

Schedule of Responses – Appendix H.1

Junction 24 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. | 89396-1360-519 | / | | | At Stage 2 of consultation Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council commented that the air quality baseline had been adequately defined, but that additional monitoring should take place to assess if impact mitigation is effective. As a direct response to this comment further air quality monitoring, which includes an extension of the existing baseline dataset during both the construction and operational phases of the Hinkley Point C development, has been proposed. This is discussed in greater detail within Chapter 10 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement and the supporting management plan. |
| Tractivity 1414 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | This roundabout and link road to M5 jams up with traffic (as does road to North petherton and Bridgwater). the same access roundabout is dangerous and frightening for pedestrians and cyclists! However all traffic then has to go through Bridgwater. Slow congested roads! Too many bottle-neck junctions = Pollution because of stagnant traffic. | 89989-1360-25 | | | / | |

| 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 | Air Quality Further Air Quality assessments are to be undertaken by EDF Energy. The methodologies will need to be consistent with current UK guidance and the methods and results will need to be approved by Sedgemoor DC. | 88420-1368-1266 | / | | | <p>Consultation comments in respect of the Junction 24 Associated Development site were received at Stage 1 from Sedgemoor District Council and WSC, and primarily related to the need for further air quality assessments to be undertaken and for applied methodologies to be approved by SDC.</p> <p>At the Stage 1 consultation stage, an initial air quality consultation meeting had been held with WSC and SDC (on 9 December 2008). Two further air quality consultation meetings have been subsequently held with WSC and SDC (and their environmental advisors), on 1 October 2009 and 22 February 2011. The methodologies applied to the air quality impact assessment were discussed and agreed with SDC during these consultation meetings. A summary of the key outcomes of these consultation meetings is provided in the Air Quality Chapter (Volume 9, Chapter 10) of the Environmental Statement (ES).</p> <p>At the Stage 2 consultation stage the Highways Agency requested that the impact assessment be made available to allow a reappraisal of the impacts on the strategic road network. This is included Volume 9, Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement (ES).</p> |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | 3.100 The results show that the greatest impact for an increase in modelled NO2 and PM10 concentrations occur in the vicinity of M5 J23 and J24, however, these increases are deemed to be negligible using the ADMS-Roads dispersion modelling software. However, the impact significance has not been determined in accordance with current guidance, Development Control: Planning for Air Quality (2010 Update) published by EPUK in April 2010. The report states that the impact significance will be determined using current guidance when the final EIA is undertaken and ES prepared which will be submitted as part of the DCO. This work must be undertaken and submitted to the Agency to allow a reappraisal of the impact on the SRN. | 89174-1368-1786 | / | | | |

