance on Landscape Character Assessment from the Countryside Agency (now Natural England) and Scottish Natural Heritage. As part of the refinement of the landscape and visual assessment process, extra viewpoints were added where necessary.
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Environmental Appraisal Volume 3 Chapter 3 is broadly acceptable but no tree surveys are included in the baseline work.	89246-645-2632	/			Following field surveys the study area for the LVIA was reduced to a 5km radius. During the baseline assessment, all landscape designations, relevant landscape features, and character areas within the study area were identified to understand more fully the landscape receptors that could be affected.
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Vol.3 tables 3.11.4.to 3.11.7. The visual assessments are not acceptable and are underestimated, particularly as regards Brymore Drive footpath BW5/8 west, Park Farm and properties on Park Lane.  - Vol.3 tables 3.11.8 & 9. Significance evaluation not acceptable for above reasons.	89246-645-3770	/			In response to comments from consultees, the relationship between the Quantock Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the site was further examined. The Quantocks Hills AONB was included within the LVIA as a landscape character area and site survey work established that the closest part of the Quantocks Hills AONB is screened visually by the high ground of Woodcock Downs. A standard technique (Zone of Theoretical Visibility) was used to identify which parts of the Quantock Hills AONB might have views of the proposed development, and then field survey work was carried out to find a view point, that would give a representative view of the proposed development site from the same AONB. The impact of the proposal on this viewpoint was then assessed at day and at night.
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Vol.3 table 4.11.3, Landscape character, local assessment. The assessment is broadly acceptable other than significant points raised above.	89248-645-3172			/	As part of the refinement of the LVIA, a more detailed local level assessment was carried out of impact in order to give a better reflection of the different impacts on the local landscape and townscape of Cannington.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Both the Landscape and Visual baseline has been evaluated adequately in line with GLVIA guidance to a level that would be expected for a development of this size and extent of potential impact on both resources. The methods used to acquire the baseline data appear to be robust at this stage of the review process.	89371-645-5304			/	In response to comments from several consultees requesting detailed tree analysis, a tree survey has been carried out to BS5837: 2005 and is provided as an appendix to <b>Volume 5, Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement</b> . It has been used to inform the baseline of the LVIA and has been used in the assessment of impacts.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Generally a robust evaluation of baseline characteristics has been given.	89371-645-5846			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Quantock Hills AONB Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- The AONB Service is very concerned that it has not been consulted in respect of LVIA for any of the ADS. This is inadequate given the proximity and visibility of locations from the AONB (including at night).	89122-653-1798			/	At the time of the Stage 2 consultation landscape and visual assessment work was ongoing. Since then, work has been completed and the full results of this have been incorporated into the updated Landscapape and Visual Chapter (Volume 5, Chapter 15) of the Environmental Statement, which presents a robust baseline on which to draw conclusions in the impact assessment, including the valuation of receptors that may be affected by the development proposals. Views from the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) were obtained for each of the associated developments and potential impacts on landscape character, where appropriate, are assessed within individual associated development chapters. The methodology agreed through consultation for the HPC main site development has been used for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the associated developments. Further consultation with the AONB service was not considered necessary for the associated developments due to their scale and, their distance from the AONB.



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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There remains a need to reconsider the development as a whole - not just the Hinkley Point C on site works but between Cannington Bypass, Cannington Park and Ride, and the Freight Logistics Facility at Combwich. These have all been assessed individually for their potential impact on landscape and visual resources, but they have not been assessed in combination. It may be that the adverse impacts will be elevated in significance when these schemes are considered cumulatively as a series of interrelated specialist reports. Only by assessing fully the cumulative landscape and visual effects can a comprehensive Landscape Strategy and an effective Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan be developed that links planning policy to mitigation and allows transparency and equitable decision making around local compensatory resources.	89355-648-5964	/			The full results of the baseline survey provide a robust basis on which to assess the likely impacts of the proposed development, including those that may arise from cumulative interaction with other Hinkley Point C (HPC) and non-HPC developments. As a result of comments received from consultees at Stage 2, an updated assessment of cumulative impacts on Landscape and Visual receptors, including an assessment of Cannington A, Cannington Bypass and Combwich Wharf referenced during the Stage 2 consultation, is presented in <b>Volume 11 of the Environmental Statement</b> .
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	We suggest that an additional assessment is made of the potential cumulative impacts between Cannington Bypass, Cannington Park and Ride, and the Freight Logistics Facility at Combwich. These have all been assessed individually for their potential impact on landscape and visual resources, but they have not been assessed in combination. It may be that the adverse impacts will be elevated in significance when these schemes are considered cumulatively.	89371-648-8810	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	We suggest that an additional assessment is made of the potential cumulative impacts between Cannington Bypass, Cannington Park and Ride, and the Freight Logistics Facility at Combwich. These have all been assessed individually for their potential impact on landscape and visual resources, but they have not been assessed in combination. It may be that the adverse impacts will be elevated in significance when these schemes are considered cumulatively.	89377-648-11035	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	- It is suggest that an additional assessment is made of the potential cumulative impacts between other elements of associated development around Cannington, including the Cannington Park and Ride and development at Combwich.	89426-648-11404	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	We suggest that an additional assessment is made of the potential cumulative impacts between Cannington Bypass and Cannington Park and Ride	89427-648-16909	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There remains a need to reconsider the development as a whole - not just the Hinkley Point C on site works but between Cannington Bypass, Cannington Park and Ride, and the Freight Logistics Facility at Combwich. These have all been assessed individually for their potential impact on landscape and visual resources, but they have not been assessed in combination. It may be that the adverse impacts will be elevated in significance when these schemes are considered cumulatively as a series of interrelated specialist reports. Only by assessing fully the cumulative landscape and visual effects can a comprehensive Landscape Strategy and an effective Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan be developed that links planning policy to mitigation and allows transparency and equitable decision making around local compensatory resources.	89355-648-5964	/			The full results of the baseline survey provide a robust basis on which to assess the likely impacts of the proposed development, including those that may arise from cumulative interaction with other Hinkley Point C (HPC) and non-HPC developments. As a result of comments received from consultees at Stage 2, an updated assessment of cumulative impacts on Landscape and Visual receptors, including an assessment of Cannington A, Cannington Bypass and Combwich Wharf referenced during the Stage 2 consultation, is presented in <b>Volume 11 of the Environmental Statement</b> .
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	We suggest that an additional assessment is made of the potential cumulative impacts between Cannington Bypass, Cannington Park and Ride, and the Freight Logistics Facility at Combwich. These have all been assessed individually for their potential impact on landscape and visual resources, but they have not been assessed in combination. It may be that the adverse impacts will be elevated in significance when these schemes are considered cumulatively.	89371-648-8810	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	We suggest that an additional assessment is made of the potential cumulative impacts between Cannington Bypass, Cannington Park and Ride, and the Freight Logistics Facility at Combwich. These have all been assessed individually for their potential impact on landscape and visual resources, but they have not been assessed in combination. It may be that the adverse impacts will be elevated in significance when these schemes are considered cumulatively.	89377-648-11035	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	- It is suggest that an additional assessment is made of the potential cumulative impacts between other elements of associated development around Cannington, including the Cannington Park and Ride and development at Combwich.	89426-648-11404	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	We suggest that an additional assessment is made of the potential cumulative impacts between Cannington Bypass and Cannington Park and Ride	89427-648-16909	/			

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	It is considered by Sedgemoor District Council that the eastern route would significantly impact on the landscape character of the area, particularly as a greater amount of land will be affected and the proposed road would need to be elevated to reduce the liability of flooding.	88350-647-1387	/			The assessment of impacts in the <b>Volume 5, Chapter 15 of the Environment Statement</b> has been further developed since Stage 1 and Stage 2 Consultations. Detailed proposals have been developed, in response to concerns raised during the consultation process about impacts on Brymore School, Chad's Hill and residents on the western side of Cannington. These proposals included mitigation of potential impacts identified within the assessment, including screen planting and the extension of the noise attenuation bund to provide visual screening.
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	The western route option is shorter in length and impacts on less sensitive landscape areas, and, subject to the completion of further detailed assessment work, would also result in less loss of hedgerows and trees. In terms of landscape impact some of the road alignment would be set within a cutting which would help to screen the bypass, however, it is important to note that the western route would adversely impact the setting of Brymore School (a Grade II Listed Building).	88350-647-1666			/	A lighting strategy was designed to restrict lighting to the junctions at each end of the bypass and minimises light levels and spill. In addition the noise attenuation bunds would significantly reduce the impact on the western edge of Cannington of light from vehicles. An assessment has been made of the impact of lighting; this is included in <b>Volume 5, Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement</b> .
Tractivity 763	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? It is NOT a bypass as it cuts THROUGH the village of Cannington! It may appear as a bypass to some residents (in the middle of the village) but cutting up the land through Brymore would effect 100's of boys (and staff) and tears up beautiful countryside. How can destroying our surroundings be for us?. We will still have traffic noise, pollution - a busier village ANYWAY due to influx of extra workers - (they won't stay on site all the time!) If we cannot have a bypass further out (i.e. Northern - in a much more industrialised area. I question the whole idea of a bypass. I believe the Western bypass as proposed is a mistake. It would devastate the village - ruin many villagers homes (views, noise etc.) and box us in with virtually busy roads on all sides. Another area my children cannot access on their own - because of a road!	9521-647-3530			/	There were several comments at Stage 2 that suggested the impact of the proposed development had both been underestimated. These issues have been addressed as the proposals have been refined and a more detailed landscape assessment has been carried out.  A number of comments were made with regard to the possible bypass routes which were explored at Stage 1. Generally comments expressed the view that the eastern route would significantly impact on the landscape character of the area, particularly as a greater amount of land would be affected and the proposed road would need to be elevated to reduce the liability of flooding. The western route, as has been proposed, was shorter in length, impacted on less sensitive landscape areas and would result in loss of fewer hedgerows and trees; however concerns were raised about the impact on Brymore School, the visual impact of the road and its impact on views out from the western edge of Cannington. There were also concerns about the impact of lighting and the need to remove some newly planted trees. These concerns were all taken into consideration during the design that was carried out following the comments received at Stage 1.
Tractivity 1142	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? This is the route of cheapness. The route chosen impacts on just as many properties as the eastern route. Asking drivers to use the existing by pass then come back on themselves to use the new road may not happen.  The route has a direct impact on my property as we live at the eastern end of the route. There is inadequate screening proposed for this end of the route for those of us living on the northern side of the road.  The access to Cannington for us is made unsafe by this road cutting across the lane to the village without any crossing points and the added traffic from the new roundabout to Comwich which passes by our lane end. We do not want the lane cut off by the bypass for cyclists or walkers as this has large recreational use into further footpaths and lane network. (Personal details removed) are picked up from (Personal details removed) to get to Haygrove school. We need safe crossing of the existing road. these points were made at the recent meeting	9900-647-3097			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1142	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 concerns about the visual, light, pollution and noise impact of the Cannington by pass on our property and will be seeking adequate compensation to cover the devaluation of our home because of this. This proposed road cuts us off from safe passage to Cannington particularly by foot or cycle and also due to the proposed dead end of our lane going towards Cannington cuts us off from the local footpath and lane network for recreational use on foot or cycle. We have road safety concerns about this road as all cycle and footpaths for the new and existing Hinckly Point road are on the opposite side of the road to where we live. (Personal details removed) need to cross to catch the school bus at (Personal details removed). This is already dangerous as the traffic is now, but will get worse. All crossings etc have been put in at the Brymore end. Cannington does extend to Putnell - consider us please.	9900-647-7757			/	
Tractivity 1175	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments?  Severe congestion already exists in the area. The western bypass route for Cannington will be only beneficial, perhaps, during the construction phase and of little use to the community thereafter. A blot on the landscape! Bridgwater and Cannington should be bypassed from the M5, Junct 23 (Dunball) to C182 between Cannington and Combswich. Also would be useful for holiday traffic during and after construction of P.S's	9933-647-3715			/	
Tractivity 1223	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments?  Potential change in traffic flow (+17%) quoted at road show is negligible when applied to the present very low level of traffic through Cannington. It would seriously affect the visibility of Brymore School, cutting it off from the road. Unnecessary destruction of prime agricultural land. Short term project to appease some local residents for long term/permanent environmental destruction with possible under-use following completion of project.	9981-647-2622			/	
Tractivity 1362	Public	Stage 2 Update	Cannington by-pass. The plan suggests that this will be a substantial road with a major visual impact.	89628-647-1507			/	
Tractivity 184	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference  there is insufficient room to provide a bypass east of the village. it would be more appropriate to provide a bypass on the west of the village after the existing bypass.	8901-647-1467	/			
Tractivity 187	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference  Less impact on village, less populated area, mostly farmland that would be less disrupted than local population and school close to western proposals.	8903-647-1706			/	
Tractivity 210	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference  A shorter, cheaper route that can be landscaped out of view. The slower speed limit is also welcome.	8915-647-1462			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 212	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: East of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference Less impact on residential areas Western route could entail the removal of a vast amount of newly planted trees which if left to mature will benefit local wildlife and help to reduce global warming.	8917-647-1066	/			
Tractivity 369	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference If we have to have a bypass, west of village is sensible option as part of the existing bypass would be used and it is the cheaper, shorter route. Totally against a road to the east because:- it would have to be elevated and cause an eyesore: it would lower the value of property: restrict existing views: cause noise, dust, pollution and because of flooding issues here could create more flooding problems.	9056-647-1082			/	
Tractivity 611	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference I believe that a bypass should not be built, if it is possible to manage traffic through the construction phase. Once built the existing transport infrastructure could cope as these is only planned to be 150 person increase in permanent staffing levels. It is unnecessary (and irrevocably damaging) to build a new road over valuable natural habitat and farmland. Let alone the impact it would have on local residents with increases light, noise traffic fume pollution as well as the visual impact.	9275-647-1929		/		
Tractivity 50906	Public	Stage 1	I live in (Personal details removed) and if the Western option goes ahead then my environment will become unbearable due to traffic noise, dirt, dust and light pollution etc. It will also open up the possibility of green belt land being developed as the proposed new road will cut off (Personal details removed) from one of its fields.	9398-647-451			/	
Tractivity 62299	Public	Stage 2	Both the Bypass and park & ride facility will enormously increase the congestion on the dangerous A39 and are far too near residents' homes allowing continuous noise penetration, pollution and lighting annoyance.	9990-647-605			/	
Tractivity 62384	Public	Stage 2	Even if it was deemed necessary, the western Cannington bypass route proposed is totally unacceptable by devastating the beautiful and listed tree-lined drive leading to Brymore School, before rising up and passing close by farms and homes. This is the cheapest route for EDF and in proposing this route they obviously have little regard for villagers nearby. An outer western route would at least be less invasive on the village but, of course, would take longer to build and cost more - something EDF wish to avoid as they want the cheapest, quickest solution.	10047-647-3585			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62386	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. The original plans for the Western by pass put the road in a cutting so that it was out of sight and noise and light pollution would be reduced. However, the recent stage 2 plans clearly show the Western by pass being built on an embankment above the field level. This is totally unacceptable. This proposed road is directly in front of my home and 10 other dwellings. You know from discussions with us that we are all appalled at EDFs apparent lack of concern for the people who live on (Personal details removed) and that EDF are prepared to spoil our outlook, create more noise, dust and light pollution. If this road is allowed EDF must be made to put the whole road into a cutting to minimise all the disruptive aspects that this road will bring. We do not want a hedge and fence to disguise the road. Engineers have the skill to plan and build a road through a cutting and should be made to do so.	10049-647-2227	/			
Tractivity 62411	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	I am against the constant noise, dust, light pollution, air pollution, smells, heavy traffic etc that will happen during the build period and most of all the use of the A39. How can EDF justify this overloading of an already inadequate holiday route as their preferred main route when a perfectly good option has been put forward, i.e. the North Bridgwater By-pass which would reduce the impact to more acceptable levels.	10054-647-1057			/	
Tractivity 62569	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	The bypass will be in close proximity to our house, so the increase in traffic, noise, light and pollution will greatly impact on our daily lives.	10121-647-125			/	
Tractivity 62569	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	The road will not be screened so our magnificent views will be ruined.	10121-647-448	/			
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	This will cause noise and dust pollution and light pollution at night. Make sure lighting does end where your plans show. We like the night sky here.	10124-647-8514			/	
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	As you have probably gathered I am very concerned about the elevation of the Western bypass preferred route.  From (Personal details removed) where you propose to build the bypass. The plans show an elevated section across this field which means we will see, hear and smell these vehicles at all hours of the day and night. They will also cause light pollution as they use the road.	10124-647-8840	/			

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	Environmental Appraisal Volume 2 - Section 21.4 is broadly acceptable but some local impacts may be underestimated because of the generalised nature of the approach.	89246-647-2462			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Need to be clear whether indicators listed regarding Sensitivity (21.4.6) and Significance (Table 21.4.2) are to be applied at a local level or at a national level. Vol.3 rather confuses the two. It should be a local assessment and in that respect Vol.3 assessments are rather underestimates of impact.	89246-647-2981	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Adequacy of assessment, particularly with respect to impacts The following points are made in relation to the adequacy of assessment of impacts in relation to Landscape and Visual Impact:	89246-647-3288	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The impacts on Brymore school driveway are under estimated. In landscape and cultural terms it is an important feature and even if it is not well used by the public severance and visual changes will have greater effects than predicted.  - Construction phase visual impacts are generally well reviewed but there are omissions and sensitivity is underestimated in Table 3.11.4.	89246-647-4057	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Beneficial visual effects are identified in table 3.11.8. However, loss of view by enclosing a footpath in high hedge is not necessarily a visual benefit. The footpath is also bisected by the bypass which would reduce any beneficial effect on both the east and west portions of footpath BW5/8. Overall there is a negative effect on the western part which is now closer to a fairly major road. Beneficial results for Footpath BW5/17 at Cannington Park are not evident.	89246-647-4697	/			

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	Street lighting from Toucan crossing to Withiel Drive is a marked landscape character change and will be visible from AONB.  - Views from residential properties at Withiel Farm, Withiel Drive and Chads Hill are subject to early operational impacts. There is potential to create a roadside landform that rises at the back of the verge before falling as an embankment to existing ground level.	89246-647-6714	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Street lighting to the roundabout at Rodway is a marked landscape character change and may be visible from Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).	89246-647-7504		/		
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Underestimation of impacts on receptor sites.	89246-647-8301	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Adequacy of assessment, particularly with respect to impacts  The following points are made in relation to the adequacy of assessment of impacts in relation to Landscape and Visual Impact	89247-647-2040			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	however, the post removal / reinstatement effects are frequently judged as beneficial which it is considered to be optimistic , especially when the original judgements on landscape capacity are low and the development proposals are judged as incompatible.	89371-647-7077	/			



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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	It is judged that a level of uncertainty remains in respect of minimising the adverse residual impacts on the Landscape and Visual resource particularly in the operational phase. This uncertainty also extends to the marked difference between the generally adverse nature of significant impacts described during construction of the scheme that are then assessed to become significant (moderate and even major) benefits during operation and decommissioning of the scheme. There are potential inconsistencies in the judgement of the sensitivity of visual receptors which warrants further clarification.	89425-647-9478	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Additional residual effects are possible in the visual impact due to the lighting associated with the proposed development (including the impact on the AONB).	89425-647-10081	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	It is judged that a level of uncertainty remains in respect of minimising the adverse residual impacts on the Landscape and Visual resource particularly in the operational phase. This uncertainty also extends to the marked difference between the generally adverse nature of significant impacts described during construction of the scheme that are then assessed to become significant (moderate and even major) benefits during operation and decommissioning of the scheme. There are potential inconsistencies in the judgement of the sensitivity of visual receptors which warrants further clarification.  Additional residual effects are possible in the visual impact due to the lighting associated with the proposed development (including the impact on the AONB).	89426-647-9939	/			
Tractivity 62911	Public	Stage 2 Update	it will cause light and noise pollution	89663-647-573			/	
Tractivity 62930	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	We live in the most picturesque and tranquil part of connington, and we are very lucky indeed.  We are both semi-retired after working for years in business, and we are deeply upset with this proposal for the western by-pass.  With this new road, it will bring a high volume of traffic, pollution dust from the prevailing south west winds, noise and block our wonderful views & scenery.	89673-647-140			/	
Tractivity 62958	Public	Stage 2 Update	Given that the prevailing wind is south westerly, the fact that your proposal does not place the road within any significant cutting for the majority of its length, it is inevitable that a dramatic increase in noise, dust and visual pollution will occur, particularly the former.  This will have a severe detrimental effect on our quality of life.	89685-647-598			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
English Heritage	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	We do, however, still maintain concern over the overall impact of the proposed by-pass at Cannington in terms of the setting to the village and its conservation area. We believe that the introduction of this new road will cause visual harm to the rural setting of the village and in particular to heritage assets on this side of the village-most notably Brymore School and its associated land and buildings.	89718-647-4862	/			
Tractivity 70648	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	Having regard to the volume of traffic which it would carry, day and night, anyone living in the area would be severely affected by noise, light and fume pollution. And it would seriously damage a beautiful landscape and cause especial damage to particular parts of it - for example, Brymore School.	89766-647-3318			/	
14	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	The Western Bypass will use prime agricultural land, defaces one of the most scenic green field areas around Cannington and would spoil its glorious panoramic views.	89803-647-344			/	
14	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	Both the Bypass and park & ride facility will enormously increase the congestion on the dangerous A39 and are far too near residents' homes allowing continuous noise penetration, pollution and light annoyance.	89803-647-602			/	
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	6. Do you agree with EdF view that a Cannington western by-pass should be provided? Agree Disagree No opinion Don't know  - The by-pass will serve little or no legacy purpose. It will be a blot upon the landscape for the residents of the village and for all the surrounding communities and it will affect a number of properties adversely and permanently while offering little or no compensation.	89806-647-8652			/	
30	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	Proposed Western Bypass  If built, this road will badly affect the lives of everyone in this village, not least, those most affected in the immediate vicinity, As the predominant wind comes from, a westerly direction, it will carry noise, fumes and dust pollution across most of the village. The existing A39 bypass causes enough noise disturbance to half of the village and if the proposed bypass goes ahead, the village will be virtually surrounded with constant traffic noise for the greater part of the day and night.	89819-647-440			/	
34	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	The Western Bypass will use prime agricultural land, defaces one of the most scenic green field areas around Cannington and would spoil its glorious panoramic views.	89823-647-399			/	
34	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	Both the Bypass and park & ride facility will enormously increase the congestion on the dangerous A39 and are far too near residents' homes allowing continuous noise-penetration,-pollution and lighting annoyance.	89823-647-657			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1138	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Firstly, EDF have not made any provision for the increased traffic along the A39 from Bridgwater to Cannington which is already a busy road where there have been several accidents over the years. Secondly, we believe the Eastern bypass would have affected fewer properties. Thirdly, a temporary road dedicated to Hinkley Point traffic from the M5 at Dunball (north of Bridgwater) would render a western bypass unnecessary. Finally, the Western Bypass route goes over Brymore School Lane which is lined with mature trees and, as we understand, is in a National Heritage park.	9896-41-3216	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Quantock Hills AONB Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Key Potential Issues: Given proximity to the Quantock Hills AONB, reference should be made to potential impacts on visual amenity and views from the AONB.	8734-646-7739	/			<p>The methodology for, and presentation of, the assessment of impacts in <b>Volume 5, Chapter 15</b> of the Environmental Statement have been further developed and refined since the Stage 2 consultation. A number of comments from consultees noted that the methodology is broadly acceptable.</p> <p>As part of the refinement of the assessment process extra viewpoints were added where necessary. A viewpoint from the Quantock Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty was included in the latest visual impact assessment and considered the impact on the Quantocks at day and at night.</p> <p>In response to comments from several consultees requesting detailed tree analysis, a tree survey has been carried out to BS5837: 2005 and is provided as an appendix to the <b>Volume 5, Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement</b>. It has been used to inform the baseline and has been used in the assessment of impacts.</p>
Natural England	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Many of the same issues and inconsistencies discussed above occur in the assessment of landscape and visual impact for the off-site associated development. We would encourage careful reconsideration of the method and rigour of assessment applied in determining the potential impacts of these developments and identification of opportunities to mitigate such impacts. Clear and explicit assessments of landscape and visual impacts on designated landscape (AONB and inheritance tax exempt land, notably Orchard Wyndham and Williton Park and Ride development), general landscape character, elements and features within the landscape and visual amenity should be carried out.	89110-646-2507	/			
Quantock Hills AONB Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- The same issues regarding methodology apply to the ADS as per HPC.	89122-646-1726			/	
Quantock Hills AONB Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Cannington Bypass - Landscape Baseline  - 3.11.27. Although stating the AONB sits just 3.7 km from the site, there is no description of the interrelationship of Cannington and the Quantock Hills. There should be a clear description of prominence of the hills overlooking and forming a backdrop to the village.	89122-646-2148	/			
Quantock Hills AONB Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	- There are no descriptions of any Quantock Hills Landscape Character Areas which provide important contextual information to the site and surrounds.	89122-646-2463	/			
Quantock Hills AONB Service	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Cannington Bypass- Visual Baseline  - Table 3.11.4. Given that there are a number of references up to this point in the chapter about the Quantock Hills AONB, there is no Quantock Hills viewpoint forming part of the assessment. This is a major omission.	89122-646-2616	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Provide and use Tree Surveys to British Standard.	89246-646-1796	/			

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	Overall robustness of approach, methodology & baseline assumptions  The following points are made in relation to the approach, methodology and baseline assumptions in relation to Landscape and Visual Impact:  - Environmental Appraisal Volume 3 Chapter 3, 3.11, Landscape. All planning policy is rather out of date but Local Development Frameworks not yet advance/approved. Regional Guidance no longer relevant due to 2010 change of national government  - Environmental Appraisal Volume 1 Chapter No.5 - Environmental Impact Methodology broadly acceptable other than the significant points raised above.	89246-646-1850	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	(Personal details removed) on Sandy Lane are not identified as sensitive receptor sites. Both are sensitive as they are within 50m of the road.	89246-646-3615	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Somerset County Council (SCC) considers that the following information is missing for  the Stage 2 consultation:	89246-646-7674			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Not enough design input to landscape mitigation proposals.	89246-646-8352	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The methodology for the Bypass assessment both complies with Volume 11 DMRB and is based on the principles set out in GLVIA and Countryside Agency Landscape Character Assessment guidance.	89371-646-5945			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There needs to be an explanation of Compatibility and Capacity (with reference to Vol3 Ch3 para 3.11.43) of the landscape and how levels have been arrived at in the assessment.	89371-646-6574	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Generally the judgement of significance is appropriate during construction and operation	89371-646-6985			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 714	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below  IF your proposed preferred route via Western By Pass is approved. PLEASE start cutting from 450m mark (i.e. not have initial part on an embankment as at present) thus mitigating the distress of noise, dust and unusual hour traffic flow for those of us who will be directly disturbed as my address below will show. Also any plan to cut through Brymore School is tantamount to vandalism.	9472-649-7609			/	Several comments received at Stage 2 raised concerns about the proposed development's potential impacts on the surrounding area. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and supporting studies and surveys for the proposed development were conducted for all phases of the proposed development. This was done in accordance with the principles set out by the Landscape Institute (LI) and Institute of Environmental Management Assessment (IEMA) in the Guidelines for LVIA (GLVIA) and guidance on Landscape Character Assessment from the Countryside Agency (now Natural England) and Scottish Natural Heritage. As part of the refinement of the landscape and visual assessment process extra viewpoints were added, where necessary assessment of the impact of the road has been undertaken.  At Stage 2 one of the primary concerns with regard to mitigation was the request to put as much as possible of the bypass in cutting (, this was a particular concern of the residents of Chad's Hill). Whilst in engineering terms it was not possible to do this, in response to the comments from consultees, the southern section of the bypass on the Cannington side has been put behind a noise attenuation bund which would be planted up. This would screen the road (and light from traffic on the road) from the western edge of Cannington.  A lighting strategy has been designed which restricts lighting to the junctions at each end of the bypass and reduces light levels and spill. In addition the noise attenuation bunds will significantly reduce the impact on the western edge of Cannington of light from vehicles. An assessment has been made of the impact of lighting in <b>Volume 5, Chapter 15 of the Environmental Statement.</b>
Tractivity 864	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments?  We need more roads - hope/trust they will be well landscaped though?	9622-649-2830			/	
Tractivity 899	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments?  We would like a longer cutting from Withiel Drive to Knapp Farm to decrease noise and visibility.	9657-649-2559	/			
Tractivity 1158	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below  Noise, visual and environmental mitigation for the Cannington by-pass is totally inadequate.	9916-649-6608	/			
Tractivity 62340	Public	Stage 2	1. The route where it passes in front of Chads Hill should be in a cutting, as it was in your initial proposal. To commence the cutting only after Sandy Lane does nothing to address the significant and lasting impact this road is going to have on the dozens of residents on Chads Hill. We cannot ever be compensated for the huge negative impact this road is going to have on the value of our homes - a large part of the value being in the view which does not figure in either the Land Compensation Act or the Town and Country Planning Act. However you can address by this means some of the impact on our view, and on the noise that is to be created in what until now has been a peaceful location.	10020-649-1867	/			
Tractivity 62340	Public	Stage 2	2. Whilst I was told at the public meeting that the proposed location of the street lighting is only indicative at this stage I would propose that the lighting be kept as minimal as possible (none if possible). At this stage no street lighting is shown north of the junction with Withiel Drive and I would hope that this will continue to be the absolute maximum.	10020-649-2567			/	
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Comment  My preferred route is Dunball to H. Point. 2nd option route 1 to west of Cannington as it upsets very few houses.  If Western bypass is built it needs to go into a cutting from Withiel Drive to Rodway roundabout to cut noise to nearby houses and cut light pollution of freight moving through the night.	10124-649-3465			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Wester bypass - please put it into a cutting for Withiel Drive to Rodway. The present plans show an elevated section across the field in front of my house. This will cause noise and dust pollution and light pollution at night.	10124-649-8359	/			
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Make sure lighting does end where your plans show. We like the night sky here.	10124-649-8586			/	
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Please put the road in a cutting so it is environmentally friendly, not an eye sore and the bats will fly at a safe height - you won't need the bat tree alley. A fence of trees will not screen high sided vehicles.	10124-649-9407			/	
Tractivity 62938	Public	Stage 2	What sound and light protection could possibly be adequate to residents in Withiel Drive or Danesboro.	10177-649-4062			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Post construction visual impacts have been assessed and the mitigation proposed is poor. The document does not recognise the fact that planting in place at year 1, will be much less effective than at year 5, for example, when it has had time to mature.	89246-649-4439	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Adequacy of mitigation, compensation, long term legacy and residual effects The following points are made in relation to the adequacy of the mitigation, compensation and long term legacy in relation to Landscape and Visual Impact:	89246-649-6471			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	It would be helpful to have confirmation that the depth/s and bank profile/s are safe and ecologically positive. Generalised grass surround - need more indication of habitat creation.	89246-649-7315	/			



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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Proposals for the mixed native hedgerows, scrub, grassland and tree planting are supported on the basis that these will assist in mitigating for habitat loss and provide visual screening of the bypass.	89366-649-8735			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Use of semi-mature trees in the landscaping will be important if these are to provide the visual screening and ecological benefits referred to in the masterplan document, such as the bat 'hopover'.	89366-649-8942			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	A commitment to landscaping and a management regime that will enhance the biodiversity of the site in short and long term will be required.	89366-649-9209			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Proposals for street lighting that limit light spill into surrounding areas is welcome	89366-649-9354			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Generally mitigation proposals attempt to address the impacts of the scheme, although they are presently restricted to proposals within the redline site boundary.	89371-649-7357	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The landscape strategy for the site focuses on providing permanent landscape treatments, which would help to mitigate the visual impacts of the proposed development in the long term. The landscape mitigation plan Figure 3.11.10 indicates mitigation proposals which should be deliverable.	89371-649-7523			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	It is suggested that perhaps EDF Energy should investigate offsite mitigation measures to further reduce effects, particularly the visual effects of all the proposals.	89371-649-7814	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	We also recommended that as a minimum of a 15 year management and maintenance agreement is established.	89371-649-7985			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Details on how the impact of lighting to Cannington Bypass can be reduced from a significant residual adverse effect are poorly characterised at present.	89371-649-8114	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Lighting will require careful design and could constitute a significant residual adverse effect.	89371-649-8463			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	- Consider mitigation measures beyond the redline site boundary to more realistically inform EDF Energy's concept to 'embrace' the development in the wider landscape	89424-649-14076		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Further reasonable measures that would allow possible residual effects to be mitigated include:	89425-649-10243			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	- Revisit operational phase assessment using more detailed iterative mitigation in the design process for especially, but not exclusively, local Landscape and Visual components	89425-649-10677	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	- Consider mitigation measures beyond the redline site boundary to more realistically inform EDF Energy's concept to 'embrace' the development in the wider landscape	89425-649-10857		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	- Provide evidence and strategy - in relation to recommendations above - for early establishment of planting in the wider landscape	89425-649-11026		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	- Revisit operational phase assessment using more detailed iterative mitigation in the design process for especially, but not exclusively, local Landscape and Visual components  - Consider mitigation measures beyond the redline site boundary to more realistically inform EDF's concept to 'embrace' the development in the wider landscape  - Provide evidence and strategy - in relation to recommendations above - for early establishment of planting in the wider landscape	89426-649-10806		/		
Tractivity 62958	Public	Stage 2 Update	We are, frankly, disappointed and annoyed that despite earlier promises your proposed bypass is not in a cutting when it is directly opposite our properties. Moreover, according to one of your representatives at the display in Cannington on 06/03/11, there would no fencing, only the possibility of some sort of planting at a later date to alleviate noise, visual impact etc.	89685-649-1902			/	
Tractivity 62958	Public	Stage 2 Update	1) If you must build a bypass then at least put the part of it which will be directly in line with our properties into a cutting which will conceal traffic, lessen noise and visual impact, and reduce dust pollution from the prevailing westerly wind.	89685-649-2332			/	
English Heritage	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	We have been consistent in pressing for a separate VIA for this part of the project as we believe that the road is in itself a major infrastructure that should be subject to the same scrutiny as the main development through the EIA system.	89718-649-5270			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	No comments on monitoring are offered at this stage.	89371-650-9288			/	No comments received

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	Key recommendations The following key recommendations are made: - Relevant landscape information is spread over several documents and not easily accessible, this should be addressed.	89246-651-1547	/			It has been possible to ensure that impacts have been addressed in a coherent way in the final design proposals, which are presented in the <b>Chapter 15, Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement</b>
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Difficult to assimilate and cross reference data as it is spread through many documents. It would be helpful if all this information was located together. - Tree and hedgerow surveys - (as required by 1 App planning application forms)	89246-651-7943	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Noise monitoring has been undertaken at a number of representative locations around the site. The methodology for the baseline monitoring appears acceptable	89367-582-7749		/		Baseline noise monitoring was undertaken following consultation with the relevant Environmental Health Officers at Stage 1 consultation. The location and duration of monitoring was determined based on the proposals consulted on at Stage 1.  Baseline data was obtained at the properties considered most likely to be affected by the proposed bypass. Full details of the monitoring undertaken, including a graphical illustration of monitoring and assessment locations, has been updated since Stage 2 consultation and is included in <b>Volume 5, Chapter 9</b> of the Environmental Statement (ES).
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	At Monitoring Location ML8 (Northbrook Road, Cannington), the noise measurements have been used to derive the LA10(18hour) based on the shortened measurement methodology given in the Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (CRTN) guidance. There are some inconsistencies with this location when compared to the same location and monitoring period referenced in Appendix 10a. Firstly, the dates and times of the survey differ (ref. Table 3.4.13 and Table 12 in Appendix 10a) although the results are identical. Additionally, the description of the monitoring position in paragraph 3.4.20 states that there is an angle of view to the carriageway of 150°, compared to 35° in Section 3.2.10 of Appendix 10a;	89367-582-7991	/			The baseline used in the noise assessment comprises a combination of data collected during the noise monitoring surveys and modelled noise levels using traffic data. The modelled and measured baseline levels have been used to inform the noise assessment of all properties, within the vicinity of the proposed Cannington bypass development for potential noise and vibration impacts in <b>Volume 5, Chapter 9</b> of the ES.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Paragraph 3.4.20 also states that 'Chad's Hill has a speed limit of 30mph and is a reasonably level single track lane, used primarily for access to and from Castle Hill Quarry to the north and by farm vehicles.' This statement appears irrelevant to the monitoring location at Northbrook Road.	89367-582-8693	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	2.3.13 The proposals for the preferred alignment of the Cannington Bypass from the existing roundabout on the A39 Southern Bypass to Rodway Road (C182) remain unchanged but the proposals now include a number of measures to address previous concerns regarding pedestrians, noise and ecology.  2.3.14 In terms of flood risk, the proposed route is currently a green field site and lies within Flood Zone 1.	89865-582-11249			/	

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 1	The two proposed routes (East and West) are both too close to houses in the village and indeed the westerly route would bring increased noise and pollution into the village caused by the prevailing winds. The Council disputes the figures derived by EDF in their consultation documents, regarding the number of houses affected to the point where the Council feels the figures are round the wrong way!	8746-590-3697		/		<p>The pre-application stage of the proposed Hinkley Point C (HPC) Project has involved extensive consultation with a wide range of stakeholders. Sedgemoor District Council (SDC) and West Somerset Council (WSC) both made a number of comments throughout the consultation process. As a result of the engagement with SDC and WSC (and their technical advisors), both through the formal stages of consultation and through direct meetings and discussions, changes were incorporated into the assessment methodology and the mitigation measures at all stages of the consultation process.</p> <p>EDF Energy has also held a number of meetings with local residents to provide a forum for direct discussion and feedback regarding potential noise issues.</p> <p>Following on from Stage 1 and Stage 2, more detailed studies were undertaken into the various options for addressing traffic issues in the village of Cannington. A desk-based assessment of alternative options to the western Cannington bypass scheme was undertaken, including the feasibility for a Northern Bridgwater bypass option. The potential noise and vibration impacts of the two route options considered are included in this assessment.</p> <p>Following Stage 2 consultation responses received, notably from SDC and WSC, and on-going consultation with local residents, changes were made to the noise mitigation proposed as part of the development. The noise attenuation barriers in the final scheme design consist of earth bunds rather than fences as proposed at Stage 2. A detailed assessment of the attenuation provided by the earth bunds is contained within <b>Volume 5, Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement</b>.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	<p>Noise and Vibration and Air Quality</p> <p>The Noise &amp; Vibration and Air Quality sections of the ESR provide a preliminary assessment of the potential impacts at the Main Development Area and the western and eastern bypass route options. Whilst this is welcome, there is limited information (particularly baseline data) allowing a technical preference to be provided in noise and air quality terms.</p> <p>The rationale for providing a Cannington Bypass is understood with respect to minimising air quality, noise and vibration impacts in the centre of the village. Nonetheless, current government guidance stresses the need to consider alternatives to building new roads. Proposals for the construction of major new highways must therefore meet the most rigorous levels of justification (Sedgemoor Local Plan, paragraph 7.11). Further information should be included within the Stage 2 Consultation by way of justification.</p> <p>It is understood that further assessments are to be undertaken by EDF Energy. The roads that should be assessed will need to be agreed with Sedgemoor District Council.</p>	88350-590-0	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	d. The cladding material used for the 2m high structures will need to be agreed by the Council to ensure they are appropriate for the rural setting, and views to and from Brymore School and Cannington Conservation Area	89366-590-9741	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 218	Public	Stage 1	Please give reasons for your preference The road will be away from the village and the cuurent by pass which will be a more obvious choice bearing in mind the village traffic and that going through in summer. Noise and polution must be a consideration as well as congestion.	8921-585-1650			/	The approach to assessing the cumulative impacts of noise and vibration associated with the Hinkley Point C (HPC) Project has evolved following Stage 2 consultation. The cumulative impacts of the proposed HPC Project with other committed and proposed development is considered in <b>Volume 11, Chapter 6</b> of the Environmental Statement (ES). Interactive cumulative impacts of noise and vibration with other environmental topics (e.g. dust, landscape) associated with the HPC Project on specific sensitive receptors are also considered in <b>Volume 11</b> of the ES.  The assessment of traffic impacts on the wider highway network has been assessed for all traffic associated with the HPC Project. Therefore the assessment of road traffic noise is a cumulative assessment.
<b>Somerset County Council</b>	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Noise and Air Quality - the cumulative impacts with the park and ride construction and operation should be assessed fully.	89202-585-2628		/		
<b>Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response</b>	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The section which assesses the noise and vibration impacts of development of the Cannington Bypass does not identify or assess any cumulative noise impacts.	89367-585-15724	/			



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 1	Is far too close to the village of Cannington that in turn will bring noise, dust and pollution into the village.	8746-584-4119			/	<p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy proposed two search areas, to the east and west of Cannington respectively, as potentially suitable locations for the provision of a bypass. An initial assessment of both of the proposed bypass routes was carried out following feedback from the consultation. There are significant flood risk issues related to development of the eastern bypass route compared with the western bypass route. EDF Energy acknowledged the risk associated with the eastern bypass route, and this was important to the selection of the western bypass route as the preferred option for incorporation in the Stage 2 consultation. The western bypass route would also be shorter with lesser environmental impacts, and fewer residential properties near the route. A fuller explanation for the choice of the western bypass route was provided in the Stage 1 Consultation Report and is included in the <b>Planning Statement</b>.</p> <p><b>Volume 5, Chapter 9</b> of the Environmental Statement details the potential noise and vibration impacts associated with the proposed Cannington Bypass.</p> <p>Following Stage 2 Update consultation and meetings held with residents of Chad's hill, the noise bund to the east of the proposed bypass has been extended northwards to reduce predicted noise levels at this location. The proposed development now includes the provision of four earth acoustic bunds to reduce the impact of noise on the closest noise sensitive receptors. These bunds are to be 2m in height and constructed from reinforced earthwork with vegetated slopes.</p> <p>In recognition of the noise impacts, eg at night, which have been assessed in the Environmental Statement, and taking account of the relatively rural character of the affected areas, EDF Energy would provide an offer of noise insulation support to those properties most affected by transport related noise arising from the HPC development construction phase. Detailed eligibility would be based on a careful analysis of the findings of the noise assessment work and further details and communication to eligible residents will take place following submission of the DCO application. It would be provided by EDF Energy on a voluntary basis as noise impacts and levels are expected to be below those at which there would be a</p>
Tractivity 942	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? The proposed bypass (by EDF) will destroy Brymoor School and with the prevailing winds will cause pollution in Cannington village. ALSO the noise will add to an already high level of road noise. ALSO this will mean TWO lots of construction cokers using Cannington. THE BEST OPTION IS THAT FROM DUNBALL!!!	9700-584-3096		/		
Tractivity 1050	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Disagree strongly. The bypass is too close to houses, school footpaths etc. to be called a bypass. It will affect our property. Noise, light, pollution and impact on the environment will be catastrophic. The Northern route is the only option.	9808-584-2949		/		
Tractivity 1050	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	7. Any other ideas or comments? It will cause congestion. Noise, pollution and light will increase. Environment and wildlife will be affected.	9808-584-3649			/	
Tractivity 1050	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	10. Any other ideas or comments? Hinkley Point freight sent outside peak periods would pass Cannington bypass (if built) early in the morning or evening! More noise for us people alongside the bypass! Not acceptable!	9808-584-5477			/	
Tractivity 1050	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	12. Any other ideas or comments? Construction materials would travel along the bypass. More noise as already stated.	9808-584-6607			/	
Tractivity 1070	Public	Stage 2	Any additional traffic in the Cannington area will be detrimental to village life, with noise and pollution becoming unbearable.	9828-584-3461			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1142	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 have concerns about the visual, light, pollution and noise impact of the Cannington by pass on our property and will be seeking adequate compensation to cover the devaluation of our home because of this. This proposed road cuts us off from safe passage to Cannington particularly by foot or cycle and also due to the proposed dead end of our lane going towards Cannington cuts us off from the local footpath and lane network for recreational use on foot or cycle. We have road safety concerns about this road as all cycle and footpaths for the new and existing Hinckly Point road are on the opposite side of the roads to where we live. (Personal details removed) need to cross to catch the school bus at (Personal details removed). This is already dangerous as the traffic is now, but will get worse. All crossings etc have been put in at the Brymore end. Cannington does extend to Putnell - consider us please.</p>	9900-584-7757			/	legislative requirement to offer noise insulation.
Tractivity 1336	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	It is not sufficient to say that noise will not exceed maximum allowed levels - you need to take into account the current levels. At the moment weekend noise is limited to birdsong - this will not be the case when we have a new road in front of our houses.	89602-584-624	/			
Tractivity 217	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>Would be more logical as the traffic would be taken further away from the village, reducing noise pollution. This would also help provide an alternative route for the villages along the existing Hinkley Point road to use. It would cut down the speeding and ignorance of drivers thinking they can use our main road as a race track. As one of the primary school's access is on the main road, this would also help school children to arrive safely and for our older village members to cross the road without having to run a marathon to reach the other side.</p>	8920-584-1897			/	
Tractivity 218	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>Please give reasons for your preference The road will be away from the village and the current by pass which will be a more obvious choice bearing in mind the village traffic and that going through in summer. Noise and pollution must be a consideration as well as congestion.</p>	8921-584-1650			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 360	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference I do not believe either route is the correct one but since another option is not included in your tick box questionnaire I am opting for the least intrusive and most likely to be used. You completely ignore the effects of the prevailing south westerly winds in your initial attempts to quantify the effects of noise, air and dust pollution on local residents. If you take account of these it is evident that the eastern route is the better of two bad options. The A38 into Bridgwater is already congested at rush hour making the town impossible to access without queueing. When your 3000 (50%) 'local' employees (ie travelling for 90 minutes or less!) are using the route it will be gridlocked.	9048-584-1292			/	
Tractivity 370	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference The east road crosses natural wetland with dykes, because of this the road will be longer & built up. This will disrupt natural habitat & we may lose some wildlife. The road would be in a very open area so that noise levels would not be absorbed. This would cause a constant drone of traffic for the villages	9057-584-1136	/			
Tractivity 575	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Please give reasons for your preference The existing bypass is already and a west bypass would not relieve this. Also the east side is less developed, so least traffic noise disturbance for residents as well getting Hinkley traffic away from the other A39 traffic earlier.	9244-584-1809			/	
Tractivity 583	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Please give reasons for your preference Takes traffic through less habitation: quieter for people living there	9252-584-1115			/	
Tractivity 611	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference I believe that a bypass should not be built, if it is possible to manage traffic through the construction phase. Once built the existing transport infrastructure could cope as these is only planned to be 150 person increase in permanent staffing levels. It is unnecessary (and irrevocably damaging) to build a new road over valuable natural habitat and farmland. Let alone the impact it would have on local residents with increases light, noise traffic fume pollution as well as the visual impact.	9275-584-1929			/	
Tractivity 62248	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	-a- By pass - both routes will be seen from our property. Apart from the construction time issues, once opened we will have increased lighting pollution and noise. Would our lane still be allowed to have a junction onto the HP road? Would the speed limit be enforced and extended from the green route roundabout to past the grain store so that we could possibly cross this road? Would our children be able to cross the road at all- their current school bus stop is at Rodway Farm. However we would consider the by pass a lesser issue compared to the following:	9369-584-1720			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 50906	Public	Stage 1	I live in (Personal details removed) and if the Western option goes ahead then my environment will become unbearable due to traffic noise, dirt, dust and light pollution etc. It will also open up the possibility of green belt land being developed as the proposed new road will cut off Withiel Farm from one of its fields.	9398-584-451			/	
Tractivity 62299	Public	Stage 2	Both the Bypass and park & ride facility will enormously increase the congestion on the dangerous A39 and are far too near residents' homes allowing continuous noise penetration, pollution and lighting annoyance.	9990-584-605			/	
Tractivity 62411	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	I am against the constant noise, dust, light pollution, air pollution, smells, heavy traffic etc that will happen during the build period and most of all the use of the A39. How can EDF justify this overloading of an already inadequate holiday route as their preferred main route when a perfectly good option has been put forward, i.e. the North Bridgwater By-pass which would reduce the impact to more acceptable levels.	10054-584-1057			/	
Tractivity 62415	Public	Stage 2	4) The walks and quiet lanes north of Cannington would be ruined.	10056-584-2567			/	
Tractivity 62448	Public	Stage 2	3. Noise Increased due to new road being to the front of the property and the existing Hinkley Point road becoming busier.	10074-584-481			/	
Tractivity 62457	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	This new by-pass proposed by EDF will destroy farmland and divide Brynmore School in two halves, as well as the increased traffic, noise and air pollution.	10081-584-646			/	
Tractivity 62568	Public	Stage 2	As the predominant wind comes from a westerly direction, it will carry noise, fumes and dust pollution across most of the village. The existing A39 bypass causes enough noise disturbance to half of the village and if the proposed bypass goes ahead, the village will be virtually surrounded with constant traffic noise for the greater part of the day and night. The original plans for this route for a bypass were proposed many years ago when traffic was far lighter than it is today, present lorry size and weight were not in existence and there were far less housing developments in the area. It is also going to ruin the access and land to Brynmore School, a Grade II Listed building, cause danger to the pupils having to use a busy road and totally isolate the school from the village.	10120-584-602			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62569	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	The bypass will be in close proximity to our house, so the increase in traffic, noise, light and pollution will greatly impact on our daily lives.	10121-584-125			/	
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2. Outside peak periods for freight means more noise pollution for me as a resident of Chads Hill – 150 yards from proposed new Western bypass. However better at M5 than on edge of Cannington.	10124-584-6818			/	
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	This will cause noise and dust pollution and light pollution at night. Make sure lighting does end where your plans show. We like the night sky here.	10124-584-8514			/	
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	As you have probably gathered I am very concerned about the elevation of the Western bypass preferred route.  From my window and those of my neighbours we look straight across the field where you propose to build the bypass. The plans show an elevated section across this field which means we will see, hear and smell these vehicles at all hours of the day and night. They will also cause light pollution as they use the road.	10124-584-8840	/			
Tractivity 62578	Public	Stage 2	No, I do not agree that a Cannington bypass would solve anything and Comwich, probably more than Cannington, will see the greatest change to traffic flows. A bypass at Cannington would solve nothing. It would still bring the traffic past the end of the rural village of Comwich making it an utter nightmare for the villagers there in terms of both trying to get in and out of the village every day and the noise and pollution.	10129-584-7276			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Work within 50 metres of dwellings is noted as starting at 8.30am. This may be difficult to both monitor and enforce, and more appropriate mitigation measures against such impacts should be adopted.	89202-584-2424	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment of noise from construction traffic is assessed as Minor adverse. However, from inspection of the data, it does not appear that an assessment has been carried out for the potentially quieter roads to the north of the western bypass junction with Rodway. There is the potential for increased impacts along this route.	89346-584-10731	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The report identifies that vibration from vibratory compaction may cause perceptible groundborne vibration at Knapp Farm, which has been assessed as an impact of Moderate Adverse significance. It is agreed that this is an appropriate conclusion.	89367-584-10770			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	groundborne vibration at Withiel Farm and Withiel Drive is also assessed as being perceptible but of minor adverse significance. Given the distances to these properties, there is the potential that vibration from vibratory compaction may have been underestimated at these locations	89367-584-11025		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	no assessment of effects once Hinkley Point C construction work has finished and the bypass is being used by residual traffic.	89367-584-11543	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	does not appear that an assessment has been carried out for the potentially quieter roads to the north of the western bypass junction with Rodway. There is the potential for increased impacts along this route.	89367-584-11802	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There is likely to be a Major Adverse impact at Knapp Farm from construction noise and a Moderate Adverse impact at Withiel Farm and Withiel Drive.  From construction vibration, a Moderate Adverse impact is predicted at Knapp Farm, with a minor adverse impact at Withiel Farm and Withiel Drive. Vibration impacts at Withiel Farm and Withiel Drive may have been underestimated.	89367-584-14308		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The residual impact of traffic along existing roads is assessed to be Minor Adverse. This is applicable to the roads that have been included in the assessment but does not include impacts at properties further north than the junction of the western bypass with Rodway. At these locations, impacts may be higher.	89367-584-14690	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	no assessment appears to have been carried out of the impact at receptors close to the bypass once Hinkley Point C has been constructed. It is therefore not possible to determine the impacts in this scenario.	89367-584-15484		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Residual noise impacts from the operation of the bypass are assessed as not being permanent. However, the bypass will be permanent and no assessment has been carried out for the operation of the bypass once Hinkley Point C has been constructed, potentially understating the residual effects.	89426-584-635	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Residual impacts due to vibration from construction activities such as vibratory compaction may have been underestimated at some receptors. Residual noise impacts from road traffic on existing roads may have been underestimated as no assessment has been carried out for roads further north of the bypass junction with Rodway.	89426-584-930		/		
Tractivity 62911	Public	Stage 2 Update	It will split the village, it will cause light and noise pollution, it will also end the village community that we have enjoyed to date.	89663-584-546			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62930	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	We live in the most picturesque and tranquil part of connington, and we are very lucky indeed.  We are both semi-retired after working for years in business, and we are deeply upset with this proposal for the western by-pass.  With this new road, it will bring a high volume of traffic, pollution dust from the prevailing south west winds, noise and block our wonderful views & scenery.	89673-584-140			/	
Tractivity 70648	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	Having regard to the volume of traffic which it would carry, day and night, anyone living in the area would be severely affected by noise, light and fume pollution.	89766-584-3319			/	
14	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	Both the Bypass and park & ride facility will enormously increase the congestion on the dangerous A39 and are far too near residents' homes allowing continuous noise penetration, pollution and light annoyance.	89803-584-602			/	
30	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	Proposed Western Bypass  If built, this road will badly affect the lives of everyone in this village, not least, those most affected in the immediate vicinity, As the predominant wind comes from, a westerly direction, it will carry noise, fumes and dust pollution across most of the village. The existing A39 bypass causes enough noise disturbance to half of the village and if the proposed bypass goes ahead, the village will be virtually surrounded with constant traffic noise for the greater part of the day and night.	89819-584-440			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The residual impact of construction traffic is assessed to be Minor Adverse. This is applicable to the roads that have been included in the assessment but does not include impacts at properties further north than the junction of the western bypass with Rodway. At these locations, impacts may be higher.	89346-275-18470	/			
Tractivity 1050	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments?  Disagree strongly. The bypass is too close to houses, school footpaths etc. to be called a bypass. It will affect our property. Noise, light, pollution and impact on the environment will be catastrophic. The Northern route is the only option.	9808-401-2947		/		



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>Noise and Vibration and Air Quality</p> <p>The Noise &amp; Vibration and Air Quality sections of the ESR provide a preliminary assessment of the potential impacts at the Main Development Area and the western and eastern bypass route options. Whilst this is welcome, there is limited information (particularly baseline data) allowing a technical preference to be provided in noise and air quality terms.</p> <p>The rationale for providing a Cannington Bypass is understood with respect to minimising air quality, noise and vibration impacts in the centre of the village. Nonetheless, current government guidance stresses the need to consider alternatives to building new roads. Proposals for the construction of major new highways must therefore meet the most rigorous levels of justification (Sedgemoor Local Plan, paragraph 7.11). Further information should be included within the Stage 2 Consultation by way of justification.</p> <p>It is understood that further assessments are to be undertaken by EDF Energy. The roads that should be assessed will need to be agreed with Sedgemoor District Council.</p> <p>Landscape and Visual</p> <p>Mapping data provided under this section are generally adequate to describe the proposed routes. However, additional photographic material and photomontages from key viewpoints will be important to understand the landscape and visual impact of the bypass route options.</p> <p>It is considered by Sedgemoor District Council that the eastern route would significantly impact on the landscape character of the area, particularly as a greater amount of land will be affected and the proposed road would need to be elevated to reduce the liability of flooding. The western route option is shorter in length and impacts on less sensitive landscape areas, and, subject to the completion of further detailed assessment work, would also result in less loss of hedgerows and trees. In terms of landscape impact some of the road alignment would be set within a cutting which would help to screen the bypass, however, it is important to note that the western route would adversely impact the setting of Brymore School (a Grade II Listed Building).</p> <p>3.4 Cannington</p>	88350-583-0		/		<p>The methodology used to undertake the noise and vibration assessment for the proposed development is detailed in <b>Volume 5, Chapter 9</b> of the Environmental Statement. The construction, operation and post-operational phase assessments have been undertaken in accordance with the latest standards and guidance.</p> <p>The methodology for the noise and vibration assessment has been developed through consultation with key statutory consultees, namely Sedgemoor District Council (SDC) and West Somerset Council (WSC) and their technical advisors (ARUP). The approach has evolved throughout the pre-application consultation and detailed design process to ensure all aspects of potential noise and vibration impacts have been assessed. In response to the Stage 2 consultation, favourable comments were received from SDC and WSC were in general agreement regarding the approach and robustness of the assessment undertaken.</p> <p>Construction noise impacts have been assessed against the construction noise thresholds advised in British Standard on Construction Noise BS5228-1:2009 (Ref. 9.16, <b>Volume 5</b>).</p> <p>Following Stage 2 consultation, further detailed assessment was undertaken in accordance with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges to determine the impact of the proposed bypass in the different years, including the operational phase of the Hinkley Point C power station. In addition, an assessment of hourly traffic noise has been carried out to predict potential impacts during the early morning and late evening periods from changes in construction shifts.</p>
Tractivity 362	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>A road to the west is less likely to be used and your proposal document does not take account of wind direction when assessing the impact of the road on residents</p>	9050-583-1068		/		
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>The Noise and Air quality assessment makes no specific reference to whether (or how) the analysis takes into account the large volume of HGV, LGV and PSVs associated with the HPC construction traffic.</p>	89231-583-9502		/		