| 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 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). | 89396-1363-2448 | | / | | Comments received in relation to the potential cumulative impacts of the Junction 24 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 potential cumulative effects other than those from road traffic and the recommendation to include a cumulative assessment of car park, freight facility and road traffic emissions. |
| 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 cumulative assessment of car park and emissions from the freight facility and traffic along local access roads. | 89396-1363-4453 | | / | | 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 HPC Project with other committed and proposed development are considered in the Volume 11 of the Environmental Statement (ES) . Interactive cumulative air quality impacts with other environmental topics (e.g. noise, landscape) associated with the HPC Project on specific sensitive receptors are also considered in the Volume 11 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 | In relation to the Freight Logistics & J24 there should be a cumulative assessment of car park and emissions from the freight facility and traffic along local access roads. | 89409-1363-16633 | | / | | The vehicular air quality impacts on the wider highway network, associated with the operation of the Junction 24 AD site, have been assessed for all traffic associated with the HPC Project. Therefore the assessment of operational vehicular emissions is a cumulative assessment. Car parks have not been included within a cumulative assessment on the basis of their size and intended usage. Until the Junction 23 site becomes available, the Junction 24 AD site would provide up to 1,300 parking spaces and up to 140 Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) holding spaces. Once the Junction 23 facilities become fully operational, the number of parking spaces and HGV holding spaces at the Junction 24 AD site would be reduced. The operational profile of the car park and freight/HGV holding facility would not be comparable to that of, for example, a supermarket car park whereby numerous drivers may use each space several times per day. It is on this basis that a cumulative assessment with emissions from car parks and the freight facility has not been included within either the Chapter 10 of Volume 9 of the ES or Volume 11 , as they are unlikely to be a significant source of emissions to air. |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 713 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? I am concerned about the noise, pollution, amount of traffic going in and out of this site. The P&R will also change the street scene from coming down the road into the development from being quiet to lots of activity which at the moment is a lovely development. Also the Huntworth Roundabout gets congested when people are trying to access the services at this junction. | 9471-1362-5354 | / | | | <p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council commented on the M5, J24 and Bridgwater Highways Improvements Consultation that EDF Energy would need to appraise the air quality impacts both on-site and off-site, during construction and operation of the Somerfield site.</p> <p>The assessment of potential air quality impacts as a result of the construction and operation of the revised site has been carried out both off-site and on-site, and is detailed within the Chapter 10 of Volume 9 of the</p> |
| Tractivity 970 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Concerns of traffic congestions on Huntsworth Roundabout all directions. Concerns what will the site be used for when EDF hands over. Blot on the landscape, eating into greenbelt land added pollution in a confined area. Resale value of houses. Excessive noise levels when freight vehicles start the engines in cold climate. In conclusion there is no benefit to the residents of stockmore Village, Wilstock Village, North Petherton. | 9728-1362-5419 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1013 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The junction cannot cope with the volume of traffic that currently exists due to the service station. It is also a highly populated residential area and out of peak hours would affect the residents with both noise and light pollution. | 9771-1362-7712 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1315 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 Update | DO NOT implement the park and ride facility and freight terminal at Junction 24. This will affect us with regard to house values, congestion, pollution, noise, open country views, shortage of land for food production. Developing green field sites will curtail food production. | 89581-1362-845 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1319 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 Update | The site will obstruct views of Quantock Hills and impact on local wildlife and the environment due to noise and pollution. | 89585-1362-1346 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 62333 | Public | Stage 2 | This proposed site would be visible from our house and we are sure there is going to be associated noise and pollution to go along with this. | 10015-1362-537 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 62611 | Public | Stage 2 | 19/8/10 - He lives on the Willstock side of junction 24. He is very concerned about park & ride/ Lorries. Wants to speak to someone about roads. Also worried about pollution and house prices | 10158-1362-48 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - The significance of impact on air quality is also played down because of the site's relationship to the A38 and M5. The Council advocates that the additional impact of EDFE using the Somerfield site (with a more intensive use pattern than currently on-site) in conjunction with the impacts of the A38 and M5 results in the need to appraise air quality impacts both on-site and off- site, and during both construction and operation, so as to demonstrate that breaches in air quality levels will not occur. | 89960-1362-21980 | / | | | <p>Environmental Statement (ES), where the significance level of all impacts are presented. This includes an assessment of operational vehicular emissions which take account of non-work related trips of construction workers.</p> <p>Impacts have all been assessed in line with current published guidelines and best practice guidance, in addition to the professional experience of the air quality assessor. Impacts are therefore assessed on the basis of the risk posed by the construction site and the proximity of sensitive receptors. The significance criteria applied to the assessment of air quality impacts has also been updated since Stage 2, to take account of the latest published guidance from Environmental Protection UK (EPUK).</p> <p>Comments were also received from local residents at Stage 2 and Stage 2a raising concern about the air pollution associated with the increased road traffic associated with the facility, particularly with regards to the network around the Huntworth roundabout.</p> <p>Measures have been proposed at the Huntworth roundabout in order to mitigate impacts (including air quality) as a result of the increased traffic and congestion at this location. The proposals include the introduction of signalling at this roundabout as a result of other developments in this area, thereby managing traffic more effectively and minimising associated impacts. Full details of these proposals are provided in the Chapter 8 of Volume 9 of the ES.</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 | Air Quality Further Air Quality assessments are to be undertaken by EDF Energy. The methodologies will need to be consistent with current UK guidance and the methods and results will need to be approved by Sedgemoor DC. | 88420-1361-1266 | / | | | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| 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. | 89396-1361-915 | / | | | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. |
| 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 very fine particles (PM25) has been included beyond the identification of assessment criterion. | 89396-1361-1078 | / | | | On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. |
| 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 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. 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. | 89396-1361-1194 | / | | | The comments for the Junction 24 site were received from Sedgemoor District Council (SDC) and West Somerset Council (WSC) at Stage 2 and related to the need to include the pollutant PM _{2.5} within the assessment of vehicular emissions, questioned the appropriateness of including the Junction 24 site within the 'Bridgwater' ADMS Roads model and recommended the use of updated air quality impact significance criteria published following Stage. |
| 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. | 89396-1361-1727 | / | | | Emissions of PM _{2.5} from vehicle exhausts have been considered within the Chapter 10 of Volume 9 of the |

| 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 is qualitative and makes a number of unsupported assumptions. The use of the Bridgwater model in ADMS is not supported and a location specific model would be more appropriate. Given the location of receptors (relatively close) the conclusions of the assessment could be greater than stated. | 89396-1361-3002 | / | | | <p>Environmental Statement (ES) and their impacts determined. The inclusion of the Junction 24 site within the Bridgwater model is considered to be a valid approach. The ambient background concentrations (without vehicular process contribution) at the Junction 24 will be comparable to those measured for the remainder of Bridgwater. The highest background pollutant concentrations obtained for the Bridgwater model area from the Defra UK Air Quality Archive (UKAQA) background maps have been applied to the assessment, and thus a worst-case approach has been taken. Full details of the ADMS Roads dispersion modelling exercise are provided in the supporting modelling to Chapter 10 of Volume 9 of the ES.</p> <p>A Comment made by SDC and WSC at the Stage 2 consultation stated that "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". The lack of observed decreases in ambient NO₂ concentrations in future years has been discussed in the Chapter 10 of Volume 9 of the ES. In order to take account of uncertainties regarding trends in NO₂ 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). 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). Development Control: Planning for Air Quality (2010 Update) (2010).</p> |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Significance 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 | 89396-1361-3376 | / | | | |
| 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 qualitative and makes a number of unsupported assumptions. The use of the Bridgwater model is not supported. Given the location of receptors (relatively close) the conclusions of the assessment could be greater than stated. | 89428-1361-14900 | / | | | |
| 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. There is no assessment of very fine particulate matter (PM25). | 89428-1361-15243 | / | | | |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | 3.100 The results show that the greatest impact for an increase in modelled NO ₂ and PM ₁₀ concentrations occur in the vicinity of M5 J23 and J24, however, these increases are deemed to be negligible using the ADMS-Roads dispersion modelling software. However, the impact significance has not been determined in accordance with current guidance, Development Control: Planning for Air Quality (2010 Update) published by EPUK in April 2010. The report states that the impact significance will be determined using current guidance when the final EIA is undertaken and ES prepared which will be submitted as part of the DCO. This work must be undertaken and submitted to the Agency to allow a reappraisal of the impact on the SRN. | 89174-41-1786 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|---|---|--------------------|--|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1319 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 Update | What proposals are you putting into place to compensate residents of Stockmoor Village who live opposite proposed site at Junction 24 to compensate them for decrease in property values/pollution/noise/disruption. | 89585-1364-82 | | / | | <p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>The comments for the Junction 24 site were received from Sedgemoor District Council (SDC) and West Somerset Council (WSC) at Stage 2 and primarily related to clarification of the mitigation measures that would be committed to in order to mitigate any potential air quality impacts. A consultee also queried at Stage 2 Update the prospect of compensation for residents of Stockmoor Village, owing to the potential</p> |
| 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. | 89396-1364-2089 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Shipping emissions are not quantified and so no mitigation is proposed. Residual effects should be monitored in some cases. This is not discussed in the EnvApp. | 89396-1364-2281 | | / | | |
| 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. | 89396-1364-3650 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Moderately adverse impact has been identified as likely to result during construction of this site and this is mitigated to "minor adverse". This is contingent on adequate mitigation to which there is no commitment in the EnvApp; mitigation relies on the EMMP and its adequate implementation. Other impacts are stated as Negligible. | 89396-1364-4011 | / | | | |