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	Noise and Vibration - Technical or Typographic Inaccuracy	89241-583-0			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	however there are a few anomalies in the monitoring which are identified below:	89367-583-7906			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The general approach to assess and quantify significance from noise and vibration is acceptable however there are some potential issues in how this approach has been applied.	89367-583-9011			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	For construction noise, significance criteria are presented based on a 12 hour daytime working period. No significance criteria are presented for evening or night time working and therefore significance cannot be determined during these periods.	89367-583-9190		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	No significance criteria have been presented for the change in 1 hour noise levels from road traffic.	89367-583-9441	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	No assessment appears to have been carried out to determine the impact at receptors close to the bypass once Hinkley Point C has been constructed. Noise from residual traffic using the bypass may have a permanent impact at properties that are not presently subjected to high levels of traffic noise.	89367-583-9548		/		

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment of noise from the operation of the bypass appears to meet the requirements of DMRB.	89367-583-9852			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Paragraph 3.4.71 states that the assessment of construction impacts was undertaken with regard to potential noise and vibration impacts at locations ML1 to ML8. However, the assessment has been undertaken at three locations where noise monitoring has not been carried out with only the receptor at (Personal details removed) likely to be represented by a nearby noise monitoring location (ML7).	89367-583-9976			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	the construction noise assessment does appear to appropriately identify the significance of the likely impacts at these locations in line with the significance criteria.	89367-583-10366	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Paragraph 3.4.86 appears to imply a cosmetic building damage threshold of 5mm/s without reference to a source. This does not appear to have been referred to previously and no justification or reference is provided for its use.	89367-583-10540	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	In general, the assessment of operational noise and vibration from the Cannington bypass (during the period of use by Hinkley Point C construction related traffic) appears to have been carried out in a robust way.	89367-583-11311			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	For the assessment of bypass noise during peak hours, the assessment predicts impacts at (Personal details removed) of Moderate Adverse significance. It is not clear how this assessment has been reached since there are no significance criteria for 1 hour traffic noise levels. However, assuming the same methodology as other elements of the project, this is assessment is appropriate.	89367-583-12015	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Significance from vibration effects of road traffic appear to have assessed in an appropriate manner.	89367-583-12387			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 888	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Whilst accepting the need for the bypass - albeit reluctantly as it will increase noise levels significantly for our property - we feel that the current plans are inadequate as the road should be in a cutting for virtually its whole length (ie from Withiel drive right through to Rodway) and not merely at its highest point by Knapp Farm. A cutting for virtually its entire length would minimise both visual and noise pollution for residents so affected.	9646-586-2559	/			<p>The bypass route to the west of Cannington was chosen following Stage 1 consultation, see Stage 1 Consultation Report.</p> <p>As part of the proposals consulted on at Stage 2, acoustic screening was proposed at several locations. The screening extended on the eastern side of the proposed Cannington bypass north and south from Withiel Drive. On the western side, the screening extended north from Withiel Drive. The screening was included in the scheme design as part of the Stage 2 proposals as a result of the noise assessment undertaken at that stage.</p> <p>Following the noise assessment undertaken for Stage 2, changes have been made to the detailed design of the proposed bypass. The extent of the proposed screening has been increased and the form of the attenuation has been altered. The impact of these design changes have been assessed in <b>Volume 5, Chapter 9</b> of the Environmental Statement (ES).</p> <p>The proposed design incorporates mitigation in the form of reinforced earth bunds to a height of 2 metres. The extent of the bunds on the eastern side of the proposed bypass has been increased northwards to provide noise attenuation to residential properties on Chad's Hill. The noise attenuation provided by the proposed bunds is detailed in <b>Volume 5, Chapter 9</b> of the ES.</p> <p>As part of the construction phase, an Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (EMMP) will be put in place prior to works starting on site. The EMMP will include site-specific measures contained <b>Volume 5, Chapter 9</b> of the ES for noise and vibration along with general control measures which define Best Practicable Means.</p>
Tractivity 899	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? We would like a longer cutting from Withiel Drive to Knapp Farm to decrease noise and visibility.	9657-586-2559	/			
Tractivity 1158	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Noise, visual and environmental mitigation for the Cannington by-pass is totally inadequate.	9916-586-6608			/	
Tractivity 1258	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Yes how are you going to compensate the people on (Personal details removed) Cannington whose property will not only be devalued and possibly unsellable, but also will have to put up with light, noise and visual impact disruption. Will you buy my house off me?	89524-586-290	/			
Tractivity 1336	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Your transport consultant says they need not provide any further noise or environmental mitigation than that currently proposed for the new road. Given that you are potentially destroying peoples home environment here I believe you need to do more. It is not sufficient to say that noise will not exceed maximum allowed levels - you need to take into account the current levels. At the moment weekend noise is limited to birdsong - this will not be the case when we have a new road in front of our houses.	89602-586-376	/			
Tractivity 1336	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	I also believe that the level of the road could still be dropped further. I have listened to your (Personal details removed) reasoning but the limit on levels has not yet been reached - you should mitigate the effects of this road to the highest degree engineering considerations will allow.	89602-586-883		/		
Tractivity 1362	Public	Stage 2 Update	It is essential that the speed limit is kept at 30 MPH to reduce noise and accident hazard to pedestrians.	89628-586-1710		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 242	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference I think the eastern bypass would be a lot quieter for the village.	8938-586-1930			/	
Tractivity 249	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: West of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference To the East would open the development floodgates and the higher speed proposal would be twice as noisy (60 mph is much noisier than 40!!) but the West proposal is planned too close to the village. Why not make it from the roundabout but slightly west of Brymore School land.	8942-586-1342			/	
Tractivity 583	Public	Stage 1	Box ticked: East of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference Please give reasons for your preference Takes traffic through less habitation: quieter for people living there	9252-586-1080			/	
Tractivity 62340	Public	Stage 2	4. A suitable acoustic barrier, properly camouflaged (hopefully by landscaping) should be provided along the length of the road. This should take account of the fact that much of the traffic passing along the road will be heavy vehicles. Additionally if the road is placed in a cutting then the spoil need not wholly be removed from site but could form an additional bund which will also serve in noise amelioration.	10020-586-3659	/			
Tractivity 62386	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	3. The original plans for the Western by pass put the road in a cutting so that it was out of sight and noise and light pollution would be reduced. However, the recent stage 2 plans clearly show the Western by pass being built on an embankment above the field level. This is totally unacceptable. This proposed road is directly in front of my home and 10 other dwellings. You know from discussions with us that we are all appalled at EDFs apparent lack of concern for the people who live on (Personal details removed) and that EDF are prepared to spoil our outlook, create more noise, dust and light pollution. If this road is allowed EDF must be made to put the whole road into a cutting to minimise all the disruptive aspects that this road will bring. We do not want a hedge and fence to disguise the road. Engineers have the skill to plan and build a road through a cutting and should be made to do so.	10049-586-2227	/			
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	If Western bypass is built it needs to go into a cutting from Withiel Drive to Rodway roundabout to cut noise to nearby houses and cut light pollution of freight moving through the night. You have considered protecting the wildlife now protect the humans who live along the proposed route.	10124-586-3598	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Wester bypass - please put it into a cutting for Withiel Drive to Rodway. The present plans show an elevated section across the field in front of my house. This will cause noise and dust pollution and light pollution at night.	10124-586-8359	/			
Tractivity 62938	Public	Stage 2	What sound and light protection could possibly be adequate to residents in Withiel Drive or Danesboro.	10177-586-4062			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Volume 3 chapter 3 - Cannington bypass 3.4.143 - A 2m high acoustic fence is proposed for the screening of (Personal details removed) and (Personal details removed) properties. Details are to be provided, but the benefit of the acoustic barrier will be reduced by opening Withiel Drive. It is unclear if it is necessary to have access from Withiel Drive onto the bypass.	89240-586-8521		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The incorporation of acoustic barriers to limit noise impacts during construction and operation is supported	89366-586-9633			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	For construction noise and vibration, no mitigation has been proposed since it may prolong the works and is difficult to achieve. The report also states that site specific mitigation measures for construction noise and vibration may be agreed in advance with SDC and emphasises the importance of community relations and the effective use of an Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plan. It has been identified that neither of these will make a quantifiable difference to the overall impact and this is agreed.	89367-586-12512			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Site specific mitigation measures, and any exceptions to the Local Authority construction policies, must be agreed in advance with the Local Authority	89367-586-13028			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	the use of a low noise road surface such as Stone Mastic Asphalt is discussed but does not appear to have been proposed for the scheme.	89367-586-13443		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	A 2.0m high acoustic barrier has been proposed at (Personal details removed) and (Personal details removed). However, the benefit from the barrier has not been quantified so it is difficult to confirm if the predicted residual noise effect at these receptors is appropriate.	89367-586-13582	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	the mitigation does not quantify the level of attenuation provided by the acoustic barrier. This needs to be quantified in order to properly assess the residual impact at the nearest receptors.	89367-586-13915	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	For construction noise and vibration, the mitigation measures are unlikely to quantifiably alter the pre-mitigation impacts and therefore the residual effects remain.	89367-586-14138			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The residual impact at (Personal details removed), (Personal details removed) and (Personal details removed) are assessed to be Moderate Adverse. However, it is not clear how this impact has reduced from the pre-mitigation assessment of Major Adverse significance at properties on (Personal details removed), since the use of a low noise surface has not been specifically proposed and the benefit of an acoustic barrier has not been quantified.	89367-586-15005	/			



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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Mitigation measures include a number of best practice management tools to minimise the potential for construction noise nuisance. In general, these are likely to be difficult to enforce and a monitoring programme should be undertaken to understand the effectiveness of the management tools during the operational phase of the development.	89367-586-15904			/	
Tractivity 62930	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	If planning permission is granted, has anyone considered compensation owing to the noise & dust of the construction of the new road?	89673-586-534			/	
Tractivity 62958	Public	Stage 2 Update	Given that the prevailing wind is south westerly, the fact that your proposal does not place the road within any significant cutting for the majority of its length, it is inevitable that a dramatic increase in noise, dust and visual pollution will occur, particularly the former.  This will have a severe detrimental effect on our quality of life.	89685-586-598	/			
Tractivity 62958	Public	Stage 2 Update	We are, frankly, disappointed and annoyed that despite earlier promises your proposed bypass is not in a cutting when it is directly opposite our properties. Moreover, according to one of your representatives at the display in Cannington on 06/03/11, there would no fencing, only the possibility of some sort of planting at a later date to alleviate noise, visual impact etc.	89685-586-1902	/			
Tractivity 62958	Public	Stage 2 Update	1) If you must build a bypass then at least put the part of it which will be directly in line with our properties into a cutting which will conceal traffic, lessen noise and visual impact, and reduce dust pollution from the prevailing westerly wind.	89685-586-2332	/			
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	- 'Noise from the road will be limited by embankments instead of fencing, which are more in keeping with the rural character of the area.' No information is provided on the height of embankments or the relative effectiveness of these compared to acoustic barrier fences in terms of noise reduction. Additional drawings and preliminary environmental information on this matter would be useful.	89896-586-5133	/			
Cannington Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	6.7 However, the Council have received numerous concerns from residents who live on (Personal details removed) that the improvements made to reduce the visual impact as well as to reduce the pollution through noise, dust and fumes do not go far enough. This Council asked in our response to Stage Two for a cutting to be constructed, which has not been acknowledged.	89748-461-4068			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Otterhampton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	We would be strongly opposed to any such proposal, not only for its effect on the Parish, but also that the land involved is an SSSI and a European RAMSAR site.  Before any such suggestion is considered we would ask for full consultation.	8718-562-4208	/			EDF Energy has carried out a thorough and iterative consultation process on its proposals for the HPC site and associated development sites. This has followed a four stage process, with Initial Proposals and Options consulted on at Stage 1 (November 2009 – January 2010), Preferred Proposals consulted on at Stage 2 (July 2010 to October 2010), followed by update consultations in February 2011 which provided an update to the preferred proposals, and July to August 2011 which related to M5 Junction 24 and Highway Improvements in the Bridgwater Area. At each stage consultees including Sedgemoor District Council and Somerset County Council, the local community and members of the public were invited and encouraged to comment on the proposals, in order that these could shape and influence the proposals being developed by EDF Energy. The consultation process has provided EDF Energy with valuable feedback on its proposals, highlighted key issues and options to be considered and has continually helped refine the proposals for the Cannington bypass.  At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy presented the first outline proposals for the Cannington bypass. At Stage 1 consultation EDF Energy explained that its favoured option around Cannington was a route to the west of the village. However it also presented an alternative route around the east of the village at Stage 1 consultation. Consultees were asked for their comments on each. At the same stage, two other alternatives (the outer western route and a 'no bypass' option) were presented as options that had been considered and discounted.  The Stage 1 consultation document was sent to the identified landowners accompanied by a covering letter setting out the avenues for providing feedback and obtaining further information from EDF Energy's land programme team if required. During this period a number of parties with an interest in land contacted EDF Energy to discuss the proposals. Additionally, a number of informal meetings were held with interested parties over the course of this consultation period.  At the Stage 1 consultation, all respondents were invited to comment on EDF Energy's suggested options for the bypass route, as well as provide feedback on the need, suitability and possible legacy benefits for the community. At this stage the
Wembdon Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	3.9 The Parish Council expresses no preference for the route of the Cannington By-Pass, which it considers, should be a matter for detailed discussion between the appropriate Authorities and Cannington Parish Council.	8724-562-8240			/	
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	In terms of the proposed 'associated development' at Cannington, the Agency provided comments to the applicant in a letter dated the 4th August 2009. This concluded that in principle, the Agency is not opposed to the proposed development options - i.e. the bypass, employee accommodation, Park & Ride site and a freight consolidation centre. We would expect all of the proposals to be supported by a robust TA and to be incorporated into the TP as appropriate.	88860-562-12522	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	Therefore the proposals for a by-pass must be fully justified with a rigorous environmental and transport assessment of the alternatives. This justification is considered to be largely absent from the Stage 1 consultation document (particularly in terms of evaluating development-induced transport effects). At this stage, the authorities can reach no material conclusion on the preference for either route option presented in the Stage 1 consultation document and are unlikely to be able to reach a conclusion until the full justification has been provided.	88060-562-1418	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	It is considered that more detailed consultation is required with Cannington Parish Council, Cannington College, Sedgemoor District Council, Somerset County Council, and the Environment Agency to discuss bypass options, and highway usage and maintenance post-construction. Discussions are also required around potential legacy benefits including:  - Flood risk management for Cannington;  - High quality public transport proposals along the A39;  - Joint car parking and travel planning for EDF Energy and Cannington College.	88340-562-1342	/			
Tractivity 62237	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	Figure 10.13. This shows two potential routes for the proposed bypass. Firstly, the route to the east of Cannington cuts through in important corner of my land on which there exists an established badger set. I would require an in depth discussion regarding your proposals for its future since the problem raises sensitive, environmental issues. Secondly, the new road would need to be raised somewhat to avoid flooding issues.	8780-562-531	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 821	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? It is untrue that traffic can be accommodated within existing road capacity. Your survey is flawed on several grounds and you resist giving to Sedgmore DC the information they request. The western bypass round Cannington will have the effect of routing all traffic along the A39 and most along the NDR at Brsgwater, a road built only for access to the new homes there and unsuitable for heavy traffic.	9579-562-3105	/			proposals were necessarily very broad, in order to provide consultees with an opportunity to influence them. Therefore a detailed assessment of the environmental impacts of individual proposals had not been undertaken.  Following the Stage 1 consultation, and taking account of written comments received by statutory consultees, including local authorities, the local community and general public, EDF Energy discounted the eastern bypass because it would have resulted in significantly more land-take and hence a greater loss of high quality agricultural land and an impact on a greater number of properties. Also, any eastern bypass would have needed to be elevated in order to avoid any impacts on flood risk, which would have consequently increased transport movements associated with constricting a more significant structure and visual impacts. For more information on the discounted options and rationale for the eastern bypass, please refer to the Alternative Site Assessment document, appended to the Planning Statement.
Tractivity 895	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  We agree with the proposed new road, however due to our business we would appreciate in writing confirmation that while the work is going on that we and the other residents off (personal details removed) will have access too and from the village during the work building off the road. However, if you cannot confirm in writing that we shall have access during this time then we shall be proceeding to obtain this and access legally.	9653-562-5835			/	The written comments received during the Stage 1 consultation helped to inform alterations and improvements into the design of the preferred western bypass. These alterations included:  - the inclusion of a signal-controlled crossing to enable pedestrians, in particular school children, to cross the proposed bypass safely;  - the inclusion of a culvert across Mill Stream along the Brymore School access road and two balancing ponds to mitigate flood risk; and  - further development of the landscaping strategy, through the inclusion of planting, shrubs and hedgerows, having regard to the site context and visual impacts.
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.	9763-562-3549	/			The written comments received during the Stage 1 consultation helped to inform alterations and improvements into the design of the preferred western bypass. These alterations included:  - the inclusion of a signal-controlled crossing to enable pedestrians, in particular school children, to cross the proposed bypass safely;  - the inclusion of a culvert across Mill Stream along the Brymore School access road and two balancing ponds to mitigate flood risk; and  - further development of the landscaping strategy, through the inclusion of planting, shrubs and hedgerows, having regard to the site context and visual impacts.
Tractivity 1168	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments?  We know your opinions on Cannington, Stogursey and surrounding areas are very pleasant and rural too. We hope you will respect that as well.	9926-562-2822			/	At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy presented its Preferred Proposals and provided an environmental appraisal which drew upon work undertaken up until then to inform the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) that would in the form of an Environmental Statement accompany the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.  The Stage 2 consultation documents were made available through newsletters, the dedicated Hinkley Point C website, media and advertising, as well as during meetings with the local community and
Tractivity 1169	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments?  As above, there is too much not on my backdoor syndrome in Cannington. Village should make the most of a golden opportunity to get all they can. EDF should listen to individual concerns of people very close to proposed route and provide land owners with all they need from this (eg field access, farm access) Certain areas are having too much to say, be given good compensation. Further Western Route if no real benefit.	9927-562-2811	/			
Tractivity 1193	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments?  1) You are wrong. You have been told by every local group, ie town, parish and locals that these roads are not suitable. 2) This small extension will not benefit Cannington. Save this work for the northern B/W bypass.	9951-562-2749		/		
Tractivity 1198	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments?  People of Cannington probably best consultees.	9956-562-2959			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1255	Public	Stage 2 Update	Q3 Do you have any comments on our proposed community mitigation and benefits? Yes, consult the persons on the routes not the Parish Council - it is their way of life and homes being turned upside down.	89521-562-300			/	stakeholders. Members of the public were invited to record their views on EDF Energy's consultation via a questionnaire available online, on the project website and in hard copy form at all the public consultation events.
Tractivity 280	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference At the public meeting in Cannington 22.09.09, it became apparent that the vast majority wanted a bypass from Dunball to Combwich. If this is not forthcoming then I think we should not build a bypass for Cannington. The people living near the favoured (West) bypass will suffer from visual and noise pollution. The cost is too high. Why is Cannington being hit so hard? Would you compensate people that found themselves next to the bypass? I am not personally affected by either bypass.	8969-562-1193		/		Following the Stage 2 consultation, and again in response to the comments received from statutory consultees, further amendments were made to the masterplan in order to minimise environmental impacts and to enhance the overall sustainability of the proposed development. EDF Energy published these changes in the Stage 2 Update consultation in order to give the statutory consultees another opportunity to make their views known. Consultees have raised concerns that the Stage 2 Update consultation document provided limited information and did not respond to all the comments made at Stage 2. However, it is explained within the consultation document that it was not meant to be a comprehensive response to all comments raised during the Stage 2 consultation and was limited to material changes made to the proposals. These included any changes that could result in new or significant different impacts on people living in the vicinity of the proposed developments.
Tractivity 362	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference A road to the west is less likely to be used and your proposal document does not take account of wind direction when assessing the impact of the road on residents	9050-562-1068	/			Local residents have asked for clarification of the alternative access arrangements to Cannington during the construction phase. As it states within <b>Volume 5, Chapter 3 of the Environmental Statement</b> , alternative access arrangements would be put in place to reduce any impacts on those using land in the vicinity of the construction area where required. EDF Energy would ensure that access to the existing properties would be maintained during the construction phase. Temporary crossing points would also be provided where necessary to maintain access routes for people, animals and vehicles.
Tractivity 378	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference If this bypass is essential to this project now, why was it not so when the Hinkley site was originally developed? On the face of it, the shorter Western route would appear to be the option which is least destructive to the local environment, but I believe the inhabitants of Cannington should be given the final say. As much freight as possible should be delivered by sea.	9346-562-2745			/	Many public consultees have expressed a desire that the residents of Cannington should be fully consulted and some comments have stated that the residents should have the final decision regarding the Cannington bypass, instead of the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC). This response has demonstrated that the residents of Cannington have been an important part of the consultation process, however the Development Consent Order and decision making procedure has been provided for in the Planning Act 2008, in order to improve the way in which major infrastructure proposals are considered; EDF Energy does not have any influence over who
Tractivity 443	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Ask the people of cannington	9122-562-1007	/			
Tractivity 498	Public	Stage 1	This is a matter for the locals	9171-562-1399			/	
Tractivity 501	Public	Stage 1	From the feed back I've been getting nobody wants a bypass	9174-562-1572			/	
Tractivity 542	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Ask the residents of Cannington!	9211-562-1433	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 556	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference This must be what Cannington villagers want and what is best for the future of the village.	9225-562-960			/	<p>considers the proposals.</p> <p>EDF Energy has been committed to listening to the views of all statutory consultees, and the Cannington Bypass proposal has been designed having regard to the comments received throughout the pre-application process, in addition to a series of preliminary environmental assessments. EDF Energy will continue to work closely with the local community, prior to and throughout the construction phase to address any concerns arising from the construction and operation of the bypass.</p> <p>Details of how the consultation process was undertaken, including availability of the consultation documents, workshops and local exhibitions is set out <b>Chapter 2 of the Consultation Report.</b></p>
Tractivity 591	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? I think the plans for the Cannington by-pass have been drawn up with no consideration of current use by land-owners or tenants.	9257-562-3336			/	
Tractivity 610	Public	Stage 1	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? Could someone discuss the Western Bypass around Cannington with me as this has already blighted my property I think a discussion before you published this document might have been courteous and might avoided confusion.	9274-562-2824			/	
Tractivity 664	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Let Cannington people choose	9327-562-1065			/	
Tractivity 671	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference As a non-resident of Cannington I feel any bypass should be with their full agreement. I only know that any farming of workers is highly unpopular there.	9334-562-2235			/	
Tractivity 505	Public	Stage 2	Wanted to know about the plans for the Cannington bypass as he is a small business and feels the bypass will severely affect his business. Felt he couldn't find any information on line.	9983-562-0			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62299	Public	Stage 2	<p>We are pleased to note that EDF no longer propose an accommodation campus or any freight facilities in Cannington. Unfortunately however a Park &amp; Ride/Western Bypass still appear to be on your agenda in the second stage consultation. Our community did not invite you (EDF) or your infrastructure proposals for Hinkley Point C into our village.</p> <p>The Western Bypass will use prime agricultural land, defaces one of the most scenic green field areas around Cannington and would spoil its glorious panoramic views. It will go through the grounds of Brymore School a well known agricultural training centre. Both the Bypass and park &amp; ride facility will enormously increase the congestion on the dangerous A39 and are far too near residents' homes allowing continuous noise penetration, pollution and lighting annoyance. The park &amp; ride facility, taking into consideration the huge size still proposed is of major concern for the nearby properties, as is the risk of flooding. We also note from your brochure that you believe traffic can be accommodated within the existing road network. We would question as to how you have obtained this knowledge and to what depth. Our understanding from your personnel was that you have monitored the traffic for just two months?</p> <p>Despite your assurances that construction workers to be accommodated at the Hinkley Point site, with its recreational facilities, will stay in-situ during their free time, we have our doubts that would indeed be the case. They will inevitably travel to/from their workplace seeking alternative facilities in Bridgwater and surrounding areas. What realistic provision is there in the second stage consultation to cater for the extra traffic using the A39 and projection over the next 9 years construction period?</p> <p>May we respectfully remind EDF that when the Barnes Report was published back in 1989 during the previous Hinkley Point C application, it recommended the best option was to build the northern Bridgwater Bypass? Traffic has increased significantly since the findings of this report so why has common sense been ignored and the recommendations apparently discounted? The A39 is a "Red Route " rated in a national survey as No 10 of the UK's most dangerous roads.</p> <p>We are given to understand that you (EDF) believe there is insufficient time to build the northern Bridgwater bypass but your lack of planning should not become our problem. Your present proposals do not give any beneficial long term legacy only long term misery and are a cost saving alternative.</p> <p>Yes of course it will take longer to build and will be financially more costly, but the cost and time to build such a bypass far outweigh the infrastructure problems which will inevitably occur should your solution be imposed upon our community.</p>	9990-562-0			/	
Tractivity 62340	Public	Stage 2	<p>As far as I am aware none of your transport planners or designers has visited any of the houses and gardens on Chads Hill to assess the impact of your proposals. May I invite you to contact me to come and stand in some of the gardens so that you can see from our point of view the impact of your proposal so that you can understand the requirement for the mitigation referred to above.</p>	10020-562-4604			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62414	Public	Stage 2	E.D.F don't appear to be listening to any local people and seem hell bent on constructing a by-pass west of Cannington.	10055-562-919		/		
Tractivity 62457	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	EDF are not listening to the views of our local community and the significant impact it will have on our lives and homes they are determined to drive through what meets their needs. They are only giving lip service to the consultation process and will not consider the social environmental impact of their actions on a small rural village.	10081-562-802			/	
Tractivity 62575	Public	Stage 2	The majority of the villagers of Cannirigton have stated that their preferred bypass option is the Northern Bridgwater route. However it appears that the EdF preferred option is the Cannington West route. Should this be the final approved route a number of problems would arise. I therefore ask that the following be taken into account when the planning application is being considered.	10126-562-64		/		
Tractivity 62583	Public	Stage 2	c) Our rejection of the western bypass route  11. You will be aware that, during the Stage 1 consultation, the Cannington Parish Council canvassed four options for the route of a Cannington bypass, and that the western bypass, which is now your preferred proposal, was the least favoured of them all. So much for consultation. But this bypass is the shortest and therefore the cheapest, and no one doubts that this is why EDF favours it.  13. We strongly oppose the building of the western bypass. 75.5% of Cannington voters are against it. We ourselves have an axe to grind here because this bypass would have some effect on our own property. But other properties would be affected far more. This includes houses in (personal details removed) and, above all, Brymore School. If EDF had set out deliberately to commit an act of really unforgivable vandalism, you would have succeeded through the harm you plan to inflict on Biymore.	10134-562-4571		/		
British Telecommunications (BT)	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Openreach apparatus will be affected within your areas of interest. Openreach records indicate that a substantial amount of our apparatus exists near to the areas of your proposed works, which will need to be diverted.  Please note that no site survey's have yet been carried out at this stage and will be chargeable, and therefore can you please contact us directly so that we can provide you with the necessary estimate of costs to provide survey's and any subsequent alteration/diversion. Plans of at least 1:500 will be required.	10200-562-180			/	
Sedgemoor District Council, West Somerset Council and Somerset	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee (Somerset) and consultee with an	Stage 2	we wish to draw your attention to a number of documents which we believe are missing from the Stage 2 consultation. Specifically, the documents that are missing are:  Thematic Vision Next Steps Document  Freight Management Strategy Updated Saturn Forecasting Report	10275-562-835			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
County Council Joint Councils Response	interest in land (Somerset and Sedgemoor)		<p>Supporting Traffic Flow data</p> <p>Paramics Forecasting Report</p> <p>Local Model Validation Report (Saturn and Paramics)</p> <p>Draft Transport Assessment</p> <p>Legacy plans for both the proposed M5 Park &amp; Ride sites Visitor Management Strategy Site Waste Management Plan</p> <p>Integrated Waste Strategy Construction Management Plan Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan Detailed 1:500 drawings of Masterplans</p> <p>Overarching Accommodation Strategy including location of temporary accommodation, permanent and affordable housing, housing sector mitigation and details of management systems to be employed Community Safety and Wellbeing Plan</p> <p>Procurement Strategy and Contract Implementation Strategy</p> <p>Operations Workforce Development Strategy</p> <p>Lighting Strategy</p> <p>Delivery Plan for the Low Carbon Business Cluster</p> <p>Fire and Rescue Resourcing Strategy</p> <p>Ambulance Resourcing Strategy</p> <p>Security Management Strategy</p> <p>Incident Management Plan</p> <p>Archaeology - Written Scheme of Investigation, Amec 2009 'Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment, Hinkley Point Hinkley Point Foreshore Survey, Gloucester CC Archaeology Service</p> <p>Intertidal and offshore Archaeology at Hinkley Point</p> <p>Cannington Bypass - Geophysical Survey</p> <p>Junction 24 P and R - Geophysical Survey</p> <p>Junction 23 P and R - Geophysical Survey</p> <p>Wiliiton - Geophysical Survey</p> <p>Comwich - Geophysical Survey</p> <p>Integrated Land Management Plan</p> <p>Site Drainage Management Scheme</p> <p>Soil Management Plan</p> <p>Ecology Surveys Findings</p> <p>BEEMS 2010. Impact of new nuclear build at Hinkley Point on intertidal food availability for birds.</p> <p>BEEMS 2009. The combined effects of Hinkley B + C and refuelling</p>					



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			<p>scenarios.</p> <p>BEEMS 2010. Coralline aldae thermal sensitivity report.</p> <p>BEEMS 2010 Hinkley Jetty Scour Assessment</p> <p>Amec 2010 Environmental Impact Assessment. Technical Note Radiological (CIDEN-002). Issue 04 - Preliminary. March 2010</p> <p>Details of the Contractor's Charitable Trust</p>					
Tractivity 1169	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	there is too much not on my backdoor syndrome in Cannington. Village should make the most of a golden opportunity to get all they can. EDF should listen to individual concerns of people very close to proposed route and provide land owners with all they need from this (eg field access, farm access) Certain areas are having too much to say. be given good compensation. Further Western Route if no real benefit.	10279-562-2842			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	This should include a NATA assessment of bypass options.	89296-562-4007			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>Due to the extent of the proposals New Approach to Appraisal (NATA) Transport Analysis Guidance (webTAG) appraisals would have been expected to be within the Stage 2 proposals, specifically a NATA webTAG appraisal of the following elements would have been expected:</p> <p>the overall transport strategy;</p> <p>alternative options/measures considered (i.e. alternative bypasses, park &amp; ride locations such as at J22 etc); and</p> <p>the actual proposed transport measures (e.g. Cannington bypass and park &amp; rides).</p> <p>NATA based appraisals would enable the comparison of the proposed EDF Energy transport strategy, alternative options and proposed measures against the national transport Objectives (i.e. Economy, Accessibility, Safety, Environment and Integration), and the national, regional and local transport related policies (e.g. under Land-Use Policy Sub- Objective).</p>	89308-562-2607			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>Authorities position December 2009:</p> <p>Further discussion was required regarding flood risk management, public transport, car parking and travel planning for EDF Energy and the college, traffic management in the village centre, and access to limited housing and small business growth to meet needs</p> <p>Update September 2010:</p> <p>This level of detail has not been provided at Stage 2.</p>	89326-562-903			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	although the limitations of the options appraisal and environmental appraisal work were highlighted by the authorities.	89366-562-1663	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	All impacts are assessed as Negligible before the transport strategy is introduced. If this is the case it is difficult to understand why the Transport Strategy is needed.	89367-562-5095	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The following concerns have been identified with respect of the flood risk study report for Cannington Bypass: - There is no evidence of consultation with Environment Agency as well as the Somerset Drainage Boards Consortium.	89408-562-13386	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	- While the study assumes there is no tidal or fluvial flood risk impacting on the bypass route, the fluvial floodplain of the Mill stream has been omitted and this potential flood risk should be clarified. - It is unclear whether the 50% fluvial event against the 0.5% tidal event combination been agreed with the Environment Agency? The climate change allowances has not been confirmed.	89408-562-13699			/	
Tractivity 62913	Public	Stage 2 Update	The residents of Cannington have made it very clear that a western bypass is not what they want. A northern bypass is the only acceptable solution.	89665-562-6980		/		
Tractivity 62958	Public	Stage 2 Update	We are, frankly, disappointed and annoyed that despite earlier promises your proposed bypass is not in a cutting when it is directly opposite our properties.	89685-562-1902			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	6. Do you agree with EdF view that a Cannington western by-pass should be provided?  Agree Disagree No opinion Don't know  - The by-pass will serve little or no legacy purpose. It will be a blot upon the landscape for the residents of the village and for all the surrounding communities and it will affect a number of properties adversely and permanently while offering little or no compensation.	89806-562-8652		/		
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	We do not consider that the material presented in this consultation addresses all of the Councils' previous comments and we are frustrated by the lack of detailed direct engagement with local planning authorities on associated development proposals.	89873-562-980			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	Proposed changes to the Cannington Bypass relate to alterations to crossing arrangements, minor changes to the alignment of the road and environmental mitigation measures. Comments on these alterations are provided below, however it is noted that the Proposed Changes document does not explain why certain changes are proposed and provides only very limited information. The bypass map at Figure 32 is very small, making it difficult to see the detail of the proposals.	89896-562-1814			/	
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	Of the eastern and western bypass options presented in the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy express a preference for the western route. This preliminary view is supported by Sedgemoor DC on landscape, ecology and land use grounds, although as described below, it will not be possible for the Council to confirm a stance on the Cannington Bypass proposals prior to the completion of Environmental Impact Assessment work and further consultation.	88340-562-64		/		
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	The assessment of the Western and Eastern Route Options is based upon a preliminary environmental assessment. Further detailed evaluation (including opportunities and constraints) should be detailed in this section.	88340-562-512	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	A new bypass at Cannington would comprise a major development in its own right, so proposals must be supported with rigorous justification (considered to be largely absent from the Stage 1 Consultation document at this time). No material conclusion can be reached as to the preference for either route option prior to the completion of the Environmental Impact Assessment work in full (including a full options appraisal). The options appraisal should present 'no bypass' scenarios alongside the bypass route options, and should incorporate information on related Park & Ride and	88340-562-731	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			public transport proposals.					
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The Stage 2 documentation lacks evidence related to the transport impact of the Hinkley Point C development, which therefore means that the County Council is unable to formally comment on the suitability of the proposals. For example, the bypass study is extremely 'high level' and lacks sufficient detail in order to justify the need, or otherwise, for the respective Cannington and Bridgwater bypass proposals.	89191-562-4146	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The following comments are made in relation to the Cannington Bypass: - Justification for the bypass, and therefore its associated impacts, is limited and the evidence for its need should be made available to enable a comprehensive technical assessment.	89202-562-21	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Reference is made to "particular considerations" at Cannington, but these are not clearly identified or assessed. The issues of air quality and noise are raised - stating the assessments indicate there would not be a significant impact - and the traffic flow is noted as the main reason for a new bypass. At a superficial level the benefits of a bypass seem obvious as it will limit the disruption to the local community within Cannington, but it is not without other impacts that need full consideration.	89202-562-278	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The authorities remain concerned that a new bypass at Cannington would be a major development in its own right and potentially would be likely to result in significant environmental impacts. Therefore the proposals for a bypass must be fully justified with a rigorous environmental and transport assessment of the alternatives (including a NATA). This justification is considered to be largely absent from the Stage 2 consultation document (particularly in terms of evaluating the detail of effects including the severance of access to Brymore School). As noted in our Stage 1 response, the authorities consider that more detailed consultation is required in respect of long term sustainability benefits or impacts of the by-pass options including: a) Flood risk management for Cannington; b) High quality public transport proposals along the A39; c) Joint car parking and travel planning for EDF Energy and Cannington College. d) Traffic management in the village centre e) Providing access to limited housing and small business growth to meet local needs.	89299-562-3626	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in	Stage 2	The authorities believe that further detailed technical work is needed to justify the bypass route choice for Cannington.	89311-562-2219		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset Council Joint Council Response	land (Sedgemoor)							
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There should be a detailed plan showing the both the Park and Ride and Western Bypass proposals, to allow consideration of cumulative effects.	89373-562-7314	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment of the need for the Cannington and Bridgwater Northern Bypasses is totally inadequate.	89426-562-1874			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	1.57 As requested in response to the Stage 2 consultation, the County Council requires a full justification of the need, or otherwise, for both the Cannington and Bridgwater Northern Bypass options. We have clearly set out our detailed requirements for the Bypass Study, in our response to the Bypass Scoping Report, which we issued on 3 December 2010. No further information has since been forthcoming on the Bypass Study since this time, nor does the Stage 2a consultation provide any further assessment or clarity. A full Bypass Study is formally requested,	89846-562-9007	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	1.59 The route for the Cannington Bypass requires justification (p. 30). It should be noted that the County Council has not had sight of the bypass study to provide justification for exclusion of the Bridgwater bypass and haul road.	89846-562-9922			/	
Tractivity 62455	Public	Stage 2	(personal details removed) asked if the IPC decided to reject the inner route and state that the outer route should be considered would there be further public consultation.	10079-559-3383			/	
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.	9763-226-3547			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
<b>Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response</b>	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	We are also concerned that the potential impacts of the Cannington Bypass are not reflected in terms of the potential short and long term effects on habitat networks. While Table 7.1 suggests that the proposed route has been chosen to minimise impacts on biodiversity, Stage 2 Consultation material shows no apparent evaluation of route options. Furthermore, the scheme will serve to sever ecological corridors along a linear route of approximately 2km. With much of the route in cutting, severance would extend approximately 60 m in places.	89411-563-16661			/	<p>During the consultation exercise, EDF Energy has received a number of consultation responses relating to sustainability. This has included comments in relation to the sustainability measures proposed at specific sites, however comments regarding the sustainability of these sites in general were also received.</p> <p>This section provides a response to the site specific consultation comments received for Cannington Bypass at Stage 2 consultation from West Somerset Council and Sedgemoor District Council in a joint submission. These related to the way in which the bypass had been assessed under EDF Energy's Sustainability Evaluation. No comments were received directly on matters relating to sustainable design or construction.</p>
<b>Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response</b>	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The summary conclusions, and scoring, which suggest that the scheme will exceed the stated objective, draw the reader to the conclusion that the scheme will make a positive contribution to improving the function and efficiency of the strategic transport infrastructure. We consider this to be overly generous, particularly in the absence of any measures to improve or upgrade the highway network (other than provision of the Cannington Bypass). On the basis of the information provided, the scheme would fail to avoid adverse impacts on the function and efficiency of strategic transport infrastructure.	89412-563-8630			/	<p>Comments were received in regard to the performance against objectives relating to strategic transport infrastructure. The Sustainability Evaluation published at Stage 2 identified that objectives would be exceeded. The consultation comments identified that in the absence of highways improvements and upgrades to the existing strategic road network, the scheme would fail to avoid adverse impacts on the function and efficiency of strategic transport infrastructure.</p> <p>The Objective, which is: to avoid adverse impacts on the function and efficiency of strategic transport infrastructure, was considered to be exceeded because a number of transport planning initiatives are being put forward to mitigate the effects of EDF Energy's proposals. This includes Cannington Bypass, which will have an on-going legacy. This is delivered in combination with a range of other physical and transport logistics controls employed during construction. The Sustainability Evaluation has been updated and is submitted with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application. Further information which justifies the findings of the appraisal is available within Part 4 of the Sustainability Statement, further details on the proposals to upgrade the highway network is available within the description of the development section of the Environment Impact Assessment (EIA).</p> <p>Another comment related to the achievement of the biodiversity and ecosystem objective, which was 'to avoid adverse impacts on valuable ecological networks and ecosystem functionality'. Concern was raised about the route severing ecological corridors along a linear route of approximately 2km, thus failing to achieve the objective.</p> <p>The Sustainability Evaluation considered the project's</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
								<p>performance as a whole, and did not just appraise the performance of the bypass against the objective. On balance, it is considered that the project can meet these objectives, particularly given the proposals to mitigate impacts and create an increase in habitats allowing for such connectivity to occur. It is accepted that the proposed route will have impacts on ecological corridors; however mitigation has been proposed to reduce these impacts. Further details are available within the terrestrial ecology chapter of the EIA.</p> <p>Furthermore, the route option was chosen to have fewer impacts on ecologically sensitive receptors. The discussion of route options was identified at Stage 1 consultation.</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>The Stage 1 Consultation Stage 1 document identifies a series of planning matters that apply to the CAN-A search area, which have been supplemented here with relevant policy guidance where relevant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The search area falls outside the defined settlement boundary. Local Plan Policy STR3 states that outside defined settlement boundaries, development will be strictly controlled.</li> <li>- Part of the area falls within a Local Plan Green Wedge designation. Local Plan Policy CNE4 encourages positive land management for landscape, amenity and nature conservation in these areas.</li> <li>- The search area falls within the setting of Cannington Conservation Area. Policy HE4 advises that new development should positively enhance the character or setting of the Conservation Area.</li> <li>- Part of the search area falls within the functional floodplain of Cannington Brook (Flood Zone 3b). PPS25 states that only water-compatible uses and essential infrastructure should be permitted in these areas.</li> <li>- Cannington is identified in the Core Strategy Preferred Options as a Key Rural Settlement, with potential for limited housing and small-scale development growth.</li> </ul>	88350-560-2461		/		<p>The compliance of the proposed Cannington bypass with relevant national, regional and local planning policy is addressed in detail in the Planning Statement submitted with this application for Development Consent.</p> <p>With specific regard to the policies raised in the joint responses from Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council, <b>Volume 5, Chapter 16 of the Environmental Statement</b> contains a full assessment of the impacts of the proposed development on the Historic Environment and demonstrates that the Cannington bypass would not directly affect any designated heritage assets. However, three archaeological assets are assessed as 'medium' importance would be removed and preserved by record. The development ward also affects the setting of two scheduled monuments and a Grade II listed building during construction, but landscape screening should mitigate this.</p> <p>The proposed development has been designed to help reduce flood risk in the surrounding area. The use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) has been incorporated into the design in order to reduce the volume of surface water entering the drainage network. The SuDS techniques include the use of two balancing ponds which will collect, store and discharge surface water at Greenfield run-off rates. More information can be found in <b>Volume 5, Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement</b>.</p>
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Environmental Appraisal Volume 3 Chapter 3, 3.11, Landscape. All planning policy is rather out of date but Local Development Frameworks not yet advance/approved. Regional Guidance no longer relevant due to 2010 change of national government	89246-560-2064		/		<p>Amendments to the bypass design were also incorporated at EDF Energy's Stage 2 Update consultation to help address policies relating to the protection and enhancement wildlife habitats. These include an underpass for wildlife including badgers, together with an ecological balancing pond which will be built near the northern section of the bypass. The bypass route was also slightly realigned at Stage 2 Update to allow retention of an existing pond, which is important for great crested newts, as well as trees, hedges, and ditches.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The northern portion of the bypass route crosses an area of high quality agricultural land, designated as Best Agricultural Land in the Local Plan. PPS7 recommends that development is avoided on land of this quality wherever possible;	89366-560-1899			/	<p>It remains EDF Energy's position that a Cannington bypass is necessary to help mitigate the impact of the Hinkley Point C construction. The DCO is accompanied by a full suite of documents which fully assess the environmental impact of the proposed Cannington bypass including <b>Transportation Assessment</b> and <b>Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement</b>.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	e bypass route is located within the setting of two Scheduled Monuments, an Iron Age/Roman British Settlement and an Iron Age hillfort, Cynwit Castle, which is also known as Cannington Camp. Policy HE11 advises that planning permission will not be granted for development that would damage or destroy these sites or their settings unless the importance of the proposed development outweighs the national significance of the remains;	89366-560-2142			/	



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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The southern portion of the bypass, near the junction with the A39, is located close to a series of Sites of County Importance for Archaeology. Local Plan Policy HE12 advises that planning permission will not be granted for development which would damage or destroy local important archaeological remains, unless the importance of the development outweighs the local significance of the remains;	89366-560-2579			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Design measures that will reduce flood risk in Cannington, protect and enhance wildlife habitat and improve the cycling and walking network are welcomed. Proposals should contribute to the delivery of a Green Infrastructure Strategy for Cannington and seek to maintain the environmental quality in the Conservation Area and the wider area.	89366-560-5787	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment of the need for the Cannington and Bridgwater Northern Bypasses is totally inadequate.	89428-560-1637	/			
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	<p>9.7.2 Policy and Guidance</p> <p>Both Government advice, as set out in Guidance on Transport Assessment, and the Draft HPC SPD, require any new highway proposals to be justified by a New Approach to Appraisal (NATA) assessment. No such assessment is provided.</p> <p>A Cannington Bypass is not part of any highway authority programme and therefore its justification must be based on the impact of HPC project traffic. No assessment of alternatives, as required by NATA, has been provided.</p>	89896-560-2358		/		

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 proposed 'associated development' at Cannington, the Agency provided comments to the applicant in a letter dated the 4th August 2009. This concluded that in principle, the Agency is not opposed to the proposed development options - i.e. the bypass, employee accommodation, Park & Ride site and a freight consolidation centre. We would expect all of the proposals to be supported by a robust TA and to be incorporated into the TP as appropriate.	88860-561-12522	/			The principle of the Cannington bypass to support the construction of the Hinkley Point C (HPC) Project is explained in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> , provided as an Appendix to the Environmental Statement and in <b>Chapter 10, Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement</b> .  The proposed Cannington bypass would be located to the west of the village of Cannington, and would be used by EDF Energy to support the construction and operational phases of the Hinkley Point C (HPC) power station by enabling vehicles travelling up to the HPC Development Site to bypass the village of Cannington once it is available.
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	4.7 The response raises issues about the lack of a robust justification for the preferred Cannington By-pass route (the western route option). As a consequence the response states that "the authorities can reach no material conclusion on the preference for either route option presented in the Stage 1 consultation document and are unlikely to be able to reach a conclusion until the full justification has been provided."	88890-561-25549			/	Throughout the pre-application consultation period, EDF Energy received a large amount of feedback regarding the principle of the Cannington bypass. Overall the comments were divided between those that supported the principle of providing a bypass around Cannington and those that objected to it for reasons which included concerns over increased traffic, noise and light pollution or the possible damage to the environment or to Brymore School.
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	Is far too close to the village of Cannington that in turn will bring noise, dust and pollution into the village. It cuts across a superb drive of Brymore School thus spoiling a marvellous vista and creating a danger to 200 plus young students who live there and cross the drive on a regular basis during their daily tasks undertaking their rural studies in order to farm the land that the school owns. It would cut through Grade One agricultural land.	8746-561-4119		/		It has remained EDF Energy's position that, whilst the level of traffic anticipated through Cannington could be accommodated within the capacity of the existing road, the increase in traffic levels above the current flows and the construction-related nature of that traffic would be more pronounced in Cannington than elsewhere. Therefore the proposed bypass is integral to EDF Energy's vision for, and delivery of, the HPC Project by ensuring that any significant adverse effects are appropriately mitigated in a way that is environmentally responsible and sensitive to the needs of the community. The proposed bypass would dramatically reduce the effect of construction traffic passing through the village and for this reason it represents an important element of the <b>Freight Management Strategy</b> and is included in the Development Consent Order.
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	This route could pose a flood hazard to the village. By building this road it could act as a flood barrier by keeping the water in the village in times of flood. The village floods on a regular basis and we enclose photos that show evidence of this happening. Appendix C.	8746-561-4594			/	The principle of the Cannington bypass development has remained consistent throughout the consultation period however the design and layout of the bypass has evolved in response to the feedback received from statutory consultees, including local authorities, the local community, and general public. Please refer to the <b>Cannington Bypass Design and Access Statement</b> for a description of how the design of the Cannington bypass evolved in response to comments that have been received.
Cannington Women's Institute	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	What do you think about plans for a new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point?  I am (Personal details removed) at Brymore School where the bypass is going to be built. I also live 15 miles from Cannington so this really affects me, my family, my classmates and my friends and neighbours.  Edf's bypass will take 20 acres of our 30 acres of pasture land, Our school is the only agricultural and horticultural specialist school for boys aged 13-18 and teaches us all kinds of land and countryside management skills to help us learn how to best manage our countryside for future generations. It is the best school in the world and is truly unique and all my classmates, and hundreds of old boys would agree that if our school was to close it would be a dreadful waste of a most amazing resource. It would also mean that the opportunities we receive would not be there for future pupils. It seems that green belt land is only safe when it suits the government and when it doesn't they can build whatever they like and rip up the countryside to suit their short term needs. Has anyone thought that the bypass won't be needed after the new power station is built? It is only needed whilst the building is in process but who's ever heard of them returning roads to pastureland?  Why would EDF even contemplate helping to close a school that holds the next generation of farmers and land managers? If you must have a bypass then build it from Dumball Wharf as everyone wants and stop trying to cut costs. Just something to think about Edf.	8765-561-3844			/	A large number of public consultees have supported the principle of building a bypass to stop traffic from

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Save Cannington Action Group	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	We the undersigned who live in the Parish of Cannington reject all site-related activity within the Parish.	8777-561-0			/	<p>having to travel through Cannington but do not agree with EDF Energy's proposed route. EDF Energy has assessed a number of alternative routes and a full explanation of this process can be found in the <b>Alternative Sites Assessment</b> appended to the planning statement. However, at all stages of consultation EDF Energy has presented the western route around Cannington as the 'preferred' routing option, whilst at the same time inviting comments on this and other options, which it took into account before making a final decision. The western route was selected for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the western route is the shortest route option, thereby minimising the amount of land take. In terms of noise and air quality, the route would have an impact on fewer properties than a 'no bypass' or the alternative routes;</li> <li>although the western route would result in the loss of some landscape features, including hedgerows and trees, it is considered that the loss of these features can be satisfactorily mitigated compared with the other options;</li> <li>groundwater is at a greater depth relative to the alternative options, minimising the potential for pollution due to ground contamination;</li> <li>ground conditions are preferable to the other options and would preclude the need for pre-loading;</li> <li>the western route would cross fewer watercourses and particularly would not cross Cannington Brook, which is identified to be a sensitive ecological feature in the area;</li> <li>the habitats along the western route are largely of limited biodiversity value and the route would not cross any designated sites; and</li> <li>the western route would minimise any amenity impacts of the centre of the village and would have a lesser impact than any alternative routes.</li> </ul> <p>Comments have suggested that the Cannington bypass would not be needed if more, or all, construction related deliveries were made by sea. Whilst EDF Energy is proposing to import a significant volume of construction materials by sea (via a jetty on-site and Combwich Wharf) rather than road, there is a</p>
Tractivity 704	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? This seems sensible.	9464-561-3985			/	
Tractivity 716	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? No. Use the existing bypass - enough environmental degradation already	9474-561-3042		/		
Tractivity 759	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Yes great idea!	9517-561-2734			/	
Tractivity 824	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Dreadful thought	9582-561-3148			/	
Tractivity 849	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? We don't want a bypass in or near cannington. Just build the new road at Dunball and keep away from the A39. We dont want it.	9607-561-2923		/		
Tractivity 863	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Used to live in Cannington and I believe you have dealt with possible traffic problems satisfactorily	9621-561-2691			/	
Tractivity 864	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? We need more roads - hope/trust they will be well landscaped though?	9622-561-2830			/	
Tractivity 874	Public	Stage 2	Do you agree with EDF Energy's view that a Cannington western bypass should be provided? Box ticked: Disagree 6. Any other ideas or comments? Again, the time factor appears to be the driving force behind this statement, with the environment being a secondary backup.	9632-561-3006			/	
Tractivity 877	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Not necessary of above is built!	9635-561-3035		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 882	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? If EDF would listen to what the people of Cannington say and build a road direct from Junction 23 of the M5 direct to Hinkley point there is no need for a bypass either side of Cannington.	9640-561-2668		/		limit imposed by tidal conditions and practical considerations which means that not all materials can be delivered by sea. It is EDF Energy's intention, however, to maximise the use of both the jetty and the wharf in order to limit HGV traffic as far as possible. EDF Energy has therefore proposed a combination of measures which will help reduce and control the use of road freight traffic during the construction phase. Please refer to the <b>Freight Management Strategy</b> for more information.  A large number of public consultees have expressed concern that the Cannington bypass could adversely impact Brymore School and create a possible danger to the students. As explained in the, <b>Cannington Bypass Design and Access Statement</b> the proposal includes a traffic signal controlled Toucan crossing which is to be provided for pedestrians and cyclists to safely cross the bypass between Cannington village and Brymore School. A footway and cycleway would be provided on the east side for the entire length of the bypass. A link would also be provided from the bypass to the eastern section of the Brymore School front drive, which would become a footpath/cyclepath. It is also proposed to provide a cattle crossing with corrals and warning lights for Brymore School to ensure pupils can move cattle across the bypass. The bypass would also intersect an existing watercourse along the north side of the Brymore School access road and large box culvert is proposed in this location. Finally, EDF Energy knows from comments received during Stage 1 and 2 consultations that many people would prefer a Bridgwater bypass and think that this should be provided instead of the western Cannington bypass. EDF Energy do not consider a Bridgwater bypass is necessary to mitigate the impact of Hinkley Point C construction and a full response to these comments can be found in the <b>Transport - Transport Strategy - Northern Bridgwater Bypass</b> section of this report.
Tractivity 892	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? This is only for YOUR benefit	9650-561-3204			/	
Tractivity 901	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Any Cannington by-pass will impinge negatively on the village, and the the end point of further congestion in Bridgwater and along the busy A39. You make no mention of time scale, but at meetings have said the bypass would not be complete until 18 months into construction work. Can you seriously intend all this heavy traffic to come through the village? Think again!	9659-561-2778			/	
Tractivity 913	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? This again is EDF compromise and consideration at its best. It sounds very well thought out of course.	9671-561-3740			/	
Tractivity 927	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Cannington will need a bypass.	9685-561-3334			/	
Tractivity 927	Public	Stage 2	7. Any other ideas or comments? I agree with the park and ride facility. At the end of its life I would like to see the facility turned into something which would benefit the area and leave a legacy. It could be used as landscaped gardens, childrens play area which would attract people from outside.	9685-561-3822		/		
Tractivity 940	Public	Stage 2	I agree that a bypass should be provided nevertheless, will it ensure that motorists will use it? I know, from experience, that upon leaving work you take the shortest route back home!! (Which in this case will probably be through the centre of Cannington village!)	9698-561-3501			/	
Tractivity 945	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Reservations	9703-561-2930			/	
Tractivity 980	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? If you live in Cannington I can see the appeal of this bypass but I live in Comwich and it will not help us at all. I note that in your publications you say that you will put a bypass round the pretty rural village of Cannington. Can you explain why Cannington is in such a priveledged position? Are the people who live there better than us? Do they deserve a better quality of life than Comwich? Or is this a typical tactic of divide and rule?	9738-561-4028		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 981	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Definitely the best option, and very necessary. Should have been done when ?B? Station was being constructed.	9739-561-2690			/	
Tractivity 986	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? No bypass at Cannington. EDF should build a road from Dunball Wharf direct to Hinkley site. This would reduce the disruption to local villages. i dont think EDF have fully considered all the options available. Very worried about this.	9744-561-4646		/		
Tractivity 1087	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? We have already been told by EDF that the Cannington bypass will not be used by the traffic coming from the Williton area. Traffic will be increased through Stogusey and Stringston and so I see little benefit in this bypass.	9845-561-3102			/	
Tractivity 1091	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Cannington centre could not and should not sustain further traffic. There must be a by pass to reduce accidents in the centre of the village by the war memorial. Large vehicles turning with such regularity as buses and HGVs as the data has disclosed would be disastrous. However there seems little point in a bypass unless it is built and fully working before building on site commences. There is also limited detail regarding how the bypass road will rejoin the C182- this needs careful consideration.	9849-561-6036			/	
Tractivity 1142	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? This is the route of cheapness. The route chosen impacts on just as many properties as the eastern route. Asking drivers to use the existing by pass then come back on themselves to use the new road may not happen. The route has a direct impact on my property as we live at the eastern end of the route. There is inadequate screening proposed for this end of the route for those of us living on the northern side of the road. The access to Cannington for us is made unsafe by this road cutting across the lane to the village without any crossing points and the added traffic from the new roundabout to Combwich which passes by our lane end. We do not want the lane cut off by the bypass for cyclists or walkers as this has large recreational use into further footpaths and lane network. Kids are picked up from Rodway farm to get to Haygrove school. We need safe crossing of the existing road. these points were made at the recent meeting	9900-561-3097			/	
Tractivity 1146	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? See answer to Q5. If the by-pass is built, it should be removed after the reactor development is completed and the land restored to original use (as you claim you will do with the accommodation campuses)	9904-561-3652		/		
Tractivity 1185	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? This is good idea.	9943-561-3082			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1190	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? I strongly oppose the building of another bypass around Cannington. The proposed Western byopass route will cut Brymore school and its farm in two. NO no no.	9948-561-3613			/	
Tractivity 1193	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? 1) You are wrong. You have been told by every local group, ie town, parish and locals that these roads are not suitable. 2) This small extension will not benefit Cannington. Save this work for the northern B/W bypass.	9951-561-2749		/		
Tractivity 1221	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Anything to spread the traffic burden on Cannington would be a benefit.	9979-561-3805			/	
Tractivity 1232	Public	Stage 2 Update	A bypass at cannington is not neccessary and is not wanted by the local community. It will destroy the area. You should do the job properly and build a by pass fron Dunball. Your proposals are purely driven on cost and do not take account of local needs.	89498-561-78		/		
Tractivity 243	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference why build a road that is not going to be used?	8939-561-1257			/	
Tractivity 247	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? EDF should work closely with Cannington to constuct traffic calming and landscaping of the village centre to avoid a short cut (rat run) through the village, avoiding the bypass. Also help with the extra load on local amenities and facilities required for contractors etc during and after construction.	8940-561-3366	/			
Tractivity 269	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Less impact on the environment and the village.	8958-561-1024			/	
Tractivity 281	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference As a responsible firm, EDF should minimise impact on Cannington which will be hosting an influx of construction workers. A bypass West of the village appears to use marginally less land.	9344-561-2084			/	
Tractivity 370	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference The east road crosses natural wetland with dykes,because of this the road will be longer & built up.This will disrupt natural habitat & we may lose some wildlife.The road would be in a very open area so that noise levels would not be absorbed. This would cause a constant drone of traffic for the villages	9057-561-1136	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 378	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference If this bypass is essential to this project now, why was it not so when the Hinkley site was originally developed? On the face of it, the shorter Western route would appear to be the option which is least destructive to the local environment, but I believe the inhabitants of Cannington should be given the final say. As much freight as possible should be delivered by sea.	9346-561-2745		/		
Tractivity 403	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference There is no way that the people of Cannington will permit either of the proposed routes-!!!	9086-561-1329			/	
Tractivity 461	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference shortest section of road building	9138-561-1450			/	
Tractivity 476	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Yes a road is required but not as suggested. Northern Bridgwater Bypass linking to Hinkley Point Road required to join (sluice at) Dunball (A38) via connecting road to link with Cannington/Hinkley Road. Neither option is best see4. above for longer term perspectives and the bigger picture (A38 to Hinkley) The Sluice and Road from Dunball would fit far better into the long term needs of Bridgwater. It will also assist with future flood control on a wider scale than simply the nuclear power stations. This is a duty of the Government which requires action.	9152-561-2872		/		
Tractivity 477	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference We do not want a bypass at Cannington, you do. Do not persist with this folly.	9153-561-1629		/		
Tractivity 495	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Please give reasons for your preference minimal amount of the country side disrupted	9168-561-1083			/	
Tractivity 508	Public	Stage 1	A second transport route	9180-561-1390			/	
Tractivity 510	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Your should bring in everything you need by ship, not putting more of the countryside under tarmac!! I cannot see a bypass would be needed after the construction phase, souly build a permanent blight on the landscape? If a bypass does get the go-aheas, then it is only right the inhabitants of Cannington and it's environs get to decide on the route.	9182-561-2133		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 542	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>1. Miles from site and will make risk of flooding worse.</p> <p>2. A39 one of the most dangerous roads in the county and you propose to increase traffic on it?!!</p> <p>3. We don't need a badly planned, badly designed, cheaply built hostel left at the end of the day with acres of tarmac.</p> <p>4. "Park and Ride" to where?</p> <p>Question 7(a) - "Wrong side of village"(South) and "Preferable. Closer to site" (North-West).</p> <p>Question 7(b) - "All the wrong side of Bridgwater. All traffic to site will have to go through the town."</p> <p>Question 7(c) - "Again - the wrong side of Bridgwater."</p>	9211-561-2920	/			
Tractivity 543	Public	Stage 1	I don't see the need to bring anything at all through the village. Therefore a bypass at either side is not necessary. Wherever you propose will be problems. What about all public footpaths etc that these roads will go right through? The wildlife you will be disturbing? One of your proposals goes through a nature reserve! Bring it by sea!	9212-561-1002		/		
Tractivity 550	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>Traffic from Bridgwater needs to be directed around the village.</p>	9219-561-2230			/	
Tractivity 582	Public	Stage 1	<p>4. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>I believe that all the construction workers that are temp. housed be accommodated on a camp site enclosed at the site as we did for Hinkley A and B. Management and supervising staff who are on site for a long period (up to 5 years) will buy or rent their homes in the surrounding area and we did on Hinkley Point A and B. Most employers provided help with short term with free rooms and settlement cost to get staff to site in a reasonable manner. I was one of them. The bypass around Cannington is a very good idea.</p>	9251-561-1024			/	
Tractivity 595	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>The routes proposed to by-pass Cannington should seriously be reconsidered. The most direct and practical route would be J23 to the C182 at a point located between Cannington and Combwich. (EDF already own a section of the land required. This could incorporate the proposed Western bypass for Cannington.</p>	9261-561-1369		/		
Tractivity 599	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>Shortest route, less disruption.</p>	9265-561-1368			/	