| 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 commitment to any mitigation so the impacts could be greater than that predicted. | 89428-1364-15144 | / | | | <p>air pollution impacts associated with the site.</p> <p>Possible management measures that would be employed during the construction phase of the Junction 24 site are outlined in the Chapter 10 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (ES). Further 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 environmental monitoring and management plan (EMMP) and Associated Development Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP).</p> <p>The air quality impacts associated with the construction and operation of the site have been assessed to be not significant. With the implementation of the management and mitigation measures, potential impacts will be further reduced. No compensation package is therefore considered to be necessary solely in relation to potential air quality impacts.</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 | 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. | 89396-1365-519 | / | | | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| 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. | 89396-1365-1727 | | | / | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. |
| 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. | 89396-1365-2356 | / | | | On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. The monitoring comments received from Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council for the Junction 24 AD site were received at Stage 2 and related to the monitoring of residual air quality effects. 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. |

| 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 | 4. The former Huntworth Depot at the M5 Junction 24 area is also an area with potential for land contamination, because of possible fuel storage or other automotive activity. (pg 214, pdf pg 231). | 87960-1378-0 | | | / | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| 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 used to assess the baseline ground conditions are those that would normally be expected and include: a walk over survey, Envirocheck Reports the site, reference to Ordnance Survey (OS) and Geological maps of the area, review of the Environment Agency website and review of local maps of Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) and Regionally Important Geological Sites (RIGs). | 89396-1378-10327 | | | / | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. |
| 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 form part of, and be included within the baseline assessment. | 89396-1378-11205 | / | | | On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Basing the assessment on desk study information is acceptable. However, incorporating the site investigation results would be even better. Also an outline of the scope, timing and duration of intrusive investigation works is not provided. | 89396-1378-11890 | / | | | The potential for land contamination has been considered in Chapter 12 of Volume 9 of the ES and includes a reassessment of historical land use maps of the proposed development site with data not available 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 | Copies of the historical maps have not been included in the EnvApp, so the accuracy of the description and interpretation cannot be checked. More recent historical OS maps would have provided information on the more recent land uses at the site and surrounding area. | 89396-1378-14596 | / | | | |

| 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 assessment 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. 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. | 89396-1378-15331 | / | | | |
| 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 and/or during removal and re-instatement following the closure of the proposed development. | 89396-1378-17906 | / | | | |
| 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. | 89396-1378-18328 | / | | | |
| Environment Agency | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Groundwater and Contaminated Land For the Somerfield site, we have no reason to suspect that there are any significant contamination issues on the site, either for the ambient store area or the chilled store area. However, because we have no history of the development of these sites, in the first instance we would require a desk study to check previous uses and for possible sources of contamination. | 89917-1378-2391 | / | | | |

| 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 | Land Contamination and Waste Further contaminated land assessments/surveys are to be undertaken by EDF Energy on relevant sites. These will need to be reviewed and approved by Sedgemoor District Council when they are completed. If these surveys identify contamination risks then further work may be required. | 88420-1386-951 | / | | | At Stage 2 intrusive investigations had not been undertaken at the proposed development site. A full intrusive site investigation was undertaken at the proposed development site between January and February 2011. The works included soil, soil leachate and groundwater sampling and analysis along with three rounds of gas monitoring. The results and associated risk assessments are presented within the Geology, Land Contamination and Groundwater Chapter (Chapter 12 of Volume 9) of the Environmental Statement (ES) and its appendices. |

| 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. | 89397-1381-6349 | / | | | The cumulative impacts of identified individual impacts for geology and land contamination are presented as Chapter 12 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (ES) . The chapter also includes information on the methodology for assessing cumulative impacts. Chapter 7 of Volume 1 of the ES includes information on the generic assessment criteria for the EIA. |

| 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 | 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. | 89397-1380-3054 | | / | | <p>The Environmental Appraisal presented at Stage 2 of the consultation process provided an initial assessment of potential impacts of the then proposed development site. Information concerning the qualification of the significance of the impacts was presented in a preceding chapter as the information was generic to all assessments.</p> <p>A full assessment of the significance of the potential impacts associated with land contamination of the proposed development site has been undertaken as part of the impact section presented in Chapter 12 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (ES). The chapter includes information on the methodology for assessing cumulative impacts. Full details concerning the qualification of the significance of the impacts, including a table showing the criteria for each significance level, is presented within Chapter 7 of Volume 1 the ES.</p> <p>The appropriate management plans will include measures to ensure that the stated management and monitoring requirements are adequately being undertaken.</p> |
| 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 these residual effects assumes that the proposed mitigations are correctly implemented, however and without checks and audits this is unlikely to be sustained. | 89397-1380-6142 | / | | | <p>The appropriate management plans will include measures to ensure that the stated management and monitoring requirements are adequately being undertaken.</p> |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--------------------|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | Whilst it is understood that on-site assessment has now been undertaken the basis by which the proposals have been formulated is fundamentally flawed as they are not informed by the potential for on-site historic constraints. | 89434-1379-151 | | / | | At Stage 2 the assessment criteria for magnitude included discussion on the 'responsible party' and the definition of change in respect to geology. As part of the production of the Chapter 12 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement 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. This section also includes information on the methodology for assessing the significance of impacts. Where changes to geology are concerned all changes (both manmade and natural) have been considered. The general EIA methodology is represented in Volume 1 Chapter 7 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 | <p>Table 6.7.1 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.</p> <p>Table 6.7.2 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. 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.</p> | 89397-1379-1030 | / | | | |

| 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 considered that mitigation would be required during the operation phase to prevent impact on the underlying soils from any leakages and spillages during the operation of the proposed (hardstanding cover, controlled system for discharge of foul and surface water, interceptors). In addition good standard health and safety measures should be in place to prevent exposure to contamination to any maintenance workers (e.g. utilities) which may be exposed to the soils beneath the site. | 89397-1382-4052 | / | | | <p>Since the comments were received at Stage 2 the proposed site has been changed. In the UK, it is an expectation that construction and operational sites are subject to a number of 'standard' health and safety and environmental control/infrastructure requirements which ensure legal compliance and the adoption of standard good practices/control measures. These will be adhered to/adopted for the proposed development.</p> <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 Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Chapter 12 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (ES) contains the assessment finding and any associated mitigation.</p> |
| 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 would be required prior to development to confirm the ground conditions and contamination status of the site. If contamination is identified then a remediation strategy will be required to identify how the material will be dealt with. This document should also contain a validation strategy detailing testing frequencies and identifying appropriate assessment criteria for site won and imported materials. This document will need to be approved prior to construction. | 89397-1382-5220 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Good standard practice adopted via an EMMP must be in place during the removal/reinstatement works. | 89428-1382-17258 | / | | | |

| 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. | 89396-1383-11718 | / | | | Since the comments were received at Stage 2 the preferred development site has been moved. In accordance with standard good practice management plans would be developed for implementation during the construction of the proposed development. The plans detail 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 assessment provides no consideration of monitoring. | 89397-1383-6436 | / | | | |

| 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 | Copies of planning records discussed within the EnvApp are not included within the document, and therefore have not been independently verified. | 89396-1384-16744 | | | / | Planning history records are not included as part of the submission as they are available through Sedgemoor District Council (SDC) and therefore are already available to stakeholders. |