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 618	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Shorter route and away from flood plain.	9282-561-1567			/	
Tractivity 671	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference As a non-resident of Cannington I feel any bypass should be with their full agreement. I only know that any farming of workers is highly unpopular there.	9334-561-2235			/	
Tractivity 62209	Public	Stage 1	Relief Road With reference to the above, I would point out that the building of a by-pass is essential before construction of Hinkley 'C' starts. I very much hope an Easterly route will be chosen (through more open country and away from the Quarry) You will appreciate my concern from my address. This road is unlit, with a poorly maintained footpath and inadequate speed controls (not taken far enough to the N. to include Grain Store traffic.) At peak times crossing the road is already difficult. I hope this matter will be given priority before construction begins.	9429-561-0		/		
Tractivity 62327	Public	Stage 2	Also, I would like to see the by pass built first then there would be no need for any proposed traffic slow downers needed in Cannington.	10011-561-688		/		
Tractivity 62631	Public	Stage 2	Probably irrelevant	10175-561-5809			/	
Stockland Bristol Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	This Parish considers that the EDF proposals for a Cannington bypass is totally wrong, we need a bypass that will bypass Bridgwater from the Motorway and then around Cannington on the River side. Your proposals will have little to no effect on construction or worker traffic as they will still use Cannington as a 'Rat Run'	10232-561-2755	/			
Timberscombe Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	4. A direct link from the motorway to the site is needed rather than expect existing roads to cope: a relief road around Cannington will be inadequate.	10234-561-560		/		
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- A concern about the volume of material that will be transported by road and that will travel through the centre of Cannington Village in particular, until the jetty and Cannington bypass are built.	89196-561-11333			/	

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 justification for transport proposals, the Cannington Bypass and exclusion of the Bridgwater bypass, needs further elaboration.	89199-561-643	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Justification for the preferred course of action relating to the Cannington and Bridgwater bypass option remains limited.	89201-561-701	/			
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	6.3 No further information has been identified in the transport and environmental appraisals that might alter the findings of the Stage 1 report and therefore the proposal for a western bypass seems reasonable.	89442-561-8894			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Further mitigation is likely to be necessary, by early construction of the Cannington Bypass to mitigate the impact of the preliminary works, the construction of mitigation measures in Bridgwater in line with the transport strategy for the town, and possibly the construction of the Bridgwater Northern Bypass.	89423-561-4389			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Further mitigation is likely to be necessary, by early construction of the Cannington Bypass to mitigate the impact of the preliminary works, the construction of mitigation measures in Bridgwater in line with the transport strategy for the town, and possibly the construction of the Bridgwater Northern Bypass.	89423-561-17565		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment of residual impacts is poor, with only 24 hour flows being presented. This means that highway and environmental impacts cannot be correctly assessed. The assessment of the need for the Cannington and Bridgwater Northern Bypasses is totally inadequate.	89425-561-1510	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62958	Public	Stage 2 Update	I write on behalf of and after consultation with the residents of (Personal details removed), Cannington which is, without doubt, one of the most tranquil and picturesque areas of the village.  We wish it to be known that after considering and absorbing all stages of the so say consultation periods, we are totally opposed to the proposed western by pass. However, given that you are apparently not considering alternatives, we would point out what we consider serious shortcomings in your proposal.	89685-561-102		/		
Tractivity 70648	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	4. Your intention is that all construction and other traffic should pass through the heart of Cannington village, where roads are already narrow and not free from danger, for a period amounting probably to some four years:  If your application for preliminary works at Hinkley Point is granted by West Somerset District Council, all the traffic needed for those works would pass through Cannington for the first part of this period.  If your main application to the IPC is granted, then all the traffic involved in the building of the new reactors would pass through the village during the second part of the period.  This would be extremely oppressive and damaging. Your plans to build a bypass rest on the view that it would be unacceptable for this traffic to pass through the village. Yet that is exactly what you now propose should happen during this lengthy period. If a bypass is necessary, it is no less necessary during this period. It follows that the bypass should be completed before the traffic begins, and this traffic should not be allowed to use the existing route through the village at any time. 90.8% of Cannington voters took this view.	89766-561-1299		/		
Tractivity 70648	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	It would do nothing to reduce traffic on the A39 and other existing roads, or to reduce the dangerous consequences (referred to below) of an accident blocking those roads or of their being inadequate to deal with a nuclear problem.	89766-561-3086			/	
Tractivity 70648	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	We note the statement that the road would not be available in time to meet peak traffic. But neither, according to your proposals, would the western bypass.	89766-561-5596			/	
15	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	The proposed infrastructure is not fit for purpose and no realistic traffic modelling has been demonstrated.	89804-561-1934	/			
16	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	Similarly, EDF claim that the existing Cannington roads could handle the proposed increase in traffic. If this is the case why are they proposing the Western bypass?	89805-561-2479			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
34	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	We are pleased to note that EDF no longer propose an accommodation campus or any freight facilities in Cannington. Unfortunately however a Park & Ride/Western Bypass still appears to be on their agenda in the second stage consultation. Our community did not invite (EDF) or their infrastructure proposals for Hinkley Point C into our village.	89823-561-53			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	Both Government advice, as set out in Guidance on Transport Assessment, and the Draft HPC SPD, require any new highway proposals to be justified by a New Approach to Appraisal (NATA) assessment. No such assessment is provided.  A Cannington Bypass is not part of any highway authority programme and therefore its justification must be based on the impact of HPC project traffic. No assessment of alternatives, as required by NATA, has been provided.	89896-561-2387	/			
Tractivity 722	Public	Stage 2	7. Any other ideas or comments? Do not agree with the proposed Bypass	9480-561-3126			/	
Tractivity 894	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? The main concern is the effect it is going to have on the village of Cannington. The proposed bypass will be a problem.	9652-561-125			/	
Tractivity 894	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Have no objection to Hinkley C but concerned about the effect the proposals will have on the area as a whole. Feel more could be concentrated at Hinkley and the Cannington bypass will be a real problem	9652-561-6056			/	
Tractivity 917	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? The Cannington bypass that you speak of is exactly the same route that the council has passed years ago. But they ran out of money. It was all part of a new road the council has planned running from the A38 at Dunball over the river across the flats around the back of Cannington through the fields of Brymore College and connects with the roundabout on the A39. Yes this must be built, but not paid for by YOU.	9675-561-3342		/		
Tractivity 1223	Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments? If existing highway network is being used WHY APPLY FOR A CANNINGTON BYPASS?	9981-561-1923			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 273	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: Don't Know 5. Please give reasons for your preference The bypass could be significant for decommissioning both of the two existing stations and of Hinkley C in due course. I have in mind not so much the use of the road to aid decommissioning but the fact that the presence of a good road would improve the prospects for long term after-use of the site - i.e. could be a trigger to sustaining longer term (100 year plus) economic activity even if nuclear power is no longer needed by then.	8962-561-1208			/	
Tractivity 384	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference i think a bypass is needed, i am not happy with the propoals.	9069-561-1052			/	
Tractivity 385	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference i think a bypass is needed, i am not happy with the proposal	9070-561-1074			/	
Tractivity 402	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference If a bypass was built it would destroy Cannington as a village and only serve to increase traffic in the locality.	9085-561-1405		/		
Tractivity 405	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference It would be better for the village to endure the disruption for 6 years rather than use green land for a bypass.	9088-561-1143		/		
Tractivity 540	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference I would think a bypass would be needed- I don't know enough about the area to say which route is should take.	9209-561-1466			/	
Tractivity 62386	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	EDF's preferred option is a Western bypass which they claim is cheaper and quicker to build. I object to the building of the Western bypass for several reasons.	10049-561-1289			/	
Tractivity 62436	Public	Stage 2	In your letter of 14th September 2010 you referred to a so-called 'Western bypass' of Cannington as being beneficial. It will not be beneficial to residents who live within sight and sound of this potentially very busy road.	10068-561-0			/	
Timberscombe Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	4. A direct link from the motorway to the site is needed rather than expect existing roads to cope: a relief road around Cannington will be inadequate.	10234-561-560		/		

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	s) A Cannington bypass to the west is downright idiotic. Even if construction traffic is signposted, people follow their sat-navs these days unless they are very familiar with the area and the shortest route from the motorway won't be the bypass. EDF won't be able to control taxi companies either and customers won't appreciate the extra costs incurred going the long way round. It certainly won't work after construction has been completed and nominal controls end. It has to be to the east or an alternative solution found.	89470-561-572			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	1.21 The bypass study is extremely 'high level' and lacks sufficient detail in order to justify the need, or otherwise, for the respective Cannington and Bridgwater bypass proposals	89220-561-6444	/			
Tractivity 62983	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	It is no use hiding behind time delays, which independent consultants have stated as being wildly e/aggerated nor using the Government's so called ban on new roads. If there was a blanket ban on all roads how could the proposed Cannington Western bypass be approved?	89689-25-8412			/	
Tractivity 62913	Public	Stage 2 Update	Cannington traffic calming - at the consultation meeting on 4th March 2011 it was stated that none of the measures proposed would take place until after the western bypass has been built and is in operation. 'To encourage use of the bypass'. There is an assumption that the western bypass will be built, how arrogant!	89665-452-4147			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Bridgwater College	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	- There could be a serious risk of stress to the cattle during the construction phase while the work is carried out and then also post construction from noise/possible pollution	8774-558-5469			/	The bypass construction works cannot start until the Development Consent Order (DCO) has been granted. It is envisaged that construction of the bypass would begin in 2013 with a construction programme of 21 months. Construction works are likely to commence from both the northern and southern ends working towards the central section, in order to maximise speed of delivery of the bypass.
Tractivity 870	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? But: Levels of traffic anticipated cannot be accommodated within existing road capacity. A western bypass for Cannington is the best option but this would not be completed before work begins on the powerstation. This is unacceptable. Work should not start on the powerstation until the bypass has been built.	9628-558-2557		/		The central section would initially be used as a borrow pit, to balance the cut and fill operations along the route of the bypass.  EDF Energy would progress works on the power station site during the period of construction of the bypass since various mitigation measures are to be undertaken as part of the Site Preparation works within Cannington village eg traffic calming and other safety measures.
Tractivity 871	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Bypass must be completed before construction on powerstation starts	9629-558-2625		/		Construction methodology and phasing would maintain or redirect all existing access routes during construction.  All affected landowners would be notified of proposed work activities prior to commencement during construction of the bypass. EDF Energy would liaise with the local residents to ensure minimum disruption.
Tractivity 895	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? But concerned about being cut off while this work is going on as you go straight across our only access to village	9653-558-2553			/	Upon completion of the bypass works and the maintenance and defects period, the bypass is expected to be adopted by the highway authority (Somerset County Council).  Further detail can be found within the <b>Transport Assessment</b> and the <b>Environmental Statement, Volume 5, Chapter 3</b>
Tractivity 895	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  We agree with the proposed new road, however due to our business we would appreciate in writing confirmation that while the work is going on that we and the other residents off (Personal details removed) will have access too and from the village during the work building off the road. However, if you cannot confirm in writing that we shall have access during this time then we shall be proceeding to obtain this and access legally.	9653-558-5835			/	
Tractivity 901	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Any Cannington by-pass will impinge negatively on the village, and the the end point of further congestion in Bridgwater and along the busy A39.  You make no mention of time scale, but at meetings have said the bypass would not be complete until 18 months into construction work. Can you seriously intend all this heavy traffic to come through the village? Think again!	9659-558-2778		/		
Tractivity 915	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Bypass should be built before major road works.	9673-558-3098		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1121	Public	Stage 2	7. Any other ideas or comments? No faith that you will build a by pass in time	9879-558-3231			/	
Tractivity 1281	Public	Stage 2 Update	Concerned about the proposed Cannington byo pass in the fact it will be built from both ends. This will mean real disruption as heavy lorries will have to go through the village. Surely with the amount of money to be spent on the so called road improvements in Bridgwater, and the disruption that will cause, would be better spent on a road from Dunball to Hinkley.	89547-558-38		/		
Tractivity 1372	Public	Stage 2 Update	The Cannington bypass needs to be built before any workls commences. local roads should be made no entry for HPC traffic.	89638-558-887		/		
Tractivity 1373	Public	Stage 2 Update	Cannington bypass should be opened before the main construction commences. EDF are pushing ahead before the infrastructure is in place.	89639-558-1509		/		
Tractivity 62209	Public	Stage 1	With reference to the above, I would point out that the building of a by-pass is essential before construction of Hinkley 'C' starts. I very much hope an Easterly route will be chosen (through more open country and away from the Quarry)  You will appreciate my concern from my address. This road is unlit, with a poorly maintained footpath and inadequate speed controls (not taken far enough to the N. to include Grain Store traffic.) At peak times crossing the road is already difficult.  I hope this matter will be given priority before construction begins.	9429-558-15		/		
Tractivity 62455	Public	Stage 2	Just had a phonecall from a (Personal details removed) for Cannington. She attended the meeting last night and wanted to speak to (Personal details removed) to follow up a point made about the bypass. She wants to know about the diversions onto side roads that would be put in place whilst the bypass is being built and how the whole operation would be dealt with.	10079-558-54			/	



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62583	Public	Stage 2	<p>9. The rationale behind the building of a bypass rests on the view that it would be unacceptable for this traffic to pass through the village. If this really is so, it must be just as unacceptable for the first 15 months or more as it is after that time. It follows that the bypass and the wharf should be completed before the heavy traffic begins, and this traffic should not be allowed to use the existing route through the village at any time. 90.8% of Cannington voters take this view.</p> <p>b) Do we need a bypass?</p> <p>10. But the converse of this argument should also be considered. If it is acceptable to send Hinkley traffic through the village during the first 15 months (or if, though not acceptable, EDF is nonetheless allowed to do it) this calls into question the need to have a bypass at all. Certainly it would shorten (by at least 15 months) the period for which a new bypass would serve any useful purpose.</p>	10134-558-3648		/		
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	[13.9] As noted elsewhere, the provision of the Cannington bypass, and other required road improvements, must be made before main construction works starts. This states that the bypass will not be offered for formal adoption by SCC until completion. This means that the bypass will remain the private property of EDF for about a decade. Will EDF confirm that they will guarantee to keep this road open for public use during this long period of private ownership?	89294-558-2130		/		
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	15.4 In particular, the delivery of the Cannington By-pass should be prioritised so as to be completed prior to the commencement of construction works.	89446-558-1608		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Other than the mitigation offered by the park and ride strategy, the authorities are concerned that the only other mitigation specifically offered by EDF to address the potential significant traffic impacts of the project is the Cannington Bypass. However, EDF Energy currently intend this to be completed after the preliminary works stage of the project, despite the likelihood of significant traffic impacts within Cannington during the preliminary works period.	89311-558-20		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	the authorities consider that it will be necessary to construct the bypass prior to undertaking the preliminary works for the project in order to mitigate the traffic effects of these works within Cannington.	89367-558-6172		/		

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The authorities are concerned that the timing of the construction of the Cannington Bypass, set out at paragraph 13.9, is linked to the implementation of the DCO application and there is no link to the timing and traffic impacts associated with the preliminary works. It is important to understand how the Cannington Bypass can be delivered to help mitigate the construction traffic associated with the preliminary works and this should be reflected through an Obligation, linking the bypass to the implementation of the preliminary works. The timescales and process for maintenance and adoption need to be confirmed.	89420-558-18360		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Further mitigation is likely to be necessary, by early construction of the Cannington Bypass to mitigate the impact of the preliminary works, the construction of mitigation measures in Bridgwater in line with the transport strategy for the town, and possibly the construction of the Bridgwater Northern Bypass.	89423-558-4389		/		
Tractivity 62911	Public	Stage 2 Update	This village will bear the brunt of all through traffic to Hinkley Point for approx. three years prior to completion of the proposed western bypass. With the areas of pavement barely wide enough for one person in places on main routes, the risk of an accident is extremely high. Lorries with their heavy tonnage and associated width plus their large wing mirrors could side swipe people using these narrow pavements as there is no room to step safely back from the edge of the road.	89663-558-1886	/			
Tractivity 62955	Public	Stage 2 Update	The Cannington by-pass should be in place before any works commence. This is yet another example of EDF not organising properly; an unbelievably bad way of running a project which worries me greatly.	89683-558-3218		/		
Stop Hinkley	Non-statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	EDF has made no major alteration to its transport plans, such as taking up the proposal to build a bypass round Bridgwater, as repeatedly called for by local community representatives. There is also no proposal to construct the proposed new bypass route round Cannington before any preliminary works take place.	89770-558-1516		/		
16	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	In the interim, during the 18 month construction period, all traffic would have to pass through Cannington village.	89805-558-2869			/	

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 and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	<p>2.97 Reference is made to Cannington Bypass being constructed in Sections, with the Southern Section and Northern Section being constructed generally in parallel and then the central section following on to complete the bypass. From the information provided we have not been able to identify the extent of the Sections referred to in the text.</p> <p>2.98 Constructing the northern section in parallel to the southern section will necessitate construction traffic passing through Cannington to reach the construction site to the north of Cannington. This would be in addition to the construction traffic for the main HPC and Combwich Wharf.</p> <p>2.99 The County Council's preference would be for the construction to commence at the southern end and for either construction to progress northwards or for a haul road to be constructed along the route of the bypass to enable delivery of materials to travel through the construction works rather than through Cannington.</p>	89847-558-6973			/	
Otterhampton Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	- Cannington Bypass is not projected to be finished until Oct 2013/Jan20147 this means HGVs and buses will be routed through Cannington! Looking at Figure 18 there will be in excess of 200 HGVs and around 100 P&R Bus's daily making 1 way trips. The residents of Cannington will have 600 vehicle movements each day for over a year until the bypass is built. This does not take into account any LGVs or visitors to HPC.	89869-558-3243			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.5.2 The timing of the Cannington Bypass is of concern. The proposed traffic volumes required in the early months of the project before the bypass is complete will all have to pass through Cannington, which will be unable to cope. The bypass must be built before any works start on site.	89872-558-18035			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	Transport related impacts at Cannington, that would occur during the proposed preliminary works and during the main works prior to the construction of a bypass, are a major concern that are not addressed by the consultation and represent an important omission.	89875-558-8678			/	
<b>Sedgemoor District Council &amp; West Somerset Council Joint Council Response</b>	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	<p>4. Cannington By-pass</p> <p>The authorities are concerned that a new bypass at Cannington would be a major development in its own right and potentially could result in significant environmental impacts.</p>	88060-563-1218			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 858	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Although I agree in principle I cannot see what is wrong with using the current Hinkley Road which was built when A and B sites were erected - there is nothing wrong with this road and it would save carving up more countryside.	9616-554-2603			/	<p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy presented the first outline proposals for the Cannington bypass. At Stage 1 consultation EDF Energy explained that its favoured option around Cannington was a route to the west of the village. However it also presented an alternative route around the east of the village at Stage 1 consultation. Consultees were asked for their comments on each. At the same stage, two other alternatives (the outer western route and a 'no bypass' option) were presented as options that had been considered and discounted. Following careful consideration of responses at Stage 1, EDF Energy presented the route to the west of the village as its preferred proposal at Stage 2.</p> <p>EDF Energy's detailed design for the Cannington Bypass has evolved by taking into account the key comments received from statutory consultees, including local authorities, the local community, and general public during the formal consultation process; as well as the inputs from the technical specialists as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process.</p> <p><b>a) Stage 1</b></p> <p>In response to the feedback from Stage 1 which informed the proposed development presented at Stage 2 some small alterations were made to the design, albeit the principle of the development remained the same, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>inclusion of an at grade toucan crossing to enable pedestrians, in particular school children, to cross safely;</li> <li>inclusion of culvert to cross the Mill Stream along the Brymore School main drive;</li> <li>inclusion of two balancing ponds to mitigate flood risk; and</li> </ul> <p>further development of the landscaping strategy, through the inclusion of planting, shrubs and hedgerows, having regard to the site context and visual impacts.</p> <p><b>b) Stage 2</b></p> <p>Following feedback from the Stage 2 consultation the following alterations were made to the proposed development, which were presented at the Stage 2 Update consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>inclusion of an at grade cattle crossing and associated corral in the southern part of the site to enable cattle to safely cross the bypass;</li> <li>deletion of underpass previously proposed alongside</li> </ul>
Tractivity 888	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Whilst accepting the need for the bypass - albeit reluctantly as it will increase noise levels significantly for our property - we feel that the current plans are inadequate as the road should be in a cutting for virtually its whole length (ie from Withiel drive right through to Rodway) and not merely at its highest point by Knapp Farm. A cutting for virtually its entire length would minimise both visual and noise pollution for residents so affected.	9646-554-2559	/			
Tractivity 1017	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? New road Dunball to Hinkley would wipe out the need for a Cannington bypas.	9775-554-2885		/		
Tractivity 1044	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Bypass on the Eastern side would provide access options for a link to Dunball	9802-554-2940		/		
Tractivity 1081	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? No I think that an eastern bypass would be best and even better if linked to a Bridgwater bypass from the A38 north of Bridgwater.	9839-554-4362		/		
Tractivity 1248	Public	Stage 2 Update	Questions/suggestions about the Cannington bypass. 1) The map shows an access to the east of the bypass at the Sandy Lane intersection. I would like to suggest this is both a foot and a bridle path. Sandy Lane is a route used by horses from the Cannington Equestrian Centre.	89514-554-355		/		
Tractivity 1248	Public	Stage 2 Update	2) I would like to suggest a footpath from the north end of Chad?s Hill to the bypass. This would complete the route for walkers fro footpath BW5/7	89514-554-630		/		
Tractivity 62569	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	The environment will be spoilt, public access changed (footpaths), as no bridges or underpasses will be built across the road. This would be dangerous especially for children.	10121-554-272		/		
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in	Stage 2	13. Comment Wester bypass - please put it into a cutting for Withiel Drive to Rodway. The present plans show an elevated section across the field in front of my	10124-554-8342		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
	Land and Public		house.					Brymore School main drive to the north; Toucan crossing relocated southwards closer to Brymore School main drive access;
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	As you have probably gathered I am very concerned about the elevation of the Western bypass preferred route.  From (Personal details removed) we look straight across the field where you propose to build the bypass. The plans show an elevated section across this field which means we will see, hear and smell these vehicles at all hours of the day and night. They will also cause light pollution as they use the road.	10124-554-8840	/			closure of Withiel Drive to through traffic from the High Street to the bypass; modifications to alignment and access for Withiel Drive and Brymore School back drive; inclusion of noise bunds rather than acoustic fences to mitigate noise impacts, which respond more appropriately to the rural character of the area;
Landowner - Bridgwater College	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	- The re-location of the junction from the by-pass onto Rodway Road to a point beyond the entrance to Rodway Farm could reduce the threat to the safety of staff and students and could potentially provide a link up with the access road to the wharf at the same roundabout.	89436-554-9924		/		minor realignment of side roads to maximise continued traffic use during construction; inclusion of bat-hop overs along the proposed route to minimise potential ecological impacts;
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	When previous proposals for Hinkley Point C were considered in the late 1980s, the Inspector, (Personal details removed), concluded that the construction of both the Bridgwater and Cannington bypasses would be required.	89366-554-3376			/	inclusion of underpass for bats and badgers in the northern part of the bypass; minor realignment of northern section of bypass to mitigate impact on existing pond with Great Crested Newts; inclusion of field accesses; and the site boundary has been altered to reflect these changes.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	only two alternative alignments for the bypass are considered and justification for the alignment chosen is not comprehensive or in accordance with good practice. A third alignment further to the west is considered in Chapter 3 of the EnvApp (which considers Cannington Bypass) but is again ruled out without a comprehensive assessment.	89367-554-2708		/		<b>c) Stage 2 Update</b> Since the Stage 2 Update Consultation the following alterations have been made in response to detailed design and consultation responses: omission of bat hop-over at Chad's Hill junction and along the north-south field boundary to the west of the northern roundabout to ensure that mitigation would be appropriately focussed;
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The alignment is kept tight to the village, although an alignment further to the west would reduce impacts on the village. In particular, the proposed alignment impacts significantly upon Brymore School. The school accommodates boarder who live on-site, and also those who live within Cannington; the bypass alignment segregating the two. Although a new route is proposed to the toucan crossing, this entails the use of a track which is not within the control of the school. Furthermore, school activities feature agricultural specialities including, for instance, taking cattle from the school farm to pasture, however the bypass alignment severs this movement. An underpass for cattle is proposed although this results in health and safety issues for children with large animals in a confined space, and also issues associated with the need for removal of cattle slurry.	89367-554-3291	/			an extension to the acoustic bund along the eastern part of the bypass northwards up to Sandy Lane; modifications to field accesses to the south of Brymore School main drive; inclusion of new field accesses crossing the Brymore School main drive to the west of the bypass; and minor diversion of public footpath linking Chad's Hill to Sandy Lane where intersected by bypass to allow retention of existing mature tree.  EDF Energy has undertaken a <b>Transport Assessment</b> which considers the capacity of the bypass, roundabouts at each end and the junctions along its route. The assessment confirms that the level of provision along the bypass is appropriate for the predicted volume of traffic. In addition to
Sedgemoor District Council and	Dual - local authority and consultee	Stage 2	Stage 1 requested a full assessment of the no-bypass option, however this has not been carried out. Two alternative routes are considered briefly, with both traffic and environmental considerations	89368-554-9469			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)							considering the impacts of the development flows on the bypass the assessment also considers the impacts on the adjoining existing roads including traffic flows along the C182 (Rodway).
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The methodology therefore needs completion with regard to criteria for the magnitude of effects, and consideration of alternatives.	89368-554-9671			/	For the safe passage of pedestrians across the bypass at Brymore School EDF Energy has proposed the inclusion of a toucan crossing. This is a type of traffic signal controlled crossing which is intended for use by both pedestrians and cyclists to cross a public highway.  The existing footpath (BW5/8) intersected by the bypass would be diverted over the road.  The provision of the cycle/footway link between Sandy Lane and the bypass would enable continued use by pedestrians and cyclists to and from the village along routes identified by a number of consultees as being frequently used and connecting with other public rights of way.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	no reference is made to consideration of alternative routes. Therefore it is not possible to determine the relative merits of the proposed scheme compared to others considered.	89371-554-10576			/	Cyclists and walkers wishing to get to Sandy Lane or Chad's Hill to the west of the bypass could use the proposed cycle/footway link referred to above and then either cross the bypass towards Sandy Lane or use the cycle/footway alongside the bypass to the Chad's Hill junction where they would cross the bypass. The bypass, by complying with national standards commensurate with the design speed of the road, would have good visibility between all users whether they are on foot, cycling or in vehicles.  Provision of a footpath from the north end of the severed Chad's Hill to the bypass cycle/footway would not comply with the standards required for disability access due to the steepness of the existing topography to the north-east. If the footpath was to follow the natural topography it would connect with the bypass at a proposed field access located 40 metres to the north-east of the Chad's Hill junction. If a disability compliant footpath was to be provided it would require a significant redesign of the bypass cutting slope and would result in a greater loss of agricultural land to provide a solution that would have a walking distance similar to that by using the link from Sandy Lane to the bypass and then along the bypass cycle/footway.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Further work is required to assess the need for and routes of the Cannington and Bridgwater Northern Bypasses. In particular, a more westerly route for Cannington Bypass should be considered to reduce the environmental impact on properties in Cannington and the severance of Brymore School from the village and of its agricultural holdings.	89416-554-9528			/	Provision of a footpath from the north end of the severed Chad's Hill to the bypass cycle/footway would not comply with the standards required for disability access due to the steepness of the existing topography to the north-east. If the footpath was to follow the natural topography it would connect with the bypass at a proposed field access located 40 metres to the north-east of the Chad's Hill junction. If a disability compliant footpath was to be provided it would require a significant redesign of the bypass cutting slope and would result in a greater loss of agricultural land to provide a solution that would have a walking distance similar to that by using the link from Sandy Lane to the bypass and then along the bypass cycle/footway.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The justification for the chosen route of the bypass in preference to an eastern bypass and a route further to the west is superficial.	89426-554-1976			/	Provision of a footpath from the north end of the severed Chad's Hill to the bypass cycle/footway would not comply with the standards required for disability access due to the steepness of the existing topography to the north-east. If the footpath was to follow the natural topography it would connect with the bypass at a proposed field access located 40 metres to the north-east of the Chad's Hill junction. If a disability compliant footpath was to be provided it would require a significant redesign of the bypass cutting slope and would result in a greater loss of agricultural land to provide a solution that would have a walking distance similar to that by using the link from Sandy Lane to the bypass and then along the bypass cycle/footway.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Further work on the alignment for the bypass is necessary to overcome design deficiencies and reduce its environmental impact on Cannington.	89426-554-2347	/			Consultee suggestions to connect the bypass to the C182 (Rodway) road to the north of Rodway Farm would have a significant impact on existing properties to the north of the current proposed bypass and on Straddlings Lane. The existing sub-standard alignment of the C182 (Rodway) at the grain silos would also require departures from standard for the bypass design which would be difficult to justify given that there is already a compliant design proposed.

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
								<p>The proposed roundabout traffic islands would be provided with pedestrian crossings which would enable pedestrians to cross the roundabout entries and exits to gain access to the bypass cycle/footway. For pedestrian movements along C182 (Rodway) between Rodway Farm and the village the bypass proposals include the provision of a cycle/footway along the section of road that would be closed to traffic once the bypass roundabout has been constructed thus improving the route to the village.</p> <p>Following further consideration of the requirements for bats along the existing main drive to Brymore School the need for an underpass on ecological grounds at this location was deemed no longer necessary. In response to the adverse comments made by consultees regarding the proposed underpass EDF Energy has removed it from their proposals.</p> <p>Following further discussions with consultees EDF Energy propose to replace the underpass with an at-grade cattle crossing, for use by the school, incorporating opposing gated accesses with livestock corrals so that cattle can be herded into them and then across the bypass. Road signage including flashing amber lights erected in the highway verge in advance would be provided warning road users of the use of the cattle crossing.</p> <p>Removal of the underpass also enabled EDF Energy to relocate the proposed traffic signal controlled toucan crossing closer to the school main access and thereby encourage greater use by the school pupils of the route along the traffic free section of the drive between the bypass and the High Street. In addition the removal of the underpass negated the need for a new track across farm land for the school's cattle to get to the underpass.</p> <p>The landscape proposals have been designed to produce the best landscape setting and immediate screening of the bypass and to provide for a long-term landscape as a legacy, whilst being directed by the ecological objectives of the area and enabling the ecological mitigation requirements of the site. The landscape design has responded to comments received at Stage 2 requesting additional planting to screen Chad's Hill. The refined proposals show a comprehensive landscape scheme designed to integrate the road into the surrounding landscape using locally occurring native species. The proposals are also designed to provide screening of the proposed development particularly from the most sensitive visual receptors. In response to concerns about the impact on Brymore School main drive additional planting would be provided to maintain the</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
								<p>line of the tree avenue across the bypass.</p> <p>Where the bypass crosses the Brymore School main drive EDF Energy have given careful consideration to the landscape and ecological impacts of the landscape and road design both during construction and operation of the bypass. Temporary and permanent mitigation measures would include the creation of a bat hop-over across the bypass along the existing route used by bats and for the inclusion within the proposed culvert, where the bypass crosses the Mill Stream, a shelf that would allow wildlife to pass under the bypass but above the level of the water.</p> <p>EDF Energy's lighting strategy for the bypass has been designed to restrict lighting to minimise light levels and light spill, compliant with standards, at the roundabouts at each end of the bypass and for the Toucan crossing by Brymore School. In addition the proposed acoustic bunds will significantly reduce the impact of light from vehicles on the properties on the western edge of Cannington. An assessment has been made of the impact of lighting on sensitive receptors.</p> <p>Following further investigation on the impacts of the bypass on existing routes used by bats the 1.8 metre high chain link fence proposed along the bypass boundaries, at Stage 2, has been changed to hedges with stock proof fencing in conjunction with bat hop-over's at identified points where the existing bat routes would intersect the bypass.</p> <p>At Stage 2 one of the primary concerns with regard to mitigation was the request to provide as much as possible of the bypass in cutting; this was a particular concern of the residents of Chad's Hill. EDF Energy has endeavoured to balance competing requirements of minimising loss of land, noise and visual impacts to the area and sustainable construction. The requirement to lower the bypass to be in cutting over much of its length would require a greater loss in agricultural land and would result in additional excavated material going to land fill which would result in adverse impacts beyond the area of the bypass. In response to consultation comments the acoustic bund on the east side of the bypass to the north of Withiel Drive has been extended northwards to connect with the deep cutting at Sandy Lane. The crest of the bund would continue to be 2 metres above the level of the bypass carriageway. Except for a gap required at a farm access which includes the footpath crossing the bund on the east side would be continuous between Withiel Drive and the Sandy Lane cutting. The provision of the bund in conjunction with planting on the non-highway slope will provide increased screening which in the short term would conceal views</p>



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
								<p>to cars and in the longer term reduce views to higher vehicles. The bund would also help to screen light from traffic on the road for the residents on the western edge of Cannington. The provision of the extended bund would have limited impact on loss of agricultural land as the area occupied by the rear face of the bund was intended for screen planting which can now be at a higher level. The extended bund has also reduced the surplus excavated material that would have needed to be removed off site.</p> <p>Details of potential alternative routes for the Cannington Bypass are included in the Environmental Statement.</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1140	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Should not use countryside	9898-555-2656			/	The landscape proposals have been designed to produce the most appropriate landscape setting and immediate screening of the proposed development and aim to provide a long-term landscape as a legacy for the surrounding area, whilst being directed by the ecological objectives of the area and enabling the ecological mitigation requirements of the site. The landscape design has been modified to include additional planting to screen Chad's Hill, in response to comments received from consultees at Stage 2. The refined proposals show a comprehensive landscape scheme designed to integrate the bypass into the surrounding landscape using the planting of locally occurring native species. The proposals are also designed to provide screening of the proposed development particularly from the most sensitive visual receptors. The proposals include additional planting that would be provided to maintain the line of the avenue near Brymore School.
Tractivity 1146	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? See answer to Q5. If the by-pass is built, it should be removed after the reactor development is completed and the land restored to original use (as you claim you will do with the accommodation campuses)	9904-555-3652			/	
Tractivity 62340	Public	Stage 2	1. The route where it passes in front of Chads Hill should be in a cutting, as it was in your initial proposal. To commence the cutting only after Sandy Lane does nothing to address the significant and lasting impact this road is going to have on the dozens of residents on (Personal details removed). We cannot ever be compensated for the huge negative impact this road is going to have on the value of our homes - a large part of the value being in the view which does not figure in either the Land Compensation Act or the Town and Country Planning Act. However you can address by this means some of the impact on our view, and on the noise that is to be created in what until now has been a peaceful location.	10020-555-1867	/			
Tractivity 62340	Public	Stage 2	3. More detail is required for the Landscaping along the road. At present only taller trees are shown to be provided where they are required for the bats. I would insist that the human population should be shown equal consideration. The verges are shown at present with just hedge planting - this should be amended to suitable broad leaf trees. In addition you are cutting down at least 2 mature specimen trees to build the road. Whilst they may not yet be the subject of TPO's I think you should in any event offer to replace these as they form a significant amenity asset to the locality. In addition taller tree planting will assist in ameliorating the deleterious affects of noise and dust pollution from the new road.	10020-555-2933	/			
Tractivity 62583	Public	Stage 2	14. If this bypass is nonetheless to be built we believe that its impact could and should be minimised. In particular, we think that the embankment which is proposed for parts of it should be eliminated and that it should be sunk so far as possible below the level of the existing land through the use of deeper and more extensive cuttings. This would include in particular the stretch of road which runs alongside Chads Hill. 84.3% of Cannington voters think that the present proposals for mitigation are inadequate.	10134-555-5769			/	

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	<p>The Parish Council requests that there is no building of any related works until all by-pass roads are completed. If this is not the case, the Council are of the belief that there will be serious damage not only to properties but a very high risk of loss of life. There is a Primary school on the main road as it comes through the village, as well as the Village Hall that supports good use by many groups young and old alike. There are shops that attract cars as well as customers and this area has very narrow pavements and parking problems. There is a College of Further Education situated in the heart of the village and many young people attending the campus on both sides of the Hinkley Point road. Students from Brymore School walk through the village for accessing the shops and to reach their dormitory which is situated in the centre of the village.</p> <p>Number of pupils/students:</p> <p>Cannington C of E Primary School ~ 250 approx.</p> <p>Brymore Agricultural School~ 200 approx.</p> <p>Bridgwater College, Cannington - 1200 approx.</p> <p>Number of Cannington residents - 2S00</p>	10221-555-13692			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Legacy resulting from the scheme is currently ambiguous, with firm commitments for 'legacy' focussing on the Cannington Bypass, while other legacies may currently be considered only as opportunities.	89331-555-1719	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Once the construction phase at Hinkley Point C is completed, it is understood that the new Cannington bypass would be retained as permanent highway infrastructure. This is supported for the reason that traffic associated with the general operation, outages, transport of waste materials and decommissioning of nuclear power plant can be routed around Cannington rather than through the village for the next 60-160 years.	89366-555-6149			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Impact on the setting of the listed Brymore School is not assessed sufficiently. For instance, reference is made to the tree-lined avenue, but it is not clear whether additional planting will be provided to maintain the line of the avenue across the bypass.	89366-555-7997	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Little space seems to be allowed for landscaping which would further reduce visual intrusion.	89367-555-4640	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	- Implement landscape strategy including planting, creation of public spaces improving access and screen planting around the site perimeter	89425-555-11159	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	- Implement landscape masterplan; tree and hedgerow planting, including taller trees in central and northern sections	89426-555-11283	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 861	Public	Stage 2	Box ticked: Agree 6. Any other ideas or comments? It will secure long term benefits for Cannington at Hinkley. Clear safety improvement for Cannington.	9619-556-2622			/	At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy presented the first outline proposals for the Cannington bypass. The western bypass was EDF Energy's favoured routing option. However a bypass on the eastern side of the village was also included at this stage. Statutory consultees were invited to comment on both options. At Stage 2 consultation EDF Energy consulted on its preferred western route which would run approximately south to north commencing at the existing western roundabout on the A39 southern bypass and ending at the C182 (Primary) north of Cannington. After Stage 2 consultation, the design of the bypass was refined and these improvements were set out in Stage 2 Update. The improvement included realignment of the bypass to avoid an existing pond; the addition of an underpass; and repositioning of the toucan crossing closer to the pedestrian "desire line".  Throughout the pre-application consultation EDF Energy has received many questions and comments about the best use of the Cannington bypass once the new nuclear power station at Hinkley Point C is complete and the bypass would no longer be needed to help mitigate the peak construction traffic.  A number of comments from members of the public have stated that the bypass should be removed. Others remarked that retaining the bypass would provide little benefit or legacy to Cannington in the long term.  Whilst EDF Energy understands that some members of the local community would like to see the land returned to its original state, it is considered that the best post-operational use of the bypass would be to form an integral and lasting part of the public highways network. Thus it is intended that the bypass be adopted by the Highway Authority. It would therefore continue to provide an alternative route to Hinkley Point C for the increased number of operational employees and for the additional workforce needed when maintenance works are carried out on the reactors. It would also help to absorb the increased number of trips associated with the decommissioning of Hinkley Point A. The additional benefit to the public provided by the bypass would therefore be longterm.  Further information on the Cannington Bypass can be found in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> and the <b>Planning Statement</b> .
Tractivity 1146	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? See answer to Q5. If the by-pass is built, it should be removed after the reactor development is completed and the land restored to original use (as you claim you will do with the accommodation campuses)	9904-556-3652		/		
Tractivity 1174	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Severe congestion already exists in the area. The Western bypass route for Cannington will only be beneficial during the construction phase and of little use to the community thereafter. Bridgwater should be bypassed from Junction 23 M% (Dunball()) to the C182 between Combwich and Cannington. Also useful for holiday traffic during and after construction of the power stations.	9932-556-3028		/		
Tractivity 428	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference east of the village only if it has long term advantage locally	9109-556-1131		/		
Tractivity 62386	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2. The by pass will have no lasting legacy for Cannington as the proposed road is only useful for Hinkley Point construction traffic. Once the power station is commissioned the shift and day workers will still drive through Cannington as a quicker route to and from Bridgwater. The Western by pass will basically have no use.	10049-556-1899		/		
Tractivity 62436	Public	Stage 2	This letter also refers to the road as being 'a permanent legacy' 'diverting much of the construction, maintenance and operational traffic away from the centre of the village'. In other words, rather than by-passing the village, traffic will not only pass along this new road with its associated pollution but will almost certainly continue to use the existing route through the centre of the village and therefore be of benefit to very few of the residents of Cannington.	10068-556-231		/		
Tractivity 62577	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Do you agree with EdF view that a Cannington western by-pass should be provided? Disagree - The by-pass will serve little or no legacy purpose. It will be a blot upon the landscape for the residents of the village and for ail the surrounding communities and it will affect a number of properties adversely, permanently, while offering little or no compensation.	10128-556-8241		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62583	Public	Stage 2	15. We also believe very strongly that if this bypass is built it should be only temporary. Even if it were thought to serve a purpose during the construction work at Hinkley, it would serve no useful purpose after that. There is no suggestion that the existing road through the village has been inadequate for staff going to and fro in order to maintain and run the Hinkley installation, and it will not be inadequate for that purpose in the future. The detriment caused by a western bypass should be eliminated, and the land restored to its original condition, once the construction work has ended. If the IPC gives permission for the bypass to be built, it should be upon that condition.	10134-556-6290		/		
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	6.4 In order to provide a valuable local highway asset for future legacy and to minimise unplanned maintenance closure or restrictions, the Estate wishes it to be noted that the high quality of route construction should in no way be compromised by a desire to accelerate the speed of construction.	89442-556-9108			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The legacy of the bypass from an ecological perspective is negative. The new road, even if built to the best standard and incorporating comprehensive mitigation and compensatory planting will continue to have fragmentation effects. Currently the mitigation proposed is not committed to firmly and will not completely address the impacts identified.	89371-556-2707		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The legacy elements for the associated development are still to be finalised but appear at present to provide little 'legacy' beyond a few ponds and hedgerow planting. Other aspects are mitigation not legacy. Reference to the evolving Green Infrastructure Strategy would provide a clearer indication of what could be achieved.	89426-556-7997		/		
Tractivity 63007	Public	Stage 2 Update	- state There is doubt regarding disruption and a return the lands previous	89695-556-377		/		
Tractivity 70648	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	(a) It would obviate the need for a western bypass at Cannington, which no one wants. The reasons why no one wants it are stated briefly in paragraph 7 above. I should add that, so far as I know, this road would not be wanted, after the construction was completed, as a "legacy" road. Once the reactors were completed, the traffic needed for maintenance workers would presumably be about the same as it has been in the past, and to my knowledge no one is inconvenienced by this amount of traffic passing through Cannington.	89766-556-6933		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
16	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	They say it would be a legacy to the village after completion. It would only be a liability. After adoption, the taxpayer will be responsible for the upkeep. The only beneficial users will be traffic to and from Hinkley.	89805-556-2645		/		
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	6. Do you agree with EdF view that a Cannington western by-pass should be provided?  Agree Disagree No opinion Don't know  - The by-pass will serve little or no legacy purpose. It will be a blot upon the landscape for the residents of the village and for all the surrounding communities and it will affect a number of properties adversely and permanently while offering little or no compensation.	89806-556-8652		/		
Highways Agency	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.12 Once again the consultation from EDF Energy does not provide clarity regarding their intentions for legacy at each of the Associated Development sites.	89837-556-7218	/			
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	A Cannington Bypass could provide a legacy in terms of reduced traffic flows in Cannington Village. A full NATA assessment is required to assess the long term benefits in Cannington and any disbenefits which result from the bypass so that a judgement can be made on the need for the bypass.	89896-556-7504		/		

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 1	Full details of the Cannington Bypass proposal should be provided in order for the County Council to provide meaningful comment, including detailed design, layout, widths and elevations. EDF will need to provide long-term maintenance funds if the route is built.	87940-557-1946	/			<p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy presented the first outline proposals for the Cannington bypass. At Stage 1 consultation EDF Energy explained that its favoured option around Cannington was a route to the west of the village. However it also presented an alternative route around the east of the village at Stage 1 consultation. Consultees were asked for their comments on each. At the same stage, two other alternatives (the outer western route and a 'no bypass' option) were presented as options that had been considered and discounted. Following careful consideration of responses at Stage 1, EDF Energy presented the route to the west of the village as its preferred proposal at Stage 2.</p> <p>EDF Energy's detailed design for the Cannington Bypass has evolved by taking into account the key comments received from statutory consultees, including local authorities, the local community, and general public during the formal consultation process; as well as the inputs from the technical specialists as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process.</p> <p><b>a) Stage 1</b></p> <p>In response to the feedback from Stage 1 which informed the proposed development presented at Stage 2 some small alterations were made to the design, albeit the principle of the development remained the same, as follows:</p> <p>inclusion of an at grade toucan crossing to enable pedestrians, in particular school children, to cross safely;</p> <p>inclusion of a culvert to cross the Mill Stream along the Brymore School main drive;</p> <p>inclusion of two balancing ponds to mitigate flood risk; and</p> <p>further development of the landscaping strategy, through the inclusion of planting, shrubs and hedgerows, having regard to the site context and visual impacts.</p> <p><b>b) Stage 2</b></p> <p>Following feedback from the Stage 2 consultation the following alterations were made to the proposed development, which were presented at the Stage 2 Update consultation:</p>
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	1.29. Full details of the Cannington Bypass proposal should be provided in order for SCC to provide meaningful comment, including detailed design, layout, widths and elevations (4.4.5).	88000-557-4819	/			
Tractivity 859	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? should be provided but current plans do not go far enough. will still create an unacceptable increase in traffic on the main road (which has already a bad accident reputation) past several small villages. more of this road could and should be bypassed	9617-557-2637		/		
Tractivity 919	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? This coupled with eastern bypass is fine	9677-557-2690		/		
Tractivity 1142	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? This is the route of cheapness. The route chosen impacts on just as many properties as the eastern route. Asking drivers to use the existing by pass then come back on themselves to use the new road may not happen. The route has a direct impact on my property as we live at the eastern end of the route. There is inadequate screening proposed for this end of the route for those of us living on the northern side of the road. The access to Cannington for us is made unsafe by this road cutting across the lane to the village without any crossing points and the added traffic from the new roundabout to Combwich which passes by our lane end. We do not want the lane cut off by the bypass for cyclists or walkers as this has large recreational use into further footpaths and lane network. Kids are picked up from Rodway farm to get to Haygrove school. We need safe crossing of the existing road. these points were made at the recent meeting	9900-557-3097		/		



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1142	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 concerns about the visual, light, pollution and noise impact of the Cannington by pass on our property and will be seeking adequate compensation to cover the devaluation of our home because of this. This proposed road cuts us off from safe passage to Cannington particularly by foot or cycle and also due to the proposed dead end of our lane going towards Cannington cuts us off from the local footpath and lane network for recreational use on foot or cycle. We have road safety concerns about this road as all cycle and footpaths for the new and existing Hinckly Point road are on the opposite side of the road to where we live. Kids need to cross to catch the school bus at Rodway Farm. This is already dangerous as the traffic is now, but will get worse. All crossings etc have been put in at the Brymore end. Cannington does extend to Putnell - consider us please.	9900-557-7757		/		inclusion of an at grade cattle crossing and associated corral in the southern part of the site to enable cattle to safely cross the bypass;  deletion of underpass previously proposed alongside Brymore School main drive to the north;  Toucan crossing relocated southwards closer to Brymore School main drive access;  closure of Withiel Drive to through traffic from the High Street to the bypass;  modifications to alignment and access for Withiel Drive and Brymore School back drive;  inclusion of acoustic bunds rather than fences to mitigate noise impacts, which respond more appropriately to the rural character of the area;
Tractivity 1248	Public	Stage 2 Update	3) It is not clear how farm traffic would pass from Park Farm in Park Lane to the parts of Sandy Lane and Chad's Hill to the West of the bypass.	89514-557-778		/		minor realignment of side roads to maximise continued traffic use during construction;  inclusion of bat hop-overs to maintain bat commuting routes across the road;
Tractivity 1332	Public	Stage 2 Update	Your plans cut in half the lane on which we live so that we will have to cross the new road in order to walk or cycle anywhere. There is at the moment no proposals for sensible crossing points at the eastern end unless you are a badger or bat. People seem to be of very low priority	89598-557-654		/		inclusion of low underpass for bats and badgers in the northern part of the bypass;  minor realignment of northern section of bypass to mitigate impact on existing pond with Great Crested Newts;
Tractivity 1332	Public	Stage 2 Update	Cannington by pass remains our main concern as see 3. response. the lack of consideration for eastern pedestrian crossings affects our family. no thought has been given to safe crossings either on the eastern end of the new by pass or across the existing road which will now be more busy.	89598-557-1139		/		inclusion of field accesses; and  the site boundary has been altered to reflect these changes.
Tractivity 1362	Public	Stage 2 Update	Cannington by-pass. The plan suggests that this will be a substantial road with a major visual impact. We feel that the details need further thought to lessen the impact on Cannington and Brymore School. It is essential that the speed limit is kept at 30 MPH to reduce noise and accident hazard to pedestrians.	89628-557-1507		/		<b>c) Stage 2 Update</b>  Since the Stage 2 Update Consultation the following alterations have been made in response to detailed design and consultation responses:  omission of bat hop-over at Chad's Hill junction and along the north-south field boundary to the west of the northern roundabout to ensure that mitigation would be appropriately focussed;
Tractivity 275	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 horrified to see that your proposals for a bypass so severely compromise Brymore School. The building of new and fast road, so close to the residential accommodation provided at the school for 200 people would seem to fly in the face of national government Safer Routes to School initiatives. It is essential that the students continue to have good safe pedestrian access to Cannington for recreational and curriculum purposes. This would be bad enough, but the unique offer of Brymore School is the running of a school farm. They only own 30 acres and your proposal to purchase 20 of them will cause considerable damage to the curriculum provided at the school. The proximity of these acres to the school is essential as the agricultural element is a closely integrated element of the whole school curriculum. Please reconsider your plans.	8964-557-3391		/		an extension to the acoustic bund along the eastern part of the bypass northwards up to Sandy Lane;  modifications to field accesses to the south of Brymore School main drive;  inclusion of new field accesses crossing the Brymore School main drive to the west of the bypass; and  minor diversion of public footpath linking Chad's Hill to Sandy Lane where intersected by bypass to allow retention of existing mature tree.  EDF Energy has undertaken a <b>Transport</b>

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	5. Please give reasons for your preference Possibly a better route in the long term- post 2017. On higher ground and not likely to flood. WOuld fit in with the south of Cannington dormitory area. On the other hand if the dormitory area were to be in the North of Cannington the road to the east might then fit better.	9040-557-1951			/	<b>Assessment</b> which considers the capacity of the bypass, roundabouts at each end and the junctions along its route. The assessment confirms that the level of provision along the bypass is appropriate for the predicted volume of traffic. In addition to considering the impacts of the development flows on the bypass the assessment also considers the impacts on the adjoining existing roads including traffic flows along the C182 (Rodway).
Tractivity 581	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Please give reasons for your preference The western route is uncomfortably close to Brymore College and *local farms and the bulk of the traffic from the east would need to use the existing by-pass to reach the western route. The eastern route affects fewer houses and spoil from the construction site could be used to provide as embankment against flood possibility.	9250-557-1843			/	The proposed cross-section for the bypass comprises a 7.3m wide single carriageway road, with kerbed edges, along with a minimum 2.5m wide grass verge on the left hand (west) side and a 3.5m wide segregated cycle/footway on the right hand (east) side. This cross-section is in keeping with the semi-urban character of the bypass with a speed limit of 40 miles per hour (mph) and also provides a traffic capacity in excess of the predicted traffic flows with development traffic for Hinkley Point C (HPC).
Tractivity 597	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference The roundabout should be moved further up the Cannington mile road near that awful sharp bend, where there are a lot of accidents it could go straight across the field to Combwich Wharf - won't interfere with many homes/farms/people - Cost should not be main factor.	9263-557-1631			/	The 3.5m wide segregated cycle/footway along the full length of the eastern side of the proposed bypass would comprise a 1.5 metre wide footway, 1.5 metre wide cycleway and a 0.5 metre wide marginal (buffer) strip with contrasting coloured surface between the cycleway and carriageway. The cycle/footway would be located on the eastern side of the bypass so that it is nearer to the village where the greatest number of users would originate from and who would therefore only need to cross the bypass if they are proceeding towards an area to the west of the bypass.
Tractivity 62248	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	-a- By pass - both routes will be seen from our property. Apart from the construction time issues, once opened we will have increased lighting pollution and noise. Would our lane still be allowed to have a junction onto the HP road? Would the speed limit be enforced and extended from the green route roundabout to past the grain store so that we could possibly cross this road? Would our children be able to cross the road at all- their current school bus stop is at Rodway Farm. However we would consider the by pass a lesser issue compared to the following:	9369-557-1720	/			The proposed speed limit of 40 miles per hour (mph) would be commensurate with the design of the proposed bypass and the degree of access along its length. Suggestions by consultees to either reduce or increase the speed limit would either lead to difficulties with enforcement or worsen the impacts of the bypass respectively.
Tractivity 62248	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	iv) Western Bypass - look at junction and road -If western: -a- would lane retain access to main road: -b- Speed limit from junction of bypass to grain store? -c- Crossing road - what measures planned e.g. school bus? -d- provision of suitable footway	9369-557-4954	/			The horizontal and vertical alignments of the bypass have been designed using national standards applicable to a road with a speed limit of 40mph. Where back to back horizontal curves occur transitions have been provided with appropriate changes in crossfall and superelevation.
Tractivity 571	Public	Stage 1	A further concern is access to Sandy Lane from the top of Chads Hill during construction of the by-pass. The lane is not wide enough for vehicles such as the dust cart, oil tanker, cattle truck, tractors etc to turn around in so access is required at both ends of the lane at all times, will this be provided?	9377-557-767			/	For the safe passage of pedestrians across the bypass at Brymore School EDF Energy has proposed the inclusion of a toucan crossing. This is a type of

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62286	Public	Stage 2	Withiel Drive Cannington I note from your document on Preferred Proposals that it is intended to connect Withiel Drive with the new Western Bypass. Withiel Drive is a private road owned by (personal details removed) of (personal details removed). All residents have a right of access along the drive to their property. Residents are also required ( as stated in their properly deeds) to contribute to the maintenance of Die road. Will the road remain in private hands as at present, if so what is to prevent anyone using it as a through route to the new bypass. If ownership of the road is to be transferred to the Highways Dept will all the property deeds be altered to reflect this change and if so at whose expense.	9984-557-49	/			<p>traffic signal controlled crossing which is intended for use by both pedestrians and cyclists to cross a public highway.</p> <p>In response to consultee comments EDF Energy briefly investigated the replacement of the proposed toucan crossing with a pedestrian bridge over the bypass. Not only would such a bridge have a significant visual impact the lengths of ramps required for compliance with disability design standards would be significantly greater than the distance across the bypass carriageway and it would therefore be questionable as to how often a bridge would be used by pedestrians.</p>
Tractivity 62327	Public	Stage 2	, the question I would like to ask is regarding the new Cannington by-pass which is the best option. When traffic comes out onto the new road such as from Cannington Quarry I think all traffic should turn left only from all these little roads, down to the new roundabout then back the way you want to go as traffic if allowed to turn right into oncoming traffic there will be a lot of accidents on what will be quite a fast road as the existing Hinkley Point road is now.	10011-557-212		/		<p>The existing footpath (BW5/8) intersected by the bypass would not be stopped up as result of the bypass however a short diversion to nearby proposed field accesses to the north would be required in order to retain an existing mature tree.</p>
Tractivity 62340	Public	Stage 2	1. The route where it passes in front of Chads Hill should be in a cutting, as it was in your initial proposal. To commence the cutting only after Sandy Lane does nothing to address the significant and lasting impact this road is going to have on the dozens of residents on (personal details removed). We cannot ever be compensated for the huge negative impact this road is going to have on the value of our homes - a large part of the value being in the view which does not figure in either the Land Compensation Act or the Town and Country Planning Act. However you can address by this means some of the impact on our view, and on the noise that is to be created in what until now has been a peaceful location.	10020-557-1867	/			<p>The realignment of Chad's Hill and Sandy Lane would allow wider verges to be provided than existing thus improving the safety for walkers along these sections. The provision of the cycle/footway link between Sandy Lane and the bypass would enable continued use by pedestrians and cyclists to and from the village along routes identified by a number of consultees as being frequently used and connecting with other public rights of way. The use of this cycle/footway link by farm traffic would be inappropriate for the intended users and could encourage inappropriate use by other road</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62458	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>Thank you for organising the Workshop on Monday evening. I thought it was at least an opportunity to see that there is still a great deal of accord with those affected as to what can be done to improve your proposals - though obviously without prejudice to the fact that we all would prefer it didn't happen at all!</p> <p>I have just one point arising from the evening. Your Highway Engineer, (personal details removed), kept re-iterating at our table that the original phase 1 Consultation did not provide for the bypass to be in a cutting where it ran alongside Chads Hill. Unfortunately I had not brought all of my notes with me. Having looked back at your Phase 2 Consultation Report then clause 5.4.4 page 21 of the document Masterplan:Cannington Bypass references the fact that Indicative Vertical designs were produced and states that 'the bypass would have gone into a deep cutting (up to 8m high) through the west-east ridge'.</p> <p>Going back to Phase 1 of your consultation it does clearly state in 4.4.16 that 'an 8m deep cutting will be required where the route bisects Sandy Lane, which should help to screen the bypass within the landscape'. Exactly our point and made by every table at the workshop. This is the position to which you need to return - your original vertical designs need to be revisited.</p> <p>Perhaps you might pass this on to the Highway Engineers who seem to have mislaid the original designs</p>	10082-557-54			/	<p>users wishing to gain direct access to and from the bypass.</p> <p>Cyclists and walkers wishing to get to Sandy Lane or Chad's Hill to the west of the bypass could use the proposed cycle/footway link referred to above and then either cross the bypass towards Sandy Lane or use the cycle/footway alongside the bypass to the Chad's Hill junction where they would cross the bypass. The bypass by complying with national standards commensurate with the design speed of the road would have good visibility between all users whether they are on foot, cycling or in vehicles.</p> <p>Where the northern roundabout takes the C182 (Rodway) of the line of the existing road EDF Energy would provide a segregated cycle/footway that complies with the highway authority standards. This route would allow cyclists and walkers to take a more direct route to and from the village by bypassing the roundabout.</p> <p>The introduction of a formal pedestrian crossing on the C182 (Rodway) road, adjacent to Rodway Farm, which requires vehicles to stop on the road for pedestrians, would be inappropriate given the very limited use by pedestrians and the sub-standard alignment of the existing road to the north. EDF Energy is sympathetic to concerns about the vehicle speeds on this road and in response to local consultations proposes that the bypass has a speed limit of 40mph.</p>
Tractivity 62502	Public	Stage 2	Transport: No cycle path/section has been indicated on the new Bypass.	10096-557-736			/	<p>In response to information provided by consultees that Withiel Drive is a private road EDF Energy in consultation with the landowner and highway authority revised the junction onto the bypass, shown at Stage 2, to a farm access so that traffic would not be provided with a direct route between the High Street and bypass via Withiel Drive. Once the bypass is opened to traffic Withiel Drive would become a no-through road.</p>
Tractivity 62502	Public	Stage 2	The bypass meets the Combwich road before the Grain Store and will create multiple difficulties with Grain Store traffic which is often slow with trailers. The traffic calming measures prior to the completion of the Bypass may not work with this Grain Store transport and School and College buses.	10096-557-1226			/	<p>EDF Energy would not support the need to restrict traffic movements at the junction of Chad's Hill and the bypass as suggested by a consultee as the capacity of the junction would not justify such a requirement and it would result in unnecessary additional journey miles for the users of Chad's Hill. Similarly the suggestion to provide an acceleration lane within the bypass carriageway for right turning traffic out of Chad's Hill would not be progressed as</p>
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Will there be a speed limit on bypass?	10124-557-8798			/	
Tractivity 62575	Public	Stage 2	<p>Proposal</p> <p>I firmly believe that it is essential that this section of road must, before construction starts at Hinkley Point, be made dual carriageway. This would then a) allow a section of road to remain open in the event of a serious or fatal accident, by allowing traffic to use the non affected carriageway, one lane in each direction and b) allow unrestricted access for emergency services to such other incidents as may occur during that time</p>	10126-557-2266			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62583	Public	Stage 2	14. If this bypass is nonetheless to be built we believe that its impact could and should be minimised. In particular, we think that the embankment which is proposed for parts of it should be eliminated and that it should be sunk so far as possible below the level of the existing land through the use of deeper and more extensive cuttings. This would include in particular the stretch of road which runs alongside Chads Hill. 84.3% of Cannington voters think that the present proposals for mitigation are inadequate.	10134-557-5769	/			this would not comply with highway design standards.  EDF Energy do not propose to adopt a suggestion to close off a section of Straddlings Hill to prevent rat-running between C182 (Rodway) and the bypass as they are of the opinion that Straddlings Hill is of such a low standard in terms of width and alignment that it would not be an attractive alternative to the bypass. In addition closing of the road would adversely impact on existing properties that currently gain access from the lane.
Tractivity 62938	Public	Stage 2	Road too visible, cutting needs to be deeper (if built).	10177-557-4005	/			Consultee suggestions to relocate the northern roundabout further north along the C182 (Rodway) road towards the grain store would in order to comply with design standards require the demolition of existing properties and was therefore not considered by EDF Energy.  Clear visibility from between all road users would be provided along the bypass and at junctions as required by national design standards. Where required, the verges would be widened to ensure clear views are maintained.
Wessex Water	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Works associated with the proposed bypass will impact upon our supply mains in the area. Discussions should be held at an early stage to agree mitigation measures to ensure apparatus is not affected by any changes in ground levels.	10199-557-1651			/	At the Stage 1 consultation as commented on by one consultee the depth of cutting at Sandy Lane was reported as being 8 metres; unfortunately this was misquoted and the actual figure should have been 5 metres. Subsequent to the Stage 1 consultation and with the benefit of more accurate existing ground level information, EDF Energy were able to ensure that the proposed design depth of cutting remained at approximately 5m below the higher ground level alongside Sandy Lane, deepening to 7m slightly further to the north.  Following further consideration of the requirements for bats along the existing main drive to Brymore School the need for an underpass on ecological grounds at this location was deemed no longer necessary. In response to the adverse comments made by consultees regarding the proposed underpass EDF Energy has removed it from their proposals.  Following further discussions with consultees EDF Energy propose to replace the underpass with an at-
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	It cuts across the Grade II listed drive of Brymore School, thus creating a danger to 200 plus young students who live there and use the drive on a regular basis during their daily tasks undertaking their rural studies in order to farm the land that the school owns.	10221-557-9802		/		
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Question 5.  Do you consider the current design and mitigation proposals for the western bypass to be adequate? Mitigation refers to design and management measures that are intended to reduce impacts and disturbance, such as noise and light pollution.  Yes 15.7%No 84.3%	10221-557-10802			/	
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	7.0 Withiel Drive  It is this Council's recommendation that Withiel Drive, which is a private and narrow lane, be blocked at the new proposed by-pass thus not allowing the drive to be used as a rat run for cars leaving from the proposed by-pass and heading for Cannington.	10221-557-11257	/			

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	<p>8.0 Chads Hill</p> <p>It is this Council's recommendation that a cutting be constructed from Withiel farm upwards to the top of Chads Hill where it intersects with Sandy Lane. This would have benefits for those living in Chads Hill and residents on the west side of the village:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It would reduce the visual impact of the new proposed road</li> <li>2. It would help to alleviate noise, light, dust and general pollution being brought into the village from the westerly prevailing winds</li> </ol>	10221-557-11533	/			<p>grade cattle crossing, for use by the school, incorporating opposing gated accesses with livestock corrals so that the cattle can be herded into them and then across the bypass. Road signage including flashing amber lights erected in the highway verge in advance would be provided warning road users of the use of the cattle crossing.</p> <p>Removal of the underpass also enabled EDF Energy to relocate the proposed traffic signal controlled toucan crossing closer to the main school access and thereby encourage greater use by the school pupils of the route along the traffic free section of the drive between the bypass and the High Street. In addition the removal of the underpass negated the need for a new track across farm land for the school's cattle to get to the underpass.</p>
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	Although there is very limited grazing land adjoining the farm buildings, the main grazing areas during the spring, summer and autumn months are located on the opposite side of the road leading into Cannington at the entrance to the School drive. In order to take the cattle to the grazing areas daily requires students to assist in cattle movement which would, with the construction of the bypass, become far more complicated and potentially dangerous.	10242-557-4798			/	<p>The landscape proposals have been designed to produce the best landscape setting and immediate screening of the bypass and to provide for a long-term landscape as a legacy, whilst being directed by the ecological objectives of the area and enabling the ecological mitigation requirements of the site. The landscape design has responded to comments received at Stage 2 requesting additional planting to screen Chad's Hill. The refined proposals show a comprehensive landscape scheme designed to integrate the road into the surrounding landscape using locally occurring native species. The proposals are also designed to provide screening of the proposed development particularly from the most sensitive visual receptors. In response to concerns about the impact on Brymore School main drive additional planting would be provided to maintain the line of the tree avenue across the bypass.</p>
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	<p>The present proposals include the provision of a 2.5 metre high underpass to allow the passage of livestock beneath the new road in order to allow access to the grazing fields. Such an access is insufficient in height to allow tractors or other farm machinery to pass through requiring stock to be driven under the road on foot.</p>	10242-557-5260	/			<p>Where the bypass crosses the Brymore School main drive EDF Energy have given careful consideration to the landscape and ecological impacts of the landscape and road design both during construction and operation of the bypass. Temporary and permanent mitigation measures would include the creation of a bat hop-over across the bypass along the existing route used by bats and for the inclusion within the proposed culvert where the bypass crosses the Mill Stream, a shelf that would allow wildlife to pass under the bypass and above the level of the water.</p>
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	<p>The by-pass is likely to be used by badgers, as well as cows to cross the road. With both animals being funnelled into such a restricted area the spread of disease (tuberculosis) is markedly increased which would put the long term sustainability of the farm, and therefore the School itself, at risk.</p> <p>2.7 It is considered that there are potential health and safety hazards involved with young students driving large dairy animals through the underpass particularly at busy times with heavy construction traffic passing over the top at a point where lorries will be accelerating away from a roundabout and up a gradient causing substantial noise and vibration. Forcing young children into a restricted area with large livestock, in close proximity to noisy traffic, seriously increases the potential for human tragedy.</p>	10242-557-6094	/			<p>Where the bypass crosses the Brymore School main drive EDF Energy have given careful consideration to the landscape and ecological impacts of the landscape and road design both during construction and operation of the bypass. Temporary and permanent mitigation measures would include the creation of a bat hop-over across the bypass along the existing route used by bats and for the inclusion within the proposed culvert where the bypass crosses the Mill Stream, a shelf that would allow wildlife to pass under the bypass and above the level of the water.</p>
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	The proposed alternative access from the farm buildings to the underpass shows a new route crossing adjoining farmland and indeed passing through a secondary farmyard on the adjoining farm, with the potential for health hazards and spread of disease between two independent groups of livestock. It will also compromise the organic nature of Brymore School Farm.	10242-557-7241	/			<p>Where the bypass crosses the Brymore School main drive EDF Energy have given careful consideration to the landscape and ecological impacts of the landscape and road design both during construction and operation of the bypass. Temporary and permanent mitigation measures would include the creation of a bat hop-over across the bypass along the existing route used by bats and for the inclusion within the proposed culvert where the bypass crosses the Mill Stream, a shelf that would allow wildlife to pass under the bypass and above the level of the water.</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	<p>should the scheme go ahead, we feel the impact of the by-pass could be mitigated in a number of ways:</p> <p>4.1 The proposed underpass for the movement of cattle needs to be widened to ensure the passage of farm vehicles is possible. This will reduce the amount of farm traffic needing to use the main road (farm machinery would need access, turning right onto a busy road at least twice a day).</p> <p>4.2 The proposed toucan crossing would need to be replaced with a foot bridge, which would improve traffic flow, but more importantly significantly reduce the health and safety risks to the students.</p>	10242-557-9331	/			<p>EDF Energy's lighting strategy for the bypass has been designed to restrict lighting to minimise light levels and light spill, compliant with standards, at the roundabouts at each end of the bypass and for the Toucan crossing by Brymore School. In addition the proposed noise attenuation bunds particularly on the east side will significantly reduce the impact of light from vehicles on the properties on the western edge of Cannington. An assessment has been made of the impact of lighting on sensitive receptors.</p> <p>Following further investigation on the impacts of the bypass on existing routes used by bats the 1.8 metre high chain link fence proposed along the bypass boundaries, at Stage 2, has been changed to hedges with stock proof fencing in conjunction with bat hop-over's at identified points where the existing bat routes would intersect the bypass.</p>
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	Most critically, the presence of special needs students requires a very high degree of care and supervision. The presence of a bypass of the nature discussed cutting across and severing the main access ways from the School to the local community is considered very high risk from a health and safety viewpoint.	10242-557-11448			/	
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	The provision of an underpass for the use by the farm for livestock movements is impractical and again increasing health and safety risks to the students working on the farm.	10242-557-12011	/			The design of the Sandy Lane and Chad's Hill diversions has evolved to enable most of the construction work to be undertaken off the line of the existing roads thus minimising the disruption to existing traffic. EDF Energy's road contractor would be required to consult with the Highway Authority to avoid temporary road closures where practical and if a closure is deemed necessary on safety grounds then its duration would be limited to the minimum required for safe construction and use. Permanent severance of the existing roads would not be permitted until such time as appropriate sections of the bypass have been constructed to provide safe access to the public highway at the northern or southern extents as applicable.
Landowner - Castle Hill Quarry Company Ltd	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	Another concern is the quarry access onto the bypass.	10249-557-550			/	Development of Cannington village westwards towards the bypass boundary would be controlled by the local planning authority and would not form part of EDF Energy's proposals.
Landowner - Castle Hill Quarry Company Ltd	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	<p>1. Lorries currently use Chads Hill between the quarry and the road network 24 hours per day. Should this route be closed during by-pass construction a suitable alternative route must be made available.</p> <p>2. The northern end of Chads Hill accesses the bypass in a cutting at the bottom of a gradient. Most of the quarry lorries will turn right from Chad's Hill and will return from the west and turn left to go back to the quarry. On entering the bypass the loaded lorries will have to climb the gradient. We would seek an acceleration lane to enable the slow-moving loaded lorries to reach a suitable speed before joining the main carriageway.</p> <p>3. We suggest that as part of the scheme a section of Stradlings Lane, between the quarry and the cottages at the eastern end of the lane, should be permanently closed to prevent "rat-runs".</p>	10249-557-722		/	At Stage 2 one of the primary concerns with regard to mitigation was the request to provide as much as possible of the bypass in cutting; this was a particular concern of the residents of Chad's Hill. EDF Energy has endeavoured to balance competing requirements of minimising loss of land, noise and visual impacts to the area and sustainable construction. The requirement to lower the bypass to be in cutting over much of its length would require a greater loss in agricultural land and would result in additional excavated material going to land fill which would result in adverse impacts beyond the area of the bypass. In response to consultation comments the noise bund on	
Landowner - Castle Hill Quarry Company Ltd	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	The Cycle Path from the Bypass into Park Lane should be accessible by Park Farm machinery to ease the problems arising from severance of the farm.	10249-557-1580		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Landowner - Castle Hill Quarry Company Ltd	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	6. An access into the westernmost field adjoining Rodway Hill is required for farm machinery. Perhaps the most suitable location is on the roundabout. A field gate may need to be provided between this field and the adjacent field to the west.	10249-557-2241	/			the east side of the bypass to the north of Withiel Drive has been extended northwards to connect with the deep cutting at Sandy Lane. The crest of the bund would continue to be 2 metres above the level of the bypass carriageway. Except for a gap required at a farm access which includes the footpath crossing the bund on the east side would be continuous between Withiel Drive and the Sandy Lane cutting. The provision of the bund in conjunction with planting on the non-highway slope will provide increased screening which in the short term would conceal views to cars and in the longer term reduce views to higher vehicles. The bund would also help to screen light from traffic on the road for the residents on the western edge of Cannington. The provision of the extended bund would have limited impact on loss of agricultural land as the area occupied by the rear face of the bund was intended for screen planting which can now be at a higher level. The extended bund has also enabled a reduction in the surplus excavated material that would have needed to be removed off site.
RAC Foundation	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	3.2 A 50 mph road should now be considered as a co-equal option to a 40 or 60 mph road (6). If feasible, the present Masterplan should be re-calibrated for a 50 mph road. That appears consistent with the advice in DfT Circular 01/2006, 5.3 and Appendix D. Also, there have been Government proposals for national 50 mph limits on major country roads (7).	10267-557-5086		/		
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- The spatial impact of a new bypass could mean the creation of a potential new western boundary to the Cannington settlement. This, along with the new road infrastructure, would have a significant impact upon its character and scale.	89202-557-1349			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- The developer should demonstrate how the use of bunding to provide pollution prevention measures is to be incorporated within the development.	89202-557-2276			/	At the various consultation stages requests for more details of the bypass proposals were made by the Highway Authority Somerset County Council (SCC). In response to this EDF Energy have undertaken ongoing informal consultation with SCC, and the level of detail considered and consultations undertaken have evolved as the design has progressed.  Clear definition of the proposed highway boundary would be provided by means of either fencing or hedgerows or where the acoustic bunds are provided the bottom of the steep slope on the traffic face of the bund. Where field gates are provided they would be set back where required so that if they swing out towards the bypass they would not obstruct any part of the highway.
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- More detail is required on the design of the site.	89246-557-1739			/	Consultation between EDF Energy and affected landowners has resulted in the inclusion of proposed field accesses with livestock corrals, where required, to enable landowners to gain access to their land where it would be severed by the bypass.



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	In relation to Brymore Drive, detailed design at both sides of the new road should be carefully considered to emphasise its cultural significance. Possible loss of avenue trees to the footpath shown entering the North side of the drive and to the proposed underpass access to the South is an issue. Footpath from the drive to the toucan crossing does not seem essential; it might be better to insist pedestrians use the new access and avoid use of the old drive.	89246-557-6006	/			Traffic Calming measures proposed by EDF energy along the C182 (Rodway) would be designed to accommodate all road users able to use the existing road, the measures would be provided to calm traffic not prevent access that is authorised. These measures would also be subject to technical and safety audit by the Highway Authority before they could be implemented.  EDF Energy has commenced consultations with the various statutory undertakers with regards to any services diversions that would be required as a result of the construction of the bypass. This consultation would continue through the detailed design period and during the construction of the bypass.
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Despite its claimed support from the urgency of government policy (see 1. above) there is no statutory obligation on the company to build a nuclear power station. It is simply responding as a commercial enterprise to the government's policy framework. If building the new bypass delays the project then that is the price the company will have to pay for ensuring that it meets its commitment to recognise the concerns of the local community.	89451-557-1486			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The Masterplan document provides a useful and reasonably comprehensive appraisal of the existing site character and context.  • There should be a detailed plan showing the both the Park and Ride and Western Bypass proposals, to allow consideration of cumulative effects.	89366-557-6686			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The decision to design the road for a speed limit of 40mph (70kph) is noted for the reason that the height of road embankments will be reduced, with benefits in terms of visual impact.	89366-557-6982			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The decision to design the road for a speed limit of 40mph (70kph) is also noted in relation to safety factors, with the pedestrian crossing to Brymore School and frequency of priority junctions along the route.	89366-557-7172			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Incorporation of a cycle and footway along the bypass is welcome. This is particularly important as the bypass will obstruct and redirect existing routes along lanes, such as Chad's Hill.	89366-557-7389			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	the bypass will be constructed on an embankment where it passes the school, increasing visual impact and 'severance' from the village, so a more comprehensive context appraisal and design solution will be required.	89366-557-8269			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The routing of the bypass through a cutting for the northern part of the highway will assist in limiting visual impacts on the setting of the Scheduled Monuments, the Iron Age/Roman British Settlement and an Iron Age hillfort, Cynwit Castle.	89366-557-8488			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	r 1.8m chain link fencing is not considered appropriate in the rural setting where post and rail fencing is more typical.	89366-557-9507	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Use of contrasting surface material for the cycle and foot way to the main carriageway is supported.	89366-557-9961			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The alignment is kept tight to the village, although an alignment further to the west would reduce impacts on the village. In particular, the proposed alignment impacts significantly upon Brymore School. The school accommodates boarder who live on-site, and also those who live within Cannington; the bypass alignment segregating the two. Although a new route is proposed to the toucan crossing, this entails the use of a track which is not within the control of the school. Furthermore, school activities feature agricultural specialities including, for instance, taking cattle from the school farm to pasture, however the bypass alignment severs this movement. An underpass for cattle is proposed although this results in health and safety issues for children with large animals in a confined space, and also issues associated with the need for removal of cattle slurry.	89367-557-3291	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The horizontal alignment contains back to back curves in opposite directions with no transitions between radii. This will cause abrupt changes in direction for drivers and mean that changes in superelevation will be on the curves.	89367-557-4169	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Other than the deep cutting adjacent to Park Lane the bypass is generally at or close to ground level. It is noted that the setting of the bypass in cutting or between earth bunds would reduce the visual effects from the village.	89367-557-4405	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Withiel Drive is retained as a through road between High Street and the Bypass. This may encourage rat-running. Its closure at the bypass end would allow better noise and visual screening for residents in Withiel Drive.	89367-557-4739	/			
Tractivity 62857	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	C25/2annington Bypass. This cuts the existing Sandy Lane which is a popular dog walking route. It is not clear from the map how this pedestrian route will be retained, will there be foot access along the redundant section of road? Will there be a pedestrian crossing at this point?	89649-557-398		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62911	Public	Stage 2 Update	Proposed western bypass The proposal to alter the underpass which was not generally acceptable to a controlled crossing to be used by both people and cattle could cause problems due to excessive speed. The cattle crossing on the existing bypass has not been used for many years due to this problem.	89663-557-3407		/		
Tractivity 62958	Public	Stage 2 Update	We urge that if you insist on proceeding with the western route, then the road be placed in a 3 metre or more cutting for the majority of its length beginning at the commencement of land incline at the end of Withiel Drive.	89685-557-951		/		
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	<p>Drg No 9W2434/01/CH/103/01 rev A - General Arrangement Sheet 1 of 6</p> <p>1. The forward stopping site distance line for vehicles approaching the roundabout from the north is not indicated on the drawing. However, it would appear that line of this visibility splay is very tight to the face of the hedge as drawn on the plan. It is important that forward stopping site distance on the approach is not compromised by growth from the hedge.</p> <p>Further clarification is required, as to how the highway boundary is to be defined, i.e. hedge only or hedge and fence.</p> <p>The hedgerow should be located in such a way that it does not compromise visibility on the approach to the roundabout.</p> <p>2. Visibility to the right from the Brymore School Access appears to cut across the hedge line indicated on the plan.</p> <p>As stated above; clarification of the demarcation of the Highway Boundary is required and the location of the hedgerow should be reviewed to ensure that it does not compromise visibility from this junction.</p> <p>3. The proposed hedge on the east side appears to run in a continuous line across the severed section of the access to Brymore School. It had previously been assumed that pupils would be able to cross the bypass at the signalised crossing; before entering the severed section of the School access to get to Cannington. The current plan appears to show a route, which takes pupils south to the roundabout and then along the main road into the village. The lack of footpaths makes this an unfavourable route.</p> <p>Clarification of the pedestrian / cyclist to access routes into the village from Brymore School needs to be provided.</p>	89849-557-9052			/	

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 and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	<p>Drg No 9W2434/01/CH/103/02 rev A - General Arrangement Sheet 2 of 6</p> <p>1. The drawing does not indicate any highway boundary on the left hand side (LHS) between the realigned Withiel Drive and the 'Clean' access to Withiel Farm B&amp;B.</p> <p>Further clarification as to where this boundary will be and what form it will take. This is particularly important, given the need for the visibility splay to the right from the Clean access, which appears to cut across what would appear to be non highway land.</p> <p>2. To the north of the Clean access to Withiel Farm, on both sides of the road; the acoustic barriers are set back from the back of the highway verge / footway / cycleway, although the drawings do not indicate any earthwork slopes in these areas.</p> <p>Further clarification as to what the intended use / ownership of the land between the back of the footway / cycleway / verge and the face of the acoustic barrier is for.</p>	89849-557-10698			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	<p>Drg No 9W2434/01/CH/103/03 rev A - General Arrangement Sheet 3 of 6</p> <p>1. Between approximately Ch 460 and Ch 550 on both sides of the road the acoustic barriers are set back from the back of the highway verge / footway / cycleway, the drawings do not indicate any earthwork slopes in these areas.</p> <p>Further clarification as to what the intended use / ownership of the land between the back of the footway / cycleway is for.</p> <p>2. At Ch 625 approximately the toe of batter slopes on both sides are indicated curved around to 90 degrees to the bypass on either side of an existing hedgerow, which could be taken as indicating that there is some form of access at this location.</p> <p>Please confirm that it is not proposed to provide an access at this location and that the toe of embankment and boundary fence will run straight across the existing hedgerow boundary.</p>	89849-557-11622			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	<p>Drg No 9W2434/01/CH/103/05 rev A - General Arrangement Sheet 5 of 6</p> <p>1. At Ch 1235 right hand side (RHS) the gate to the field access is opened towards the highway, which would obstruct the footway / cycleway.</p> <p>The gate should be set back further from the cycleway / footway so that if opened towards the highway it will not obstruct the footway / cycleway.</p>	89849-557-12580			/	

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 and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	<p>Drg No 9W2434/01/CH/103/06 rev A - General Arrangement Sheet 6 of 6</p> <p>1. The forward site stopping distance available on the approach to the roundabout from Cannington appears to be limited to approximately 50m; this is significantly less than that required for a 30 mph approach speed (90m).</p> <p>The visibility on the approach to the roundabout should be reviewed and the necessary visibility provided within the new highway limits.</p> <p>2. The forward site stopping distance available on the approach to the roundabout from Hinkley Point appears to be less than 120m which would not be appropriate for a design speed of 40 mph.</p> <p>The visibility on the approach to the roundabout should be reviewed and the necessary visibility provided within the new highway limits.</p> <p>3. The available visibility for vehicles exiting the roundabout towards Hinkley Point is limited to less than 90m by the proposed new hedge.</p> <p>A review of the alignment of the proposed boundary needs to be carried out to ensure that there is adequate visibility for vehicles exiting the roundabout</p> <p>4. Consideration should be given to visibility to the right for pedestrians / cyclists crossing from the footway / cycleway across the approach to the roundabout from Cannington to join the footway / cycleway link, which is being provided along the line of the existing carriageway (to the east of the roundabout).</p> <p>A review of the visibility should be carried out, with the assumption that there is a crossing through the splitter island on the Cannington approach to the roundabout.</p> <p>5. It is assumed that the link to the east of the roundabout between the Cannington Approach and the Hinkley Point approach is for both pedestrian and cycle use. However, its width appears to be only 2m wide which is not considered to be adequate for cycleway / pedestrian use.</p>	89849-557-12945			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	- 'The traffic light controlled pedestrian crossing will be at a more convenient location further to the south.' It is expected that this change seeks to allow the pupils of Brymore School to cross on the route of the school avenue, rather than needing to walk along the bypass and access the school via Withiel Farm. The routes taken by cattle and pupils are not clear on the map provided but it is stated that the same crossing point would be utilised. It is understood that the school prefers to keep the main avenue and agricultural uses separate, which would not be achieved by the design set out in the Proposed Changes.	89896-557-4503			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	- 'Inclusion of field and farm access points for Withiel Farm, Brymore School, Hensfield Farm and Quarry Land.' Alterations to ensure access to farms and continuation of agricultural operations are support in principle by SDC, subject to the agreement of details with farm operators.	89896-557-5529			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	- 'Withiel Drive will be blocked to vehicles, following residents' concerns about a busy transport link or 'rat run' being unwittingly created.' SDC support the principle of alterations that address residents concerns and help to protect residential amenity.	89896-557-6926			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	- 'Sandy Lane and Chads Hill have been realigned so that traffic can be maintained along both roads at all times during construction.' Alterations to maintain access are supported in principle, but the nature of the proposed changes are not clear from the very limited information provided.	89896-557-7188			/	
Tractivity 62248	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	ii) What exactly is involved for our area and which fields? What access would be required for: -a- Quarry infill? Possibly access from further north near grain depot with use of conveyors to deliver spoil to quarry. -b- Park and Ride -c- Freight	9369-450-4659			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1258	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? This will impact significantly on the people who live on Chad's Hill Cannington who will have a bypass directly in front of them. Traffic will be moving for 19 hours of the day.	89524-1763-0		/		EDF Energy are sensitive to the effects which the proposed Cannington bypass may have on the residents of Chad's Hill. Whilst noise and visual impacts are predicted in relation to the construction and operation of the proposed development, comprehensive mitigation measures are proposed to significantly reduce all identified impacts. These include a landscape strategy and the creation of an acoustic bund adjacent to the eastern side of the carriageway as it rises up towards the top of Chad's Hill. Lighting has also been kept to the minimum to protect visual amenity whilst meeting safety requirements.  It is, however, considered that the impacts which are identified within the Volume 5 of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> and summarised above are relatively limited given the role that the proposed Cannington bypass development would perform in the delivery of the HPC Project. Additionally, it is important to consider that the proposed Cannington bypass development is, itself, proposed to mitigate against the transport and operational impacts of the HPC Project which would be substantially greater if it were not for this associated development. Also, the proposed route was chosen because it was the most sensitive to, and least impactful on, the local character, landscape and ecology, compared to alternative routes.  The suitability of the proposed Cannington bypass from a planning and environmental perspective is tested as part of the application for development consent, as detailed in the documents which support the applications. (In particular, see the <b>Planning Statement, Volume 5</b> of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> and the <b>Cannington bypass Design and Access Statement</b> for details).
Tractivity 1302	Public	Stage 2 Update	EDF run these presentations and none of their personnel make any notes of comments which the public make to them. Obviously it is just a formality. EDF know what they are going to do and us residents of Cannington have to put up with all the traffic because EDF will not build a bypass first. it is needed now. It also appears that Hinkley staff are told different stories to the rest of us. I think it is all lies we are being told. We are British, not French. Why should we be steamrollered.	89568-1763-661		/		
Tractivity 1362	Public	Stage 2 Update	Cannington by-pass. The plan suggests that this will be a substantial road with a major visual impact. We feel that the details need further thought to lessen the impact on Cannington and Brymore School. It is essential that the speed limit is kept at 30 MPH to reduce noise and accident hazard to pedestrians.	89628-374-0			/	



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Nether Stowey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	3.5 The Parish Council expresses no preference for the route of the Cannington By-Pass which it considers should be a matter for detailed discussion between the appropriate Authorities and Cannington Parish Council.	8717-559-9753			/	At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy presented the first outline proposals for the Cannington bypass. At Stage 1 consultation EDF Energy explained that its favoured option around Cannington was a route to the west of the village. However it also presented an alternative route around the east of the village at Stage 1 consultation. Consultees were asked for their comments on each. At the same stage, two other alternatives (the outer western route and a 'no bypass' option) were presented as options that had been considered and discounted. Comments were invited on the route options, including necessity and suitability.
Stockland Bristol Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The Parish does not subscribe to the proposals set out in the consultation document, the Parish considers that the West route will only make Cannington into a 'Rat Run' and the East route will not elevate any of the problems that will arise with the new construction traffic along the A39 and Hinkley Road.	8721-559-1171		/		
Stockland Bristol Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The Parish does not subscribe to the ill founded and ill thought out route suggested by the Cannington Action Group for the Road across the Steart common adjacent to the 400kv line to the North of Stockland-Bristol, idea will be vigorously opposed by the Parish.	8721-559-1650		/		
Bridgwater College	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	The College's preference would be for the by-pass to go to the west of the village. The western route would have significantly less impact on the College than the Eastern route. A possible concern might be the potential difficulties that the College might have in accessing its farm given the close proximity of the new roundabout to the farm entrance. The major benefits of the Western approach however would be that it does not cross any College land. As a prospective partner for the Brymore Trust, the College does have a potential interest in the impact on Brymore's drive, and access to Brymore's grazing land on what would become the other side of the new by-pass road.	8774-559-3393			/	It was suggested by the statutory consultees that the both the eastern and western routing options were too close to residential properties in the village, with the western option potentially bringing increased noise, dust and pollution. However, a number of respondents also suggested that the western option would have less impact on the local ecology as it was located a good distance away from any protected habitat sites. The western option was ultimately considered to be the preferred option by many statutory consultees because of the smaller land take and the location was considered beneficial from a landscape perspective.  Comments from the general public were divided. However more respondents felt that the eastern option would cause less disruption and had the potential to leave a flood barrier as a future legacy for Cannington. There were also a number of respondents concerned about the western route's potential impact on Brymore School. However, those in favour of the western option felt it would affect fewer dwellings and be the shorter and more direct route.  At the Stage 2 consultation some small alterations were made to the design of the preferred western route, albeit the principle of the development remained the same. The preferred route ran approximately south to north commencing at the existing western roundabout on the A39 southern bypass and ending at the C182 (Rodway) north of Cannington. The route would head northwest from the A39 roundabout, bisecting the access road leading to Brymore School and then an un-named track to the north. The bypass would then head to the east of Withiel Farm and continue northwards crossing Withiel Drive, Sandy Lane and Chads Hill before passing to the east of the disused quarry. The route then turns north-east to join with the (C182) (Rodway) road just south of Rodway Farm, where it is proposed to construct a new
Tractivity 62237	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	Figure 10.13. This shows two potential routes for the proposed bypass. Firstly, the route to the east of Cannington cuts through in important corner of my land on which there exists an established badger set. I would require an in depth discussion regarding your proposals for its future since the problem raises sensitive, environmental issues. Secondly, the new road would need to be raised somewhat to avoid flooding issues.	8780-559-531		/		
Tractivity 763	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments?  It is NOT a bypass as it cuts THROUGH the village of Cannington! It may appear as a bypass to some residents (in the middle of the village) but cutting up the land through Brymore would effect 100's of boys (and staff) and tears up beautiful countryside. How can destroying our surroundings be ?for us?. We will still have traffic noise, pollution - a busier village ANYWAY due to influx of extra workers - (they won't stay on site all the time!) If we cannot have a bypass further out (i.e. Northern - in a much more industrialised area. I question the whole idea of a bypass. I believe the Western bypass as proposed is a mistake. It would devastate the village - ruin many villagers homes (views, noise etc.) and box us in with virtually busy roads on all sides. Another area my children cannot access on their own - because of a road!	9521-559-3530		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 858	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Although I agree in principle I cannot see what is wrong with using the current Hinkley Road which was built when A and B sites were erected - there is nothing wrong with this road and it would save carving up more countryside.	9616-559-2603			/	roundabout. The process of confirming the preferred siting was informed by the comments received at Stage 1 as well as a series of preliminary environmental assessments (forming an environmental appraisal of the route) and the decision was made by evaluating and comparing the relative merits of each option. More information on the decision making process and relative merits of each of the bypass option can be found in the <b>Alternative Site Assessment in the Planning Statement</b> .
Tractivity 895	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? But concerned about being cut off while this work is going on as you go straight across our only acces to village	9653-559-2553		/		Within the Alternative Site Assessment it explains that the outer western route was discounted prior to the Stage 1 consultation following analysis of traffic modelling which demonstrated that, although the journey time for drivers travelling from Bridgwater would be less using the outer western bypass, drivers would perceive the route as being longer and this would deter them from using it. This would mean that drivers would be likely to continue driving through Cannington to access the Hinkley Point C site. Furthermore, the route would pass through some sensitive areas of historic importance.
Tractivity 937	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? A road should be built from Dunball to Hinkley with a bridge over the river - there are almost NO houses on that route. this should join the Hinkley Road near the grain store where there there is already an access road. The West of Cannington is NOT suitable - it has Brymore School and prime agricultural land and dwellings.	9695-559-3857		/		The eastern bypass was discounted at Stage 2 because it was a longer route which would result in greater loss of high quality agricultural land and affect a greater number of properties. The road would also require elevating to reduce vulnerability to flooding. This would result in a greater environmental impact in terms of landscape character due to the tranquillity of the area and limited built development in the vicinity. Finally, the eastern route would have crossed minor and major aquifers, at low depth, increasing the potential for contamination.
Tractivity 1063	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? A Cannington bypass, not the proposed Western route, but an ?outer Western route? going behind Brymore School, not across the front drive, would be beneficial, but only in conjunction with a designated road from Dunball.	9821-559-3343		/		The western route was selected for the following reasons:
Tractivity 1092	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? However, it should be extended beyond Combwich, which is a tiny village adjacent to the main road.	9850-559-4250		/		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the western route is the shortest route option, thereby minimising the amount of land take. In terms of noise and air quality, the route would have an impact on fewer properties than a 'no bypass' or the alternative routes;</li> <li>although the western route would result in the loss of some landscape features, including hedgerows and trees, it is considered that the</li> </ul>
Tractivity 1102	Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? Thre shouldn?t be the park and ride and bi pass at Cannington - there should be a new road from Dunball and storage facilities at Dunball	9860-559-397		/		
Tractivity 1107	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? I agree that a Cannington bypass is need but I am not sure re east-west aspect. I heard that the east side had the merit that the embankment required would also provide Cannington with help in respect of flood defences.	9865-559-3721		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1112	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? If you have to do this please, please, please move it further away from Cannington instead of chopping across an unadopted road that could become a rat run, afield close to where people live and the access to Brymore College. The quality of life of the people at this spot will considerably lowered for a long period of time with no advantage whatsoever to them.	9870-559-2735		/		<p>loss of these features can be satisfactorily mitigated compared with the other options;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>groundwater is at a greater depth relative to the alternative options, minimising the potential for pollution due to ground contamination;</li> <li>ground conditions are preferable to the other options and would preclude the need for pre-loading;</li> <li>the western route would cross fewer watercourses and particularly would not cross Cannington Brook, which is identified to be a sensitive ecological feature in the area;</li> <li>the habitats along the western route are largely of limited biodiversity value and the route would not cross any designated sites; and</li> <li>the western route would minimise any amenity impacts of the centre of the village and would have a lesser impact than any alternative routes.</li> </ul> <p>Following the Stage 2 consultation the design of the bypass and the route were slightly realigned to allow for the retention of the existing pond, trees and other landscape features, however the preferred route option remained on the western side of Cannington.</p> <p>Some members of the public have suggested that the bypass should not be on the west side of the village since most of the construction traffic will be coming from Bridgwater which is located to the east. Concerns were raised that this could lead to construction traffic still travelling through the centre of Cannington instead of using the bypass. However, as it is explained within the Transport Assessment, all construction traffic associated with HPC will be required to use the bypass as soon as it is completed. This will be monitored through the use of automatic number plate recognition cameras which form an important part of the proposed freight management strategy for the HPC project.</p> <p>A number of comments from local residents suggested that the western bypass could also unwittingly create a 'rat run' through Cannington for traffic not associated with HPC. To address these concerns EDF Energy proposed to block Withiel Drive to vehicles at the Stage 2 Update consultation..</p> <p>Comments were also received which raised concerns</p>
Tractivity 1194	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? In the circumstances it seems inevitable	9952-559-3907			/	
Tractivity 204	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Whilst being a longer route, it uses land that has no practical value other than agricultural, and allows for any future expansion of Cannington to the west, where the land is more appropriate to development.	9335-559-2972		/		
Tractivity 204	Public	Stage 1	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? Once the construction phase is over, most of the other sites would become redundant - the most practical one is probably location C at Junction 24, because it would reduce the traffic going through Bridgwater onto the A39, which can be problematic at the best of times. The Cannington location A is the second best option, but does not reduce possible congestion issues between Bridgwater and Cannington. The fewer vehicular movements north of Cannington the better.	9335-559-5609		/		
Tractivity 228	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Would create a permanent flood relief barrier which WOULD be a legacy for Cannington. An eastern bypass WOULD be a legacy taking all Hinkley Point traffic from Bridgwater away from Cannington. An eastern bypass does not cut through Brymore School, private residential properties and avoids the need for several new road junctions.	9338-559-2331		/		
Tractivity 247	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: West of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference Shorter route so less land affected. Fewer properties affected. Better opportunities for future development inside bypass boundaries.	8940-559-1055			/	

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	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: West of the village  5. Please give reasons for your preference  To the East would open the development floodgates and the higher speed proposal would be twice as noisy (60 mph is much noisier than 40!!) but the West proposal is planned too close to the village. Why not make it from the roundabout but slightly west of Brymore School land.	8942-559-1342		/		over the possible impact of traffic noise associated with the Cannington bypass. A complete impact assessment of the noise and vibration associated with the Cannington bypass can be found in Volume 4 Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement. It has been established that traffic noise impacts are predicted at Withiel Farm and the residential dwellings on Withiel Drive and therefore it is proposed that a 2.0m high acoustic bund is proposed on the east and west side of the proposed bypass at this location to help mitigate the impact. Erection of the acoustic barriers, prior to road construction, between the proposed bypass and Withiel Farm would also provide screening during the construction phase.  A large number of public consultees have expressed concern that the Cannington bypass could adversely impact Brymore School and create a possible danger to the students. As explained in the <b>Cannington Bypass Design and Access Statement</b> the proposal includes a traffic signal controlled Toucan crossing which is to be provided for pedestrians and cyclists to safely cross the bypass between Cannington village and Brymore School. A footway and underpass would be provided on the east side for the entire length of the bypass. A link would also be provided from the bypass to the eastern section of the Brymore School front drive, which would become a footpath/cyclepath. It is also proposed to provide a cattle crossing with corrals and warning lights for Brymore School to enable pupils to move cattle across the bypass. The bypass would also intersect an existing watercourse along the north side of the Brymore School access road. A large box culvert is proposed in this location.  Finally, EDF Energy knows from comments received during Stage 1 and 2 consultations that many people would prefer a Bridgwater bypass and think that this should be provided instead of the western Cannington bypass. EDF Energy do not consider a Bridgwater
Tractivity 252	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference  This is the shortest route and, I suspect, the low cost option. Your proposed Western route is too close to the village and cuts Brymore School off from the rest of us. Basically it should go NORTH of the quarry.	8945-559-1730		/		
Tractivity 256	Public	Stage 1	Local people are being asked questions about what they would like to happen to facilities after construction has finished. It is surely more relevant to engage with them now to see what community benefit is available to mitigate what will be considerable inconvenience.  I think there is a feeling people are being asked to comment on options rather than engaged on how some of those options were arrived at.  I would like consideration given to extending the length of the proposed western by-pass for Cannington beyond the Combwich turning. The response at the	9343-559-3924		/		
Tractivity 259	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: East of the village  5. Please give reasons for your preference  The A39 is too congested and need to keep as much off it as possible	8948-559-1128		/		
Tractivity 265	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference  Need a bypass to Bridgwater. Either east or west takes out my friends farms	8954-559-1170		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 275	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 horrified to see that your proposals for a bypass so severely compromise Brymore School. The building of new and fast road, so close to the residential accommodation provided at the school for 200 people would seem to fly in the face of national government Safer Routes to School initiatives. It is essential that the students continue to have good safe pedestrian access to Cannington for recreational and curriculum purposes. This would be bad enough, but the unique offer of Brymore School is the running of a school farm. They only own 30 acres and your proposal to purchase 20 of them will cause considerable damage to the curriculum provided at the school. The proximity of these acres to the school is essential as the agricultural element is a closely integrated element of the whole school curriculum. Please reconsider your plans.</p>	8964-559-3391		/		bypass is necessary to mitigate the impact of Hinkley Point C construction and a full response to these comments can be found in the <b>Transport - Transport Strategy - Northern Bridgwater Bypass</b> section of this report.
Tractivity 280	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>At the public meeting in Cannington 22.09.09, it became apparent that the vast majority wanted a bypass from Dunball to Combwich. If this is not forthcoming then I think we should not build a bypass for Cannington.</p> <p>The people living near the favoured (West) bypass will suffer from visual and noise pollution. The cost is too high.</p> <p>Why is Cannington being hit so hard?</p> <p>Would you compensate people that found themselves next to the bypass?</p> <p>I am not personally affected by either bypass.</p>	8969-559-1193		/		
Tractivity 281	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>As a responsible firm, EDF should minimise impact on Cannington which will be hosting an influx of construction workers. A bypass West of the village appears to use marginally less land.</p>	9344-559-2084			/	
Tractivity 286	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>This route would minimise the traffic on the A39 from Bridgwater, and particularly on the existing bypass section.</p> <p>The West bypass option has a negative impact on Brymore School, which is an important asset for Cannington.</p>	8974-559-1161		/		
Tractivity 289	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>A bypass east of the village would seem to be the better option.</p> <p>The bypass proposed for the west of the village would seem very intrusive and inconvenient running between Brymore school and the village and across Withiel Way, and landscaping and planting would not answer these objections.</p>	8977-559-1286		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 290	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Less effect on the landscape and village	8978-559-1189			/	
Tractivity 296	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference An east bypass would be a scar on the landscape. The west bypass will also take Cannington Quarry traffic out of the village. Of course a road directly to Dunball would be best of all. What would happen where west bypass crosses Brymore School Drive, Sandy Lane and the road to the quarry?	8984-559-1274		/		
Tractivity 297	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference A driver take the easist route. If EDF choose the west route. A driver might choose to go through the village instead.	8985-559-987		/		
Tractivity 298	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Shorter route and clearer of river Parrett	8986-559-974			/	
Tractivity 299	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: no data 5. Please give reasons for your preference Needed but not sure whether is should be east or west.	8987-559-1150			/	
Tractivity 302	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: East of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference There is less habitation on the east of the village and the land is flat. To the west is the agricultural school and the quarry which already attract their own traffic which is containable. Cannington Village will certainly need a bypass, the village couldn't cope with the all the expected traffic.	8990-559-1847		/		
Tractivity 303	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Shortest and won't cut through so much more countryside.	8991-559-1403			/	
Tractivity 314	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Will pick up more traffic from Bridgwater	9002-559-1544			/	

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	5. Please give reasons for your preference Further from village, less socially valuable land	9007-559-1104			/	
Tractivity 320	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference I could say a bypass is not required; so I say the west because there are no plans to support which, long term, is best suited.	9008-559-1302		/		
Tractivity 322	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference The land to the east of Cannington and North of Bridgwater is more suitable for accomodation than the Williton sites. The eastern route would have less impact on residents of Cannington and the advantage of the higher speed linet and future connections to Bridgwater.	9010-559-1290		/		
Tractivity 323	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference I am choosing the west route as it is shorter - not on the flood plain - can be screened etc. However, if I lived on this route no doubt I would choose the eastern route!	9011-559-1785			/	
Tractivity 329	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference This is a shorter distance and better ground. Always better to build East rather than West of centres of population. Easterly winds not common in this area so noise levels will be reduced viz a viz western route.	9017-559-1282			/	
Tractivity 330	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Is the one that will not cause too much concern for village as agreed in 1989 public enquiry.	9018-559-1051		/		
Tractivity 333	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference If the bypass goes west of the village, you will be building a road through the main entrance of a school. By doing this will endanger the lives of the students crossing this road.	9021-559-1221		/		
Tractivity 338	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Easiest to construct and gives access to both areas for accommodation and parking.	9026-559-987			/	
Tractivity 340	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference See above, comments re direct from Junction 23. But if it has to be east or west then east would be preferable.	9028-559-1639		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 341	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference The west option is preferable in terms of environmental impact of the two proposal options. However, the best option of all would be a road from Dunball/M5 Junction 23, across to Combwhich. This can also form a flood defence for Bridwater.	9029-559-1459			/	
Tractivity 343	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference This is a more direct route.	9031-559-1388			/	
Tractivity 347	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: Not required 5. Please give reasons for your preference if means buying land from local businesses ad schools would be to disruptive, particularly to brymore school as it would take away much of their land and also put a major road on a school premises.	9035-559-983		/		
Tractivity 351	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference It minimises the impact on the residents of the village life and gets the necessary heavy track closer to Hinkly Point site than would be the case with the western route.	9039-559-1652		/		
Tractivity 352	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Possibly a better route in the long term- post 2017. On higher ground and not likely to flood. WOuld fit in with the south of Cannington dormitory area. On the other hand if the dormitory area were to be in the North of Cannington the road to the east might then fit better.	9040-559-1951		/		
Tractivity 353	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference i think this is best because most traffic will come from the bridgwater direction. also this will not affect the village with any flood risk.	9041-559-1174		/		
Tractivity 360	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference I do not believe either route is the correct one but since another option is not included in your tick box questionnaire I am opting for the least intrusive and most likely to be used. You completely ignore the effects of the prevailing south westerly winds in your initial attempts to quantify the effects of noise, air and dust pollution on local residents. If you take account of these it is evident that the eastern route is the better of two bad options. The A38 into Bridgwater is already congested at rush hour making the town impossible to access without queueing. When your 3000 (50%) 'local' employees (ie travelling for 90 minutes or less!) are using the route it will be gridlocked.	9048-559-1292		/		



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 361	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference less interference to village and more quickly accessed from the Bridgwater direction - minimises as far as possible traffic on the existing Cannington by-pass	9049-559-1037		/		
Tractivity 362	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference A road to the west is less likely to be used and your proposal document does not take account of wind direction when assessing the impact of the road on residents	9050-559-1068		/		
Tractivity 363	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference A bypass to the west would bring heavy traffic far too close to Brymore School	9051-559-1050		/		
Tractivity 370	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference The east road crosses natural wetland with dykes, because of this the road will be longer & built up. This will disrupt natural habitat & we may lose some wildlife. The road would be in a very open area so that noise levels would not be absorbed. This would cause a constant drone of traffic for the villages	9057-559-1136			/	
Tractivity 376	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Appears the shortest route, concerned that smaller cars may ignore it and go thru the village as quicker or just plain laziness.	9063-559-1593		/		
Tractivity 383	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Neither. A new road must be provided from close to M5 junction 23 to the existing Hinkley Point access road. NB This may also provide additional flood defence capability.	9068-559-1246		/		
Tractivity 391	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference With the current Cannington by pass running to the west of the village the length of new road required is reduced.	9076-559-2007			/	
Tractivity 392	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference This route will have less impact on Brymore school and the surrounding houses. The proposed route to the west cuts the school main drive and would seriously affect what carries on at the school putting students at greater risk.	9077-559-1048		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 397	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Traffic accessing the construction site from a westerly direction will be able to merge from A39 to C182 easier. Also see comments at end.	9348-559-1087			/	
Tractivity 410	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Q5 both options ticked. Cutting down the passage of traffic through Cannington is very important as it is the only way in and out and through to Comwich.	9092-559-1274		/		
Tractivity 413	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: East of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference A bypass is required around Cannington as the east will surely be the main access point.	9095-559-1233		/		
Tractivity 422	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Would not interfere with existing established community. It would be preferable however for a direct link from Bridgwater/Dunball to site if this could be established.	9104-559-1102		/		
Tractivity 428	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference east of the village only if it has long term advantage locally	9109-559-1131		/		
Tractivity 430	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Traffic from Bridgwater, not picked up by the dedicated road north of the town, should be taken off the A39 at the earliest opportunity -Sandford Corner?	9111-559-1574		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 432	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	<p>. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>Both the proposed routes have an impact on our property.</p> <p>Eastern option the proximity, in your view, between your properties and this proposed bypass option means that there will be significant impacts on the residential amenities of our property in terms of road noise/pollution/ dust and lighting.</p> <p>At present we have rural views from our property. With either bypass these will be interrupted by the visual impact of the road and itâ€™s lighting.</p> <p>The western bypass option is better served to relieve the quarry traffic, but will increase the volume of traffic passing by the end of our lane. In my view this will increase the volume of traffic in relation to our property and have an impact in terms of noise, dust, pollution etc on our residential amenities</p> <p>The by pass proposed for Cannington depending on the mitigation chosen re safe crossing points will potentially cut us off from safe passage to Canington village its</p>	9352-559-2173		/		
Tractivity 438	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>Take notice of the people of Cannington. With all the traffic coming from the east it seems stupid to build to the west. What about the disruption to the people around Wembdon and Bridgwater? Perhaps there IS a need to bypass them too.</p>	9117-559-1237		/		
Tractivity 441	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>Crosses land of lower agricultural value. Further from the heart of the village. Cuts fewer local roads and footpaths. The embankment will provide some protection for the village against flooding from the Parrett.</p> <p>Would have less impact on Cannington if it left the A39 near Sandford Farm and followed the line of Cannington Brook.</p>	9120-559-2469			/	
Tractivity 442	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>More traffic should be coming from the Bridgewater area than to the West: both freight and workers.</p>	9121-559-1679		/		
Tractivity 444	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>The need for an embankment to the Eastern route would make this route extremely intrusive both visually and through traffic noise. The Western route is therefore much more appropriate.</p>	9123-559-1919			/	
Tractivity 450	Public	Stage 1	<p>5. Cannington bypass options</p> <p>Box ticked: East of the village</p> <p>5. Please give reasons for your preference</p> <p>I would feel that this route would cause the least disruption.</p>	9128-559-1320		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 451	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference The obvious solution is to build a bridge across the river parrett and Dunball. This would solve all transport and congestion problems and automatically bypass Cannington and link up with the Hinckley Point road. This would benefit the residents of Bridgwater and Cannington and help make up for the enormous disruption that this vast construction project will cause to this part of Somerset.	9129-559-1784		/		
Tractivity 452	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference I believe that this option will disturb fewer residents of Cannington. It is obviously essential that a bypass be built for Cannington	9130-559-2618			/	
Tractivity 457	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Less impact on village and will exit onto existing private road, impinging less on local traffic. Combwich Wharf could be used as freight handling - rather than a new site near Carrington.	9134-559-1948		/		
Tractivity 464	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference The traffic should be kept to the North East of Carrington with a proper Bridgwater bypass. Bridgwater is already grid locked at times, there are significant other projects in and around the town in the medium term which will add to this. I think the Hinkley traffic should be kept away from the town, this would be of great benefit during and after construction.	9141-559-2302		/		
Tractivity 465	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Bypass from Sanford corner would help to ease the blackspot on that corner and reduce the traffic from there to Cannington and existing bypass through to A39.	9142-559-1182		/		
Tractivity 495	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Please give reasons for your preference minimal amount of the country side disrupted	9168-559-1083			/	
Tractivity 506	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Please give reasons for your preference Less disruptive to housing less archaeological impact (probably)	9179-559-1207			/	
Tractivity 510	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Your should bring in everything you need by ship, not putting more of the countryside under tarmac!! I cannot see a bypass would be needed after the construction phase, souly build a permanent blight on the landscape? If a bypass does get the go-ahneas, then it is only right the inhabitants of Cannington and it's environs get to decide on the route.	9182-559-2133		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 519	Public	Stage 1	Best one for ease/safety of traffic flow.	9191-559-1257		/		
Tractivity 520	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: East of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference The East Route does not disturb any Cannington households and provides uninterrupted transit all the way to Hinkley Point. The construction could contribute towards spoil disposal. The West Route distrubs many household and discharges onto the busiest part of the C182. It will experience serious traffic congestion aroud Bridgwater College farm and Cannington Grain Store where slow moving tractors and trailers are constantly turning into and out of the Grain Store throughout the summer months.	9192-559-1298		/		
Tractivity 528	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: East of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference Most of the road transport into and out of the site will probably approach from the East.	9199-559-1666		/		
Tractivity 542	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Ask the residents of Cannington!	9211-559-1433			/	
Tractivity 542	Public	Stage 1	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? 1. Miles from site and will make risk of flooding worse. 2. A39 one of the most dangerous roads in the county and you propose to increase traffic on it?!! 3. We don't need a badly planned, badly designed, cheaply built hostel left at the end of the day with acres of tarmac. 4. "Park and Ride" to where? Question 7(a) - "Wrong side of village"(South) and "Preferable. Closer to site" (North-West). Question 7(b) - "All the wrong side of Bridgwater. All traffic to site will have to go through the town." Question 7(c) - "Again - the wrong side of Bridgwater."	9211-559-2920		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 544	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference I think the project is too big. If you reduced it to build one reactor (instead of 2) it would reduce extra traffic by half. I think a bypass to West of village will cause a great deal of unrest in the village of Cannington.	9213-559-1775		/		
Tractivity 546	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Eastern route preferred but should at junction of A39 and B3339 (direction Wembon) to completed circumnavigate Cannington. Route East of sewage works and grain depot.	9215-559-2595		/		
Tractivity 547	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Least of two evils.	9216-559-1447			/	
Tractivity 559	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference This will avoid impacting the school and would ensure that HP workers use the route. A West route would not be the preferred route for commuters, they would drive through the village - even if you add traffic calming measures!	9228-559-1471		/		
Tractivity 563	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Creating new roundabout at the Eastern end of the A39 Cannington mile straight, a notorious accident blackspot at this tight bend. This new link road could connect with Comwich Wharf proposal.	9232-559-1046		/		
Tractivity 564	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Neither the Eastern nor Western bypass will be used by traffic from Bridgwater if there is a park and ride North of Cannington as it would be quicker to go through Cannington. If the Western bypass was constructed it would not be used by traffic from Bridgwater.	9233-559-1048		/		
Tractivity 565	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference If developed to the West nobody will use it when travelling from Bridgwater. If it developed to the West, it should be very close to Cannington to avoid the impact on farmland/green sites. Develop a North Bridgwater bypass in construction with other stakeholders.	9234-559-1907		/		
Tractivity 569	Public	Stage 1	East route will cut up many agricultural holdings and the flood plane is very vulnerable	9238-559-1227			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 575	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Please give reasons for your preference The existing bypass is already and a west bypass would not relieve this. Also the east side is less developed, so least traffic noise disturbance for residents as well getting Hinkley traffic away from the other A39 traffic earlier.	9244-559-1809		/		
Tractivity 581	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Please give reasons for your preference The western route is uncomfortably close to Brymore College and *local farms and the bulk of the traffic from the east would need to use the existing by-pass to reach the western route. The eastern route affects fewer houses and spoil from the construction site could be used to provide as embankment against flood possibility.	9250-559-1843		/		
Tractivity 583	Public	Stage 1	Box ticked: East of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference Please give reasons for your preference Takes traffic through less habitation: quieter for people living there	9252-559-1080		/		
Tractivity 585	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Our preference is for the route to the west of the village, but this should be altered to avoid bisecting the road to Brymore. The route to the east will cause loss of undisturbed land and be more intrusive on the landscape.	9364-559-1252		/		
Tractivity 597	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference The roundabout should be moved further up the Cannington mile road near that awful sharp bend, where there are a lot of accidents it could go straight across the field to Combwich Wharf - won't interfere with many homes/farms/people - Cost should not be main factor.	9263-559-1631		/		
Tractivity 598	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference This route has less disruption to established properties. You are encouraging strong links to Bridgwater College in term of education and accommodation-therefore surely it is natural to tie in a transport route across their land (which is not productive farmland) and ties in with Combwich Wharf. Makes perfect sense! To put a route (east of village) through an established private farm and more important ly a 'high class', nationally renowned boys school would be absolutely "criminal". Please don't spoil this school thank you.	9264-559-1004		/		
Tractivity 605	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Less 'intrusive' than Westerly bypass.	9271-559-1292			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 607	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference The best of very poor options. Traffic would still have to come through built-up areas.	9272-559-1009			/	
Tractivity 607	Public	Stage 1	. If EDF decides to adhere to its proposals despite the strongly expressed objections to them by the residents of Cannington, then we would urge that the bypass on the East of the village be the one chosen.	9272-559-3920		/		
Tractivity 610	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference The west route blights my property, I could not sell if I wanted to, so I agree with the West route provided you compensate me or purchase my property. Otherwise my response above is the Eastern route.	9274-559-1098		/		
Tractivity 612	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Most traffic will come from the Bridgwater direction therefore this will be the logical route, also any flood problems with Cannington Brrok will be after the village not before.	9276-559-1247		/		
Tractivity 613	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Least disruption to through traffic to the ongoing traffic to A39 Minehead area.	9277-559-1907		/		
Tractivity 618	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Shorter route and away from flood plain.	9282-559-1567			/	
Tractivity 668	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: Don't Know 5. Please give reasons for your preference We do not have local knowledge.	9331-559-1877			/	



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 30706	Public	Stage 1	With reference to your 'Initial Proposals and Options Summary Document', I would like to make my views about the proposed Cannington Bypass known:- I have an interest in protecting Brymore School grounds and drive in their entirety, and therefore urge you NOT to take the Western Route Option. (Personal details removed)at Brymore, and I have come to see the school as a national asset which should be protected. Despite - or perhaps because of - its small size, it provides a highly valuable facility, valuing each boy and helping him to attain his full potential. Many of the boys who go to Brymore have had difficulties settling into larger state schools, and find the caring and enthusiastic family atmosphere of Brymore a confidence-boosting time, which they leave having gained personal successes and opened up possibilities for their future. This can be seen by the high 'value added' percentage in Brymore's statistics. It works because it is a home-like, farm unit, situated within a wider community. EDF's western bypass proposal would fundamentally change this, cutting the school off from the community, reducing its land ownership and shattering the peace which is so important to maintain the nature of the school. Please don't look on Brymore as an insignificance: - It's place in our society is of vital importance. Because of this, I urge you strongly against the western route option.	9384-559-30		/		
Tractivity 30711	Public	Stage 1	I would like to point out that Cannington already has a by-pass so quite why it needs another is bemusing - especially when it will run through 20 acres of organic farmland and chop this specialist school in half. Quite why you feel the need to build 300 construction workers homes and a massive park and ride car park in Williton on Green Field sites is beyond me	9385-559-405		/		
Tractivity 30711	Public	Stage 1	Brymore takes boys from all over the country and to take away 20 acres could well spell the beginning of the end for it. It would struggle to keep the organic farm - such an important part of the school- going. You must not do this	9385-559-2248		/		
Tractivity 50697	Public	Stage 1	This is added unnecessary pressure which causes stress and anxiety to staff and parents but more importantly to the boys. (personal details removed) is worried that Brymore will be unable to function with less land and if a by-pass is built then inevitably it would be surrounded by new houses and industrial estates.	9387-559-481		/		
Tractivity 50878	Public	Stage 1	(a) In common, I think, with nearly everyone in Cannington, I should very much prefer a bypass running from the Dunball area, passing to the east of Cannington and joining the Hinkley road to the north of the village This would provide a much better access for most of the Hinkley traffic' keeping it off the local A39 road. It would also form a basis for siting worker accommodation, park and ride and freight handling facilities close to Dunball. In all these respects, it would be of immense benefit to people living in Cannmngton. I understand that this bypass option has been rejected by EDF, but their objection has to do mainly with cost. It should be strongly emphasised that, in or about 1988, when Nuclear Electric plc had plans (later abandoned) to build another reactor at Hinkley planning permission was sought and granted for the building of a bypass from Dunball. This shows that it would not be impossible or impracticable.	9393-559-1595		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 50878	Public	Stage 1	(b) The shorter document offers only two alternatives. Of these, I should prefer the eastern bypass. It seems to me less damaging to those living in Cannington. I think its potential for flood alleviation is important I find the list of reasons to prefer the western bypass, set out in Table 4 5 of the longer document, unconvincing and in some respects contradictory- and I have some sense that EFD has started with an a priori preference for the western bypass because it would be cheaper to build and have tried to find ways of justifying that preference.	9393-559-2537		/		
Tractivity 50878	Public	Stage 1	(c) The other alternative offered is what the shorter document calls the western bypass. I wholly reject this alternative. The road would go through the middle of the beautiful driveway of Brymore School, go through Brymore School land and pass unnecessarily close to the village affecting more residents as a result.	9393-559-3099		/		
Tractivity 50878	Public	Stage 1	<p>The longer document records, at para. 4.4.24, that EDF has rejected another version of the western bypass - they call it "the outer western route - which would "avoid the residential properties on the outskirts of the village and Brymore School" On that basis it is clearly much preferable to the (inner) western bypass. But para. 4.4.24 then goes on to give two reasons for rejecting this route:</p> <p>(i) The main one is that traffic modelling</p> <p>"demonstrated that although the journey time for drivers travelling from Bridgwater would be less using the outer western bypass, drivers would perceive the route as being longer and this would deter them from using the bypass".</p> <p>This reason does not withstand examination. For one thing the problem is not confined to the outer western route- both the eastern bypass and the (inner) western bypass would also be perceived as being longer because they are longer. But this argument is in any case destroyed by the first sentence of para 4,4.21 on the same page: "Construction traffic ... will be required to use the bypass". So the traffic for which the bypass was built would not be deterred from using it because that traffic would be required to use it. A requirement of this kind is obviously necessary wherever the bypass is built; there would be no point in building a bypass to stop the traffic passing through the village if that traffic were free to take the shorter route and go on passing through the village. I take it that this requirement would extend - as clearly it should - to all traffic going to Hinkley Point for purposes connected with the development.</p>	9393-559-3420		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 50878	Public	Stage 1	<p>(ii) The subsidiary reason for rejecting the outer western route refers to "some sensitive areas of historic importance". I am of course well aware of the historic importance of Cannington Park, which is already being eroded by quarrying operations, but the outer western route does not seem to me to affect it. In any case, Table 4.5 records that the eastern bypass would "affect the setting of 16 heritage sites" and that the (inner) western bypass would "affect the setting of 28 heritage sites". It does not seem that an outer western route could do much worse than that.</p> <p>I think neither of these reasons justifies the rejection of the outer western route, which would be very much preferable to the (inner) western bypass. Because the reasons given are so flimsy, I feel that EDF must have other reasons for rejecting it and that these may have to do with its greater cost.</p>	9393-559-5045		/		
Tractivity 50878	Public	Stage 1	<p>In order of preference, therefore, I rank bypass options as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A bypass from Dunball.</li> <li>2. The eastern bypass which is offered as an option.</li> <li>3. The outer western route shown in Figure 4.4 in the longer document.</li> <li>4. The (inner) western bypass I would wholly reject.</li> </ol>	9393-559-5930		/		
Tractivity 50906	Public	Stage 1	<p>I live in (personal details removed) and if the Western option goes ahead then my environment will become unbearable due to traffic noise, dirt, dust and light pollution etc. It will also open up the possibility of green belt land being developed as the proposed new road will cut off (personal details removed) from one of its fields.</p>	9398-559-451		/		
Tractivity 62340	Public	Stage 2	<p>If we accept that the residents preferred route is not an option, I would ask again that you consider placing the bypass further to the west where it will affect far fewer residents. If, as you have stated, all workers on the new site will only be able to use the new route there should be no issue in them travelling a few hundred yards further, especially as many of the trips will be via your park and ride bus, the route of which you can control.</p>	10020-559-1206		/		
Tractivity 62345	Public	Stage 2	<p>The obvious solution is building the Easterly route, or abandoning the whole Hinkley project. I imagine in a more favourable financial environment, free from unemployment and underinvestment, more pressure and (Editor's note: 2 words illegible) brought to (Editor's note: 1 word illegible) regarding the above (!?).</p>	10024-559-561		/		
Tractivity 62411	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>I am a resident in Cannington and as can be seen from my address will be directly affected by the building of a new road behind my home to accommodate the transportation of building materials and personnel to the new site.</p> <p>It is inconceivable that EDF has the right to ruin this rural environment when there is a perfectly good option that appears to be preferred by the people in the villages that will be most affected, namely the North Bridgwater By-pass - a dedicated road from the A38/M5 at Dunball.</p>	10054-559-295		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62414	Public	Stage 2	It is surely not beyond the wit of man to construct a by-pass east of Cannington which would be on level ground avoiding two substantial hills and Brymore school and leaving a far better carbon footprint.	10055-559-1039		/		
Tractivity 62414	Public	Stage 2	By avoiding the western bye pass there would be no need for E.D.F to put any floodwater into Cannington Brook, as the eastern bye pass would drain off down stream from the village. Which in wet times is prone to flooding. There are approximately 300 homes in Cannington, which already have problems with insurance.	10055-559-1551		/		
Tractivity 62415	Public	Stage 2	I emphatically say NO to EDF's so called preferred western route option. I strongly urge all residents of the greater Bridgwater area to do the same for the benefit of the whole region.	10056-559-3069		/		
Tractivity 62455	Public	Stage 2	Not surprisingly (personal details removed) again took the opportunity to express the opinion that the western outer route should be provided instead.	10079-559-2839		/		
Tractivity 62457	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	EPF Proposal-Western By-Pass Cannington I am writing to you with regard to the above, we wish to object most strongly to the proposed by-pass. I understand having attended various meetings with EDF that this is the shortest route and probably the cheapest. I am in favour of a road from the M5 north of Bridgwater across the river directly to Hinckley Point to avoid traffic chaos and this surely will not destroy local communities.	10081-559-0		/		
Tractivity 62569	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	We disagree with your proposals to construct the Western Bypass in Cannington.	10121-559-43		/		
Tractivity 62571	Public	Stage 2	6.0 PROPOSED WEST BY-PASS. It is essential that, in order to assist in road safety for residents and students in the village, that this proposed by-pass construction is commenced from the Western A39 roundabout towards Hinkley, rather than from the proposed Rodway junction. This is in order that heavy traffic makes use of the existing by-pass between the two A39 roundabouts, rather than using roads running through the village.	10122-559-2849		/		
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2nd option route 1 to west of Cannington as it upsets very few houses.	10124-559-3525			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62583	Public	Stage 2	<p>(d) An outer western route would be preferable to the route proposed</p> <p>16. A route which would be a great deal better than the proposed western bypass, and which has attracted greater support, would be the one which has been referred to as the outer western bypass. 58% of Cannington voters prefer this outer version. It would start a little further along the A39 in the direction of Nether Stowey and would take a route roughly parallel to that of the western bypass but further away from the village, avoiding both Withiel Drive and Brymore. For Cannington, the advantages of this are too obvious to need stress. The only disadvantage from EDF's point of view is that it would cost rather more than the (inner) western bypass.</p> <p>17. EDF has advanced two reasons against this route and I have commented on both in previous correspondence. One is that it would affect heritage sites - but, as already mentioned, the (inner) western bypass would affect 28 of these.</p> <p>18. The second and main reason is that it would be perceived as longer than the existing route through the village and that people would therefore be deterred from using it. It is true that people coming from the direction of Bridgwater (but not those coming from the other direction) would perceive it as longer. But the same is true of the (inner) western bypass; and this is entirely irrelevant anyway because EDF has already said that it would require the Hinkley traffic to use the bypass wherever it may be. There is no substance in this reason.</p>	10134-559-6984		/		
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Cannington By-Pass- In the previous round of consultation there were two routes shown around Cannington. We have not seen any evidence to indicate that both routes have been fully and robustly assessed to ensure that the least damaging route environmentally has been chosen.	10190-559-8035			/	
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We are also aware that a third route has been indicated to the west of Brymore School but cannot trace where this has come from and why it has been discounted.	10190-559-8310			/	
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>5.5 By-pass - Westerly route - General: This proposed route preferred by EDF, is far too close to the village of Cannington that in turn will bring noise, dust and light pollution into the village, caused by the prevailing winds.</p> <p>5.6 It cuts across the Grade II listed drive of Brymore School, thus creating a danger to 200 plus young students who live there and use the drive on a regular basis during their daily tasks undertaking their rural studies in order to farm the land that the school owns.</p> <p>5.7 This route would cut through Grade One agricultural land</p>	10221-559-9564		/		
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>Question 2. Are you for or against the building of the EDF proposed Western by-pass route? For 24.5%Against 75.5%</p>	10221-559-10134			/	

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	Would you prefer this outer western route to the proposed EDF route? (Question 2) Yes 58%No 42%	10221-559-10704			/	
Nether Stowey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	2.2 It is noted that in the Stage 2 "Preferred Proposals" documents the scale and location of much of the associated (off site) developments has changed from those outlined at Stage 1. Whilst some of these changes may reflect comments made at Stage 1 it is notable that on some issues, despite local opposition, EDF Energy has not amended its position.	10226-559-6461		/		
Tractivity 1169	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Cannington build proposed western route but also consider Bristol Rd to hinkley Point Rd to provide full bypass for Cannington.	10279-559-2084		/		
Tractivity 1169	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Further Western Route if no real benefit.	10279-559-3211		/		
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	s) A Cannington bypass to the west is downright idiotic. Even if construction traffic is signposted, people follow their sat-navs these days unless they are very familiar with the area and the shortest route from the motorway won't be the bypass.	89470-559-572		/		
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	u) Cutting through Brymore is not acceptable. Brymore senses a rare, under-appreciated function. With agriculture heading towards crisis point, the role of this place will become increasingly important in the future and its potential to expand its operations should not be hampered in this way.	89470-559-1659		/		
Landowner - Bridgwater College	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	- We are concerned that the present suggestion to site the junction of the new by-pass and the current road opposite Rodway Farm entrance would create a hot-spot of vehicle activity close to an area of student activity. This is further compounded by the close proximity of Cannington Grain Store, which has seen significant increases in business and therefore farm traffic in recent years.	89436-559-4247		/		

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The authorities however continue to have concerns regarding the appropriateness of the associated development proposals and whether or not what is presented does represent the optimum location.	89325-559-5299			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Options for siting of the compound in order to minimise the environmental impact have not been addressed, although they are referred to as mitigation measures (Table 3.6.4).	89368-559-10575		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The precise impacts associated with the construction compound effects are uncertain, as the siting has not been identified.	89368-559-12494			/	
Tractivity 62998	Public	Stage 2 Update	Too much green land taken in the proposal @ Cannington with the by pass as well. Village will be swamped.	89692-559-3427		/		
Tractivity 63007	Public	Stage 2 Update	Western bypass - This is too close to the village disrupting school and private property business and roads considered to be within the village of Cannington - The initial understanding was of a bypass much further away.	89695-559-152		/		
Tractivity 63012	Public	Stage 2 Update	The provision of the Cannington by pass is necessary as HGVs will have difficult navigating the road bends in the centre of the village, but the bypass will have no impact on the rest of the route past Cannington.	89696-559-7491		/		
Tractivity 70648	Consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	6. Your intention is still to build what is known as the western bypass at Cannington. You will be aware that, during the Stage 1 consultation, the Cannington Parish Council canvassed four options for the route of a Cannington bypass, and that this western bypass was the least favoured of them all. In common with 75.5% of Cannington voters, we continue to oppose the western bypass.	89766-559-2621		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
5	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	<p>(b) The longer document records, at para. 4.4.24, that EDF has rejected another version of the western bypass - they call it. "the outer western route" - which would "avoid the residential properties on the outskirts of the village and Brymore School" On that basis it is clearly much preferable to the (inner) western bypass: But para. 4.4.24 then goes onto give two reasons for rejecting this route:</p> <p>(i) The main one is that traffic modelling "demonstrated that although the journey time for drivers travelling from Bridgwater would be less using the outer western bypass, drivers would perceive the route as being longer and this would deter them from using the bypass".</p> <p>This reason does not withstand examination. For one thing, the problem is not confined, to the outer western route: both the eastern bypass and the (inner) western bypass would also be perceived as being longer because they are longer. But this argument is in any case destroyed by the first sentence of para 4.4.21 on the same page: "Construction traffic ... will be required to use the bypass". So the traffic for which the bypass was built would not be deterred from using it because that traffic would be required to use it. A requirement of this kind is obviously necessary wherever the bypass is built: there would be no point in building a bypass to stop the traffic passing through the village if that traffic were free to take the shorter route and go on passing through the village. I take it that this requirement would extend - as clearly it should - to all traffic going to Hinkley Point purposes connected with the development.</p> <p>(ii) The subsidiary reason for rejecting the outer western route refers to "some sensitive areas of historic importance". I am of course well aware of the historic importance of Cannington Park, which is already being eroded by quarrying operations, but the outer western route does not seem to me to affect it. In any case, Table 4.5 records that the eastern bypass would "affect the setting of 16 heritage sites" and that the (inner) western bypass would "affect the setting of 28 heritage sites". It does not seem that an outer western route could do much worse than that.</p> <p>Neither of these reasons justifies a failure to consult about this outer western route, which would be very much preferable to the (inner) western bypass. Because the reasons given are so flimsy, I feel that EDF must have other reasons for rejecting it and that these probably have to do with its greater cost.</p>	89794-559-7097		/		
13	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	Naturally we are relieved in the proposed reduction of scale as some of the above has since been scrapped. There are exceptions being the suggested "Western by-pass" is wrongly placed, and the current proposal of a 360 car parking area on a Greenfield site; the size of which will be the same as Bridgwater Morrison's Car-Park.	89802-559-382		/		
30	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	<p>It is also going to ruin the access and land to (Editor's note: information redacted)</p> <p>a Grade ii Listed building, cause danger to the pupils having to use a busy road and isolate the school from the village.</p>	89819-559-1194		/		



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
31	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	For the sake of the residents in Cannington and the surrounding villages PLEASE do not give EDF planning permission for their preferred route which will affect the whole of West Somerset for years to come.	89820-559-1729			/	
34	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	The Western Bypass will use prime agricultural land, defaces one of the most scenic green field areas around Cannington and would spoil its glorious panoramic views.	89823-559-399		/		
Tractivity 919	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? This coupled with eastern bypass is fine	9677-559-2690			/	
Tractivity 268	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference If all the accomodation and Park and Ride is at the Brymore end then put the bypass there as well. Otherwise its quicker to drive into the village rather than down to an eastern bypass. There are far more people would be disturbed by an eastern bypass, plys it increases pedestrian/cyclist danger at the eastern roundabout.	8957-559-1482	/			
Tractivity 369	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference If we have to have a bypass, west of village is sensible option as part of the existing bypass would be used and it is the cheaper, shorter route. Totally against a road to the east because:- it would have to be elevated and cause an eyesore: it would lower the value of property: restrict existing views: cause noise, dust. pollution and because of flooding issues here could create more flooding problems.	9056-559-1082	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The EnvApp incorporates a useful map showing PRow in the vicinity of the site, with those crossing the site and located within 1km affected highlighted in tables in the text.	89372-663-8810			/	<p>During the Stage 2 Consultation, Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response made several points regarding the baseline information provided during the consultation, noting that several sites were not identified which are on the Western Somerset Leisure Audit.</p> <p>Further baseline data was therefore collected, collated and presented within the chapter (<b>Volume 5, Chapter 17</b>) after the Stage 2 consultation, including further detail of public open spaces (as indicated in the Western Somerset Leisure Audit). This also includes details of facilities at existing sports or recreation receptors already identified, which also entailed consultation between EDF Energy and operators of some of the amenity and recreation facilities that would be directly affected. The final chapter contains the additional baseline data, which is also presented on <b>Figure 17.1</b>.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	It is not stated that consultation has been undertaken with the operators or users of other leisure and recreation facilities in the area.	89372-663-9231	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Further facilities were recorded by the Western Somerset Leisure Audit, which should be added to the baseline: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cannington Play Area</li> <li>Cannington Walled Garden</li> </ul>	89372-663-9540	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	EDF Energy's assessment of obstruction and disturbance impacts at the Cannington Bypass are founded on well researched baseline information on recreation and amenity assets.	89426-663-13765			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 432	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	6. Please give comments on your preferences and any suggestions about the future use of these facilities.  there is a concern about the number of workers to be accommodated in Cannington on either site. What will these people have to do for entertainment? If facilities are provided them who will have access to them after completion of the Power Station. The community must be allowed to used any new sports or social facilities. Is a mix of students and workers on the same site a good one? These will be 2 very different social groups, working different hours. Some of the students are currently under 18 years of age.	9352-665-4101	/			One consultee responded in the Stage 2 Consultation concerned that the bypass would impact two Public Rights of Way (PRoW). However, <b>Volume 5, Chapter 7</b> , of the <b>Environmental Statement (ES)</b> shows that in fact only one PRoW is affected.  In response to the Stage 2 consultation, Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council made a number of comments on the conclusions of impact assessment with regard to the potential disturbance to Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) as a result of the construction and operation phases of the Cannington Bypass. However, the assessment of the potential disturbance of the construction, operation, and post-operational phases for the site on users of PRoW, sports and recreation facilities, and public open space have been undertaken within the relevant topic chapter related to the likely disturbance (i.e. noise, dust, and visual). Notably <b>Volume 5, Chapter 9</b> of the ES assessed the impacts of noise disturbance on relevant amenity and recreation receptors. <b>Volume 5, Chapter 10</b> assessed the impacts of dust (air quality) disturbance on relevant amenity and recreation receptors. <b>Volume 5, Chapter 15</b> of the ES assessed the impacts of visual disturbance on relevant amenity and recreation receptors. The impacts have been summarised in the amenity and recreation chapter, cross-referencing to the relevant topic chapters. The methodology and criteria for the assessment of disturbance are detailed in each relevant topic chapter.
Tractivity 543	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference  I don't see the need to bring anything at all through the village. Therefore a bypass at either side is not necessary. Wherever you propose we be problems. What about all public footpaths etc that these roads will go right through?	9212-665-958			/	
Tractivity 62415	Public	Stage 2	4) The walks and quiet lanes north of Cannington would be ruined.	10056-665-2567			/	
Tractivity 62502	Public	Stage 2	Rights of Way: EDF are proposing to remove approximately 8 around the Hinkley Point (HP) site and will reinstate one around the new site boundary. They will remove a section of the South West Coastal Path which they say they will resite on top of a sea wall. In Cannington 2 will be removed for the Park and Ride and 2 for the proposed Bypass, including 3 minor roads and cutting through the entrance drive to the historic Brymore School site.	10096-665-83	/			
Tractivity 62569	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	The environment will be spoilt, public access changed (footpaths), as no bridges or underpasses will be built across the road. This would be dangerous especially for children.	10121-665-272			/	During the Stage 2 Consultation, a consultee commented on the cutting of Sandy Lane by the bypass. The use of Sandy Lane by people walking their dogs for access across the bypass will be maintained during the construction phase (see <b>Volume 5, Chapter 3</b> of the ES), and the Sandy Lane access/egress onto and from the bypass would be re-aligned as part of the scheme design (see <b>Volume 5, Chapter 2</b> of the ES).
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	It is also the authorities' view that the qualitative judgements are not always consistent with other arguments developed in the text. For instance, the PRoW users questioned during the Recreational Access Survey identified the most desirable characteristics of a footpath as good views, peace and quiet and close to home. This ranking does not appear to have informed the qualitative judgements made in assigning impact significance.	89372-665-11176	/			Any cumulative impacts on the amenity and recreation resource, including PRoW, associated with the Cannington Bypass are identified and assessed in <b>Volume 11, Chapter 6</b> of the ES.

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The bypass proposals result in the obstruction of a footpath at the construction stage. It is considered reasonable that this has been assigned a Moderate Adverse effect, on the basis of a high magnitude effect on PRow of local importance. The implementation of diversions during the construction phase as mitigation is important to retain right of passage and network connectivity, but it is considered that the Minor Adverse residual effect assigned does not take sufficient account of the visual and environmental impacts to the PRow that will result. A Moderate Adverse effect is more appropriate.	89372-665-11900			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Disturbance to PRow in the vicinity of the sites has been assigned a Minor Adverse affect for the construction period, including once the EMMP is implemented as mitigation. This is considered reasonable, but should be cross-referenced against relevant sections of the EnvApp, such as noise and air pollution.	89372-665-12507	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The closest sports and leisure facility to the bypass is the community sports pitch and club house (50m distance). As this is used primarily outside of construction hours it is concluded that there would be only a Minor Adverse disturbance impact on the facility. The Minor Adverse effect is expected to persist once the EMMP is implemented as mitigation. This is considered reasonable, but should be cross-referenced against relevant sections of the EnvApp, such as noise and air pollution.	89372-665-12821	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The EnvApp concludes that the obstruction of PRow will result in a Moderate Adverse impact, which would be reduced to a Minor/Negligible adverse impact once a crossing is provided, and Negligible adverse impacts once the diversions around the Park and Ride are implemented. It is Sedgemoor DC's view that the ongoing visual, noise and pollution impacts mean that there will be a significant impact for PRow users.	89372-665-13339			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The main area of uncertainty relates to the disturbance levels that the operation of the bypass will have for users of the PRow network and nearby sports and leisure facilities.	89372-665-15584			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	It is the view of Sedgemoor DC that the classification of the residual impact of the bypass and Park & Ride for PRow users (Minor Adverse) does not reflect the overall obstruction and disturbance impact of the proposals on the experience of using the footpaths affected.	89372-665-15792			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The magnitude of disturbance impacts (such as visual impact, noise and air pollution), assigned by EDF Energy are based on qualitative judgements. In the majority of cases these are consistent and reasonable, although there are discrepancies between sites and across phases. Disturbance impacts relating to recreation and amenity assets should be cross-referenced with other relevant sections of the EnvApp in order to demonstrate that significance ratings are reasonable.	89426-665-13942	/			
Tractivity 62857	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	C25/2annington Bypass. This cuts the existing Sandy Lane which is a popular dog walking route.	89649-665-398			/	
Tractivity 1050	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Disagree strongly. The bypass is too close to houses, school footpaths etc. to be called a bypass. It will affect our property. Noise, light, pollution and impact on the environment will be catastrophic. The Northern route is the only option.	9808-401-2947		/		

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The methodology therefore considers a range of factors, although it is considered that these are not always been consistently applied in terms of gauging the significance of impacts at different projects stages.	89372-664-10639	/			In response to the Stage 2 consultation, Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council commented on the consistency of the methodology applied in terms of gauging the significance of impacts at different project stages. Further details on the methodology used to assess the sensitivity and magnitude of potential impacts of the Cannington Bypass site on amenity and recreation assets is provided below and in <b>Volume 5, Chapter 17</b> .
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Conclusions on the magnitude of disturbance impacts appear to result from qualitative judgements. In many cases these are considered reasonable, but it is considered that the assessments of disturbance impacts should be cross-referenced with relevant sections of EnvApp (landscape and visual, noise, air quality etc.).	89372-664-10854	/			All of the amenity and recreation receptors (e.g. Public Rights of Way (PRoW)) that may be impacted by the Cannington Bypass have been assigned a level of importance in accordance with the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment guidelines. The value or potential value of a receptor is a function of a variety of factors (e.g. type of use, frequency of use, the intensity of use, and the 'population' able to use it, and whether it is a private or public facility) determined within its geographical context
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The EnvApp advises that the residual effects of the bypass on the nearest sports and leisure facilities are yet to be established. Cross-referencing with other relevant sections of the EnvApp, such as noise and air pollution, will be required.	89372-664-14034	/			Determination of the magnitude of an impact or disturbance on a receptor is based on the consequences of the impact in terms of the 'size' or 'amount' of an impact, which is a function of the impact's extent, duration, likelihood and reversibility. The magnitude of an impact on an amenity or recreational resource has been presented in <b>Volume 5, Chapter 17</b> of the Environmental Statement (ES).
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	With respect to the cumulative impacts of EDF Energy's proposals, the Stage 2 EnvApp concludes that "the spatial separation of development sites does not lead to any interaction between existing amenity and recreation functions (i.e. there is no amenity and recreation functions that connect the sites). The predicted impacts for each site therefore prevail and no cumulative effects are predicted." It is acknowledged that the obstructions to the PRoW network will be relatively localised, providing suitable diversions are implemented, but it is considered that a broader analysis of opportunities to enhance footpaths and bridleways should be undertaken so that real improvements can be achieved that compensate impacts such as visual impact and disturbance by construction activity.	89372-664-16095	/			Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council commented that the cumulative assessment did not consider wider enhancements, which were considered necessary due to the wider disturbance impacts on PRoW. The detailed assessment of disturbance impacts in the other topic chapters was not available during the Stage 2 Consultation. These topic chapters now contain mitigation measures within the site. However, given the location of many PRoW and other amenity and recreation receptors outside the DCO application boundary, EDF Energy have no means to impose mitigation onto land or areas far from the development site. Consequently, since Stage 2, EDF Energy have been in consultation with Somerset County Council in order to identify strategic mitigation and enhancement measures. Many of these will be implemented through the DCO obligations.

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1378	Public	Stage 2 Update	If, in the unlikely event that you ignore local opinion mentioned above and build your preferred Cannington bypass, please remember that there are existing footpaths across that land. You will need to make provisions for these paths to cross your bypass.	89644-667-606	/			<p>A number of comments were received from members of the public and from Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council on the potential loss of Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) and the mitigation proposed in respect of noise, dust, and visual disturbance to users of the existing PRoW that would be disrupted during construction.</p> <p><b>Volume 5, Chapter 17</b> of the Environmental Statement (ES) summarises the noise impacts during construction and operation of the Cannington Bypass on users of PRoW based on the assessment in <b>Volume 5, Chapter 9</b>. It concluded that a short-term disturbance would arise as walkers pass near to the site. In addition, the impacts of air quality (see <b>Volume 5, Chapter 10</b> of the ES) and visual disturbance (see <b>Volume 5, Chapter 15</b> of the ES) are assessed along with mitigation measures. The design of the bypass and associated landscape planting has been revised in order to reduce and mitigate noise, air quality and visual impacts as far as is possible. However, given the location of the PRoW and other amenity and recreation receptors outside the DCO application boundary, EDF Energy have no means to impose mitigation onto land or areas far from the site. Consequently, since Stage 2, EDF Energy have been in consultation with Somerset County Council in order to identify strategic mitigation and enhancement measures. Many of these will be implemented through planning agreements with the local authority.</p> <p>In the Stage 2 consultation, a consultee commented that provision should be made for the PRoW affected by the bypass. Initially two PRoW were expected to be affected during construction, however, revision of the route and proposed construction areas have reduced this to one. With regard to the bypass route that will pass through the existing PRoW (BW5/8), in the long term there would be no loss of the PRoW and access to the west from Cannington, as the bypass design contains a crossing point (see <b>Volume 5, Chapter 2</b> of the ES). During the construction phase for the bypass, the PRoW would be temporarily diverted around the construction area (see <b>Volume 5, Chapter 3</b> of the ES) with diversions occurring across different routes depending on the phase and timing of works; consequently, PRoW access either side of the bypass would be maintained.</p>
Tractivity 432	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	6. Please give comments on your preferences and any suggestions about the future use of these facilities.  there is a concern about the number of workers to be accommodated in Cannington on either site. What will these people have to do for entertainment? If facilities are provided then who will have access to them after completion of the Power Station. The community must be allowed to use any new sports or social facilities. Is a mix of students and workers on the same site a good one? These will be 2 very different social groups, working different hours. Some of the students are currently under 18 years of age.	9352-667-4101	/			
Tractivity 62502	Public	Stage 2	EDF has not mentioned any replacement of any footpaths to any associated development areas.	10096-667-641	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	In relation to PRoW, the mitigation measures currently proposed at Stage 2 are considered to represent the minimum acceptable to safeguard PRoW in the immediate vicinity of the sites and reduce negative impacts such as noise and dust pollution to acceptable levels. The diversion and crossing measures set out cannot fully mitigate the overall impact on the environmental setting of the PRoW and secure the existing levels of 'good views', 'peace and quiet' that are most highly valued by users, as recorded in the Recreational Access Survey.	89372-667-14684	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	It is considered by the Councils that further mitigation and compensation will be required to address residual effects, which could include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvements to the connectivity and quality of the wider PRoW network in the area around Cannington.</li> <li>Alternative compensation for the loss of amenity experienced by PRoW users.</li> </ul>	89372-667-15230	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Mitigation measures are restricted to the immediate surroundings of the site. There is potential for enhancements to the wider Public Rights of Way network, providing improved connectivity for walkers, cyclists and horse riders, to mitigate and compensate for residual effects.	89426-667-14413	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	A commitment to undertake a programme of recreational access surveys will help to ensure, along with site visits by officers, that PRow network diversions and measures to reduce disturbance are effective.	89372-668-16906	/			<p>In response to the Stage 2 consultation, Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council raised the issue of monitoring of the Public Rights of Way (PRow) during construction and operation. This was the only comment received on this issue. In response to that request, EDF Energy committed to implementing a monitoring programme to ensure that PRow network diversions and measures to reduce disturbance are effective for the Cannington Bypass site. Somerset County Council Rights of Way team are also expected to undertake a monitoring role in terms of ensuring that any diversions of PRow are implemented and fit for purpose.</p> <p>Monitoring of access (i.e. ensuring there are no obstructions) along the PRow diversion for the Cannington Bypass site would be undertaken during the construction phase, and on completion of construction. The monitoring would ensure that access is not obstructed by growing vegetation or any other obstructions, and would lead to maintenance measures being carried out, if required, to ensure that access is maintained (see <b>Volume 5, Chapter 17</b> of the Environmental Statement). In addition, during the construction phase counts of users along the PRow during diversion would be undertaken several times a year.</p> <p>Furthermore, an appropriate mechanism for reporting, logging and investigating PRow diversion complaints would be employed by EDF Energy and monitored during the construction programme, accompanied by an action plan to ensure that the PRow diversion route is not obstructed (see <b>Volume 5, Chapter 17</b> of the Environmental Statement).</p>



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 615	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>There will be hardly any benefits from this road being built around Cannington, as it will make the village lose its community and identity and no "community centre" can replace that.</p>	9279-571-3138	/			<p>Additional mitigation measures have been proposed in Cannington since the consultations, these include traffic calming in the village, clear signposting to direct traffic to the bypass.</p> <p>In addition, as part of West Somerset Council's decision to approve our application for Site Preparation Works, we have committed to deliver a significant package of investment, much of which will benefit Cannington. Once approved, our £4 million community fund will support a range of community initiatives to be chosen by local authorities and community groups and there is a considerable opportunity for Cannington to be a major beneficiary, with £0.5m earmarked specifically for Cannington. Additionally, £2 million of investment has been set aside for Cannington in new or improved sport and leisure facilities and to fund a new construction skills centre. We have also committed to a Public Realm Heritage Contribution of approximately £250k to mitigate the traffic impact of the project on the historic environment. Again, we expect Cannington to benefit significantly from this investment. The village will also receive further investment to promote or improve economic, social and environmental well-being and to improve community safety.</p> <p>If the power station development gets the go-ahead, the community fund referred to above will benefit from a total investment of £20m.</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1303	Public	Stage 2 Update	By its intransience on the bypass EDF has alienated a large proportion of pronuclear supporters. The bypass would have provided the biggest socio-economic benefit possible, recent meetings I have attended recently suggest that the backlash is building up steam and needs to be listened to.	89569-565-2627			/	<p>One consultee felt that EDF Energy had not given due consideration to the views of the local community in relation to the perceived need for a bypass (i.e. a new road from the M5 to the north of Cannington).</p> <p>EDF Energy has considered carefully the requirements of the Hinkley Point C Development in formulating its transport strategy, and the <b>Transport Assessment</b> demonstrates that a new road from the M5 to the north of Cannington is not justified. See also the response to the <b>Transport – Transport Strategy – Northern Bridgwater Bypass</b> theme for further information</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Should you build your preferred by-pass (and not purchase our 20 acres) then our cows will have to cross the by-pass in order to get to the milking parlour. While they can safely be moved down High Street to the school (at 6 am and 4 pm each day plus return journeys an hour later) this is unlikely to be the case with the by-pass, especially when busy.	8727-567-1625			/	Some respondents to the consultation felt that a new road from the M5 north of Bridgwater to connect with the A39 west of Cannington should be a pre-requisite for allowing the development. EDF Energy has considered this option but has not accepted that such a road is necessary or justified, as long as other measures to mitigate transport impacts are implemented. These include a bypass to the west of Cannington, traffic calming measures within Cannington, and a number of highway and junction improvements within Bridgwater and on the main route to the development site.  At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy proposed two search areas, to the east and west of Cannington respectively, as potentially suitable locations for the provision of a bypass. An initial assessment of flood risk issues relating to both of the proposed bypass routes was carried out following feedback from the consultation. There are significant flood risk issues related to development of the eastern bypass route compared with the western bypass route. EDF Energy acknowledged the risk associated with the eastern bypass route, and this was important to the selection of the western bypass route as the preferred option for incorporation in the Stage 2 consultation. The western bypass route would also be shorter with lesser environmental impacts, and fewer residential properties near the route. A fuller explanation for the choice of the western bypass route was provided in the Stage 1 Consultation Report.  Concern was also raised on the impact of the proposals on Brymore School, particularly changes to its existing access, educational quality, its visibility and severance from the community, and loss/severance of agricultural land used by the school. Safe crossing points have been incorporated into the design of the bypass to avoid adverse impact on community safety, particularly in relation to the Brymore School and access on the existing lane to Cannington. EDF Energy has also committed to a Public Realm Heritage Contribution of approximately £250k to mitigate the traffic impact on the historic environment as part of the Site Preparation works.
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	It cuts across a superb drive of Brymore School thus spoiling a marvellous vista and creating a danger to 200 plus young students who live there and cross the drive on a regular basis during their daily tasks undertaking their rural studies in order to farm the land that the school owns. It would cut through Grade One agricultural land.	8746-567-4232			/	
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	In addition, the authorities consider that more detailed consultation is required with Sedgemoor District Council. Discussions are also required around potential long term sustainability benefits or impacts of the by-pass options including: a) Flood risk management for Cannington; b) High quality public transport proposals along the A39; c) Joint car parking and travel planning for EDF and Cannington College. d) Traffic management in the village centre e) Providing access to limited housing and small business growth to meet local needs.	88060-567-2299	/			
Bridgwater College	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	The proposed by-pass would split the College's farm land virtually in half. The College has completed a significant refurbishment of the farm in the last couple of years spending approx. £2m on a state of the art milking parlour and accommodation for its 250 dairy herd. Any serious disruption of the workings of the farm would mean a loss of income to the College through a drop in milk sales (current income generated is £550k per annum). In addition the current industry standard facility attracts large numbers of agricultural students who represent £250k per annum income for the College. Any major disruption to the farm's operation would therefore have a significant impact on the College's income  The land area available to the farm is already stretched for both grazing and forage growing land. The introduction of the by-pass would severely limit available land. The College would need at least the same amount of land as that lost to the by-pass to be provided in close proximity to the farm to ensure that the farm remains viable commercially and as a training facility	8774-567-4235		/		
Bridgwater College	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	In addition to concerns regarding the farm, the Eastern by-pass would also impact on the golf course and would curtail potential College plans to expand the current 9 holes to the more standard 18  The option would also severely limit expansion options for the Equitation Centre as their pony paddocks run out to the proposed by-pass.	8774-567-5648	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62237	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	An additional concern is that this new road not only duplicates some 300m of the existing shorter road (and therefore cannot be considered cost effective by EDF energy) but is far straighter. My fear is that traffic would have a tendency to travel at much greater speeds along this new route. The present highway already poses difficulties to the daily logistics of my agricultural vehicles when entering/exiting the small drive of my home. Consideration to the safety and transportation of my young children to and from school is also sought as I believe that this new road would heighten the dangers above.	8780-567-962			/	
Tractivity 942	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? The proposed bypass (by EDF) will destroy Brymoor School and with the prevailing winds will cause pollution in Cannington village. ALSO the noise will add to an already high level of road noise. ALSO this will mean TWO lots of construction corks using Cannington. THE BEST OPTION IS THAT FROM DUNBALL!!!	9700-567-3096			/	
Tractivity 990	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? The Bridgwater to Cannington road has had a number of accidents in the past that has gridlocked the entire area for hours. The road is poor, the traffic is bad enough already and having a bypass at Cannington won't change this. As a resident of Cannington that lives near the proposed bypass I am very unhappy that having waited years to move to a village and being assured that the house was on the edge of green belt land we are now going to have to put up with having a road constructed, our view spoilt and a house that will be difficult to sell while this is going on. If you must have a bypass put it further away from the village.	9748-567-2556			/	
Tractivity 1112	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? If you have to do this please, please, please move it further away from Cannington instead of chopping across an unadopted road that could become a rat run, afield close to where people live and the access to Brymore College. The quality of life of the people at this spot will considerably lowered for a long period of time with no advantage whatsoever to them.	9870-567-2735		/		
Tractivity 1142	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 concerns about the visual, light, pollution and noise impact of the Cannington by pass on our property and will be seeking adequate compensation to cover the devaluation of our home because of this. This proposed road cuts us off from safe passage to Cannington particularly by foot or cycle and also due to the proposed dead end of our lane going towards Cannington cuts us off from the local footpath and lane network for recreational use on foot or cycle. We have road safety concerns about this road as all cycle and footpaths for the new and existing Hinckly Point road are on the opposite side of the roads to where we live. Kids need to cross to catch the school bus at Rodway Farm. This is already dangerous as the traffic is now, but will get worse. all crossings etc have been put in at the Brymore end. Cannington does extend to Putnell - consider us please.	9900-567-7757	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1158	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below  Noise, visual and environmental mitigation for the Cannington by-pass is totally inadequate.	9916-567-6608	/			
Tractivity 1175	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments?  Severe congestion already exists in the area. The western bypass route for Cannington will be only beneficial, perhaps, during the construction phase and of little use to the community thereafter. A blot on the landscape! Bridgwater and Cannington should be bypassed from the M5, Junct 23 (Dunball) to C182 between Cannington and Combwich. Also would be useful for holiday traffic during and after construction of P.S's	9933-567-3715			/	
Tractivity 1211	Public	Stage 2	As a past parent of Brymore boys this will affect the school educationally - the farm will suffer and the present and future boys - they will be isolated from the local community.	9969-567-2593			/	
Tractivity 1223	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments?  Potential change in traffic flow (+17%) quoted at road show is negligible when applied to the present very low level of traffic through Cannington. It would seriously affect the visibility of Brymore School, cutting it off from the road. Unnecessary destruction of prime agricultural land. Short term project to appease some local residents for long term/permanent environmental destruction with possible under-use following completion of project.	9981-567-2622			/	
Tractivity 1258	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals?  This will impact significantly on the people who live on (personal details removed) Cannington who will have a bypass directly in front of them. Traffic will be moving for 19 hours of the day.	89524-567-0			/	
Tractivity 200	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference  The route to the east of the village does not encroach so closely to properties as it does on the west of the village which severs roads, farmland and runs extremely close to properties and farms.	8908-567-1226	/			
Tractivity 216	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference  Please give reasons for your preference From the point of view of Brymore School, they would not be losing valuable acres to your transport plans, to the detriment of the dairy cow herd, which is an essential component of their curriculum. I know this is a very narrow consideration, but of some importance to the school, and therefore all involved there.	8919-567-2019		/		
Tractivity 231	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: East of the village  5. Please give reasons for your preference  The eastern route could be modified to commence at Sandford Corner (Wembdon Turning from A39) with little increase in length, no affect on residential areas, and elimination of an accident black spot (Sandford Corner)	8932-567-1261	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 275	Public	Stage 1	I am horrified to see that your proposals for a bypass so severely compromise Brymore School. The building of new and fast road, so close to the residential accommodation provided at the school for 200 people would seem to fly in the face of national government Safer Routes to School initiatives. It is essential that the students continue to have good safe pedestrian access to Cannington for recreational and curriculum purposes. This would be bad enough, but the unique offer of Brymore School is the running of a school farm. They only own 30 acres and your proposal to purchase 20 of them will cause considerable damage to the curriculum provided at the school. The proximity of these acres to the school is essential as the agricultural element is a closely integrated element of the whole school curriculum. Please reconsider your plans.	8964-567-3537			/	
Tractivity 369	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference If we have to have a bypass, west of village is sensible option as part of the existing bypass would be used and it is the cheaper, shorter route. Totally against a road to the east because:- it would have to be elevated and cause an eyesore: it would lower the value of property: restrict existing views: cause noise, dust. pollution and because of flooding issues here could create more flooding problems.	9056-567-1082	/			
Tractivity 369	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 road should be constructed from the motorway to Hinkey Point. Either bypass at Cannington would severely disrupt village life. There would be major disruption from extra traffic on A39 from Bridgwater.	9056-567-4149			/	
Tractivity 432	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	6. Please give comments on your preferences and any suggestions about the future use of these facilities. there is a concern about the number of workers to be accommodated in Cannington on either site. What will these people have to do for entertainment? If facilities are provided them who will have access to them after completion of the Power Station. The community must be allowed to use any new sports or social facilities. Is a mix of students and workers on the same site a good one? These will be 2 very different social groups, working different hours. Some of the students are currently under 18 years of age	9352-567-4101	/			
Tractivity 432	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	Our properties will be devalued and we will have to suffer noise, exhaust, dust and light pollution as well as the visual impact of any development. The by pass routes both impact too as indicated in earlier questions.	9352-567-9094			/	
Tractivity 602	Public	Stage 1	6. Please give comments on your preferences and any suggestions about the future use of these facilities. To impose approximately one third of Cannington's total population as extra residents is unthinkable. Single men, however housed, will have cars and need parking - they will require recreational facilities. Neither are available in Cannington. The result will be excessive drinking and wandering the streets!	9268-567-2829	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 571	Public	Stage 1	<p>The road will be in a 8 metre deep cutting at the top of Chads Hill as I understand it. The following properties in Sandy Lane have private water pipes that will be dissected by the road (they run from the meters that are situated at the roadside at the top of Chads Hill across the fields to the properties) :-</p> <p>(personal details removed)</p> <p>The next property along the lane, (personal details removed) has its own private water supply so is not affected.</p> <p>We would like to know how EDF intend dealing with our water pipes. Could they be persuaded to install a new water main along the lane to supply all of the above properties?</p> <p>We will, of course, bring this matter up with EDF ourselves but we think that it would help if the Parish Council raised it as well.</p>	9377-567-1230			/	
Tractivity 30706	Public	Stage 1	<p>With reference to your 'Initial Proposals and Options Summary Document', I would like to make my views about the proposed Cannington Bypass known:- I have an interest in protecting Brymore School grounds and drive in their entirety, and therefore urge you NOT to take the Western Route Option. (personal details removed) is at Brymore, and I have come to see the school as a national asset which should be protected. Despite - or perhaps because of - its small size, it provides a highly valuable facility, valuing each boy and helping him to attain his full potential. Many of the boys who go to Brymore have had difficulties settling into larger state schools, and find the caring and enthusiastic family atmosphere of Brymore a confidence-boosting time, which they leave having gained personal successes and opened up possibilities for their future. This can be seen by the high 'value added' percentage in Brymore's statistics. It works because it is a home-like, farm unit, situated within a wider community. EDF's western bypass proposal would fundamentally change this, cutting the school off from the community, reducing its land ownership and shattering the peace which is so important to maintain the nature of the school. Please don't look on Brymore as an insignificance: - It's place in our society is of vital importance. Because of this, I urge you strongly against the western route option.</p>	9384-567-30			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 30720	Public	Stage 1	I am writing to you in response to correspondence from (personal details removed) school. (personal details removed) (personal details removed) at Brymore School in Cannington. This school is unique and (personal details removed) this might be his (personal details removed) but I feel very strongly that this school should be allowed to continue in it's current form for all the boys who will follow on from (personal details removed). It will be incredibly difficult for this to happen if the new second Cannington by-pass takes two-thirds of their local land - they run sheep and a milking herd in fields across the road from the school. Your new by-pass - and it is yours, only the new reactors are causing it to be built - will also cut through their regular cross country run - Chads. I am sure that among your many arguments will be the jobs created by the new construction. I don't doubt you are right, but could the route not have taken Brymore's land into consideration? The government is promoting diversity, and Brymore is all of that. Surely when this country has a unique asset like Brymore everything should be done to support, not to rip away one of its most precious assets. Where else in this country can boys learn agriculture and horticulture as part of their standard curriculum? However, it is going to be increasingly difficult for this education to take place if they only have ten local acres. I appreciate you are unable to visit every facility under threat from your plans but as this one will affect so many of our young people maybe you should visit the school and see for yourself the kind of work they do, and meet their inspirational (personal details removed). I shall be forwarding this email on to the local papers and MP as I think the future of Brymore is worth fighting for.	9386-567-42			/	
Tractivity 62245	Public	Stage 1	(personal details removed) Brymore School in Cannington, and I understand that one aspect of your proposal considers the compulsory purchase of 20 acres of Brymore School farmland. I must therefore raise my concern at this purchase because, in my opinion, without replacement of this land (close to the school), it would, at best, damage the school's ability to teach agriculture as part of their curriculum, or, at worst, mean that the school would have to give up the land based elements of the education at Brymore. There is a resurgent interest in farming and food production. Coupled with the extant culture within the mainstream education system to concentrate on examination performance targets and other academic pursuits, there is an active (and growing) interest in schools, such as Brymore, that can develop young people to their full potential in a wide range of activities including the more vocational skills (indeed that is why (personal details removed) Brymore, when we, in fact live outside the immediate catchment area).	9440-567-441			/	
Tractivity 505	Public	Stage 2	Wanted to know about the plans for the Cannington bypass as he is a small business and feels the bypass will severely affect his business. Felt he couldn't find any information on line.	9983-567-0			/	
Tractivity 62304	Public	Stage 2	The EDF proposed unwanted Western Cannington by-pass will be through the grounds of Brymore School. For the farming industry this has been a respected facility of long standing incorporating prime educational and agricultural use. To cut such a swathe through the site will be brutal vandalism.	9993-567-2697			/	



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62411	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	I am against the constant noise, dust, light pollution, air pollution, smells, heavy traffic etc that will happen during the build period and most of all the use of the A39. How can EDF justify this overloading of an already inadequate holiday route as their preferred main route when a perfectly good option has been put forward, i.e. the North Bridgwater By-pass which would reduce the impact to more acceptable levels.	10054-567-1057			/	
Tractivity 62411	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	I accept that the build of the new station may aid the economy of the area and possibly bring the much needed employment but our small villages cannot take this level of disruption, not without ruining our way of life. I personally moved to this area from the South East to get away from heavy traffic and the pollution that goes with it. I now look forward to not being able to open my windows or doors because of the pollution and noise that will be generated from the proposed new by-pass. Thank you EDF!	10054-567-1482			/	
Tractivity 62568	Public	Stage 2	If built, this road will badly affect the lives of everyone in this village, not least, those most affected in the immediate vicinity.	10120-567-467			/	
Tractivity 62568	Public	Stage 2	It is also going to ruin the access and land to Brymore School, a Grade II Listed building, cause danger to the pupils having to use a busy road and totally isolate the school from the village.	10120-567-1195			/	
Tractivity 62569	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Will life habitat will be destroyed and crime may increase.	10121-567-550			/	
Tractivity 62938	Public	Stage 2	The route will cut a school grounds in half. Go through the cottages at Putnam (not even on your map).	10177-567-3755			/	
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	It cuts across the Grade II listed drive of Brymore School, thus creating a danger to 200 plus young students who live there and use the drive on a regular basis during their daily tasks undertaking their rural studies in order to farm the land that the school owns.	10221-567-9802			/	
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	1. The effect on the School itself, its staff, its pupils, the parents and the business of educating children. 2. The School farm, its ability to carry on functioning due to its reliance on off lying land, including livestock grazing land which will be severed from the School site by the proposed bypass. 3. The School fabric including buildings, grounds and entrance drives.	10242-567-1912			/	
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	The School has approximately 150 pupils, all boys in early teenage years. 1.2 Approximately 50% of the School students are on Special Needs register so are at greater risk than other students. This includes students with severe learning difficulties, where crossing a road unsupervised could be potentially lethal.	10242-567-2315			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	The School is in the process of consultation with a view to increasing its pupil intake to include 11 and 12 year olds, again increasing numbers, increasing traffic and generally increasing all activities in and around the School environment. Due to the nature of Brymore's intake, this will certainly involve boys with a developmental age of 6 or below. The increased health and safety risk to the boys will have an adverse impact on the School and seriously compromise the future business and expansion of the School.	10242-567-3655			/	
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	Although there is very limited grazing land adjoining the farm buildings, the main grazing areas during the spring, summer and autumn months are located on the opposite side of the road leading into Cannington at the entrance to the School drive. In order to take the cattle to the grazing areas daily requires students to assist in cattle movement which would, with the construction of the bypass, become far more complicated and potentially dangerous.	10242-567-4798			/	
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	The underpass is due to be constructed on a site noted for high water table, with ramps leading down into the underpass from either end, with the result that it is likely the underpass will not only collect water but over the course of time soil and cow manure will also build up, which it will be impossible to remove other than by hand due to height restriction. The assumption is it will be the responsibility of the School to ensure this is cleaned regularly, increasing staffing costs.	10242-567-5595			/	
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	At present the (personal details removed) lives in the lodge at the end of the entrance drive with direct access via the back drive to the farm buildings. The existence of the bypass severs his living accommodation from the farm buildings making it more difficult to gain access in times of emergency at the farm buildings.	10242-567-6922			/	
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	3.2 The secondary existing back entrance to the property would be lost and an alternative would need to be created which under the present facilities would not be feasible. This also assumes (personal details removed), who owns the land, would agree to access which is by no means assured.  3.3 The main drive is the conduit for many services, including the Somerset County Council ICT Hub for various educational establishments in the Sedgemoor and West Somerset area.	10242-567-8068			/	
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	Increased traffic and a busy access road will almost certainly reduce the appeal of Brymore to prospective parents. One of the unique selling points of Brymore is the safe, rural setting which is suited to the School's intake. Reduced pupil numbers would put the future of the School itself into question, due to its potential lack of economic viability. Brymore is the only state run boarding school in the country specialising in rural technology, with its own farm, gardens and workshops. Students wishing to specialise in this area, cannot go elsewhere.	10242-567-8667			/	
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	The School provides an extremely important role in educational terms for the rural community within Somerset and equally importantly, provides a superb opportunity for a number of special needs students to flourish which would not otherwise be available in mainstream education.	10242-567-11162			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Landowner - Castle Hill Quarry Company Ltd	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	Castle Hill Quarry Company owns and farms Park Farm which surrounds the quarry (plans have already been made available to you). The 400 acre farm has both arable and sheep enterprises. One concern is that the Western Bypass will prevent the movement of sheep from one side to the other.	10249-567-263	/			
Landowner - Castle Hill Quarry Company Ltd	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	8. Underground telephone cables which may go beneath the bypass footprint serve Golf Cottage and the adjoining cottages owned by the company.	10249-567-2619			/	
Tractivity 62469	Public	Stage 2	u) Cutting through Brymore is not acceptable. Brymore senses a rare, under-appreciated function. With agriculture heading towards crisis point, the role of this place will become increasingly important in the future and its potential to expand its operations should not be hampered in this way.	89470-567-1659			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	A site based assessment of the individual associated development sites discounts effects arising from cumulative impacts of all the associated development proposals whose timescales overlap.	89426-567-263			/	
Tractivity 62911	Public	Stage 2 Update	the damage that the preferred western bypass around Cannington will do to the general well-being of all residents, particularly those immediately affected on the route of the bypass.	89663-567-363			/	
Tractivity 62911	Public	Stage 2 Update	it will also end the village community that we have enjoyed to date.	89663-567-614			/	
Tractivity 62911	Public	Stage 2 Update	This is without the actual residents who enjoy living in Cannington and will have to watch their village life gradually being eroded.	89663-567-3059			/	
13	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	The EDF proposed unwanted Western Cannington by-pass will be through the grounds of Brymore School. For the farming industry this has been a respected facility of long standing incorporating prime educational and agricultural use. To cut such a swathe cut through the site will be brutal vandalism.	89802-567-1265			/	
14	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	It will go through the grounds of Brymore School a well known agricultural training centre.	89803-567-510			/	
17	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	6. Do you agree with EdF view that a Cannington western by-pass should be provided? Agree Disagree No opinion Don't know The by-pass will serve little or no legacy purpose. It will be a blot upon the landscape for the residents of the village and for all the surrounding communities and it will affect a number of properties adversely and permanently while offering little or no compensation.	89806-567-8652			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
30	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	It is also going to ruin the access and land to (Editor's note: information redacted) a Grade ii Listed building, cause danger to the pupils having to use a busy road and isolate the school from the village.	89819-567-1194			/	
31	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	For the sake of the residents in Cannington and the surrounding villages PLEASE do not give EDF planning permission for their preferred route which will affect the whole of West Somerset for years to come.	89820-567-1729			/	
34	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	It will go through the grounds of Brymore School a well known agricultural training centre.	89823-567-565			/	
Tractivity 340	Public	Stage 1	4. Any other ideas or comments? Bridgewater is severely congested already. So the only workable solution would be a direct link from Junction 23 to the site. This could be linked to the first cannington roundabout and hence provide great benefits to bridgewater as a whole. This would be seen as a big plus to offset all the disturbance.  I am particularly concerned over the proposal to use land owned by Brymore School. I believe that this would effectively render the school unworkable and would be seen in the area as a multinational company with no feelings for small businesses or childrens future.	9028-442-962			/	
Tractivity 363	Public	Stage 1	6. Please give comments on your preferences and any suggestions about the future use of these facilities.  The land to the south of Cannington is 20 acres of agricultural land belonging to Brymore School. This land is essential to the viability of the school farm. The school is unique in it being the only school in the country that provides a practical vocational education to NVQ level in agriculture. As it is impossible to envisage any suitable land being available to replace the loss of this 20 acres, this would jeopardize the future of this vital national asset.  This would be an act of criminal institutional vandalism.	9051-77-2122		/		
Tractivity 63094	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	Your W. bypass suggestion is messy, disturbing countryside, its inhabitants and will do nothing to help this road.	90060-567-349			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>7.7.1 Baseline</p> <p>Much of the analysis presented necessarily rests on an assessment of the level of employment resulting from construction (and to a lesser extent during operation). The key determinants are both the overall level and phasing of employment and the share of employment filled by local residents. Employment estimates are derived from unit costs of bypass construction based on a small sample of projects presented in Technical Appendix 2.2.1. Given this reliance on secondary evidence the assessment of total employment impacts is therefore subject to a high degree of uncertainty. The cost of new road building can vary significantly. The baseline assessment of construction costs and subsequent employment requirement would benefit from more specific reference to the bypass proposals.</p> <p>Issues related to transport and parking in Cannington would provide important perspectives on the potential operational stage economic impacts of a bypass.</p> <p>Although the presented plans are at an initial stage, where possible the analysis would benefit from more specific reference to the planned by pass, rather than 'per unit costs'. Alternatively, the assessment would benefit from a wider range of case studies on which to base cost estimates.</p>	89366-568-10088	/			<p>Concerns have been raised regarding the economic impact of traffic on businesses in the area. Residents and businesses in the area and more widely in Sedgemoor would be encouraged and supported to secure economic benefits from the development at Hinkley Point C – including jobs and supply chain opportunities.</p> <p>A concern was raised that there is a level of uncertainty associated with reliance on secondary evidence. While EDF Energy accepts a level of uncertainty, and plans mitigation for it, this approach is considered the most robust.</p> <p>Significance criteria are based on the resultant effect on the observed local baseline, and this is therefore considered an appropriate estimate of impact.</p> <p>For more detail refer to the <b>Chapter 7 of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement</b></p>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	As standard thresholds for assessing the significance of impacts for socio-economic factors do not exist, socio-economic assessment requires professional judgement to be applied, based on the available evidence and logical reasoning. Assessing the magnitude of impacts with reference to proportions of local population, employment or unemployment can serve to hide very localised effects which themselves may be highly significant.	89366-568-11368	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Related to the above point, significance of employment impacts is assessed with reference to the total number of employees and the share of employment opportunities filled by residents of the CDCZ. These measures are inconsistent with an assessment of employment impacts in a study area comprising Cannington.	89366-568-11803	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Greater flexibility should be used in applying the framework to assess significance or magnitude of effects.	89366-568-12116	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	For a range of impacts, a key determinant of significance is the level of home based versus non-home based workers. The consultation assumes a home based market share of between 50% and 70%. These proportions are well above the aspirational 40% local (CDCZ) employment share for the construction of the power station itself.	89366-568-12250	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There are clearly factors which determine that the local labour market share for associated activities is likely to be higher than that of the power station itself. The level of complexity and the type and level of skill required is much greater than that of a park and ride facility. A more direct comparison can be gained by isolating 'Civil Operatives'. Under the '30% scenario', the share of home-based civil operatives is 43% and under the '40% scenario' the same proportion is 50%. The range given for civil operatives ranges from between 45% and 75%. As for the power station workforce, it is considered that the achievement a local labour market share of approaching 70% is not assured and is dependent on a range of mitigating actions.	89366-568-12575	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The focus of the assessment, across both construction and maintenance phases, is on direct employment effects. Limited reference has been made to potential economic and social implications of a by-pass. For example the impacts on local traders of a Cannington bypass.	89366-568-13323	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Assessment of the level of local labour market share which would be expected and the level which is aspirational. The assessment would benefit from more detailed treatment of the relationship between mitigation and local labour market share. Issues related to mitigation are explored further below.	89366-568-13594	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	An assessment should be made of the local social and economic impacts of new transport infrastructure, not limited to construction and maintenance employment.	89366-568-13896	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The main source of uncertainty comes from the need to assess impact in advance of procurement of contractors to undertake work. The methodology uses proxies for costs based on similar projects and industry average levels of output are assumed to apply.  Open procurement means that both these assumptions are effectively at risk and introduce a level of uncertainty concerning actual outcomes.	89366-568-14929			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The absence of a clear set of interventions in terms of training and employment castes significant uncertainty on the delivery of an enhanced level of local labour within the development.	89366-568-15328	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	WSC and SDC have concerns over the chosen method of presenting each associated development site in volume 3. From a socio economic perspective, the associated development sites appear to represent a cluster of related developments which are grouped both spatially and temporally. Spatially, their significance appears to be in relation to Bridgwater and its broader environs and temporally, their primary impact falls before the main site peak in 2012. An assessment of effect would seem more appropriate at this scale using a common set of assumptions concerning costs, worker productivity and receptor boundaries. This could be achieved by expanding the role played by Chapter 1 "Introduction off site developments"	89366-568-15547	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There is also a strong argument for considering the effects of the associated development within Volume 2. Demarcation of effects could be achieved by giving a stronger prominence to the role of Bridgwater and its environs as a receptor in its own right. Consideration of the town offers an opportunity to tie the associated development proposals into broader strategic considerations which are largely absent from the analysis in this section.	89366-568-16271	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	No impacts and therefore no residual effects have been assumed for the operational phase of the Cannington Bypass. Insufficient attention has been paid to the assessment of local economic impacts of a significant change to the local transport context.	89366-568-16947	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	EDF Energy's assessment has no residual effect. The evidence base nevertheless contains inconsistencies in relation to how beneficial effects are assessed in relation to localised definition of the receptor. A site based assessment of the individual associated development sites discounts effects arising from cumulative impacts of all the associated development proposals whose timescales overlap.	89426-568-50			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	20.5.1 Socio-economics EDF Energy's assessment has no residual effect. The evidence base nevertheless contains inconsistencies in relation to how beneficial effects are assessed in relation to localised definition of the receptor.	89426-568-14732			/	



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Bridgwater College	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	The introduction of the by-pass would severely limit available land. The College would need at least the same amount of land as that lost to the by-pass to be provided in close proximity to the farm to ensure that the farm remains viable commercially and as a training facility  There would need to be a bridge or underpass to allow cattle and farm vehicles to reach the land that would otherwise be cut off from the farm	8774-569-5044	/			Some respondents to the consultation felt that a new road from the M5 north of Bridgwater to connect with the A39 west of Cannington should be a pre-requisite for allowing the development. EDF Energy has considered this option but has not accepted that such a road is necessary or justified, as long as other measures to mitigate transport impacts are implemented. These include a bypass to the west of Cannington, traffic calming measures within Cannington, and a number of highway and junction improvements within Bridgwater and on the main route to the development site.
Tractivity 62237	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	My father who is now in his seventies owns the majority of land on which I farm. I myself am approaching forty years of age and consider that this is a time when I should be making the utmost of my farming career whilst good health and the economy prevail. By the time your proposed development is completed I will be a great deal closer to fifty and finding farming more strenuous than I did a decade ago! This goes without saying that my father, who is currently in reasonable health, is not immortal and should the worst possible case scenario happen I could find myself paying a substantial inheritance tax on land that may be occupied or rented by you.	8780-569-3358			/	At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy proposed two search areas, to the east and west of Cannington respectively, as potentially suitable locations for the provision of a bypass. An initial assessment of flood risk issues relating to both of the proposed bypass routes was carried out following feedback from the consultation. There are significant flood risk issues related to development of the eastern bypass route compared with the western bypass route. EDF Energy acknowledged the risk associated with the eastern bypass route, and this was important to the selection of the western bypass route as the preferred option for incorporation in the Stage 2 consultation. The western bypass route would also be shorter with lesser environmental impacts, and fewer residential properties near the route. A fuller explanation for the choice of the western bypass route was provided in the Stage 1 Consultation Report.
Tractivity 1142	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 concerns about the visual, light, pollution and noise impact of the Cannington by pass on our property and will be seeking adequate compensation to cover the devaluation of our home because of this. This proposed road cuts us off from safe passage to Cannington particularly by foot or cycle and also due to the proposed dead end of our lane going towards Cannington cuts us off from the local footpath and lane network for recreational use on foot or cycle. We have road safety concerns about this road as all cycle and footpaths for the new and existing Hinckly Point road are on the opposite side of the roads to where we live. Kids need to cross to catch the school bus at Rodway Farm. This is already dangerous as the traffic is now, but will get worse. All crossings etc have been put in at the Brymore end. Cannington does extend to Putnell - consider us please.	9900-569-7757	/			Activities would be established to maximise the economic benefits of the development, as outlined at the Stage 2 Update Consultation. These measures would include: Business Supplier Events and Skills Training; engagement with schools and colleges in the local area in order to help them plan the education and training requirements of their students; an on-going commitment to local procurement and training to up-skill the workforce; a dedicated supply chain representative in the Bridgwater office; and a series of 'supply chain' events for local businesses to provide a clear understanding of EDF Energy's requirements from suppliers.
Tractivity 280	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference  At the public meeting in Cannington 22.09.09, it became apparent that the vast majority wanted a bypass from Dunball to Combwich. If this is not forthcoming then I think we should not build a bypass for Cannington.  The people living near the favoured (West) bypass will suffer from visual and noise pollution. The cost is too high.  Why is Cannington being hit so hard?  Would you compensate people that found themselves next to the bypass?  I am not personally affected by either bypass.	8969-569-1193		/		Additional mitigation measures have been proposed in Cannington since the consultations, these include

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62411	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	No amount of compensation can replace the peace and rural outlook that were my reasons for buying this property. Will you buy it before the value falls through the floor?	10054-569-1990			/	traffic calming in the village, clear signposting to direct traffic to the bypass.  In addition, as part of West Somerset Council's decision to approve the application for Site Preparation Works, EDF Energy has committed to deliver a significant package of investment, much of which will benefit Cannington. Once approved, our £4 million community fund will support a range of community initiatives to be chosen by local authorities and community groups and there is a considerable opportunity for Cannington to be a major beneficiary, with £0.5m earmarked specifically for Cannington. Additionally, £2 million of investment has been set aside for Cannington in new or improved sport and leisure facilities and to fund a new construction skills centre. EDF Energy has also committed to a Public Realm Heritage Contribution of approximately £250k to mitigate the traffic impact of the project on the historic environment. Again, Cannington would benefit significantly from this investment. The village will also receive further investment to promote or improve economic, social and environmental well-being and to improve community safety.
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Comment My preferred route is Dunball to H. Point. 2nd option route 1 to west of Cannington as it upsets very few houses.  If Western bypass is built it needs to go into a cutting from Withiel Drive to Rodway roundabout to cut noise to nearby houses and cut light pollution of freight moving through the night. You have considered protecting the wildlife now protect the humans who live along the proposed route.	10124-569-3465			/	
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	The need for students to use Cannington and its facilities would need to be reduced, especially during dark nights. Improved facilities at the School would seriously reduce this risk. An indoor swimming pool, due to its ability to accommodate large numbers, would not only improve safety but it would help restore the reputation of the School. This may offset the negative impact the bypass would have and its effect on school numbers and the potential long term survival of the School.  4.4 An alternative route for cattle movement should be considered. Moving the underpass to the other side of the drive, with a cattle track running parallel to the drive on the same side of the road, eventually cutting across the drive and through the woods to the milking parlour. This would reduce movement across (personal details removed) farm, minimising the spread of disease and the possibility of compromising our organic status. It would also reduce the amount of land lost by (personal details removed).	10242-569-9934	/			If the power station development get the go-ahead, the community fund referred to above will benefit from a total investment of £20m.
Landowner - Castle Hill Quarry Quarry Company Ltd	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	5. Access must be made available for the movement of sheep from one side of the Bypass to the other. This happens many times throughout the year. The access would be best situated at the end of the track running north from Park Farm. We anticipate that a box culvert beneath the bypass with a minimum size of 2.5 metres height and 4 metres width might be suitable. Adjacent to the box culvert a crossing point for farm machinery would be required with tractor access into fields on both sides of the Bypass.	10249-569-1730	/			
Landowner - Castle Hill Quarry Quarry Company Ltd	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	A private water supply runs along the sheep track from south to north of the Bypass which must be accommodated.	10249-569-2490			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1169	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	be given good compensation.	10279-569-3183			/	
Tractivity 1169	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	If it is needed provide it, with good benefits to land owners who are getting all the grief.	10279-569-3711			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	No mitigation measures are proposed for socio-economic aspects of Cannington Bypass. Measures related to local recruitment, training, and purchasing which are in place for the construction of the power station, would not be available for bypass construction. This would place significant doubt on achievement of a local labour content at the higher end of the proposed range and would therefore have implications for the significance of negative impacts relating to demographic impacts and impacts on local services.	89366-569-14078	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Consideration should be given to mitigation measures aimed at maximising the local employment share and economic benefit of construction of the bypass. Such actions could relate to modes of procurement and requirements placed on contractors for local recruitment and local supply chains where appropriate.	89366-569-14598	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Improved linkage with the mitigation measures proposed for the main site would improve the potential effectiveness of mitigation of possible residual effects.	89426-569-457			/	
Tractivity 591	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Improvements should be made to the existing road structure to allow access to the site. Brymore School owns 30 acres of farm land, essential to the provision of agricultural education for its pupils and one of very few such establishments in the country. The proposal to compulsorily purchase two thirds of this farm land will completely destroy the school's dairy and sheep farming provision.	9257-77-1018			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62299	Public	Stage 2	The Western Bypass will use prime agricultural land, defaces one of the most scenic green field areas around Cannington and would spoil its glorious panoramic views. It will go through the grounds of Brymore School a well known agricultural training centre.	9990-600-347	/			In response to the Stage 2 Consultation Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council raised concern that the baseline information was not complete in relation to the proposed Cannington Bypass site
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	13.17 Identification and the approach expected to be taken with the wastes generated during the construction of the associated developments, which include the two Bridgwater accommodation sites, the four park and ride facilities and the Cannington bypass, are described from 7.8.16 through to 7.8.21. The total amount of waste that could be potentially produced from these developments (7.8.16) is expected to be approximately 45,000 tonnes. This estimate does not allow for topsoil and subsoil (7.8.19). These soils are not deemed to be waste and will be stockpiled for later reinstatement of the sites.	89444-600-11499	/			In response to this, the <b>Soils and Land Use chapter (Chapter 11, Volume 5) of the Environmental Statement</b> contains full baseline information for the site, including the findings of an Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) system survey (Reading Agricultural Consultants report, December 2010). Approximately 70% (approximately 11.8 ha) of the surveyed agricultural land is best and most versatile land (BMVL), Grades 2 and 3a. The remaining land area is Grade 3b, moderate quality, agricultural land.
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	Hence, what approximate quantities of topsoil and subsoil are expected in stockpiles and where will these stockpiles be located? Is the intention to have a limited number of stockpiles, each with a large quantity, or a significant number of smaller deposits? What arrangements will be in place to keep these secure from prevailing weather conditions?	89444-600-13882	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The site is described as approximately 22Ha of agricultural land, although the land-take for the operational phase is give as approximately 8Ha.	89368-600-8322	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The baseline assessment has been carried out based on appropriate use of initial source references, and the majority of the site has been identified as 'best and most versatile land'	89368-600-8467			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	soil surveys have not been completed and consequently it is not known precisely how much of the site is 'best and most versatile land'. Baseline information is therefore incomplete.	89368-600-8659	/			

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>Geology, Soils and Land Use</p> <p>Reference is made to the fact that both route options pass through areas of high quality agricultural land, designated as Best Agricultural Land in the Local Plan. PPS7 recommends that development is avoided on land of this quality wherever possible. The mechanism to address this policy tension should be detailed within the section.</p> <p>The smaller land take of the western bypass option is acknowledged as an advantage of the western bypass route option.</p>	88340-608-1931	/			<p>During the Stage 1 Consultation Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council suggested that EDF Energy should take account of Planning Policy Statement 7 when developing plans for the proposed Cannington Bypass</p> <p>The Government's Planning Policy Statement 7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas (PPS7) sets out policy for promoting development in rural areas whilst conserving the character of the countryside and protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land. EDF Energy has had regard to PPS7 in developing its proposals.</p> <p>Soils impacted by the proposed development would be carefully stripped, stored and re-used and the impact of the loss of these soils within the footprint of the scheme is considered to be acceptable and in line with Government policy.</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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Section 3.6 of the EnvApp, which assess effects of development of the Cannington Bypass on soils and landuse, does not consider any cumulative effects.	89368-603-13406	/			<p>During the Stage 2 Consultation Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council expressed concern that cumulative impacts had not been assessed in relation to the proposed Cannington Bypass.</p> <p>To summarise, no within-development additive or interactive impacts on soils and land use have been identified.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Table 4.1 in Volume 4 incorrectly describes the cumulative effect of development of the Cannington Bypass on soils and landuse as Minor Adverse. This is not consistent with the residual impact of Moderate Adverse given in Volume 3 as discussed here and hence Volume 4 under-reports this aspect to a minor extent.	89368-603-13561	/			<p>Cumulative Impacts with other developments are assessed in <b>Volume 11 of the Environmental Statement</b></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	Geology, Soils and Land Use  Reference is made to the fact that both route options pass through areas of high quality agricultural land, designated as Best Agricultural Land in the Local Plan. PPS7 recommends that development is avoided on land of this quality wherever possible. The mechanism to address this policy tension should be detailed within the section.  The smaller land take of the western bypass option is acknowledged as an advantage of the western bypass route option.	88340-602-1931	/			In response to the Stage 1 Consultation Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council suggested that EDF Energy should take account of Planning Policy Statement 7 when considering the potential impacts of the proposed Cannington Bypass.  In general terms, impacts affecting land categorised as Best and Most Versatile Land (BMVL) (comprising ALC grades 1, 2 and 3a), soil quality, agricultural field drainage, agri-environment schemes and animal health have been considered in the Soils and Land Use chapter ( <b>Chapter 11, Volume 5</b> ) of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> . The area of agricultural land that would be permanently lost to the development would be approximately 9ha.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment of significance of damage to field drainage as 'No Impact', based on only site management as mitigation in Table 3.6.4 is inconsistent with Table 3.1.1 where reinstatement and realignment is proposed.	89368-602-10935	/			PPS7 sets out policy for promoting development in rural areas whilst conserving the character of the countryside and protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land. This best agricultural land is defined as grade 1, 2 and 3a under the UK Agricultural Land Classification system. The assessment of impacts on soils and land use included the soil types, their quality and agricultural land classification likely to be affected by the development.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The significance assessment therefore needs completion.	89368-602-11345	/			The presence of BMVL is a factor in the consideration of the sustainability of development proposals as set out in paragraph 28 of PPS7. PPS7 promotes the creation of a sustainable countryside framework, and places the loss of best and most versatile land within the context of meeting wider sustainability objectives. The loss of BMVL is no longer of <i>national</i> importance (as was set out in the precursor to PPS7, Planning Policy Guidance 7 (PPG7)). The loss of BMVL is now a matter to be taken into account at a <i>local</i> level.
14	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	The Western Bypass will use prime agricultural land, defaces one of the most scenic green field areas around Cannington and would spoil its glorious panoramic views.	89803-602-344			/	In March 2010, the Government published a consultation paper for a new Planning Policy Statement: Planning for a Natural and Healthy Environment. In its final form, the PPS would replace PPS7 in so far as it relates to, amongst others, soils and agricultural quality (paragraphs 28 & 29).  With specific reference to agricultural land, draft Policy NE8.9 states:  <i>"When considering applications involving significant areas of agricultural land, local planning authorities should take account of the presence of best and most versatile agricultural land (defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the ALC) alongside other sustainability considerations. Where significant development of agricultural land is unavoidable, local planning authorities should seek to develop areas of poorer quality land (grades 3b, 4 and 5) in preference to that of a higher quality, except where this would be inconsistent with other sustainability considerations."</i>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
								<p><i>Little weight should be given to the loss of agricultural land in grades 3b, 4 and 5, except in areas (such as uplands) where particular agricultural practices may themselves contribute to the quality and character of the environment or the local economy."</i></p> <p>Soils impacted by the proposed development would be carefully stripped, stored and re-used and the impact of the loss of these soils within the footprint of the proposed Cannington Bypass is assessed as being of minor adverse significance. Throughout all phases of the development, the implementation of soil mitigation measures would be managed and monitored via the Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan or the bypass development.</p> <p>Where impacts are identified, but are addressed in greater depth in other chapters (e.g. potential impacts from alterations to drainage regimes) these impacts are considered in the Soils and Land Use chapter <b>(Chapter 11, Volume 5) of the Environmental Statement</b> with specific reference as to how they may result from changes to land use and soils. The physical characteristics of the soils present on site (including drainage characteristics, moisture status and Soil Wetness Class) have been taken into consideration in the impact assessment in terms of their potential vulnerability to stripping, handling and storage. Information on site drainage, including agricultural land drains, where available, has been used to assess the potential for damage to field drainage, both within the site and on adjoining land.</p> <p>During the construction and operation phases, temporary and permanent surface water drainage systems and a water and sediment management plan would be put in place to mitigate impacts. Where required, there would also be localised drainage below topsoil stockpiles to ensure that the upper surfaces of the soil are suitably drained. The temporary drainage facilities would help to maintain soil contained in stockpiles in a viable condition for re-use. The provision of temporary and permanent drainage would protect land drainage on adjoining land from potential disruption. Drainage is addressed in further detail in the <b>Chapter 13, Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement</b>.</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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment of Significance of Impact is according to the generic matrix in Volume 1. Criteria are presented in this chapter for the Importance of Soil and Land use Receptors, and for the Magnitude of Effects. However these do not comprehensively cover the full range of area/duration combinations and do not address the issue of land which is not 'best and most versatile'.	89368-601-8866	/			<p>In response to the Stage 2 Consultation Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council acknowledged that the methodology was in line with best practice but commented that it required further development and an increased level of information.</p> <p>EDF Energy has taken these comments into consideration and the Methodology Section of the Soils and Land Use chapter (<b>Chapter 11, Volume 5</b>) of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> addresses the following issues, as they may be affected by the construction and operation of the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ soil types, their quality and ALC grades likely to be affected by the development;</li> <li>▪ the type of farm enterprises present and farming practices including any agri-environment schemes; and</li> <li>▪ the possible presence of crop/soil/animal diseases or noxious weeds.</li> </ul> <p>The criteria used in the assessment are the ALC grades as set out by the former Ministry of Agriculture Fisheries and Food, which includes Best and Most Versatile Land (BMVL) (Agricultural Land Classification grades 1, 2 and 3a), but also lower grade agricultural soils (Grades 3b and 4). The methodology describes the assessment of magnitude of impact (change) upon soils and agricultural land, and the value and sensitivity of the soils present on site, including both BMVL and Grades 3b and lower agricultural land. This approach has allowed potential impacts to be assessed in line with Planning Policy Statement 7 (refer to the Cannington Bypass – Soils and Land Use – Consultation topic response) and in terms of the potential vulnerability of soils to stripping and handling in relation to their physical characteristics, including Soil Wetness Class. The methodology for impact assessment addresses the extent of land affected. The duration of use is also assessed as part of the Impact and Mitigation Section of the Soils and Land Use chapter (<b>Chapter 11, Volume 5</b>) of the <b>Environmental Statement</b>.</p> <p>The Soils and Land Use chapter (Chapter 11, Volume 5) of the Environmental Statement also contains full baseline information for the site, including the findings of the Agricultural Land Classification survey. Approximately 70% of the surveyed agricultural land is best and most versatile land, Grades 2 and 3a. The remaining land area is Grade 3b which is classified as moderate quality, agricultural land.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The methodology is in line with other good practice in this area but needs finalising to address this point in order to ensure consistency across the various sites and to avoid challenge of the basis of the assessment.	89368-601-9247	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment of significance of Moderate Adverse for the permanent landtake of 9Ha of 'best and most valuable land' (Table 3.6.4) is reasonable based on the criteria proposed.	89368-601-9829	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The significance of the temporary loss of land during the construction phase has not been clearly brought out. By inference from the figures in the text, this area is 13Ha (22Ha total site area minus 9Ha permanent landtake).	89368-601-10010	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	the duration of the use of this land has not been stated.	89368-601-10241	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The significance of the temporary landtake as Minor Adverse may be reasonable based on the partial criteria proposed, however the criteria do not cover this combination of area and duration. Criteria need to be fully developed to confirm these assessments of significance.	89368-601-10299	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Assessments of significance of other effects as 'Negligible Adverse' with good site management as part of the EMMP are generally reasonable (but see comments below on mitigation).	89368-601-10752	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There are some minor uncertainties regarding the quality of the land, as to how much of it is 'best and most versatile', and the assessment of the effects as Moderate Adverse is not yet confirmed.	89368-601-12782	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment of a residual Moderate Adverse impact from the permanent land-take of good quality agricultural land during the operational phase is likely to be reasonable, although further work is needed as described above in order to confirm this	89368-601-13124	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	it should be noted that in Table 3.6.4 mitigation for damage to field drainage is proposed only by part of EMMP, which is not sufficient.	89368-604-12006	/			<p>During the Stage 2 Consultation Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council commented that they considered the Cannington Bypass soil and land use mitigation measures in need of further development and detail in certain areas.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been developed following the Stage 2 Consultation and in summary the proposed bypass would be a permanent structure and as a result, the design has given particular consideration to the balance of cut and fill, and avoidance of the need for removal of excavated materials off-site. Temporary soil stockpiles would be located at the northern and southern end of the bypass. The Mitigation section of the Soils and Land Use chapter (<b>Chapter 11, Volume 5</b>) of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> outlines quality control and monitoring measures that would form part of the mitigation for stripped, stored and re-used soils. Full details would be provided in a soil management plan. Managing and documenting topsoil stripping, stockpiling and reuse would form a key part of the plan, and there would be an identified person responsible for supervising soil management during the works.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Mitigation for other issues through good practice site management via the EMMP is appropriate.	89368-604-12148			/	<p>A principal mitigation for soils and land use is the adoption of correct methods for excavation, handling, transport, stockpiling and reinstatement of agricultural soils where land restoration is necessary. An outline of these methods is provided in the Impacts and Mitigation sections of the Soils and Land Use chapter (<b>Chapter 11, Volume 5</b>) of the <b>Environmental Statement</b> and the full details would be provided in the SMP for the bypass. Soil restoration prescriptions and methods would also be provided as part of the SMP to support the requirements of the Landscape Restoration Plan.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The mitigation proposals therefore need further development.	89368-604-12410	/			<p>Again at Stage 2 of consultation, Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council also raised concern over the proposed mitigation for field drainage.</p> <p>During the construction and operation phases, temporary and permanent surface water drainage systems and a water and sediment management plan would be put in place to mitigate these potential impacts. Where required, there would be localised drainage below topsoil stockpiles to ensure that the upper surfaces of the soil are suitably drained. The temporary drainage facilities would help to maintain soil contained in stockpiles in a viable condition for re-use. The provision of temporary and permanent drainage would protect land drainage on adjoining land from potential disruption.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>Mitigation measures for management of the riparian habitat should be developed in more detail.</p> <p>Further measures to mitigate residual effects relate to strong contractual mechanisms to ensure best practice in delivery of the restoration of the non-permanent parts of the site to agriculture.</p>	89426-604-3861	/			<p>Again at Stage 2 of consultation, Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council also raised concern over the proposed mitigation for field drainage.</p> <p>During the construction and operation phases, temporary and permanent surface water drainage systems and a water and sediment management plan would be put in place to mitigate these potential impacts. Where required, there would be localised drainage below topsoil stockpiles to ensure that the upper surfaces of the soil are suitably drained. The temporary drainage facilities would help to maintain soil contained in stockpiles in a viable condition for re-use. The provision of temporary and permanent drainage would protect land drainage on adjoining land from potential disruption.</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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The relationship between the Cannington Brook and a SSSI (Pawlett Ham) is not revealed until Section 3.9.74. This is key piece of information that should be in the baseline description.	89370-627-5263		/		At the Stage 2 consultation, one of the consultees commented on the need to consider the relationship between the Cannington Brook and the Pawlett Ham Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI.). Earlier submissions of the surface water chapter ( <b>Volume 5 Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement(ES)</b> ) included reference to Pawlett Ham SSSI, however this feature has not been considered as a direct receptor due to the geographical distance between the expected discharge location from the bypass development; and the fact that the SSSI (Pawlett Ham) is located on the opposite bank of the River Parrett.

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>Hydrogeology, Hydrology, Drainage and Flood Risk</p> <p>It is noted that further studies are proposed in relation to Hydrogeology; Hydrology, Drainage &amp; Flood Defence. The completion of a Flood Risk Assessment (approach to be agreed with the Environment Agency) is considered to be a priority study. Depending on the location and design, there is potential for the bypass to either exacerbate flood risk, or serve as a flood risk management structure with legacy benefit.</p> <p>An understanding of what is possible to secure enhancements to existing flood defences on the Parrett and for the village as a whole is also required, if the western option were to be considered the preferred route.</p>	88340-635-2422	/			<p>A number of consultees, including Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council, expressed concerns regarding the potential increases in flood risk resulting from the future development of the Cannington bypass during the Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultations.</p> <p>To address these concerns, a detailed <b>Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)</b> for the bypass incorporating the proposed drainage strategy has been developed for the bypass and has been fully integrated into the design of the site. Full details are provided in <b>Volume 5, Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement</b> and the FRA prepared for the Cannington bypass development. An attenuation basin and detention pond will be constructed as part of the bypass in order to attenuate surface water to greenfield run-off rates.</p>
Tractivity 62384	Public	Stage 2	<p>I am also concerned about the increase in surface water from any western bypass. This water will run to its lowest level ie the existing water courses of Cannington Brook and it's tributaries which eventually dispose of water through the centre of the village. Although much has been made by EDF of its proposal to improve the drainage of water from the proposed park and ride facility as a valuable legacy for the village (although this work was already planned by the Environment Agency), what will safeguard our properties from this second flooding threat?</p>	10047-635-4149			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62384	Public	Stage 2	I am also concerned about the increase in surface water from any western bypass. This water will run to its lowest level ie the existing water courses of Cannington Brook and it's tributaries which eventually dispose of water through the centre of the village. Although much has been made by EDF of its proposal to improve the drainage of water from the proposed park and ride facility as a valuable legacy for the village (although this work was already planned by the Environment Agency), what will safeguard our properties from this second flooding threat?	10047-629-4149	/			<p>During the Stage 2 consultation, a number of comments were provided regarding the assessment of value/sensitivity and ultimately assessment of impacts. One specific comment raised for Cannington bypass was that a drainage ditch has been assigned a "Low" sensitivity, even though it ultimately connected to the Mill Stream which had been assigned a "Medium Sensitivity". The text of the <b>Surface Water Chapter of Volume 5 Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement</b> has now been updated to provide additional information regarding the assignment of value/sensitivity scores and to apply common terminology throughout the impact assessment process. The approach that has been adopted in order to protect the water quality of each receptor is to adopt the value/sensitivity rating of a downstream length where that downstream reach has a greater value/sensitivity score. All immediate receptors for the Cannington bypass scheme (including the drainage ditches) that receive the discharged water at Cannington bypass have therefore been assigned a medium sensitivity within the revised ES.</p> <p>The justification for the sensitivity/value assignment for each receptor is provided in <b>Volume 5, Chapter 13 of the ES</b> and provides details for both the water quality and hydrology assessments undertaken for the site. Details have been provided for both direct surface water and indirect population receptors which could be affected by the proposed development at Cannington bypass.</p> <p><b>Volume 5, Chapter 13 of the ES</b> has also been updated to provide additional information regarding individual impacts, any additional mitigation actions which are not directly considered in the design of the site and remaining residual risks. The assessment has shown there are no moderate or major surface water related impacts for the proposed Cannington bypass development. As a consequence, no specific additional mitigation is required. It should also be noted that best practice measures, good construction methodologies, pollution prevention guidance and maintenance regimes will be adopted throughout the construction of the site (and these have been taken</p>
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The village has a natural asset with Cannington Brook running through part of it and the Council do not want it spoilt. All water drains downhill from the Quantock Hills and surrounding area to this brook. The proposed park and ride area is in close proximity to the brook and there is concern with regard to pollutants and flood water running off the proposed western bypass and the park and ride which could ruin the natural habitat of the brook.	10221-629-5196	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The key receptors are the Mill Stream and the Cannington Brook; these are assigned a medium sensitivity due to the existing water quality and its importance in terms of local drainage. This is an accurate fair reflection and fits with the table of sensitivity provided in the EDF Energy text (Table 3.9.1).	89370-629-6376			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	An associated drainage ditch is assigned a low sensitivity. However, as it connects into the Mill Stream it should be assigned the same sensitivity.	89370-629-6686	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment of the identified impacts seems accurate	89370-629-7737			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The discussion of flood risk associated impacts considered too many elements simultaneously. For example, the discussion of (i) culverting the Mill Brook and (ii) an increase in surface water discharges, should be separated out for clarity.	89370-629-7797		/		into account within the assessment of potential impacts).  A number of comments received during the Stage 2 consultation process required further details on the surface water drainage strategy proposed for the Cannington bypass to ensure there was no degradation and increased flood risk to the adjacent watercourses and communities downstream as a result of the proposed development. To address these concerns, a robust surface water drainage strategy has been developed for the site. This strategy is supported by detailed drainage calculations and is presented in the <b>Cannington bypass Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)</b>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment of the effect of increased surface water runoff is inconsistent with the assessment of the same effect at the construction phase. There is a lack of detail of how surface water is going to be managed for there to be confidence that there will not be any impact. It is recommended that further details are provided regarding surface water management to minimise the impact on flood risk.	89370-629-8532	/			This drainage strategy divides the site into two (northern and southern) surface water areas which are dictated primarily by topography. The drainage strategy includes the use of Sustainable Drainage (SuDS) techniques to attenuate discharges from the site and provide primary treatment for non-aqueous phase hydrocarbons. The drainage strategy incorporated in the <b>Cannington Bypass Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)</b> ensures that there will be no run-off into the nearby quarry. The drainage strategy proposes that post-construction, run-off rates from the developed parts of the site will be limited to existing greenfield run-off rates, for the north this equates to 5.3 l/s/ha and for the south 5.47 l/s/ha. This attenuation will be achieved by the construction of an off-line attenuation basin and on-line pond.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The residual impact assigned to the effects above is considered an accurate demonstration of the adequacy of the mitigation put forward.	89370-629-10426		/		A further comment, from Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council, received during the Stage 2 consultation process requested clarity in the discussion of flood risk associated impacts. This comment has been addressed in the updated surface water chapter ( <b>Volume 5 Chapter 13</b> ) of the ES and impacts are discussed individually. Further information regarding potential impacts is provided in the <b>Cannington bypass FRA</b>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The residual impacts of surface water flows are considered adequately managed and result in 'no impact'. For this conclusion to be fully justified further detail needs to be provided with regards to the management proposals. In addition, any surface water management system will only be effective up to certain design threshold. Once this has been exceeded the system will fail. The implications of this scenario need to be considered in the assessment.	89370-629-10566		/		A consultation comment was also received during the Stage 2 consultation process regarding the need for wider consideration of the cumulative surface water impacts of the development. These interactions have been considered in detail in the development of the <b>FRA</b> . It should also be noted that cumulative impacts across the Hinkley Point C (HPC) Project developments and surrounding non-HPC schemes are considered separately in <b>Volume 11, of the ES</b>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There would be a residual impact caused by changing the hydraulics of the Mill Stream after installing the culvert. This is not discussed on the basis that the mitigation put forward would be effective. Culverting streams can affect flood risk and low flow conditions and the design of such features needs careful consideration. This level care is not displayed in the mitigation section and so a significant residual impact has to be assumed.	89370-629-11022			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Unfortunately there appears to be no associated plan that identifies where the surface water features are in relation to the proposed route. The clearest description of the watercourses is provided in the surface water quality section. The reader would benefit if this clear description was put closer to the start of the text.	89370-628-4932	/			<p>During the Stage 2 consultation, Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council requested clarification of the receptors (i.e surface waters that would be potential effected in terms of hydrology and water quality by the proposed development) which were considered in the assessment process, including the production of a detailed plan which highlights the drains and watercourses near the site. This request has been noted and is reflected in the development of a new surface water drainage plan for the Cannington bypass site which is detailed in the <b>Cannington bypass Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)</b> .</p> <p>The councils also requested that additional information be provided for the significance criteria which have been assigned to each of the receptors assessed in the surface water chapter. This information has been provided in <b>Volume 5, Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement</b> and which provides details for both the water quality and hydrology assessments undertaken for the site. Details have been provided for both direct surface water and indirect population receptors which could be affected by the Cannington bypass development.</p> <p>In addition, Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council requested clarification and further details on the proposed surface water drainage strategy for the site and also the need to consider fully appropriate Sustainable Drainage (SuDS) methods within the drainage design. A summary of the key points arising from the drainage strategy are provided in the response to consultation comments received on impacts to surface water, detailed in the Consultation Report, and the <b>Cannington bypass Flood Risk Assessment</b> prepared for this site.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The methodology is incomplete as it only provides tables that describe 'sensitivity of receptor' and 'magnitude of effect'. A table that explains the Significance Criteria is not provided in this section nor a references to how the significance has been informed using the Table 5.4.4 in Vol 1 of the EnvApp.	89370-628-6860		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The significance assessment of routine highway discharges and pollution incidences is based on quantitative data obtained via DMRB assessment methodologies and this approach is considered robust.	89370-628-8333		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	As this is a greenfield site, a robust surface water strategy is essential. Surface water strategy for the development (including the approach to sustainable drainage) is very light on detail and not sufficient for PPS25 compliance. Detailed drainage designs are not included. It is unclear how the bypass would drain surface water to the two balancing ponds at each end of the alignment.	89408-628-14094	/			



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Water Quality This route would need to consider including methods to allow the free drainage of the numerous drainage ditches and especially the Cannington Brook through proposed road embankments (applying for land drainage consent where necessary).	88830-631-2298	/			<p>During the Stage 2 consultation, the Environment Agency highlighted a number of specific conditions which would need to be addressed to ensure that the proposed development did not cause pollution and/or impact upon controlled waters. These conditions were related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The requirement to develop a scheme to prevent pollution of surface waters which will be subject to approval by the local authority;</li> <li>Standard pollution prevention approaches would be required for storage of fuels, oils and chemicals;</li> <li>No discharge of foul or contaminated surface or ground water or trade effluent would be made direct to surface waters or soakaways; and</li> <li>The local authority should be satisfied that provision is in place for foul-water.</li> </ul>
Parrett Internal Drainage Board	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	These sites are outside of the Boards area. However surface water from these sites currently enters the Boards area. Should the development proceed to the next stage we would wish for suitable surface water strategies to be developed to ensure that land in and adjacent to these areas can continue to drain to a standard at least as good as that which exists currently and that no additional burden is placed upon adjacent drainage systems from increased runoff and volumes from the sites. This will require surface water run off to be managed and for drainage features to be maintainable.	10189-631-2881	/			
Landowner - Castle Hill Quarry Company Ltd	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	9. It is important that no surface water from the bypass is permitted to run-off into the quarry.	10249-631-2764			/	<p>These conditions are reflected in the updated <b>Volume 5, Chapter 13 of the Environmental Statement (ES) Cannington bypass Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)</b> for the site. EDF Energy has continued engagement with the Environment Agency during the development of the <b>FRA</b> to ensure these requirements will be adequately addressed.</p>
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>REASON: To prevent pollution of the water environment. CONDITION: During construction No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for prevention of pollution during the construction phase has been approved by the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>REASON: To prevent pollution of the water environment. CONDITION: Any facilities, above ground, for the storage of oils, fuels or chemicals shall be sited on impervious bases and surrounded by impervious bund walls. The volume of the bunded compound should be at least equivalent to the capacity of the tank plus 10%. All filling points, vents and gauges must be located within the bund. The drainage system of the bund shall be sealed with no discharge to any watercourse, land or underground strata. Associated pipework should be located above ground and protected from accidental damage. All filling points and tank overflow pipe outlets should be detailed to discharge into the bund.</p> <p>REASON: To prevent pollution of the water environment CONDITION: There shall be no discharge of foul or contaminated drainage or trade effluent from the site into groundwater or any surface waters, whether direct or via soakaways.</p> <p>REASON: To prevent pollution of the water environment. CONDITION: No development approved by this subsequent permissions shall be commenced until the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that adequate sewerage infrastructure will be in place to receive foul water discharges from the site.</p>	89092-631-751			/	<p>A significant proportion of the remaining Cannington bypass consultation comments with regard to mitigation relate to concern or clarifications around the potential impacts (and need for mitigation) of uncontrolled surface water discharges from the site. A drainage strategy, which is detailed in the <b>Cannington bypass Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)</b> is an integral part of the site design to control discharges from the site at levels consistent with current runoff rates. This has been achieved using a variety of Sustainable Drainage (SuDS) management techniques as advocated by a number of consultees. These techniques include the use of filter drains, ditches and gullies on sections of the site; the use of a controlled drainage system; and an attenuation basin and detention pond to control discharges from the site.</p> <p>The assessment of water quality construction impacts has assumed that good construction site practices will be adopted. Due regard for the Environment Agency Pollution Prevention Guidelines will be made during all phases of the development. <b>A water and sediment management plan</b> will be developed by EDF and the appointed contractor and will detail measures which ensure the careful management and monitoring of construction practices at the Cannington bypass development site, with respect to surface water and</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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Reinstatement of ditches and drains is proposed as mitigation for damage to land drainage in Table 3.1.1, which is appropriate. However it should be noted that in Table 3.6.4 mitigation for damage to field drainage is proposed only by part of EMMP, which is not sufficient.	89368-631-11871			/	sediment control. Measures will include the provision of facilities for the appropriate storage of oils and fuels. Such measures will ensure that discharges from the site will be managed in such a way that there will be no deleterious impact on receiving watercourses and that any discharge requirements are met in terms of quality and discharge rate at all times  Consultation responses received from the Environment Agency during the Stage 2 consultation have advised that in order to prevent pollution of the water environment there should be no discharge of foul or contaminated drainage to groundwaters, via soakaways for example. There will be no generation of foul water associated with the Cannington bypass scheme.
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There is some attempt at providing detail on how surface water is to be managed. However, the details of this should be in the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The details in the FRA are insufficient to provide confidence that the effect can be completely eliminated.	89370-631-9443	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Sections 3.9.112 and 3.9.113 of the assessment identifies that the operational phase mitigation required to manage routine highway runoff and accidental spillages is a surface water system designed to manage the required quantity and quality of water. Details of this system would need to be available for the assessment to be complete. It would be expected that this detail would be within the Flood Risk Study (FRS). This is not the case.	89370-631-9732	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment of residual effects ignores the potential flood risk imposed by surface water discharges. Section 3.9.111 states that balancing ponds will ensure there is no increase in surface water discharges at the operational phase. This is encouraging but the lack of detail in this document and the supporting FRS and the lack of consideration of the design limits of surface water systems provides a lack of confidence that the assessment has been carefully thought through	89370-631-11705			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>The residual effects identified at the construction phase are negligible to minor adverse effects, which are assigned following mitigation measures reliant on the EMMP. While this may be a generally fair demonstration of the adequacy of the mitigation put forward, there is a general lack of detail available as to how the proposed systems will operate.</p> <p>The residual operational effects identified by the assessment indicate that routine runoff and the risk of a spillage will not be managed as the water quality effects are assessed to be negligible without mitigation. This is based on the Design Manual for Roads and Bridge (DMRB) assessment procedure and as such is a robust. A surface water system is described in the assessment although this is only offered to manage the quantity of surface waters to ensure the impact on flood risk is negligible (water quality is not considered)</p> <p>However, contemporary surface water management practice would advocate the adoption of a drainage system that can take account of potentially harmful substances to attenuate or treat these even if the assessment indicates that inputs would be low.</p>	89426-631-6248			/	
Parrett Internal Drainage Board	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Clearly within the development proposals there are a number of important issues which need to be resolved before any development or works commence on site. The details will need to set out and establish an effective surface water disposal strategy on each of the separate proposals and if appropriate consent applied for and is issued by the Board before any works commences on site.	89717-631-5685			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	No specific commitment to monitoring is provided. It is expected that this will be addressed within the EMMP.	89370-632-12396			/	<p>One consultation comment was received for the Cannington bypass noting that there was no specific commitment for environmental monitoring at the site. Further to the Stage 2 submission additional surface water monitoring at the site is to be carried out, under the requirements of the <b>Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (EMMP)</b>.</p> <p>The assessment of water quality construction impacts has assumed that good construction site practices will be adopted. Due regard for the Environment Agency Pollution Prevention Guidelines will be made during all phases of development. Measures will also be taken to ensure the careful management and monitoring of construction practices at the Cannington bypass site, with respect to surface water and sediment control (via a <b>water and sediment management plan</b>). These measures will ensure that discharges from the site will be managed in such a way that there will be no deleterious impact on receiving watercourses and that any Environmental Permit requirements (or discharge conditions imposed in relation to a <b>Construction Environmental Management Plan</b> or any other management and monitoring plan agreed with the Environment Agency) are met in terms of quality and discharge rate.</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Natural England	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Extended Phase 1 Habitat Surveys were undertaken in 2009 including River Corridor Survey, Hedgerow Survey, and Bird Surveys. Breeding and wintering birds, water vole, otter, dormouse, badger, great crested newts and reptiles may be impacted upon. Eight bat species were identified in 2009 including the rare barbastelle	89112-636-483			/	The desk study included a request to SERC in 2009 for records of both legally protected and otherwise notable species, the results of which are summarised in the ES chapter baseline (and appended in full). The desk study and an extended Phase 1 habitat survey were undertaken at an early stage in the Environmental Impact Assessment and design process for each component Hinkley Point C (HPC) site, including the proposed Cannington bypass, in line with the Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management's Ecological Impact Assessment guidelines (2006).
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Further work to establish usage of the landscape by Barbastelle Bats are necessary.	89255-636-13690	/			This initial stage of ecological baseline data collation identified a requirement for further detailed species survey work to be undertaken in order to establish a robust baseline, both to inform the design of the development proposals and to provide a robust basis on which to assess the impacts of development. However, at the time of the Stage 2 consultation the programme of detailed species survey work was still on-going and, consequently, the full results could not be incorporated into the Stage 2 consultation documentation.
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Details are given in 3.10.63 to 3.10.66 of on passage and wintering bird surveys conducted between August 2009 and March 2010. The results are summarised in Table 3.10.6, but the full report of the results is not appended;	89259-636-2216	/			Since the Stage 2 consultation, the full results of the baseline surveys completed in 2010 (including an extended Phase 1 habitat survey in September 2010) have been incorporated into the <b>Chapter 14, Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement</b> , which now presents a robust baseline on which to draw conclusions in the assessment. Furthermore, since the scheme ecologists have played an integral role in the iterative process of scheme design, it has been possible to ensure that the implications of the baseline results, including those received during or after the Stage 2 consultations, have been fully addressed in the final design proposals.
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- A summary of an investigation of watercourses on the preferred route is provided in paragraphs 3.10.117 to 3.10.120. Some plant species are listed in the text but no mention is made of invertebrates. It should be pointed out that the western route option involves crossing far fewer watercourses than would a route corridor to the east of Cannington.	89259-636-2632	/			An updated assessment of the impacts that may arise (if the overall proposals are approved) from cumulative interaction with other developments on terrestrial ecology and ornithology, including on bats, is presented in <b>Volume 11 of the Environmental Statement</b> .
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	A number of UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Priority Habitats occur within the terrestrial habitats represented in the vicinity of the proposed western bypass route. Their distribution and occurrence is reflected partially in the land that has been designated for nature conservation purposes. However, there are examples of Priority Habitat outside of designated sites occurring in the proposed western route corridor shown in Figure 3.10.1. These include Hedgerows and Ponds and, possibly, Arable Field Margins. The occurrence locally of Hedgerows and Ponds Priority Habitats is acknowledged in Table 3.10.7. The occurrence of margins that conform to the BAP Priority Habitat 'Arable Field Margins' is not mentioned.  There are a few hundred species listed on the UK BAP website as UK Priority Species. Many of these will occur in the area around Cannington.	89259-636-6603	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			<p>The great majority of the terrestrial species likely to occur in the area will be listed on the Somerset Priority Species List (SBP 2010). The Ecological Impact Analysis (EclA) does make use of data obtained from SERC, but it is not clear whether SerC was asked for any species data other than that concerning legally protected species. It is possible that data has not been obtained concerning those Priority Species without statutory protection.</p> <p>A number of terrestrial species are legally protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2010 and other legislation. The protected species that it is thought most likely to occur within the preferred route corridor have been identified within the EclA in Table 3.10.7.</p>					
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>3.11 Scoping - Adequacy in terms of identification of information needed to establish environmental baseline</p> <p>Paragraphs 3.10.47 to 3.10.92 outline the various sources of information being used to establish baseline conditions. As mentioned above (see 3.1 &amp; 3.2), more data should have been requested from SERC regarding UK BAP and LBAP Priority Species. In terms of survey work, SCC notes that paragraph 3.10.91 provides a summary of further surveys to be undertaken.</p> <p>3.12 Recommended additions</p> <p>A future iteration of the EclA should make use of the information gathered from the further surveys to refine the baseline. The majority of the surveys that are listed in paragraph 3.10.91 are scheduled to be completed by the end of the summer in 2010.</p> <p>4.0 Adequacy of information used to establish the environmental baseline</p> <p>The appraisal of impacts on terrestrial ecology has been carried out using information gathered from existing sources and from specially commissioned ecological surveys. It is acknowledged that there is a significant amount of survey work to be completed and that this has implications for the evaluation of some likely receptors (see, for example, comments in table 3.10.7 concerning bats).</p>	89259-636-11131	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>Commuting activity of bat populations is not sufficiently understood within the baseline to make an assessment on whether the HPC Main Site and Cannington bypass would have an interaction of cumulative effect. Similarly, there is insufficient information at present to qualify the potential effects of the NG connection on these bat populations.</p>	89353-636-9615	/			
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 approach for the assessment does follow best practice guidance (IEEM 2006) and lists the appropriate legislation and policy framework. The baseline data collection is also comprehensive. The assessment criteria and valuation of receptors follows the IEEM best practice guidance in assigning 'importance' and the scale of temporary effects is defined. The criteria used to define the magnitude of effects and the overall significance approach also follows best practice guidance.</p>	89371-636-1165			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The species grouping (Labelled 'Protected Species' - which is too narrow a description) is generally consistent with the valuations used for the well surveyed Development Site.	89371-636-1808			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment recognises that a series of baseline surveys still need to be completed. In addition to the reptile and amphibian surveys; further work is needed to confirm commuting/foraging routes for bats and the status of kingfishers on the crossed watercourse.	89371-636-2410	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Commuting activity of bat populations is not sufficiently understood within the baseline to make an assessment on whether the HPC main site, the Cannington bypass and the Park & Ride would have an interaction of cumulative effect. Similarly, there is insufficient information at present to qualify the potential effects of the NG connection on these bat populations.	89377-636-5666	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Commuting activity of bat populations is not sufficiently understood within the baseline to make an assessment on whether the HPC main site and Cannington bypass would have potential to interact with the Combwich Wharf activities. Similarly, there is insufficient information at present to qualify the potential effects of the NG connection on these bat populations.	89382-636-6650	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Commuting activity of bat populations is not sufficiently understood within the baseline to make an assessment on whether the HPC main site and Cannington bypass would have potential to interact with the Combwich Wharf activities. Similarly, there is insufficient information at present to qualify the potential effects of the NG connection on these bat populations.	89390-636-15217	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Ecology: Commuting activity of bat populations is not sufficiently understood within the baseline to make an assessment on whether the components of the overall project, such as the Hinkley Point C main site, Cannington Park & Ride and Cannington bypass would have a combined cumulative effect.	89409-636-17720	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Council Response	(Sedgemoor)		Similarly, there is insufficient information at present to qualify the potential effects of the National Grid connection on these bat populations.					
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	<p>2.3.13 The proposals for the preferred alignment of the Cannington Bypass from the existing roundabout on the A39 Southern Bypass to Rodway Road (C182) remain unchanged but the proposals now include a number of measures to address previous concerns regarding pedestrians, noise and ecology.</p> <p>2.3.14 In terms of flood risk, the proposed route is currently a green field site and lies within Flood Zone 1.</p>	89865-636-11249			/	



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>Terrestrial Flora and Fauna</p> <p>The assessment of impacts on hedgerows is considered to be insufficiently detailed at the present time. In addition to recording the number of hedgerows affected, it will be necessary to estimate the length and ecological value of hedgerows that would need to be removed for each option. An assessment of the historical importance of all hedgerows affected will also need to be carried out to determine whether they are 'important' against historical criteria.</p>	88340-644-4642	/			<p>At the time of the Stage 2 consultation, the programme of detailed ecological survey work was still on-going and, consequently, the full results were not incorporated in the Stage 2 Environmental Appraisal.</p> <p>Since then, however, the full results of the survey programme have been incorporated into the <b>Terrestrial Ecology and Ornithology Chapter (Chapter 14, Volume 5) of the Environmental Statement</b>, which has been submitted with this application for development consent and also been updated to address comments made during the consultation process in relation to assessment of hedgerows. As such, the chapter presents a robust baseline on which to draw conclusions in the impact assessment, including in relation to the valuation of receptors that may be affected by the development proposals.</p> <p>Information has been provided in support of a Habitats Regulations Assessment (and accompanies the application for development consent), and Natural England has been consulted in relation to the European Protected Species derogation licence that would be required for the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed in respect to great crested newts.</p>
Natural England	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>The results of 2010 surveys is needed to fully assess the potential impacts on the ecological resource in the vicinity of the proposed bypass and to establish an appropriate mitigation strategy. * a licence may be required. A Habitat Regulation Assessment (HRA) will be required to assess the impacts upon the International Sites in the vicinity.</p>	89112-644-972	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>5.0 Adequacy of consultations - are they complete and reflective of groups expected?</p> <p>The proponents of the development have held a number of consultation meetings with Natural England and have met twice with representatives of SCC as summarised in Table 3.10.3. In addition they have approached a number of organisations for data and these are listed in paragraph 3.10.48. However, it is not clear from this paragraph whether the organisations have been asked for their views regarding the proposed development.</p> <p>5.1 Recommended additions to consultee list</p> <p>All the organisations listed in paragraph 5.10.48., if their views have not been sought.</p>	89259-644-12410	/			

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 ecological appraisal of the impacts of the whole development package (i.e. power station plus all associated development) is done in a piecemeal fashion without due and proper consideration of 'in combination' and 'cumulative' effects.	89257-639-7542	/			The full results of the baseline survey programme provide a robust basis on which to assess the likely impacts of the proposed development, including those that may arise from cumulative interaction with other developments. An updated assessment of cumulative impacts on terrestrial ecology and ornithology receptors, including bats, is presented in <b>Volume 11 of the Environmental Statement</b> . A <b>Habitats Regulations Assessment</b> has also been produced.
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Sections considering whether significant impacts on SPA/SAC/Ramsar features are likely to arise due to the interaction of development of the Bypass along with other associated development at Cannington and at other locations.	89259-639-15041	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Commuting activity of bat populations is not sufficiently understood within the baseline to make an assessment on whether the HPC main site and Cannington bypass would have an interaction of cumulative effect.	89371-639-3523	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There is no consideration of the impacts of increased traffic from the cumulative projects	89371-639-3874	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The development on this site and the adjacent proposals do have some potential to interact. Commuting activity of bat populations is not sufficiently understood within the baseline to make an assessment on whether the HPC main site and Cannington bypass would have potential to interact with the Combrich Wharf activities. Similarly, there is insufficient information at present to qualify the potential effects of the NG connection on these bat populations.	89405-639-14120	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Eastern route option	88830-638-296	/			<p>Subsequent to the Stage 1 consultation, the eastern bypass route option was discounted for the reasons identified in <b>Chapter 6 of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement</b>.</p> <p>At the time of the Stage 2 consultation, the programme of detailed survey work was still on-going and, consequently, the full results could not be incorporated into the Stage 2 consultation documentation. Since then, the full results of the survey programme have been incorporated into the <b>Chapter 14, Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (ES)</b>, which presents a robust baseline on which to draw conclusions in the impact assessment, including the valuation of receptors that may be affected by the development proposals. The methodology for, and presentation of, the assessment of impacts has also been further developed since the Stage 2 consultation. Moreover, as the scheme ecologists have played an integral role in every stage of the iterative scheme design process, potential impacts have been avoided through design where reasonably achievable.</p> <p>An updated assessment of the impacts that may arise from cumulative interaction with other developments on terrestrial ecology and ornithology receptors, including bats and other protected species, is presented in <b>Volume 11 of the Environmental Statement</b>.</p>
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Biodiversity Biodiversity will need to be considered as this option has a variety of potential impacts. The bypass would pass over a number of small watercourses, including the Cannington Brook, which is a County Wildlife Site designated for legally protected species. The bypass would also pass within close proximity of the Severn Estuary SPA and SAC and Pawlett Hams section of Bridgwater Bay SSSI, all noted for protected bird species. As the eastern bypass proposal will be 2km longer than the western bypass, it will have a greater impact on local biodiversity.	88830-638-1097	/			
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Biodiversity The Western inner bypass would have less impacts to biodiversity as it would cut through the least amount of ditches and hedgerows. It would also be a good distance away from any protected habitat sites.	88830-638-2766			/	
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	Terrestrial Flora and Fauna The assessment of impacts on hedgerows is considered to be insufficiently detailed at the present time. In addition to recording the number of hedgerows affected, it will be necessary to estimate the length and ecological value of hedgerows that would need to be removed for each option. An assessment of the historical importance of all hedgerows affected will also need to be carried out to determine whether they are 'important' against historical criteria.	88340-638-4642	/			
Somerset Wildlife Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	From the initial information on survey results presented in the consultation document, it appears that the western bypass offers the least by way of ecological constraints: less disruption to ecological corridors is predicted with this route, and it would keep traffic further away from protected sites. However, further survey work will be needed to establish whether this is in fact the case.	8769-638-10701	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62237	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	Consideration must be given to the wildlife and water fowl that inhabits these hedges and nearby ponds. The introduction of heavy machinery and increase in traffic can only cause a detrimental effect to their current natural environment.	8780-638-2494			/	
Tractivity 1158	Public	Stage 2	13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Noise, visual and environmental mitigation for the Cannington by-pass is totally inadequate.	9916-638-6608	/			
Tractivity 212	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: East of the village 5. Please give reasons for your preference Less impact on residential areas Western route could entail the removal of a vast amount of newly planted trees which if left to mature will benefit local wildlife and help to reduce global warming.	8917-638-1066			/	
Tractivity 370	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference The east road crosses natural wetland with dykes, because of this the road will be longer & built up. This will disrupt natural habitat & we may lose some wildlife. The road would be in a very open area so that noise levels would not be absorbed. This would cause a constant drone of traffic for the villages	9057-638-1136	/			
Tractivity 543	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference I don't see the need to bring anything at all through the village. Therefore a bypass at either side is not necessary. Wherever you propose we be problems. What about all public footpaths etc that these roads will go right through? The wildlife you will be disturbing? One of your proposals goes through a nature reserve!	9212-638-958			/	
Tractivity 62569	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Will life habitat will be destroyed and crime may increase.	10121-638-550			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Please put the road in a cutting so it is environmentally friendly, not an eye sore and the bats will fly at a safe height - you won't need the bat tree alley. A fence of trees will not screen high sided vehicles.	10124-638-9407			/	
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	There are serious concerns that there will be a build up of toxic and concentrated waste in the balancing pool, which will eventually find its way into the water course killing flora and fauna.	10242-638-7611			/	
Natural England	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Eight bat species were identified in 2009 including the rare barbastelle: The loss of hedgerows will impact upon their navigation and foraging. Lighting will be an issue for some bat species.	89112-638-730	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	It is stated that the route has been chosen in order to minimise the impact of the development upon ecology. This needs to be justified.	89202-638-1207	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	11.1 Key Risks All ecological surveys required to inform baseline may not be done in time for the information to be considered properly in the decision making process;	89257-638-7366	/			

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	Sections that specifically identify and assess potential impacts on UK and Somerset BAP Priority Species not addressed as legally protected species.	89258-638-8085	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Sections that deal with potential impacts upon margins (if any) that correspond to Arable Field Margins Priority Habitat. (Clarification is needed regarding whether any of the field margins in the route corridor might be this habitat); Sections that specifically identify and assess potential impacts on UK and Somerset BAP Priority Species not addressed as legally protected species;	89259-638-8402	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	3.6 Recommended additions Expanded sections examining possible impacts upon each receptor in detail.	89259-638-10090	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	3.8 Recommended additions Text explaining the basis of the estimates of the zone of influence for each type of potential impact and receptor.	89259-638-10457	/			

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	<p>6.1 Recommended additions</p> <p>An indication in Table 3.10.8 of those impact assessments that may be affected by the results of survey work that is underway or yet to be reported and analysed.</p> <p>7.0 Assessment of impacts - is the judgement based on evidence. Is the predicted change and significance evaluation appropriate?</p> <p>As is noted above, some of the impact assessments that have been presented must be regarded as preliminary assessments the validity of which is to be confirmed once more survey data has been collected and analysed. Table 3.10.8, in which many of the assessments are presented provides only a cursory explanation in many instances about how judgements have been reached, so it is difficult to comment on the robustness of the overall assessment. In addition, there is a lack of detail concerning the precise mitigation that will be employed to minimise some impacts.</p>	89259-638-14062	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Commuting activity of bat populations is not sufficiently understood within the baseline to make an assessment on whether the HPC main site and Cannington bypass would have an interaction of cumulative effect.	89371-638-3523	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	there is insufficient information at present to qualify the potential effects of the NG connection on these bat populations.	89371-638-3746	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Off peak traffic on rural roads will increase and this is likely to have an impact on vulnerable animal species (barn owls, amphibian species such as newts and toads, plus bats)	89371-638-4048			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	re is no consideration of them in the current assessment even though they are recorded at the development site.	89371-638-4322	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The lack of surveys for the associated development means a clear picture of the distribution in the vicinity is unclear. However, they are likely to use a limited number of breeding sites which they migrate to, often across rural roads. These potential effects should be assessed, and where effects are predicted mitigation should be provided.	89371-638-4434	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The development on this site and the adjacent proposals do have some potential to interact. Commuting activity of bat populations is not sufficiently understood within the baseline to make an assessment on whether the HPC main site and Cannington bypass would have potential to interact with the Combwich Wharf activities. Similarly, there is insufficient information at present to qualify the potential effects of the NG connection on these bat populations.	89398-638-12949	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The development on this site and the adjacent proposals do have some potential to interact. Commuting activity of bat populations is not sufficiently understood within the baseline to make an assessment on whether the HPC main site and Cannington bypass would have potential to interact with the Combwich Wharf activities. Similarly, there is insufficient information at present to qualify the potential effects of the NG connection on these bat populations.	89405-638-14120	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Given the concerns described above, we consider that during the short-term, site clearance and construction would result in damage to ecosystem networks which would not be re-established until maturity of ecological mitigation measures in the medium term. Similarly, during operation of the site, it may be argued that proposals for site restoration would not result in significantly exceeding the objective, as has been concluded in this section. Based on current land-restoration plans and aspirations, while it may be expected that ecological networks may become re-established, there is little evidence to provide confidence that these networks would be better than those hedgerows and other networks currently at the site. Ecological corridors severed by the Cannington Bypass would permanently lose their function.	89411-142-17206			/	



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 63094	Public	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	Your W. bypass suggestion is messy, disturbing countryside, its inhabitants and will do nothing to help this road.	90060-638-349			/	

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 1	The ecological impacts that seem likely appear mostly to have been anticipated and surveys planned in order to collect sufficient data to allow EIA and possible appropriate assessment. EDF has recognised that some of the land that could be affected might support wintering birds from the Severn Estuary SPA and have made provision for wintering bird surveys. These bird surveys will be completed in March 2010 according to the Report. The eastern route in particular will cross many ditches and although these have been surveyed for legally protected Water Voles, no general survey appears to have been conducted to identify whether any are important botanically or in terms of their invertebrate faunae. There are examples of ditch systems in the area that are known to be of at least county significance for these features.	87980-637-34	/			<p>Subsequent to the Stage 1 consultation, the eastern bypass route option was discounted. Information on the reasons for route selection is provided in <b>Chapter 6, Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement</b>.</p> <p>At the time of the Stage 2 consultation, the programme of detailed survey work was still on-going and, consequently, the full results could not be incorporated into the Stage 2 consultation documentation. The design of the scheme and the assessment of impacts at this stage were therefore presented on a precautionary basis. Since then, the full results of the survey programme have been incorporated into the updated Environmental Statement chapter, which now presents a robust baseline on which to draw conclusions in the impact assessment, including the valuation of receptors that may be affected by the development proposals. The methodology for, and presentation of, the assessment of impacts has also been further developed since the Stage 2 consultation and, as the scheme ecologists have played an integral role in every stage of the iterative scheme design process, potential impacts have been avoided through design where reasonably achievable.</p>
Somerset Wildlife Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	From the initial information on survey results presented in the consultation document, it appears that the western bypass offers the least by way of ecological constraints: less disruption to ecological corridors is predicted with this route, and it would keep traffic further away from protected sites. However, further survey work will be needed to establish whether this is in fact the case.	8769-637-10701	/			
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Issue: Design proposals fail to take into account biodiversity factors.	89085-637-1106	/			
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Action: Proposals will need to clearly demonstrate how ecology is factored into development proposals	89085-637-1888	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	"The ecological impacts that seem likely appear mostly to have been anticipated and surveys planned in order to collect sufficient data to allow EIA and possible appropriate assessment. EDF has recognised that some of the land that could be affected might support wintering birds from the Severn Estuary SPA and have made provision for wintering bird surveys. These bird surveys will be completed in March 2010 according to the Report. The eastern route in particular will cross many ditches and although these have been surveyed for legally protected Water Voles, no general survey appears to have been conducted to identify whether any are important botanically or in terms of their invertebrate faunae. There are examples of ditch systems in the area that are known to be of at least county significance for these features."	89259-637-1010	/			

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 analysis of section 3.10 is based on a comparison of its contents with the best practice guidance summarised above.	89259-637-4894			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The County Council's specialist ecological advisers recommend the following additions to section 3.10:	89259-637-8294			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	3.3 Adequacy of Scoping in terms of identification of relevant policy and legislative issues  Paragraphs 3.10.4 to 3.10.40 inclusive identify the main sources of legislative and policy issues that are pertinent to this development. However much of the detailed discussion of the subject matter in these paragraphs addresses issues of limited relevance to the specific development under consideration.	89259-637-8788	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	3.7 Scoping - Adequacy in terms of identification of notional zone of influence  The notional zone of influence is not explicitly defined in this section. Figures show the areas surveyed for various species and habitats in relation to the route corridor.	89259-637-10197	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	3.9 Scoping – Adequacy in terms of identification of trends likely to affect terrestrial ecology in the absence of the development  Section 3.10 appears to assume that the terrestrial environment around Cannington will remain broadly the same between the present time and the point when the development takes place.	89259-637-10605			/	

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	4.1 Recommended additions See 3.12 above.	89259-637-12362			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	6.0 Evaluation of value of potential receptors The IEEM's EclA Guidelines propose an approach to valuing features "that involves professional judgement based on available guidance and information, together with advice from experts who know the locality of the project and/or the distribution and status of the species or features that are being considered." Table 3.10.1 outlines the criteria to be used to evaluate ecological receptors. Apart from the use of terms such as 'parish' and 'district' that ought to be avoided in case they cause confusion, the criteria seem reasonably fair. The way that the criteria are applied does give some cause for concern, however, particularly in the light of the fact that a significant number of surveys have yet to be completed. Some of the statements made in Table 3.10.8 (which deal with the final assessment of impacts), might benefit from being qualified by words to the effect that the conclusions are provisional pending more survey work.	89259-637-13067	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	7.1 Recommended additions More information on how assessments have been made;	89259-637-14957	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	According to the IEEM: "Scoping is the process of determining the content and extent of matters that should be covered in the environmental information to be submitted to a competent authority or other decision making body". The scope of the section on Ecology is analysed below in terms of its coverage of the issues that SCC has identified in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Biodiversity resources known to occur in the Development Site and the surrounding area (designated sites, habitats and species);</li> <li>▪ Relevant legislation and policy;</li> <li>▪ Aspects of the development likely to affect the biodiversity resources alone or in combination with other activities</li> <li>▪ Identification of notional zone of influence of different impacting activities</li> <li>▪ Identification of trends likely to affect ecology in the absence of the development</li> <li>▪ The studies - e.g. surveys, literature searches - needed to inform the ecological baseline.</li> </ul>	89260-637-5356			/	

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	3.1 Scoping - Adequacy of scope in relation to known biodiversity resources of the Development Site and surroundings	89260-637-6284			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	It is not clear how the route selection process was made between the three routes and what the ecological input was into this decision. There is no direct evidence to suggest this is the route with the least ecological effects. More clarity on route selection process and balance of potential impacts on different aspects needs to be provided to justify the selection of the preferred option.	89371-637-231	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The valuation on the various species groups should be clearly indicated as provisional, subject to the surveys still to be completed.	89371-637-1674	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There is no direct evidence to suggest this is the route with the least ecological effects. More clarity on route selection process and balance of potential impacts on different aspects needs to be providing to justify the selection of the preferred option.	89426-637-8389	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The valuation on the various species groups should be clearly indicated as provisional, subject to the surveys still to be completed.	89426-637-8937	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Further work is needed to confirm commuting/foraging routes for bats and the status of kingfishers on the crossed watercourse.	89426-637-9320	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Within each development enhanced biodiversity measures/ green infrastructure should be incorporated where practicable. Among other benefits this will enhance the environment in which the local community live in and provide a valuable resource to local residence. This is also in line with Sedgemoors Core Strategy preferred option Policy DW12 which includes the requirements for developers to protect and enhance the natural environment.	88830-640-26395	/			<p>The full results of the survey programme have been incorporated into the updated version of <b>Chapter 14 of Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement (ES)</b>. The ES now presents a robust baseline on which to draw conclusions in the impact assessment and, where necessary, define mitigation measures in respect to unavoidable ecological impacts.</p> <p>Since the Stage 2 consultation, the design of the habitat creation proposals has been further developed and an outline ecological mitigation and a habitat management plan has been prepared and is included in the ES.</p> <p>Natural England has been consulted on the European Protected Species derogation licence that would be required (if the overall proposals were approved) for the implementation of the mitigation measures proposed in respect to great crested newts.</p>
Tractivity 874	Public	Stage 2	The North route would resolve all but the health concerns. As for the environmental concerns using this route, which is more important, the human or the wildlife environment? You say you will restore any environmental damage at the end of the project.	9632-640-8861			/	
Tractivity 1076	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? There is still going to be a major environmental impact and there is still insufficient mitigation being put in place to reduce this impact.	9834-640-4141	/			
Tractivity 62573	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Please put the road in a cutting so it is environmentally friendly, not an eye sore and the bats will fly at a safe height - you won't need the bat tree alley. A fence of trees will not screen high sided vehicles.	10124-640-9407			/	
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	3.10.141 - The use of a culvert bridge needs to be reviewed. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges clearly points out that culverts are not suitable where otters occur unless they are oversized and provided on both sides with ledges. Otters frequent almost all suitable habitats in Somerset and the likelihood of otters using this site is acknowledged in para 3.10.148. A clear span bridge which allowed for otter passage along top of bank on both sides would be acceptable. As it is likely that this road will take considerable traffic we would also expect to see proposals for mammal passes which could be used by a variety of species. These are easy to provide in new build and complex to retrofit.	89085-640-1181			/	
Natural England	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	NE welcomes the retaining of important hedgerows.	89112-640-922			/	

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	<p>8.0 Mitigation - are mitigation measures consistent with addressing the impact - to what extent are they complete and deliverable?</p> <p>Generic mitigation measures are proposed in Table 3.10.8, but, as indicated above, it is difficult to judge their potential effectiveness and deliverability given a lack of detail concerning the precise nature of some of the measures. Also, since a significant number of ecological surveys are to be completed/reported upon in relation to the Cannington area, it is possible that there are potential impacts that are yet to be appreciated and for which mitigation will be required.</p> <p>The Masterplan for Cannington Bypass provides a level of detail concerning physical mitigation that is lacking from some of the other documents about the development proposals. The Masterplan includes a road section by road section presentation of the mitigation measures that it is proposed to put in place in connection with ecology. The proposals include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Bat crossings/hop over points at least five locations;</li> <li>▪ Tunnels combined with fencing to ensure safe routes are provided beneath the road for Badgers and "other wildlife";</li> <li>▪ An Otter ledge within the culverting to be provided for the Mill Stream;</li> <li>▪ Balancing ponds with associated landscaping;</li> <li>▪ Planting &amp; other habitat creation.</li> </ul> <p>There is not space here to discuss the appropriateness of each measure in relation to its role in the mitigation package or to assess its likely effectiveness. Such a discussion is best left in any case until after all ecological surveys have been completed and their results fed into the EclA process (including mitigation design).</p> <p>For now, SCC would confine its comments to making a few general points concerning the overall thrust of the mitigation being suggested.</p> <p>It will be important to ensure, where possible, that mitigation measures do not conflict with other objectives (such as landscape) and, therefore, proposals involving very visible planting and fencing, for example, will need to be considered carefully</p> <p>Lighting schemes will need to be designed with care in order that, where possible given the constraints of road safety, they do not deter light averse species from using features designed for their use;</p> <p>There needs to be discussion around whether the bat 'hop over' features are the best mitigation achievable in the locations where they are proposed. Experience on some Welsh road schemes tends to suggest that underpasses for some species (like Lesser Horseshoe Bats) might provide a better solution to the challenge of discouraging the bats from flying into traffic than does fencing and/or provision of 'hop overs'.</p> <p>8.1 Recommended additions</p> <p>More information about the mitigation measures to be employed.</p> <p>9.0 Residual effects - are the residual effects appropriately defined - are they a fair reflection of effect post mitigation - is the residual effect still significant</p> <p>For reasons given above, it is not possible for the County Council to agree at this stage with the proponent's conclusion that residual effects will be 'minor' or 'negligible' in most cases.</p>	89259-640-15270	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The incorporation of underpasses for animals is supported;	89366-640-9145			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The mitigation measures proposed to address loss and fragmentation of stewardship areas need to be further developed to take into account ecological effects.	89368-640-12621	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	A range of protected species surveys are still ongoing and it is not clear how these surveys will influence the alignment of the bypass which is already at an advanced stage. Mitigation would need to be incorporated for impacts that cannot be designed out late on in the process.	89371-640-860	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Mitigation measures such as the provision of the culverts and watercourse crossings, the bat hop-over and the planting plans should be provided as a firm commitment and with more detailed plans once the route is confirmed and designs finalised. The design information for these features should also be provided together where appropriate with other species crossing facilities.	89371-640-2009	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The legacy of the bypass from an ecological perspective is negative. The new road, even if built to the best standard and incorporating comprehensive mitigation and compensatory planting will continue to have fragmentation effects. Currently the mitigation proposed is not committed to firmly and will not completely address the impacts identified.	89371-640-2707	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The overall judgement of residual effects should be considered provisional until the surveys are completed for the site. The additional baseline data is unlikely to change the assessment significantly, unless a number of additional crossing points are identified for bats, reptiles or amphibians (toads and well as great crested newts).	89371-640-3059	/			



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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	No ecological information was presented during the Stage 1 consultations for the associated development sites and the baseline is still incomplete. A significant range of protected species surveys are still ongoing and it is not clear how these surveys will influence the design which is already at an advanced stage. Mitigation would need to be incorporated for impacts that cannot be designed out late on in the process.	89426-640-7571	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	A range of protected species surveys are still ongoing and it is not clear how these surveys will influence the alignment of the bypass which is already at an advanced stage. Mitigation would need to be incorporated for impacts that cannot be designed out late on in the process.	89426-640-8652	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Mitigation measures such as the provision of the culverts and watercourse crossings, the bat hop-over and the planting plans should be provided as a firm commitment and with more detailed plans once route is confirmed and designs finalised.	89426-640-9076	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The legacy of the bypass from an ecological perspective is negative. The new road, even if built to the best standard and incorporating comprehensive mitigation and compensatory planting will continue to have fragmentation effects. Currently the mitigation proposed is not committed to firmly and will not completely address the impacts identified.	89426-640-9454	/			
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	'An underpass for badgers, together with an ecologically friendly pond, will be built on the northern part of the bypass.' Alterations to reduce ecological impacts and provide enhancements are support in principle, subject to the provision of an environmental assessment demonstrating that the proposals are adequate and appropriate.	89896-640-5816			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	'The route has been slightly realigned to allow retention of the existing pond, trees and other landscaping features.' Alterations to reduce ecological impacts and provide enhancements are support in principle, subject to the provision of an environmental assessment demonstrating that the proposals are adequate and appropriate.	89896-640-6155			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Compensation is proposed as mitigation for temporary loss of land in agricultural stewardship schemes to reduce the Moderate Adverse effect to Minor Adverse, along with management of the riparian habitat. However this does not fully address the ecological aspects. These should be considered in the ecological section, and possible enhancements considered. These areas of mitigation should be developed further and given as a firm commitment.	89368-631-11425	/			

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 1	The ecological impacts that seem likely appear mostly to have been anticipated and surveys planned in order to collect sufficient data to allow EIA and possible appropriate assessment. EDF has recognised that some of the land that could be affected might support wintering birds from the Severn Estuary SPA and have made provision for wintering bird surveys. These bird surveys will be completed in March 2010 according to the Report. The eastern route in particular will cross many ditches and although these have been surveyed for legally protected Water Voles, no general survey appears to have been conducted to identify whether any are important botanically or in terms of their invertebrate faunae. There are examples of ditch systems in the area that are known to be of at least county significance for these features.	87980-641-34	/			The proposals for habitat enhancement have been progressed since the earlier stages of consultation. Proposals for monitoring the impacts will be set out in monitoring procedures and controls.
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	10.0 Adequacy of Monitoring Proposals An Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (EMMP) is submitted as Appendix 1.1.1 to Chapter 1 of Volume 3 of the Environmental Appraisal. This is a very generic document and it contains no specific proposals are for monitoring the impact on terrestrial ecology of the development (with mitigation measures in place).	89257-641-6471	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	A firm commitment to monitoring has not been incorporated into the assessment. Our evaluation is that monitoring should include:	89371-641-4802	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Bat activity monitoring during construction and operational phases and in particular usage of the mitigation provided (hop-over and underpass); and	89371-641-4935			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	In the absence of further crossing point mitigation - operational phase early morning mortality monitoring for bats, other mammals, birds and herpetofauna.	89371-641-5088			/	

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	A firm commitment to monitoring has not been incorporated into the assessment, but is required.	89426-641-9806	/			

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 & Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Traffic modelling evidence has not been provided to support the need, or preferred option, for the Cannington Bypass; this must be provided in order for the Authority to comment. Clarification is sought as to what method was used to conclude these statements, and evidence that the same methodology has been applied to the Bridgwater Bypass consistently.	87940-573-1349	/			<p>Consultees expressed a preference for a bypass of Cannington at an early stage to mitigate the potential impacts of HPC traffic; in particular the increase in HGV's and buses.</p> <p>EDF Energy undertook baseline surveys of the existing road network in and around Cannington and Bridgwater to determine the existing highway capacity and the environmental conditions such as, noise and air quality. These surveys enabled testing of future HPC impacts and the requirement for mitigation measures such as a Cannington Bypass. Further details of the methodology and assessment of impacts are contained within the <b>Transport Assessment</b>.</p>
Tractivity 870	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? But: Levels of traffic anticipated cannot be accommodated within existing road capacity. A western bypass for Cannington is the best option but this would not be completed before work begins on the powerstation. This is unacceptable. Work should not start on the powerstation until the bypass has been built.	9628-573-2557		/		
Tractivity 889	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Have EDF considered that upwards of 40 horses use the road between Cannington and Stogursey, mainly because there is no alternative.	9647-573-3166	/			
Tractivity 990	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? The Bridgwater to Cannington road has had a number of accidents in the past that has gridlocked the entire area for hours. The road is poor, the traffic is bad enough already and having a bypass at Cannington won't change this. As a resident of Cannington that lives near the proposed bypass I am very unhappy that having waited years to move to a village and being assured that the house was on the edge of green belt land we are now going to have to put up with having a road constructed, our view spoilt and a house that will be difficult to sell while this is going on. If you must have a bypass put it further away from the village.	9748-573-2556		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1159	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. What are your views on the proposed arrangement and landscaping of the Hinkley Point C site? Box ticked: Unsatisfactory</p> <p>1. Any other ideas or comments? an inappropriate site for such a large project.</p> <p>2. We have reduced the amount of land to be used during construction in the southern part of the site in response to concerns from local residents. What are your views on this proposal? Box ticked: Unsatisfactory</p> <p>2. Any other ideas or comments? it is still completely inappropriate and large and invasive to the local community.</p> <p>3. In order to speed up the process of building the new power station, and enable us to finish work earlier, we intend to apply this summer to undertake preliminary works to prepare the main site and build a temporary jetty for the delivery of bulk materials. If permission for the power station is not obtained, we will be required to reinstate this land.</p> <p>What are your views on our plans for Preliminary Works? Box ticked: Unsatisfactory</p> <p>3. Any other ideas or comments? there should be no preliminary works.</p>	9917-573-0			/	
Tractivity 1167	Public	Stage 2	<p>6. Any other ideas or comments? The congestion will occur on A39 long before traffic gets to Cannington. So a new road will only be required to ease congestion in Cannington - limited use. What happens to the new road once work is completed.</p>	9925-573-3404		/		
Tractivity 1175	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	<p>6. Any other ideas or comments? Severe congestion already exists in the area.</p>	9933-573-3715			/	
Tractivity 1211	Public	Stage 2	<p>6. Any other ideas or comments? As a past parent of Brymore boys this will affect the school educationally - the farm will suffer and the present and future boys - they will be isolated from the local community. Health and safety on the road - No island for people to cross the road to get to pavement only Toucan Crossing. From Rodway no island to cross to other pavement. The underpass not safe - very damp and wet and don't mix cows with badgers.</p>	9969-573-2558		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 270	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference I think that a bypass is needed, but can not make a judgment on east or west of the village. On the day of the visit there was a lot of traffic on the road- it was noisy and congested.	8959-573-1229			/	
Tractivity 62568	Public	Stage 2	The original plans for this route for a bypass were proposed many years ago when traffic was far lighter than it is today, present lorry size and weight were not in existence and there were far less housing developments in the area.	10120-573-963			/	
Tractivity 62575	Public	Stage 2	For traffic to use the Cannington West Bypass it will need to use the A39 trunk road and will have to be routed around the village of Cannington.  Cannington is a large village with 2,500 residents and has a large youth and daytime student population, it being the home of the Cannington Campus of Bridgwater College, also of Brymore (agricultural boarding) School and a Primary School adjacent to the main road through the village.	10126-573-454			/	
RAC Foundation	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The Foundation welcomes EDFE's intention to fund this proposed new road, but would suggest that a 40 mph main road represents poor value for money for road users, as the one major road investment so far proposed to emerge as a legacy from the EDF project.	10267-573-4827			/	
RAC Foundation	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The proposal to signpost incoming traffic to villages off C182 to the north via the new by-pass may fail if this new way route is both slow and much longer.	10267-573-13787			/	
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	2.32 Details within the Transport Appraisal relating to the two options (Cannington West Bypass and Bridgwater Bypass) are extremely limited. It is requested that additional detail regarding the option schemes is included in a Future Year Model Development report.	89179-573-275	/			
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Spot checks have revealed that some values used in the Chapter 10 tables do not match the backing spreadsheets. It appears that many of the values presented as 'Without Cannington Bypass' AAWT have been populated with 'With Cannington Bypass' figures (e.g. Link codes V2, V3, ST3, ST4, I2).	89179-573-4227	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	2.50 The bypass study is extremely 'high level' and lacks sufficient detail in order to justify the need, or otherwise, for the respective Cannington and Bridgwater bypass proposals. The County Council expected a detailed quantitative assessment of road network capacities, to provide greater insight into the impact of the development trips on the road network (e.g. flows / capacity / delay / queues / journey times).	89223-573-3230	/			

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 report sets out a detailed description of the existing road network; however, there is insufficient detail regarding the performance of the network, in particular within Cannington and Bridgwater. A more thorough examination of the issues and opportunities would provide a better context for the appraisal process.	89231-573-56	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The appraisal focuses solely on vehicle trips. Given the predominance of HGV, LGV and Passenger Service Vehicle (PSV) movements within the 'Peak Construction Year' scenario it would be more informative to present the relative proportion of trips types along links.  3.103 Some quantitative analysis of road network capacities would, provide greater insight into the impact of the development trips on the road network (e.g. flows / capacity / delay / queues / journey times).	89231-573-902	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The traffic modelling results provide some useful insights into the impact of the two bypass schemes upon traffic flows; however, there are a number of obvious anomalies within the result presented. Whilst it is accepted that dynamic modelling will result in changes in base trip routings there are some large, unexplained changes in vehicle flows on certain links. More analysis should be presented to explain these changes, thus providing greater confidence in the model results.  3.107 The noise and air quality assessment should make specific reference to the high proportion of HGV, LGV and PSVs within the HPC trip generations and the implications this has for noise and air quality.	89231-573-2067	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The following option scenarios have been tested and compared to the '2016 'Do Minimum' base' model and the '2016 base + development' model:  1. 2016 Base + development with Cannington West bypass; and  2. 2016 Base + development with Bridgwater bypass.	89237-573-7811			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	concerned that no comprehensive network data or peak hour data has been provided In addition there is a concern that no information has been provided for the 2012 (preliminary works) or 2020 (operational phase) stages.	89367-573-216	/			



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62911	Public	Stage 2 Update	Cannington also has its own industrial traffic to cope with. We are surrounded with farms and have a grain store at one end of the village towards Hinkley Point involving the movement of many tractors and other farm vehicles all year; the quarry with many lorry movements during the day; a primary school together with the village hall situated on one of the narrowest main road routes; Brymore School which will be isolated by the proposed western bypass with its students walking down to the centre of the village as well as taking part in daily runs around the village; finally, Bridgwater College with its many students using many parts of the village across all the main road routes.	89663-573-2368			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	2.3.13 The proposals for the preferred alignment of the Cannington Bypass from the existing roundabout on the A39 Southern Bypass to Rodway Road (C182) remain unchanged but the proposals now include a number of measures to address previous concerns regarding pedestrians, noise and ecology.  2.3.14 In terms of flood risk, the proposed route is currently a green field site and lies within Flood Zone 1.	89865-573-11249			/	
Cannington Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	This Council asked in our response to Stage Two for a cutting to be constructed, which has not been acknowledged.	89748-437-4306	/			
Tractivity 448	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference  Road communications already established there. DON't use any more green fields for roads.	9126-434-1305			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	3.4.6 The response raises issues about the lack of a robust justification for the preferred Cannington By-pass route (the western route option). As a consequence the response states that "the authorities can reach no material conclusion on the preference for either route option presented in the Stage 1 consultation document and are unlikely to be able to reach a conclusion until the full justification has been provided."	88790-581-23241	/			<p>Some consultees requested that other villages in the area to the west of Cannington should be bypassed.</p> <p>However, as significant freight movements will not use the roads through these villages it is not considered that the impacts of the proposed HPC Project traffic would justify further significant interventions in these areas.</p> <p>For Cannington, three bypass options were considered as well as the reference case of a no bypass option. They were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cannington eastern route;</li> <li>▪ Cannington western route; and</li> <li>▪ Cannington outer western route.</li> </ul> <p>The responses to the consultation provided support for all three route alignments around Cannington. The <b>Environmental Statement</b> submitted as part of the application for the Development Consent Order details the rationale behind the chosen location of the western bypass. Detailed drawings of the route were shown within the Stage 2 Consultation documents. Modifications were made in light of comments received and the final alignment and detailed drawings were submitted as part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Following the completion of the Stage 1 consultation and further technical studies the preferred route for a bypass west of Cannington (Cannington western route) was identified. Many consultation responses argued that, rather than a bypass of Cannington alone, a larger bypass of northern Bridgwater and Cannington should be provided and argued that this should be the subject of a New Approach to Appraisal (NATA) assessment.</p> <p>NATA is the Department for Transport's approved framework for appraising transport schemes in England and considers the five topics of Economy, Safety, Environment, Accessibility and Integration. The rationale for not offering a Bridgwater bypass is discussed further in <b>Annex 4 to the Environmental Statement</b>. The Cannington bypass has been the subject of a full Environmental Impact Assessment and the rationale for route choice is contained in the <b>Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement</b>.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	4.7 The response raises issues about the lack of a robust justification for the preferred Cannington By-pass route (the western route option). As a consequence the response states that "the authorities can reach no material conclusion on the preference for either route option presented in the Stage 1 consultation document and are unlikely to be able to reach a conclusion until the full justification has been provided."	88890-581-25549	/			
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Bypass may not be the solution.	88900-581-12329			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	c) The Stage 1 consultation document indicates that EDF believe that a Bridgwater bypass is not required. Evidence to show that this bypass is not required should be provided. Also, a quantitative assessment of the likely impact on the Bridgwater Northern Distributor Road should be undertaken to assess the suitability of this road to carry Hinkley Point traffic. We have a particular concern about the potential HGV increase in this residential area, given that this road was not designed for Hinkley Point traffic.	87940-581-2216	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Clarification is sought as to what method was used to conclude these statements, and evidence that the same methodology has been applied to the Bridgwater Bypass consistently. Furthermore, traffic-related environment assessments to support the western option should be provided (e.g. evidence that the western option is likely to achieve a higher shift of traffic from the centre of Cannington than the eastern option) (Table 4.5).	88000-581-4380	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	1.66. The intention to undertake traffic assessments for the Cannington Bypass, in relation to highway capacity, in addition to environmental criteria such as severance, driver stress, visual intrusion, implications for pedestrian amenity, noise and vibration and air quality, is welcomed (p. 204). The wider transport impacts of the Cannington Bypass should also be considered (p. 218).	88030-581-898			/	
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	That the village has some sort of traffic calming measures in place to make this type of journey slower and more inconvenient for the drivers who persist with this form of commuting.	8746-581-5440	/			

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	This must be supported by a full transport and environmental assessment of the options.	88060-581-1977	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	In addition, the authorities consider that more detailed consultation is required with Sedgemoor District Council. Discussions are also required around potential long term sustainability benefits or impacts of the by-pass options including: a) Flood risk management for Cannington; b) High quality public transport proposals along the A39; c) Joint car parking and travel planning for EDF and Cannington College. d) Traffic management in the village centre	88060-581-2299	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	a) There is no transport justification presented for the 200 capacity accommodation campus and freight consolidation centre at Cannington South. Given the absence of a transport case for the Cannington South the transport and traffic management benefits of this location compared to other locations nearer to the strategic road network, (for example near to the M5 J23 or J24 at Bridgwater) are not understood.	88060-581-3088	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	Further information on the number, timing and type of anticipated traffic movements through Cannington should be presented so that the significance of environmental impacts in the centre of the village can be properly assessed. A full assessment of no bypass options is considered a necessary element of future consultation material. It is understood that further SATURN and PARAMICS modelling studies will assess no bypass scenarios.	88340-581-3444	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	It is understood that Cannington Parish Council have been consulted by EDF. The minutes of the October 2009 Parish Council meeting state that the public have concerns about the proposed routes and that a Dunball option would have been a preferred choice. Concern was expressed that the routes were not on display at the public meeting in the College Main Hall. The Minutes of the October 2009 Parish Council meeting identify that parking by students from Cannington College is a problem in the village. In addition to discussions between EDF and the College about residential requirements, car parking and travel planning may provide an additional area for collaboration. This should be explored in full in progressing to the Stage 2 Consultation Document.	88340-581-3882			/	
Tractivity 800	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Local residents should hold the best views on this	9558-581-3092			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 912	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Very good	9670-581-2587			/	
Tractivity 935	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? The new bypass needs to be constructed BEFORE work begins and A roads used as much as possible.	9693-581-3635		/		
Tractivity 944	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? EDF have already decided on this route	9702-581-2888			/	
Tractivity 1062	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Sizewell traffic went via Yoxford which seemed a bind at the time but is much better for the villages that are relieved by the bypass.	9820-581-3202			/	
Tractivity 1071	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? This should be a great boon to residents of Cannington. There needs to be a way to ensure that traffic bound for Bridgewater will use the bypass and not "rat race" through Cannington.	9829-581-3743		/		
Tractivity 1089	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? I have already said the bypass is not satisfactory.	9847-581-3351			/	
Tractivity 1153	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? A bypass in western Cannington will only be effective if the bulk of the traffic is coming from the Minehead direction. It is naive to believe that traffic from Bridgewater will circumnavigate Cannington to rejoin the C182 when it could simply drive into the centre and turn right. If, however, the intended park and ride buses from Williton were travelling via Cannington, this bypass would be essential.	9911-581-3857			/	
Tractivity 1159	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Absolutely not. new roads are rarely the answer. more tarmac, more green land being paved over forever.	9917-581-2892		/		
Tractivity 1176	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? I agree with the proposal for a western bypass for Cannington and trust it would be clearly signed to discourage construction traffic from taking a ?short-cut? through the village. Would it be possible to incorporate a 20 mph speed limit through the centre of Cannington?	9934-581-2949	/			
Tractivity 1178	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? I agree that a Western bypass of Cannington would be beneficial to the village. However I have concerns that the increased traffic volumes may not be easily accommodated by the already overcrowded Bridgewater road system. In addition I would suggest traffic calming and weight restriction measures to discourage vehicle movements in the village of Cannington itself.	9936-581-2559	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1217	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Bypassing Cannington is one thing but the traffic will still be concentrated on the B road to Hinkley point. See previous comments.	9975-581-3316			/	
Tractivity 1218	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Yes in favour of a bypass as Cannington is a very small village to contend with large lorries etc, but think the bypass should be fully operational BEFORE any other construction work takes place at Hinkley Point	9976-581-3923		/		
Tractivity 215	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Less disruptive, cheaper option. Will not destroy the lovely walks on the eastern side of the village. Please ENFORCE a 30 mile speed limit through the village of Cannington ie. with sleeping policemen.	9336-581-1974	/			
Tractivity 270	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference I think that a bypass is needed, but can not make a judgment on east or west of the village. On the day of the visit there was a lot of traffic on the road- it was noisy and congested.	8959-581-1229			/	
Tractivity 291	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Certainly will be needed but I don't know Cannington well enough to comment	8979-581-1031			/	
Tractivity 328	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference See comments on combwich wharf	9016-581-1023			/	
Tractivity 361	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference less interference to village and more quickly accessed from the Bridgwater direction - minimises as far as possible traffic on the existing Cannington by-pass	9049-581-1037			/	
Tractivity 499	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Please give reasons for your preference I have no preference, I think this should be decided by Cannington residents. A road from Dunball or the A38 Bristol Road, bypassing both Bridgwater and Cannington would seem to be a good idea. Bridgwater is terribly congested for much of the time. This could be in addition to, or instead of, the proposed Cannington bypass, according to the wishes of the Cannington residents.	9172-581-2097		/		
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Cannington By-Pass- In the previous round of consultation there were two routes shown around Cannington. We have not seen any evidence to indicate that both routes have been fully and robustly assessed to ensure that the least damaging route environmentally has been chosen.	10190-581-8035	/			
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We are also aware that a third route has been indicated to the west of Brymore School but cannot trace where this has come from and why it has been discounted.	10190-581-8310		/		
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The Council is of the belief that EDF have taken the cheapest option and have not listened to the views of this community nor indeed, others.	10221-581-11113			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
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. Also, strategic issues - such as bypasses etc, are excluded from consultations as 'they are not being considered'	10222-581-1400		/		
Fiddington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Fiddington Parish Council asks for further consultation, particularly concerning the need for the bypass,	10223-581-1831			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Once a robust transport assessment is completed, if it demonstrates that a bypass (or indeed any other infrastructure improvement package) is required as the best solution to mitigate the impact of the development traffic, and if the infrastructure is demonstrated to be feasible, then the County Council would expect this infrastructure to be put in place before the development proceeds even if this means delaying the development. We assume this would be an issue for the IPC to consider in terms of the relative priority of the urgency of energy provision balanced against local impact. It is therefore our view that it is not appropriate for EDF to rule this infrastructure out on deliverability grounds largely related to timescale at this point in the process.	89231-581-10280		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Preliminary works involve site preparation and construction of the jetty. Off site works include the Cannington Bypass, Bridgwater C accommodation, Comwich Wharf refurbishment, the freight logistic facilities at Junctions 23 and 24, and the park and ride sites at Cannington and Junction 23. A key issue for the authorities is the transport of materials and workers to the site prior to the establishment of the park and ride sites and Cannington Bypass.	89310-581-1042		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	3.4.6 The response raises issues about the lack of a robust justification for the preferred Cannington By-pass route (the western route option). As a consequence the response states that "the authorities can reach no material conclusion on the preference for either route option presented in the Stage 1 consultation document and are unlikely to be able to reach a conclusion until the full justification has been provided."	88790-581-23241	/			<p>Some consultees requested that other villages in the area to the west of Cannington should be bypassed.</p> <p>However, as significant freight movements will not use the roads through these villages it is not considered that the impacts of the proposed HPC Project traffic would justify further significant interventions in these areas.</p> <p>For Cannington, three bypass options were considered as well as the reference case of a no bypass option. They were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Cannington eastern route;</li> <li>▪ Cannington western route; and</li> <li>▪ Cannington outer western route.</li> </ul> <p>The responses to the consultation provided support for all three route alignments around Cannington. The <b>Environmental Statement</b> submitted as part of the application for the Development Consent Order details the rationale behind the chosen location of the western bypass. Detailed drawings of the route were shown within the Stage 2 Consultation documents. Modifications were made in light of comments received and the final alignment and detailed drawings were submitted as part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Following the completion of the Stage 1 consultation and further technical studies the preferred route for a bypass west of Cannington (Cannington western route) was identified. Many consultation responses argued that, rather than a bypass of Cannington alone, a larger bypass of northern Bridgwater and Cannington should be provided and argued that this should be the subject of a New Approach to Appraisal (NATA) assessment.</p> <p>NATA is the Department for Transport's approved framework for appraising transport schemes in England and considers the five topics of Economy, Safety, Environment, Accessibility and Integration. The rationale for not offering a Bridgwater bypass is discussed further in <b>Annex 4 to the Environmental Statement</b>. The Cannington bypass has been the subject of a full Environmental Impact Assessment and the rationale for route choice is contained in the <b>Volume 5 of the Environmental Statement</b>.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	4.7 The response raises issues about the lack of a robust justification for the preferred Cannington By-pass route (the western route option). As a consequence the response states that "the authorities can reach no material conclusion on the preference for either route option presented in the Stage 1 consultation document and are unlikely to be able to reach a conclusion until the full justification has been provided."	88890-581-25549	/			
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Bypass may not be the solution.	88900-581-12329			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	c) The Stage 1 consultation document indicates that EDF believe that a Bridgwater bypass is not required. Evidence to show that this bypass is not required should be provided. Also, a quantitative assessment of the likely impact on the Bridgwater Northern Distributor Road should be undertaken to assess the suitability of this road to carry Hinkley Point traffic. We have a particular concern about the potential HGV increase in this residential area, given that this road was not designed for Hinkley Point traffic.	87940-581-2216	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Clarification is sought as to what method was used to conclude these statements, and evidence that the same methodology has been applied to the Bridgwater Bypass consistently. Furthermore, traffic-related environment assessments to support the western option should be provided (e.g. evidence that the western option is likely to achieve a higher shift of traffic from the centre of Cannington than the eastern option) (Table 4.5).	88000-581-4380	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	1.66. The intention to undertake traffic assessments for the Cannington Bypass, in relation to highway capacity, in addition to environmental criteria such as severance, driver stress, visual intrusion, implications for pedestrian amenity, noise and vibration and air quality, is welcomed (p. 204). The wider transport impacts of the Cannington Bypass should also be considered (p. 218).	88030-581-898			/	
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	That the village has some sort of traffic calming measures in place to make this type of journey slower and more inconvenient for the drivers who persist with this form of commuting.	8746-581-5440	/			

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	This must be supported by a full transport and environmental assessment of the options.	88060-581-1977	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	In addition, the authorities consider that more detailed consultation is required with Sedgemoor District Council. Discussions are also required around potential long term sustainability benefits or impacts of the by-pass options including: a) Flood risk management for Cannington; b) High quality public transport proposals along the A39; c) Joint car parking and travel planning for EDF and Cannington College. d) Traffic management in the village centre	88060-581-2299	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	a) There is no transport justification presented for the 200 capacity accommodation campus and freight consolidation centre at Cannington South. Given the absence of a transport case for the Cannington South the transport and traffic management benefits of this location compared to other locations nearer to the strategic road network, (for example near to the M5 J23 or J24 at Bridgwater) are not understood.	88060-581-3088	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	Further information on the number, timing and type of anticipated traffic movements through Cannington should be presented so that the significance of environmental impacts in the centre of the village can be properly assessed. A full assessment of no bypass options is considered a necessary element of future consultation material. It is understood that further SATURN and PARAMICS modelling studies will assess no bypass scenarios.	88340-581-3444	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	It is understood that Cannington Parish Council have been consulted by EDF. The minutes of the October 2009 Parish Council meeting state that the public have concerns about the proposed routes and that a Dunball option would have been a preferred choice. Concern was expressed that the routes were not on display at the public meeting in the College Main Hall. The Minutes of the October 2009 Parish Council meeting identify that parking by students from Cannington College is a problem in the village. In addition to discussions between EDF and the College about residential requirements, car parking and travel planning may provide an additional area for collaboration. This should be explored in full in progressing to the Stage 2 Consultation Document.	88340-581-3882			/	
Tractivity 800	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Local residents should hold the best views on this	9558-581-3092			/	



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 912	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Very good	9670-581-2587			/	
Tractivity 935	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? The new bypass needs to be constructed BEFORE work begins and A roads used as much as possible.	9693-581-3635		/		
Tractivity 944	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? EDF have already decided on this route	9702-581-2888			/	
Tractivity 1062	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Sizewell traffic went via Yoxford which seemed a bind at the time but is much better for the villages that are relieved by the bypass.	9820-581-3202			/	
Tractivity 1071	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? This should be a great boon to residents of Cannington. There needs to be a way to ensure that traffic bound for Bridgewater will use the bypass and not "rat race" through Cannington.	9829-581-3743		/		
Tractivity 1089	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? I have already said the bypass is not satisfactory.	9847-581-3351			/	
Tractivity 1153	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? A bypass in western Cannington will only be effective if the bulk of the traffic is coming from the Minehead direction. It is naive to believe that traffic from Bridgewater will circumnavigate Cannington to rejoin the C182 when it could simply drive into the centre and turn right. If, however, the intended park and ride buses from Williton were travelling via Cannington, this bypass would be essential.	9911-581-3857			/	
Tractivity 1159	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Absolutely not. new roads are rarely the answer. more tarmac, more green land being paved over forever.	9917-581-2892		/		
Tractivity 1176	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? I agree with the proposal for a western bypass for Cannington and trust it would be clearly signed to discourage construction traffic from taking a ?short-cut? through the village. Would it be possible to incorporate a 20 mph speed limit through the centre of Cannington?	9934-581-2949	/			
Tractivity 1178	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? I agree that a Western bypass of Cannington would be beneficial to the village. However I have concerns that the increased traffic volumes may not be easily accommodated by the already overcrowded Bridgewater road system. In addition I would suggest traffic calming and weight restriction measures to discourage vehicle movements in the village of Cannington itself.	9936-581-2559	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1217	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Bypassing Cannington is one thing but the traffic will still be concentrated on the B road to Hinkley point. See previous comments.	9975-581-3316			/	
Tractivity 1218	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Yes in favour of a bypass as Cannington is a very small village to contend with large lorries etc, but think the bypass should be fully operational BEFORE any other construction work takes place at Hinkley Point	9976-581-3923		/		
Tractivity 215	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Less disruptive, cheaper option. Will not destroy the lovely walks on the eastern side of the village. Please ENFORCE a 30 mile speed limit through the village of Cannington ie. with sleeping policemen.	9336-581-1974	/			
Tractivity 270	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference I think that a bypass is needed, but can not make a judgment on east or west of the village. On the day of the visit there was a lot of traffic on the road- it was noisy and congested.	8959-581-1229			/	
Tractivity 291	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Certainly will be needed but I don't know Cannington well enough to comment	8979-581-1031			/	
Tractivity 328	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference See comments on combwich wharf	9016-581-1023			/	
Tractivity 361	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference less interference to village and more quickly accessed from the Bridgwater direction - minimises as far as possible traffic on the existing Cannington by-pass	9049-581-1037			/	
Tractivity 499	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Please give reasons for your preference I have no preference, I think this should be decided by Cannington residents. A road from Dunball or the A38 Bristol Road, bypassing both Bridgwater and Cannington would seem to be a good idea. Bridgwater is terribly congested for much of the time. This could be in addition to, or instead of, the proposed Cannington bypass, according to the wishes of the Cannington residents.	9172-581-2097		/		
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Cannington By-Pass- In the previous round of consultation there were two routes shown around Cannington. We have not seen any evidence to indicate that both routes have been fully and robustly assessed to ensure that the least damaging route environmentally has been chosen.	10190-581-8035	/			
English Heritage	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We are also aware that a third route has been indicated to the west of Brymore School but cannot trace where this has come from and why it has been discounted.	10190-581-8310		/		
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The Council is of the belief that EDF have taken the cheapest option and have not listened to the views of this community nor indeed, others.	10221-581-11113			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
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. Also, strategic issues - such as bypasses etc, are excluded from consultations as 'they are not being considered'	10222-581-1400		/		
Fiddington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Fiddington Parish Council asks for further consultation, particularly concerning the need for the bypass,	10223-581-1831			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Once a robust transport assessment is completed, if it demonstrates that a bypass (or indeed any other infrastructure improvement package) is required as the best solution to mitigate the impact of the development traffic, and if the infrastructure is demonstrated to be feasible, then the County Council would expect this infrastructure to be put in place before the development proceeds even if this means delaying the development. We assume this would be an issue for the IPC to consider in terms of the relative priority of the urgency of energy provision balanced against local impact. It is therefore our view that it is not appropriate for EDF to rule this infrastructure out on deliverability grounds largely related to timescale at this point in the process.	89231-581-10280		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Preliminary works involve site preparation and construction of the jetty. Off site works include the Cannington Bypass, Bridgwater C accommodation, Combe Wharf refurbishment, the freight logistic facilities at Junctions 23 and 24, and the park and ride sites at Cannington and Junction 23. A key issue for the authorities is the transport of materials and workers to the site prior to the establishment of the park and ride sites and Cannington Bypass.	89310-581-1042		/		

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 1	1.28. The Stage 1 Report states that there is no traffic need for the Cannington Bypass but it is being proposed due to transport-related environmental issues. Traffic modelling evidence has not been provided to support the need, or preferred option, for the Cannington Bypass; this must be provided in order for SCC to comment (4.4.1).	88000-575-4043	/			<p>Many respondents to the consultation on transport issues felt that a new road from the M5 north of Bridgwater to connect with the A39 west of Cannington should be a pre-requisite for allowing the development. EDF Energy has considered this option but has not accepted that such a road is necessary or justified, as long as other measures to mitigate transport impacts are implemented. These include a bypass to the west of Cannington, traffic calming measures within Cannington, and a number of highway and junction improvements within Bridgwater and on the main route to the development site.</p> <p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy proposed two search areas, to the east and west of Cannington respectively, as potentially suitable locations for the provision of a bypass. An initial assessment of flood risk issues relating to both of the proposed bypass routes was carried out following feedback from the consultation. There are significant flood risk issues related to development of the eastern bypass route compared with the western bypass route. EDF Energy acknowledged the risk associated with the eastern bypass route, and this was important to the selection of the western bypass route as the preferred option for incorporation in the Stage 2 consultation. The western bypass route would also be shorter with lesser environmental impacts, and fewer residential properties near the route. A fuller explanation for the choice of the western bypass route was provided in the Stage 1 Consultation Report.</p> <p>The proposed Cannington bypass was supported by many respondents however there was concern raised that it would not be appealing to motorists and that they would continue to travel through Cannington as the route is shorter than the bypass.</p> <p>In order to maximise the use of the bypass, it is proposed that traffic calming would be provided through Cannington along High Street, Main Road, Fore Street and Rodway. A weight restriction (except for local access to Cannington) would be introduced within the village and clearly signed on the A39 and the bypass.</p> <p>Further to the use of traffic calming and weight restrictions to make travelling through Cannington less appealing, a strategy of positive direction signing would be provided to direct traffic around Cannington via the new bypass. Temporary "No HPC</p>
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	The wider transport impacts of the Cannington Bypass should also be considered (p. 218).	88030-575-1197	/			
Bridgwater Town Council	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	2. Transportation / traffic Further work is essential in terms of transportation and traffic modelling with much more thorough appraisals and an enhanced level of survey work to give a coherent transportation investment package. The Town Council are not convinced by arguments put so far that the alternatives provided by park and ride and freight handling facilities are of themselves sufficient without additional highway infrastructure over and above a 'Cannington' bypass and consideration of a northern bypass for the town. There is insufficient justification and no traffic case for NOT including a northern bypass option against the alternative or indeed as part of it	8745-575-1337	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	a) There is no transport justification presented for the 200 capacity accommodation campus and freight consolidation centre at Cannington South. Given the absence of a transport case for the Cannington South the transport and traffic management benefits of this location compared to other locations nearer to the strategic road network, (for example near to the M5 J23 or J24 at Bridgwater) are not understood.	88060-575-3088	/			
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	Transportation It is considered that the potential environmental impacts of traffic in the centre of Cannington should also be assessed as part of a full options appraisal. It is understood that this work will be undertaken on completion of more detailed traffic modelling. This should be provided as soon as it is available.	88340-575-3112	/			

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	Further information on the number, timing and type of anticipated traffic movements through Cannington should be presented so that the significance of environmental impacts in the centre of the village can be properly assessed. A full assessment of no bypass options is considered a necessary element of future consultation material. It is understood that further SATURN and PARAMICS modelling studies will assess no bypass scenarios.	88340-575-3444	/			Construction Traffic" signs will also be provided at strategic locations.  Respondents raised concerns that the proposed bypass would cause safety concerns, in particular inappropriate traffic speeds and difficulties for pedestrians, cyclists and livestock in crossing the road.  The proposed bypass would be subject to a 40mph speed limit. This would be reinforced through the design of the route which would have appropriate horizontal alignment radii and have less of a rural appearance with kerbed edges, no hard strips and a footway/cycleway along one side.
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	It is noted that the site at CAN-B is also well located in relation to northern junctions of the Cannington Bypass route options, although in comparison to CAN-A, road freight would need to travel through or past the village prior to consolidation.	88380-575-755			/	The bypass would include a toucan crossing (suitable for use by pedestrians and cyclists and livestock) that would also allow for the safe movement of pupils to Brymore School.
Bridgwater College	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	From the College's point of view, Cannington village is a high risk location. The College operates on both sides of Rodway and students cross the road continuously. Any increase in traffic along the Rodway would be of concern to the College, and would certainly need to be managed with traffic calming or traffic lights/pedestrian lights. Either by-pass should alleviate this although there would need to be some management of workforce to ensure that the by-pass was used rather than 'short-cuts' through the village.	8774-575-1695	/			
Bridgwater College	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	It is absolutely essential that there is a by-pass for Cannington. It is a bottle neck which without the by-pass would seriously affect the smooth operation of the village, would seriously impact on the College's operation and the safety of its students, and would not provide an effective vehicular access to Hinkley Point.	8774-575-3068			/	
RAC Foundation	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	3.3 We note the relative weight of the arguments for the western and eastern routes for the proposed Cannington western by-pass as they are set out in Table 4.5. But if the western route is chosen, this will be to the detriment of non-nuclear traffic between West Somerset and Bridgwater/M5. The increased nuclear traffic will mean that the existing by-pass on the A39 will cease to provide, as it does now, one of the few safe potential overtaking opportunities on the route for traffic bound for West Somerset & Exmoor. We point to the benefits from widening this stretch, so far as the under-carriageway bridges allow, in order to provide a dedicated west bound overtaking lane.	8776-575-5243		/		
Tractivity 714	Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments?  Your preferred Western By-Pass of Cannington does absolutely nothing to address the traffic flow through Bridgwater via A38, A39 & NDR routes	9472-575-2657			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 723	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Whilst the Cannington bypass will reduce the effect in that village it is also necessary to look at the junctions at Combwich and Stogursey as the increase in traffic on the Hinkley road will affect them. The development of the wetlands will bring even more traffic on this road. Speed reduction measures are needed as this road is used like a race track by some drivers	9481-575-2556			/	
Tractivity 859	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? should be provided but current plans do not go far enough. will still create an unacceptable increase in traffic on the main road (which has already a bad accident reputation) past several small villages. more of this road could and should be bypassed	9617-575-2637	/			
Tractivity 889	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Have EDF considered that upwards of 40 horses use the road between Cannington and Stogursey, mainly because there is no alternative.	9647-575-3166	/			
Tractivity 901	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Any Cannington by-pass will impinge negatively on the village, and the the end point of further congestion in Bridgwater and along the busy A39. You make no mention of time scale, but at meetings have said the bypass would not be complete until 18 months into construction work. Can you seriously intend all this heavy traffic to come through the village? Think again!	9659-575-2778		/		
Tractivity 933	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Once you have scarred the countryside, it will not be put back once you have finished.	9691-575-2658			/	
Tractivity 940	Public	Stage 2	I agree that a bypass should be provided nevertheless, will it ensure that motorists will use it? I know, from experience, that upon leaving work you take the shortest route back home!! (Which in this case will probably be through the centre of Cannington village!)	9698-575-3501		/		
Tractivity 968	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Disagree. I disagree that a western bypass to Cannington should be provided. Such a bypass will not not relieve the passage of construction traffic through Bridgwater. The obvious solution is to build a combined bridge and flood relief barrier and water turbine generator at Dunball which is adjacent to the M5. A bypass could then be constructed north of Bridgwater, east of Cannington to link twith the main road at Putnell or Rodway Cannington. The other traffic problem that is going to arise affects commuters and others at Combwich. Where the road from Combwich joins the main road there MUST be a roundabout and traffic lights to ease access to and from Combwich.	9726-575-3433		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 974	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Lanes through Shurton, Burton and Stringston could be greatly effected - no mitigation available. Cannington bypass will help by keeping traffic to the main roads.	9732-575-4061			/	
Tractivity 990	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? The Bridgwater to Cannington road has had a number of accidents in the past that has gridlocked the entire area for hours. The road is poor, the traffic is bad enough already and having a bypass at Cannington won't change this. As a resident of Cannington that lives near the proposed bypass I am very unhappy that having waited years to move to a village and being assured that the house was on the edge of green belt land we are now going to have to put up with having a road constructed, our view spoilt and a house that will be difficult to sell while this is going on. If you must have a bypass put it further away from the village.	9748-575-2556		/		
Tractivity 1071	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? This should be a great boon to residents of Cannington. There needs to be a way to ensure that traffic bound for Bridgwater will use the bypass and not "rat race" through Cannington.	9829-575-3743		/		
Tractivity 1091	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Cannington centre could not and should not sustain further traffic. There must be a by pass to reduce accidents in the centre of the village by the war memorial. Large vehicles turning with such regularity as buses and HGVs as the data has disclosed would be disastrous.  However there seems little point in a bypass unless it is built and fully working before building on site commences. There is also limited detail regarding how the bypass road will rejoin the C182- this needs careful consideration.	9849-575-6036		/		
Tractivity 1102	Public	Stage 2	12. Any other ideas or comments? Only after the construction of the new road, otherwise heavy construction traffic will make life in the villages dangerous and unacceptable	9860-575-6434			/	
Tractivity 1142	Public	Stage 2	5. Any other ideas or comments? I think that the omission of a by pass for Bridgwater will cause local traffic chaos. I don't think that adequate local traffic studies were completed when making these decisions. It is necessary to study traffic over a period of time during the day and at different times of the year.	9900-575-2189	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1142	Public	Stage 2	<p>6. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>This is the route of cheapness. The route chosen impacts on just as many properties as the eastern route. Asking drivers to use the existing by pass then come back on themselves to use the new road may not happen.</p> <p>The route has a direct impact on my property as we live at the eastern end of the route. There is inadequate screening proposed for this end of the route for those of us living on the northern side of the road.</p> <p>The access to Cannington for us is made unsafe by this road cutting across the lane to the village without any crossing points and the added traffic from the new roundabout to Combwich which passes by our lane end. We do not want the lane cut off by the bypass for cyclists or walkers as this has large recreational use into further footpaths and lane network. Kids are picked up from Rodway farm to get to Haygrove school. We need safe crossing of the existing road. these points were made at the recent meeting</p>	9900-575-3097		/		
Tractivity 1145	Public	Stage 2	<p>6. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Without bypassing Bridgewater itself you would only be moving a vast traffic jam outside Cannington which would inevitably send traffic trying to escape this through Cannington.</p>	9903-575-3457		/		
Tractivity 1148	Public	Stage 2	<p>6. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The traffic should not even be getting anywhere near Cannington which will suffer terrible consequences for many years to come.</p> <p>A NEW ROAD MUST COME FROM BRIDGWATER AT DUNBALL. WHICH WILL SOLVE ALL LOCAL TRAFFIC PROBLEMS AT A STROKE.</p>	9906-575-3477			/	
Tractivity 1167	Public	Stage 2	<p>6. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The congestion will occur on A39 long before traffic gets to Cannington. So a new road will only be required to ease congestion in Cannington - limited use. What happens to the new road once work is completed.</p>	9925-575-3404	/			
Tractivity 1176	Public	Stage 2	<p>6. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>I agree with the proposal for a western bypass for Cannington and trust it would be clearly signed to discourage construction traffic from taking a ?short-cut? through the village. Would it be possible to incorporate a 20 mph speed limit through the centre of Cannington?</p>	9934-575-2949	/			
Tractivity 1178	Public	Stage 2	<p>6. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>I agree that a Western bypass of Cannington would be beneficial to the village. However I have concerns that the increased traffic volumes may not be easily accommodated by the already overcrowded Bridgewater road system. In addition I would suggest traffic calming and weight restriction measures to discourage vehicle movements in the village of Cannington itself.</p>	9936-575-2559	/			



Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1220	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Fundamental disagree with all of this plan which will see the further desegregation of the countryside and lead to increased pollution. Congestion.	9978-575-4214			/	
Tractivity 191	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference If the majority of traffic is to be from Bridgwater the east bypass will provide the most traffic relief. It would be better to produce a relief road from the motorway. Heysham power station access road from Lancaster is a good example of fast easy access to a site.	8906-575-2487			/	
Tractivity 220	Public	Stage 1	5. Cannington bypass options Box ticked: Not required 5. Please give reasons for your preference Why can't the road come from J23 to Rodway/Combwich therefore diverting all of the traffic from Bridgwater and Cannington in one stroke. This road can then be used by not only Hinkly traffic but also South west holiday traffic relieving Bridgwater	8922-575-1499				
Tractivity 230	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Less damage to historic sites and people's houses. Nobody will respect the 40 mph limit and neither will those coming from Bridgwater direction bother to go round the town when they can go through - EDF's proposed traffic chicanes notwithstanding. But ask Cannington	8931-575-2110	/			
Tractivity 265	Public	Stage 1	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? With out a bypass Bridgwater will be impossible. I live in Strington Road- it has too much traffic already. When the silage/ harvest is in progress it will be impossible.	8954-575-2729			/	
Tractivity 268	Public	Stage 1	4. Any other ideas or comments? Using the A39 Bridgwater in Cannington road from the M5 is just plain wrong. Its a dangerous road now (2 fatalities in 2 years) and an increase in volume of traffic may make it slower (indeed, gridlocked in places) but more dangerous- a single accident will cut your power tation off completely. M5 (Dunball) to Combwich would be better.	8957-575-1037			/	
Tractivity 295	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Diverts all the site traffic from M5 and Bridgwater before Cannington Village.	8983-575-997		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 322	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference The land to the east of Cannington and North of Bridgwater is more suitable for accomodation than the Williton sites. The eastern route would have less impact on residents of Cannington and the advantage of the higher speed linit and future connections to Bridgwater.	9010-575-1290		/		
Tractivity 360	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference I do not believe either route is the correct one but since another option is not included in your tick box questionnaire I am opting for the least intrusive and most likely to be used. You completely ignore the effects of the prevailing south westerly winds in your initial attempts to quantify the effects of noise, air and dust pollution on local residents. If you take account of these it is evident that the eastern route is the better of two bad options. The A38 into Bridgwater is already congested at rush hour making the town impossible to access without queueing. When your 3000 (50%) 'local' employees (ie travelling for 90 minutes or less!) are using the route it will be gridlocked.	9048-575-1292			/	
Tractivity 369	Public	Stage 1	Either bypass at Cannington would severely disrupt village life. There would be major disruption from extra traffic on A39 from Bridgwater.	9056-575-4360			/	
Tractivity 390	Public	Stage 1	4. Any other ideas or comments? present plans would appear not to entirely address the aim of keeping traffic away from Cannington	9075-575-910			/	
Tractivity 402	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference If a bypass was built it would destroy Cannington as a village and only serve to increase traffic in the locality.	9085-575-1405		/		
Tractivity 415	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference A road should be built from the M5 at Dunball, crossing the river and goes straight to the construction site. This would take all the traffic away from Bridgwater, and the villages.	9097-575-1272			/	
Tractivity 434	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Bypassing Cannington will not alleviate road congestion in other areas.	9113-575-1308			/	
Tractivity 446	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Any of these bypasses still directs traffic towards Cannington along the congested A39, drivers will always be trying to take the shortest route through the centre of the village.	9125-575-1723	/			

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	5. Please give reasons for your preference Please give reasons for your preference I have no preference, I think this should be decided by Cannington residents. A road from Dunball or the A38 Bristol Road, bypassing both Bridgwater and Cannington would seem to be a good idea. Bridgwater is terribly congested for much of the time. This could be in addition to, or instead of, the proposed Cannington bypass, according to the wishes of the Cannington residents.	9172-575-2097			/	
Tractivity 607	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference The best of very poor options. Traffic would still have to come through built-up areas.	9272-575-1009			/	
Tractivity 611	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference I believe that a bypass should not be built, if it is possible to manage traffic through the construction phase. Once built the existing transport infrastructure could cope as these is only planned to be 150 person increase in permanent staffing levels. It is unnecessary (and irrevocably damaging) to build a new road over valuable natural habitat and farmland. Let alone the impact it would have on local residents with increases light, noise traffic fume pollution as well as the visual impact.	9275-575-1929		/		
Tractivity 615	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? There will be hardly any benefits from this road being built around Cannington, as it will make the village lose its community and identity and no "community centre" can replace that.	9279-575-3138		/		
Tractivity 62299	Public	Stage 2	Both the Bypass and park & ride facility will enormously increase the congestion on the dangerous A39 and are far too near residents' homes allowing continuous noise penetration, pollution and lighting annoyance.	9990-575-605			/	
Tractivity 62323	Public	Stage 2	(personal details removed) from EDF admitted in public that it will take 18 months to build the unwanted Cannington West By-Pass, and during that time they intend to start the construction of the jetty on site, as well as preparatory site works and digging the huge tunnels under the Bristol Channel. In the interim Cannington will have to bear the additional traffic until this road is completed. EDF have thrown every conceivable excuse regarding an alternative as recommended in the Barnes report where a dedicated road should be constructed from Junction 23 M5.	10007-575-972			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62386	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	1. This by pass will take up to 15 months to build and during this time EDF will be using heavy vehicles to transport aggregates through Cannington to build the jetty and wharf at Comwich and the Hinkley Point site. So for 15 months or so the residents of Cannington will have to put up with the noise, pollution and traffic safety issues before the new road is in use. EDF should be made to have this road in place before they start building.	10049-575-1453		/		
Tractivity 62415	Public	Stage 2	THE ROUTE VIA BRIDGWATER, THE A39 AND CANNINGTON ADVANTAGES: 1) The route would simply divert traffic away from the centre of the village.	10056-575-1998			/	
Tractivity 62415	Public	Stage 2	3) If this route were built, with few exceptions it would only serve traffic to Hinkley power stations.	10056-575-2462			/	
Tractivity 62415	Public	Stage 2	4) The walks and quiet lanes north of Cannington would be ruined.	10056-575-2567		/		
Tractivity 62457	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	This new by-pass proposed by EDF will destroy farmland and divide Brynmore School in two halves, as well as the increased traffic, noise and air pollution.	10081-575-646		/		
Tractivity 62502	Public	Stage 2	The proposed bypass will not be a useful permanent legacy for Cannington as employees will still use the quickest route through the centre of the village. It will create a danger for students staff and livestock, going in and out of Brynmore School. No pedestrian bridge has been proposed.	10096-575-938		/		
Tractivity 62568	Public	Stage 2	As the predominant wind comes from a westerly direction, it will carry noise, fumes and dust pollution across most of the village. The existing A39 bypass causes enough noise disturbance to half of the village and if the proposed bypass goes ahead, the village will be virtually surrounded with constant traffic noise for the greater part of the day and night. The original plans for this route for a bypass were proposed many years ago when traffic was far lighter than it is today, present lorry size and weight were not in existence and there were far less housing developments in the area. It is also going to ruin the access and land to Brynmore School, a Grade II Listed building, cause danger to the pupils having to use a busy road and totally isolate the school from the village.	10120-575-602		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62569	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	The bypass will be in close proximity to our house, so the increase in traffic, noise, light and pollution will greatly impact on our daily lives.	10121-575-125			/	
Tractivity 62569	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	Population and car ownership will increase over the coming years as will the need for extra houses plus extra power station traffic, all causing extra congestion on the Bridgwater and Cannington roads. The Western Bypass will be busy at non peak times with freight and power station workers which means early in the morning and during afternoon and evenings.	10121-575-673			/	
Tractivity 62575	Public	Stage 2	This is not a matter which can be dismissed by saying that the chances of this happening are remote. To happen just once, if a life is lost due to such a delay, would be once too often.	10126-575-892			/	
Tractivity 62583	Public	Stage 2	It would do nothing to reduce traffic on the A39 and other main roads, or to reduce the dangerous consequences (referred to in paragraph 21 below) of an accident blocking those roads.	10134-575-5581			/	
Tractivity 62631	Public	Stage 2	There will not be a bypass around Cannington in 2011/2012 when the Preliminary Works would be taking place causing a total disruption to the centre of Cannington for two years. The bypass would only be built if the government gave the go ahead to build the reactor and EDF feel it would be economic to do so. At present with no public subsidies being offered by the government, EDF have massive financial debt, 36 billion Euros, along with a declining credit rating and the falling price of gas it looks unlikely that EDF will build the power station, therefore a bypass would be irrelevant. Lets hope that West Somerset council refuse permission for the preliminary works.	10175-575-6076		/		
Tractivity 62938	Public	Stage 2	Will increase traffic on an already busy A39 and cause gridlock in Bridgwater (happens easily when accidents happen – for 3 to 4 hours at a time).	10177-575-3858			/	
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	However, it is the Council's view that as a small village we are still likely to experience a great deal of inconvenience by the Park and Ride facilities, Increased traffic and the construction of a by-pass.	10221-575-3385			/	
Spaxton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	We also note from the 1990 public enquiry that had Hinkley C proceeded at that time the bypass would most likely have been built. Since that time traffic has become much heavier and it is obvious that the roads will not cope. Your intention to schedule Hinkley traffic to avoid existing congestion periods will simply overload the roads at all times.	10231-575-857		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	In terms of impact, it would seem that the effect of the proposed western distributor road should be considered in three separate parts, namely:	10242-575-1766			/	
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	At the present time, certain boarding facilities exist within Cannington village requiring those students boarding there to walk to and from the School during early morning and late evening throughout the year, which will now involve crossing a busy road in the dark.  1.4 The Brymore School day starts at 6.15 am and finishes at 9.00 pm, seven days a week during term time throughout the year, which not only involves the boys passing to and from Cannington, to and from boarding facilities but also assisting with farming operations and also general access to Cannington.  1.5 Brymore School Trust is in a close partnership with Bridgwater College, with a shared curriculum and facilities which involves the daily movement to and from the School site of pedestrians (children) and vehicles.  1.6 In addition to the day to day pedestrian access, a number of the students are non-resident with the result that there is traffic in and out of the School site with parents taking and collecting children.	10242-575-2640			/	
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	The School shares many facilities with the Bridgwater College, Cannington Centre. This involves students using their facilities including Rodway Farm, the main site itself and the golf centre on a daily basis. The increased volume of heavy traffic, combined with large numbers of students crossing a busy road, raising serious concerns regarding student safety.	10242-575-4182			/	
Landowner - Brymore School	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	The suggestion of a Toucan Crossing on a road that is likely to have as many as 1,500 vehicle passages over and above the existing local traffic flow would seem totally inappropriate with such a high proportion of special needs students.	10242-575-11766			/	
Hinkley Point Site Stakeholder Group (A+B) Sites	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	A by-pass at the Nether Stowey end of the existing Cannington By-pass will only make the Rat Run through Cannington the more likely. The proposal to run from the Williton Park and Ride to Hinkley Via Stringston, Stogursey and then out onto the existing Hinkley Road at Claylands Corner has had everybody convinced that nobody has travelled this route to ensure it is viable. Let me, as respondent and local, formally put this in writing. The Road from the A39 at Gee Mare to Stingston is twisty and winding SINGLE track Road, from Stringston to Stogursey the Single Track road continues. Stogursey is a small medieval settlement with very narrow streets that are difficult to traverse at the best of times and no passing places and totally unsuitable for lard vehicles and busses. From Stogursey to Claylands Corner the single track winds it way to what everybody considers the most dangerous Junction and bend on the Hinkley road. This proposal 'Beggars Belief'.	10255-575-2482			/	

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	3. User / non-user benefits, including journey time savings, vehicle operating costs and journey reliability.	89223-575-3934			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	No consideration within the appraisal is given to any of the following aspects: 1. Safety, in particular in relation to vehicle and / or pedestrian accident levels 2. Local severance and urban realm impacts within Bridgwater and, in particular, Cannington 3. User / non-user benefits, including journey time savings, vehicle operating costs and journey reliability.	89231-575-4150	/			
Otterhampton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Between 750 and 900 vehicles per day will be funnelling off the M5/A38/A39 into a 'C' class road at the end of the proposed Cannington By-pass. The pressure on the A39 and A39 through Bridgwater and beyond Cannington on the C182, combined with other major projects will bring chaos to these roads.	89268-575-3282			/	
Otterhampton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	c) In the current Stage 2 Proposals EDF is planning to refurbish Comwich Wharf and to build the jetty at HPC before any by-passes are in place! As well as totally ignoring recommendations about road infrastructure by the Inspector at the Hinkley Point C Public Inquiry 20 years ago, this will require transporting vast amounts of material through Bridgwater and the centre of Cannington.	89268-575-4169		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Nor do the authorities have the evidence base which provides the totality of traffic impacts including supply chain and training trips, or a direct comparison of costs and benefits of any online improvements through Bridgwater town centre.	89311-575-3926	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Other locations, for example the village hall, are not considered, nor are locations such as Brymore School which is adversely affected by the bypass proposals.	89367-575-2018	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Whilst the bypass can be expected to provide mitigation within the village this can only be confirmed through a robust and through assessment of the impacts, including assessment at peak hours. As this has not been undertaken so it difficult to ascertain how effective the bypass will be as a mitigation measure.	89367-575-5679	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	There is uncertainty on the exact numbers of workers who will use the accommodation campuses. Given this uncertainty it is difficult to be precise on the traffic impacts associated with the construction workforce.	89367-575-6405			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	In addition the movements of workers for non work related trips has not been assessed which introduces another uncertainty on the extent and degree of impact.	89367-575-6619			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	As the appraisal does not correctly assess the transport impact at Cannington of the Hinkley Point C it is impossible to determine if there are residual effects. However adverse effects are likely for receptors located near to the bypass.	89367-575-6807			/	



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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The overall transport strategy is to minimise movements by car to the main site. However, during the preliminary works this strategy will not apply and most or all of the preliminary works construction traffic, materials and workers, will pass through Cannington. There is little information on the transport strategy during the operational stage and how this will impact Cannington, though by then the bypass should be built.	89426-575-1279	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment of residual impacts is poor, with only 24 hour flows being presented. This means that highway and environmental impacts cannot be correctly assessed. The assessment of the need for the Cannington and Bridgwater Northern Bypasses is totally inadequate. The travel plan does not include SMART targets and the monitoring proposed is inadequate.	89428-575-1472	/			
Tractivity 62972	Public	Stage 2 Update	I hope that EDF sees sense and revises the route, using the A39 to Cannington then the C182. If this project gets off the ground, I suggest that one of your first tasks is to construct the bypass road for Cannington, as negotiating that village will also be a nightmare with EDF traffic clogging the village.- let alone the disruption ( yet again!) of locals' peace and quiet.	89687-575-1957		/		
Tractivity 63007	Public	Stage 2 Update	Measure to calm and control traffic These measures during the bypass build would be difficult to implement and for villagers to endure.	89695-575-1358			/	
4	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	My main objection - and one which is echoed by many - are the two options for a Cannington by-pass. Both bring traffic back on to the Cannington to Hinkley Road only a few hundred yards from the village. This B road is now little more than an upgraded country lane which had a terrible accident record during construction of the previous stations and is still a dangerous road at certain times of the day now.	89793-575-1430			/	
16	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	I believe the strongest of all is the traffic chaos that will result from the proposed route via a Cannington bypass. If EDF would accept their responsibility and construct a dedicated Northern Bypass from Dunball to Hinkley, this would eliminate +-98% of all the objections.	89805-575-650		/		
16	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	I wonder whether the large HGVs referred to, (possibly 32 tonners), could negotiate the Rodway/High St./Fore St. junction in Cannington and the junctions of Penel Orlieu/St Mary's St. and Penel Orlieu/Broadway/North St. in Bridgwater! Furthermore, how much structural damage could be created by this volume of HGVs passing by shops and houses in such close proximity?	89805-575-2984			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
16	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	By introducing the proposed Western bypass I can see nothing other than gridlock from the north of Bridgwater to Cannington. This could be an absolute-disaster-as-far-as-access for any - emergency vehicles are concerned. Our Fire Station, Police Station, Ambulance Station and Taunton Hospital would be totally cut off.	89805-575-3352			/	
31	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	As you are probably aware by now, it's not the building of a new power station that the people of Somerset are trying to stop.  EDF are planning to use existing roads for lorries, cars and coaches. These roads are already oversubscribed and, furthermore, it appears that the new bypass for Cannington will not be built until after the construction work has begun. This means that all the extra transport will be coming through Cannington which is totally unacceptable.	89820-575-1071		/		
Otterhampton Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	Cannington Bypass is not projected to be finished until Oct 2013/Jan20147 this means HGVs and buses will be routed through Cannington! Looking at Figure 18 there will be in excess of 200 HGVs and around 100 P&R Bus's daily making 1 way trips. The residents of Cannington will have 600 vehicle movements each day for over a year until the bypass is built. This does not take into account any LGVs or visitors to HPC.	89869-575-3243		/		
34	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	Both the Bypass and park & ride facility will enormously increase the congestion on the dangerous A39 and are far too near residents' homes allowing continuous noise-penetration,-pollution and lighting annoyance.	89823-451-657			/	
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	In addition, the authorities consider that more detailed consultation is required with Sedgemoor District Council. Discussions are also required around potential long term sustainability benefits or impacts of the by-pass options including: a)Flood risk management for Cannington; b) High quality public transport proposals along the A39; c) Joint car parking and travel planning for EDF and Cannington College. d) Traffic management in the village centre	88060-604-2299	/			
Tractivity 690	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments?  The western bypass is still too close to housing in cannington. The access points you propose at the end of Withiel Drive, near Knapp Farm and on Rodway will encourage "rat runs" through Cannington.  You should reconsider all of these. Are ANY of them really necessary?	9450-41-3345	/			

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 proposed 'associated development' at Cannington, the Agency provided comments to the applicant in a letter dated the 4th August 2009. This concluded that in principle, the Agency is not opposed to the proposed development options - i.e. the bypass, employee accommodation, Park & Ride site and a freight consolidation centre. We would expect all of the proposals to be supported by a robust TA and to be incorporated into the TP as appropriate.	88860-574-12522	/			EDF Energy undertaken substantial liaison with the highway and local authorities to further develop the transport methodology and assessment. The details of the methodology are provided in the <b>Transport Assessment</b> .
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	4.7 The response raises issues about the lack of a robust justification for the preferred Cannington By-pass route (the western route option). As a consequence the response states that "the authorities can reach no material conclusion on the preference for either route option presented in the Stage 1 consultation document and are unlikely to be able to reach a conclusion until the full justification has been provided."	88890-574-25549	/			EDF Energy proposed a bypass of Cannington in its Stage 1 consultation. This was informed by the use of traffic modelling of the existing road network in and around Cannington and Bridgwater. This concluded that although in capacity terms the road network would be able to cope with the additional traffic, in Cannington it would be appropriate to construct a bypass in order to mitigate for traffic-related environmental impacts including noise and vibration and wider amenity impacts on Cannington residents.
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Insufficient justification and lack of evidence based for not taking forward a Bridgwater bypass option. The strategy appears to be driving the answer rather than the evidence base.	88890-574-26844	/			This conclusion was particularly informed by the large increase in HGV and bus traffic that Cannington would experience over the full length of the construction programme if no bypass was provided.
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Traffic modelling evidence has not been provided to support the need, or preferred option, for the Cannington Bypass; this must be provided in order for the Authority to comment. Clarification is sought as to what method was used to conclude these statements, and evidence that the same methodology has been applied to the Bridgwater Bypass consistently. Furthermore, traffic related environmental assessments to support either option should be provided (e.g. evidence that the western option is likely to achieve a higher shift of traffic from the centre of Cannington than the eastern option).	87940-574-1349	/			For Bridgwater, detailed modelling demonstrated that the demand management measures combined with localised junction capacity improvements would mitigate the construction impacts and there is no need to construct a Bridgwater bypass.
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	1.28. The Stage 1 Report states that there is no traffic need for the Cannington Bypass but it is being proposed due to transport-related environmental issues. Traffic modelling evidence has not been provided to support the need, or preferred option, for the Cannington Bypass; this must be provided in order for SCC to comment (4.4.1).	88000-574-4043	/			Many respondents to the consultation on transport issues felt that a new road from the M5 north of Bridgwater to connect with the A39 west of Cannington should be a pre-requisite for allowing the development. EDF Energy has considered this option but has not accepted that such a road is necessary or justified, as long as other measures to mitigate transport impacts are implemented. These include a bypass to the west of Cannington, traffic calming measures within Cannington, and a number of highway and junction improvements within Bridgwater and on the main route to the development site
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	The wider transport impacts of the Cannington Bypass should also be considered (p. 218).	88030-574-1197	/			

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>In general terms the description of transportation is inadequate with limited reference to supporting data. Although partially referenced in the relevant parts of section 4, there is limited information on the transport network performance / congestion and safety related issues in this section. Information and cross- referencing to section 4 in this section 3.10 is inadequate or incomplete with baseline data not presented for the Cannington Bypass; M5 junction 23; accommodation campuses in Bridgwater and Williton included neither here nor in section 4. Section 3.10.16 states that preliminary modelling has indicated that a bypass around Bridgwater is unlikely to be warranted.</p> <p>There is no justification given for this assertion and it is too important to base such a significant decision on early and very limited modelling. The very same modelling indicated no Cannington Bypass was required, but it has been proposed all the same. Full and robust assessment of the traffic conditions will be required when the main model is in place. The modelling scenarios will need to be agreed with the planning as well as the transport authorities.</p>	88180-574-3710	/			
Tractivity 1182	Public	Stage 2	<p>6. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Your opening statement is incorrect; there is a lack of evidence to support this view. If a bypass for Cannington is to be built, then it should form a part of a large scheme to bypass both Bridgwater and Cannington. Your proposals DO NOT resolve the A38/39 Bridgwater congestion issues.</p>	9940-574-3343			/	
Tractivity 62299	Public	Stage 2	<p>We also note from your brochure that you believe traffic can be accommodated within the existing road network. We would question as to how you have obtained this knowledge and to what depth. Our understanding from your personnel was that you have monitored the traffic for just two months?</p>	9990-574-974			/	
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>In 1989 the Barnes report (Hinkley C inquiry) advocated a dedicated road from the A38 Dunball area to the construction site. At that time traffic was a fraction of what it is today and if trends continue the situation will deteriorate even more. Add to the present congestion, all the construction traffic and the commuters to site and we will enter gridlock. It seems strange to this Council that there has been no mention of the Barnes report, undertaken in 1989 after the Hinkley "C" enquiry that was paid for by the tax payer at a great expense. Why have EDF chosen to ignore this document in their Stage Two Consultation?</p>	10221-574-7998	/			
Fiddington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>You have consistently refused to undertake a full traffic appraisal - (your 4 line dismissal - page 30 - 4.5.6) - on the validity of the Northern Bridgwater bypass (NBB), despite calls from Somerset County Council, Community Council for Somerset, the Quantock Cluster of 13 Parish Councils, individual Parish Councils including ourselves, and many other organisations.</p>	10223-574-8120	/			
RAC Foundation	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>The toucan crossing proposed for Brymore School would be replaced by an underpass and fenced off cycle/footway between its Cannington end and Withiel Drive.</p>	10267-574-5449		/		
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>It is not clear as to the exact route that freight will follow to pass Cannington. The details provided (12) in the appraisal appear to assume the inclusion of the Cannington West Bypass.</p>	89178-574-3816			/	

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 2	It appears from Figure 8.1 in the appraisal that freight will travel westbound via the A39 and avoid Main Road. If this is the case we would expect to see a link closure for these vehicle types on Main Road to force this route. No link closure is included on Main Road in any scenario. Therefore, Freight is able to route to HPC via Main Road. In the 'with Cannington Bypass' option a link closure on Rodway is provided to force use of the new bypass. However, they can still traverse Main Road.	89178-574-4008	/			
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	As with Freight, it is not clear as to the exact route that development buses will follow to pass Cannington and buses are able to pass via Main Road in all scenarios (with and without Cannington Bypass).	89178-574-8363			/	
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The methodology and assumptions relating to the Bridgwater Bypass are not discussed in the appraisal.	89179-574-957	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	A lack of evidence to justify EDF's transport strategy (including the proposal for a Cannington bypass, the omission of a Bridgwater bypass	89196-574-11086	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Robust Assessment of the Bypass Proposals; including the various Bridgwater and Cannington bypass options; and	89221-574-2612			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	2.39 Given the large number of highway works being proposed (all new accesses to AD sites and the HPC site, Cannington bypass as a minimum), the County Council seeks clarification from EDF on the process for undertaking the Road safety Audit and drafting S278 agreements, particularly in relation to the level of detail required for the DCO application, since these aspects can be very timely.	89222-574-13599	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	1. Safety, in particular in relation to vehicle and / or pedestrian accident levels; 2. Local severance and urban realm impacts within Bridgwater and, in particular, Cannington; and	89223-574-3746			/	

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	<p>2.51 The conclusions for the Bridgwater Northern Bypass scheme are consistent with the data and analysis presented within the rest of the report; however, a much wider appraisal is advocated in order to assess the operation of the bypass across all relevant scenarios and across all relevant criteria.</p> <p>2.52 The bypass study should also consider innovative and lower cost engineering options for direct access to the site (such as temporary structures, floating structures and shuttle operation). It is possible that cheaper bypass options could be identified, particularly if access is solely for HPC traffic and is not a public facility.</p> <p>2.53 The conclusions for the Cannington Western Bypass scheme are considered to be inconsistent with the data and analysis presented within the rest of the report. The authors themselves highlight that there are no definitive reasons to justify the scheme but state that it would still be beneficial to construct. A much wider appraisal is required in order to provide objective justification.</p>	89223-574-4047	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>It is recommended that the bypass study be updated by undertaking the following actions:</p> <p>1. A more detailed issues and opportunities assessment is undertaken that incorporate reference cases which test impacts during various stages throughout the construction and operational phases;</p>	89223-574-5430	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>2. A clear set of SMART objectives is established against which to assess scheme option performance, in the context of the transport strategy;</p> <p>3. A more detailed review of the traffic model results is undertaken with additional commentary on the results presented;</p> <p>4. A wider set of appraisal criteria are employed, using the New Approach to Transport Appraisal (NATA) methodology; and</p> <p>5. The conclusions are reviewed in the light of the new analysis.</p>	89223-574-5720	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	10. Bypass Study;	89226-574-669			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>The future year modelling assessment has focussed on the network conditions predicted in 2016.</p> <p>3.78 The following 2016 year models have been provided by SBA:</p> <p>1. 2016 'Do Minimum' Base</p> <p>2. 2016 Base + development</p> <p>3. 2016 Base + development with Cannington West bypass</p> <p>4. 2016 Base + development with Bridgwater bypass</p>	89228-574-13403			/	

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 assessment of the road network should then be extended to include the impact that the HPC development trips will have upon performance. It is recommended that testing is undertaken in relation to a number of reference cases which test impacts during various stages throughout the construction and operational phases (including outages). It is important that impacts are examined both within peak periods, as well as across the day. The current analysis only examines the 'Peak Construction Year' scenario.	89231-574-384	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Based upon the analysis of the forecast road network performance under the reference cases, a clear set of SMART objectives should be established against which the two bypass options can be assessed. This will allow the performance of the proposed bypass schemes to be objectively assessed.  3.105 There is a very thorough policy review section that is used to emphasise that traffic management measures and sustainable travel options should be promoted instead of new road capacity. This has significant relevance for the appraisal; however, the later conclusions, in relation to the support for Cannington Western Bypass, appear at odds with this policy position.	89231-574-1390	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	08 It is our view that it is not appropriate for EDF to rule infrastructure out on deliverability grounds largely related to project timescales at this point in the process. We expect this would be an issue for the IPC to consider in terms of the relative priority of the urgency of energy provision balanced against local impact.  3.109 The conclusions for the Bridgwater Northern Bypass scheme are consistent with the data and analysis presented within the rest of the report; however, a much wider appraisal is advocated in order to assess the operation of the bypass across all relevant scenarios and across all relevant criteria.	89231-574-2765	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	It is considered more informative to assess the two bypass options against the 'reference case' that includes the HPC development trips. This would then clearly identify how each bypass would impact upon traffic flows across the network. Much of the text references this type of comparison and so it would be easy to see the relevant numbers in the tables.	89231-574-7731	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The concluding comments in 6.4.9 state that "the level of HPC traffic routing through Bridgwater can be mitigated by local improvements". These improvements should be referenced and an explanation provided as to why there is confidence that they will resolve any issues related to higher traffic flows.  3.126 The final concluding comments in 6.4.9 presents the impact of the bypasses on reducing trips through Cannington; however, it would again be useful for the text to discuss the proportion of trips that are diverted that are HPC-related trips and the proportion that relates to existing traffic movements.	89231-574-8878	/			

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 issues raised in relation to deliverability are valid with there being little logic in constructing the Bridgwater Bypass to mitigate HPC-construction traffic if the project proceeds as scheduled; however, since none of the analysis considers either the 'normal' or 'outage' HPC operation it is unclear whether the Bridgwater Bypass could deliver benefits beyond the construction phase. The comments relating to the requirement to deliver HPC within the current programme in order to "secure the nation's energy supply" is beyond the scope of this audit.	89231-574-9711			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	It is not clear as to the exact route that freight will follow to pass Cannington. The details provided (6) in the appraisal appear to assume the inclusion of the Cannington West Bypass.	89236-574-6835		/		
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	As with Freight, it is not clear as to the exact route that development buses will follow to pass Cannington and buses are able to pass via Main Road in all scenarios (with and without Cannington Bypass).	89237-574-3246		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Impact criteria are only given for severance, cyclist and pedestrian amenity and fear and intimidation, and therefore do not relate to all the potential impacts listed above	89367-574-1025			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	In all cases any traffic flow change of less than 30% is assessed as Negligible. Whilst this is the basic criteria set down in the Guidance, it specifically refers to the need also to assess sensitive areas where traffic increases of at least 10% or where HGV's have increased significantly can result in impacts. Both these criteria will apply to Cannington.	89367-574-1199			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	No assessment of affected parties is made, though a "receptor sensitivity" table is included, presumably as a proxy.	89367-574-1563			/	



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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	No assessment is made of the preliminary works phase or the operational phase despite the Guidance specifically requiring all phases to be considered	89367-574-2180	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment is based on 24 hour flows with no evidence of development peak or highway peak hour modelling being undertaken. This is despite IEMA Guidance specifically requiring assessment of the hours of greatest traffic change. For Cannington this will be early morning (shift start) or late evening (shift end)	89367-574-2334	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	the assessment methodology is totally inadequate and no reliance can be placed on the assessment of impacts or their significance.	89367-574-3060	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	any assessment of significance is meaningless because of the fundamental flaws in the methodology.	89367-574-5276			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	situation of Hinkley C going ahead without the Transport Strategy (i.e. with no mitigation due to the park and ride sites) is not addressed.	89367-574-5392	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	no assessment has been undertaken on receptors near to the bypass, such as Brymore School, which it is assumed would be adversely affected by the proposal.	89367-574-6004	/			

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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The justification for the bypass has not been fully presented, as the no-bypass option has not been included	89368-574-12984			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Due to the extent of the proposals a holistic transport appraisal should be undertaken which is in accordance with the New Approach to Appraisal (NATA) Transport Analysis Guidance (webTAG). In addition as there are significant infrastructure related works to the highways network locally and interfacing with the strategic highways network NATA appraisals are required which consider the options for the actual proposed measures (e.g. bypasses and Park & rides) and enable the comparison of options against the national transport Objectives (i.e. Economy, Accessibility, Safety, Environment and Integration) and the local transport policies (e.g. Land-Use Policy Sub-Objective).	89416-574-7970	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The assessment of residual impacts is poor, with only 24 hour flows being presented. This means that highway and environmental impacts cannot be correctly assessed.	89426-574-1709			/	
30	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	The original plans for this route for a bypass were proposed many years ago when traffic was far lighter than it is today, present lorry size and weight were not in existence and there were far less housing developments in the area.	89819-574-961			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	Both Government advice, as is set out in Guidance on Transport Assessment, and the Draft HPC SPD, require any new highway proposals to be justified by a New Approach to Appraisal (NATA) assessment. No such assessment is provided.  A Cannington Bypass is not part of any highway authority programme and therefore its justification must be based on the impact of HPC project traffic. No assessment of alternatives, as required by NATA, has been provided.	89896-574-2387	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	If there is a new By-pass at Cannington the Parish Council would prefer the Westerly option because of the bus links from the A39 West linking up with CI 82. This makes it easier for the buses.	8723-577-1800		/		The proposed Cannington bypass was supported by many respondents however there was concern raised that it would not be appealing to motorists and that they would continue to travel through Cannington as the route is shorter than the bypass.
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	Full details of the Cannington Bypass proposal should be provided in order for the County Council to provide meaningful comment, including detailed design, layout, widths and elevations. EDF will need to provide long-term maintenance funds if the route is built.	87940-577-1946			/	In order to maximise the use of the bypass, it is proposed that traffic calming would be provided through Cannington along High Street, Main Road, Fore Street and Rodway. A weight restriction (except for local access to Cannington) would be introduced within the village and clearly signed on the A39 and the bypass.  Further to the use of traffic calming and weight restrictions to make travelling through Cannington less appealing, a strategy of positive direction signing would be provided to direct traffic around Cannington via the new bypass. Temporary "No HPC Construction Traffic" signs will also be provided at strategic locations.
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	1.30. It is agreed that EDF will need to provide long-term maintenance funds if the route is built (4.4.23).	88000-577-5012			/	Respondents raised concerns that the proposed bypass would cause safety concerns, in particular inappropriate traffic speeds and difficulties for pedestrians, cyclists and livestock in crossing the road.
Somerset Wildlife Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	For the bypass to be an attractive alternative to journeying straight through Cannington, traffic-calming measures to deter through-traffic will need to be installed throughout the village. Without these, there is little incentive for any vehicle to use the bypass, and successful enforcement of a travel policy for construction and EDF-related traffic seems unlikely. Unless traffic calming can be instituted in Cannington, thus making the bypass the more attractive routing option for drivers, the accrual of ecological impacts through road construction seem unwarranted.	8769-577-11099	/			The proposed bypass would be subject to a 40mph speed limit. This would be reinforced through the design of the route which would have appropriate horizontal alignment radii and have less of a rural appearance with kerbed edges, no hard strips and a footway/cycleway along one side.
Bridgwater College	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	From the College's point of view, Cannington village is a high risk location. The College operates on both sides of Rodway and students cross the road continuously. Any increase in traffic along the Rodway would be of concern to the College, and would certainly need to be managed with traffic calming or traffic lights/pedestrian lights. Either by-pass should alleviate this although there would need to be some management of workforce to ensure that the by-pass was used rather than 'short-cuts' through the village.	8774-577-1695	/			The bypass would include a toucan crossing (suitable for use by pedestrians and cyclists and livestock) that would also allow for the safe movement of pupils to Brymore School.  Consultees expressed concerns in relation to the legacy of the proposed bypass and its usefulness, including concerns that the new road would offer little benefit to road users other than to those travelling to Hinkley Point.
Tractivity 753	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments?  For this bypass to achieve its objective there must be traffic calming measures installed in Main Rd, High St and Roadway in Cannington, otherwise vehicles will use the village as a 'rat run'.	9511-577-3144		/		EDF Energy intends that the road will remain a permanent legacy for Cannington once work is completed at HPC and that the road will be adopted as public highway and managed by Somerset County Council. The long term maintenance would be supported by EDF Energy who would contribute towards a long term maintenance fund.
Tractivity 880	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments?  Provided sufficient traffic calming provision is made at the junctions either end of the bypass and at the entrance to Combwich Village and where the wharf road joins main carriageway and all other existing junctions between Cannington and the Hinkley Point site.	9638-577-3007		/		The <b>Transport Assessment</b> undertaken for HPC indicates that the Cannington western bypass would

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 887	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? I would like to see some traffic calming measures 1) within the village of Cannington 2) I would like an extension of the 30 mph speed limit from Bridgwater to Cannington itself.	9645-577-2917		/		be effective in attracting traffic away from the village centre during construction of HPC and would continue to be effective in attracting traffic away from the village centre post completion of the HPC works
Tractivity 908	Public	Stage 2	7. Any other ideas or comments? If you can find land for such a temporary carpark, it sounds a good idea. It will need to be easily accesible by the motorist and well signposted.	9666-577-3728			/	
Tractivity 1178	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? I agree that a Western bypass of Cannington would be beneficial to the village. However I have concerns that the increased traffic volumes may not be easily accomodated by the already overcrowded Bridgwater road system. In addition I would suggest traffic calming and weight restriction measures to discourage vehicle movements in the village of Cannington itself.	9936-577-2559		/		
Tractivity 1182	Public	Stage 2	6. Any other ideas or comments? Your opening statement is incorrect, there is a lack of evidence to support this view. If a bypass for Cannington is to be built, then it should form a part of a large scheme to bypass both Bridgwater and Cannington. Your proposals DO NOT resolve the A38/39 Bridgwater congestion issues.	9940-577-3343		/		
Tractivity 1186	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? They should not begin until an ADEQUATE bypass for Cannington has been completed.	9944-577-1001		/		
Tractivity 215	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Less disruptive, cheaper option. Will not destroy the lovely walks on the eastern side of the village. Please ENFORCE a 30 mile speed limit through the village of Cannington ie. with sleeping polcemen.	9336-577-1974	/			
Tractivity 266	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference If shuttle buses are used for transporting workers the volume of traffic could be managed.	8955-577-1311			/	
Tractivity 398	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Access for traffic from Minehead direction of A39 to join C182 easier. By pass from Dunball to Combwich wharf road a better option.	9082-577-1218		/		
Tractivity 613	Public	Stage 1	5. Please give reasons for your preference Least disruption to through traffic to the ongoing traffic to A39 Minehead area.	9277-577-1907			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62248	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 1	<p>iii) Eastern Bypass - look at junction</p> <p>iv) Western Bypass - look at junction and road</p> <p>-If western:</p> <p>-a- would lane retain access to main road:</p> <p>-b- Speed limit from junction of bypass to grain store?</p> <p>-c- Crossing road - what measures planned e.g. school bus?</p> <p>-d- provision of suitable footway</p>	9369-577-4912			/	
Tractivity 62386	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	1. This by pass will take up to 15 months to build and during this time EDF will be using heavy vehicles to transport aggregates through Cannington to build the jetty and wharf at Comwich and the Hinkley Point site. So for 15 months or so the residents of Cannington will have to put up with the noise, pollution and traffic safety issues before the new road is in use. EDF should be made to have this road in place before they start building.	10049-577-1453		/		
Tractivity 62571	Public	Stage 2	<p>7.0 Post Completion.</p> <p>7.1 It is recommended that the C182 Rodway be restricted to a limited access road at the roundabout where it will join the proposed new by-pass when travelling south, towards Cannington village, by means of a drop pole barrier. This would be accessible by public service vehicles and emergency vehicles only. This is to prevent vehicles using this section of the C182 as a 'rat-run'.</p> <p>7.2 That the recommended 7.5 tonnes weight restriction in Cannington village be continued permanently. This is to ensure that heavy goods vehicles use the by-passes.</p>	10122-577-3335		/		
Tractivity 62575	Public	Stage 2	<p>Cannington Village Traffic Calming- Intent of Proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To safeguard the residents of Cannington</li> <li>▪ To prevent Cannington being used as a "rat run" if the Cannington 'West' bypass is approved</li> <li>▪ - To slow traffic through the village</li> </ul>	10126-577-2720		/		
Tractivity 62575	Public	Stage 2	<p>Background</p> <p>Currently all traffic travelling from Bridgwater to Hinkley Point power station has to pass through Cannington village. The present amount of traffic using this route is a cause for concern to villagers. The route would not safely handle an increased amount of traffic, therefore it is necessary to ensure that time is saved by using the bypass, not passing through the village.</p>	10126-577-2956			/	
Tractivity 62631	Public	Stage 2	There is no compulsion for traffic to take a bypass around Cannington many drivers will still try to take a short cut through the village, will the Satellite Navigation Mapping Systems be altered to save excessive traffic through the village?	10175-577-5830		/		
Cannington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	There will always be commuters and heavy goods vehicles who will try to drive through the village as a short cut rather than use the proposed bypass. It is essential that traffic calming measures are implemented prior to any proposed works taking place.	10221-577-14782		/		

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 2	It is noted in the 'with Cannington Bypass' scenario Rodway is closed to HPC freight and bus trips and therefore forces the use of the new bypass. This appears to agree with the routing plans presented in Figure 9.1.	89179-577-740			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	is that the proposals contain no substantive detail on proposed mitigation to address the impact on Somerset's highway network other than a Cannington bypass and Park and Ride provision.	89195-577-1432	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	9. Any Transport Mitigation Measures; which are required to minimise the impact of the development (with exception to Cannington Bypass).	89221-577-2726	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	2.56 A key omission of the Transport Appraisal is the assessment of the phasing of the development. There are particular concerns in the early years of development when construction has started but the Transport Strategy measures are not in place (e.g. 2012 / 2013). This work is fundamental to understanding the impacts on a year-by-year basis and to establish trigger points by which various transport mitigation may need to be introduced.	89223-577-6184	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The transport mitigation proposed to date includes a Travel Plan, a Freight Management Strategy (not yet provided), a Waste Management Strategy (not yet provided) and a Cannington Bypass.	89224-577-3317			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	It appears from Figure 8.1 in the appraisal that freight will travel westbound via the A39 and avoid Main Road. If this is the case we would expect to see a link closure for these vehicle types on Main Road to force this route. No link closure is included on Main Road in any scenario. Therefore, Freight is able to route to HPC via Main Road. In the 'with Cannington Bypass' option a link closure on Rodway is provided to force use of the new bypass. However, they can still traverse Main Road.	89236-577-7031		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stogursey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	Cannington By-pass: The provision of traffic calming measures in Cannington before the by-pass is built is not practical or desirable. These measures should only be put in place once the by-pass is complete, to dissuade people from travelling through the village, which should be made 'access-only'. All HPC traffic must be required to use the by-pass.	89289-577-1936		/		
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	As with the park and ride facility proposed for Cannington, the Cannington West Bypass should be in operation in order to mitigate the effect of traffic movements from the proposed park and ride facility at Williton.	89443-577-4750		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Other than the mitigation provided by the park and ride strategy during construction and the Travel Plan measures during operation, the only mitigation proposed is the Cannington Bypass. There is no evidence of consideration of sea transport as a potential means of mitigating road journeys completed by workers	89345-577-2226	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The bypass should be in conjunction with weight restrictions and traffic calming measures in Cannington	89367-577-4964	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The authorities are concerned that the timing of the construction of the Cannington Bypass, set out at paragraph 13.9, is linked to the implementation of the DCO application and there is no link to the timing and traffic impacts associated with the preliminary works. It is important to understand how the Cannington Bypass can be delivered to help mitigate the construction traffic associated with the preliminary works and this should be reflected through an Obligation, linking the bypass to the implementation of the preliminary works. The timescales and process for maintenance and adoption need to be confirmed.	89420-577-18360	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Further mitigation is likely to be necessary, by early construction of the Cannington Bypass to mitigate the impact of the preliminary works, the construction of mitigation measures in Bridgwater in line with the transport strategy for the town, and possibly the construction of the Bridgwater Northern Bypass.	89423-577-4389	/			
English Heritage	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	It is understood that there are also benefits to the village through the construction of the by-pass as it should reduce the amount of heavy goods traffic through the village centre. We understand that there may also be some enhancement works proposed to the high street in order to provide some traffic calming. We would ask that this is done in accordance to our "Streets for All Manual" <a href="http://www.helm.org.uk/upload/pdf/South-West-Streets-Part1.pdf?1301323748">http://www.helm.org.uk/upload/pdf/South-West-Streets-Part1.pdf?1301323748</a> and that the (personal details removed) for Sedgemoor is consulted on these proposals.	89718-577-5513			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
6	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 1	The questionnaire puts forward two alternative sites for a facility at Cannington. Although I would reject them both, I must now express a preference between them. I come down unhesitatingly in favour of CAN-A and against CAN-B, If it is desirable to intercept light vehicles at Cannington, then it must be desirable to do it earlier in their journey rather than later, and certainly before they have to drive round the new bypass. - The reasons which I-have given, in relation to park and ride, for preferring CAN-A to CAN-B apply largely here as well.	89795-577-1531	/			
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	'The width of the footway/cycleway has been reduced, in response to comments from statutory consultees that this would reduce the perception of space and in turn reduce speed on the roads.' In addition to the provision of a footway/cycleway, EDFE should provide alternative footpath and cycle routes along popular routes that would prevent the need for pedestrians and cyclist to have to travel long distances along the bypass.	89896-577-6493		/		



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 and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Monitoring during the construction period is inadequate	89367-578-7219	/			<p>Consultees expressed concerns that monitoring during the construction period would be inadequate.</p> <p>All freight vehicles associated with the development that pass through Cannington would have to use the bypass once opened. This agreement would form part of the contract with EDF Energy and suppliers would be monitored via series of Automatic Number Plate Recognition Cameras The monitoring would be carried out by the Transport Steering Group.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	No details of monitoring during the preliminary works are provided	89367-578-7276	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	For the operational phase monitoring is proposed three months after commencement of operations and annually thereafter for a period of ten years. The frequency of monitoring should be greater in the earlier years to reflect the phased timescales of the two reactors, and continue for a period of at least ten years from the second reactor coming on-stream.	89367-578-7344			/	

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	Justification for the Cannington and Bridgwater Bypasses.	89196-579-2304			/	<p>Consultees raised concerns under this heading related to specific transport issues which are addressed under the appropriate topic headings within the Cannington Bypass theme.</p> <p>The <b>Transport - Other - Documentation</b> topic response addresses consultee comments raised about wider documentation issues related to transport.</p>
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Spot checks have revealed that some values used in the Chapter 10 tables do not match the backing spreadsheets. It appears that many of the values presented as 'Without Cannington Bypass' AAWT have been populated with 'With Cannington Bypass' figures (e.g. Link codes V2, V3, ST3, ST4, I2).	89230-579-2525	/			