| 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 | The Stage 1 Consultation document refers to an alternative Park and Ride site further to the north on the A38 (adjacent to Dawes Farm), which is allocated in the adopted Local Plan. It is noted that this site has been discounted by EDF Energy on grounds of potential adverse impacts on residential amenity on the basis of off- peak operation, but would request that a full and comprehensive assessment is undertaken before discounting the site completely. Particularly given that the legacy benefits on this site could ensure an outcome consistent with the objectives of the Local Plan and Bridgwater Vision. | 88410-1322-4715 | / | | | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Details of the site selection process are presented in Volume 3 of the Environmental Appraisal for accommodation campuses, Cannington by-pass, Cannington Park and Ride, Comwich Wharf Refurbishment and Freight Logistics/Storage facility, Junction 23 Park and Ride and Freight Logistics facility, Junction 24 Park and Ride and Freight Logistics facility and Williton Park and Ride. Whilst these sections contain a description of reasons why additional sites identified by the authorities, following Stage 1, have been rejected and include information (based on the responses received as part of Stage 1 consultation) on reasons why sites identified as part of the Stage 1 have been rejected or taken forward, there is no information or a separate document that describes the work undertaken by EDF Energy to systematically assess sites. | 89296-1322-765 | / | | | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Alternatives around J24 have been considered but ruled out. In transport terms their rejection is not based on a quantified assessment of traffic impacts. | 89428-1322-13434 | | | / | On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. |
| Tractivity 40251 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | Re: Statement of Representation On Behalf of (Personal details removed) I am the Agent instructed to make representations on behalf of (Personal details removed) in relation to his land at J24:M5 where you are proposing to construct a park and ride and freight logistics site. (Personal details removed) is the owner of much of this land. The land is under option to Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd which is being promoted through a special purchase vehicle known as Bridgwater Gateway Ltd. It is recognised that there is a need for this use in this general location, however the specific positioning of the site will have a huge detrimental impact upon the plans for the proposed development of this site by the options holder. Your specific use can be accommodated within the site but needs to be repositioned to allow the full development of this site to take place to the benefit of the whole community. Some of the intended uses for the site would also be of benefit to EDF directly but also your sub contractors. | 10244-41-0 | / | | | The rationale for the location of the proposed Junction 24 site is set out in the Transport Assessment and the appended Freight Management Strategy . As stated within these documents, there is a clear strategic requirement of the HPC Project for park and ride facilities, freight management facilities, a temporary consolidation facility for postal/courier deliveries and the temporary induction centre to be provided close to Junction 24 of the M5. These documents also explain the size of facilities required at Junction 24. The Chapter 6 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (ES) sets out the site selection methodology and explains the justification for discounting alternative sites. Sites around Junction 24 were considered during the project evolution, having regard to existing areas of commercial and residential |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--|------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| | | | Therefore please record this as our objecting to your current proposal, but please continue to negotiate for a repositioned site that will work for all. | | | | | <p>development in the vicinity of the Junction. The sites were then 'filtered' by applying the three key criteria: size/availability, location and access to determine the most suitable location. Certain sites had fundamental flaws in terms of either size, existing/active uses, location, and accessibility (or a combination of those factors), such that these sites were fundamentally unsuitable and/or inappropriate. For EDF Energy to have pursued them any further would have been illogical as they do not meet the defined key operational prerequisites.</p> <p>Two of the sites were both available to EDF Energy for the period required and were fit for purpose in terms of size, location and accessibility. Crucially, however, one of these sites (the Somerfield site) was located on previously developed land, rather than being a greenfield site. The buildings on the site could be reused and the site could be brought forward early in the HPC construction phase which would offer operational advantages to EDF Energy.</p> <p>Additionally, in response to the Stage 1 Consultation, West Somerset Council (WSC) and Sedgemoor District Council (SDC) made reference to use of an undeveloped park and ride site that is allocated in the Local Plan. This is located on an area of land to the west of the Proposed Development site at Junction 24. In January 2007 outline planning permission was granted (LPA ref. 37/04/00014) for a residential led mixed-use development (known as 'Stockmoor Village') on this land. This permission included a park and ride facility. A number of Reserved Matters Applications (RMAs) have come forward for residential development on Stockmoor Village, however EDF Energy is not aware of any plans to bring forward the park and ride site.</p> <p>In a public meeting held on 19th April 2011 at the Regional Rural Business Centre to discuss proposals at Bridgwater Gateway (LPA ref. 37/10/00116), (SDC) officers stated that the Stockmoor park and ride would not go ahead in the short term.</p> <p>At 4.6 ha in size the land comprising the Stockmoor park and ride site is too small to accommodate the size of development required for the Proposed Development. Even if the facility were sufficiently sized, the necessary operational hours of EDF Energy's development would be incompatible with the adjacent residential development.</p> <p>Finally, in the Joint Council response to the M5 Junction 24 and Highway Improvements consultation, the Councils stated that the proposal to provide a park and ride and freight management facility at the proposed Junction 24 site is acceptable in land use</p> |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------|------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | terms, subject to the agreement of a robust, deliverable and effective transport strategy for the HPC Project and an assessment of environmental impacts. |

| 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 | <p>Junction 24 of the M5 has been identified as a potentially suitable location for a park and ride facility to accommodate up to 350 cars and also a freight consolidation facility for road-borne freight in the event that EDF Energy's preferred search area at Junction 23 is not pursued.</p> <p>The status report noted that surface water drainage within this area is limited to minor drains that lead into the River Parrett by draining to the north-west on the west side of the M5, or to the east and north into the River Parrett on search areas to the east of the M5. The entirety of the search area falls within Flood Zone 1 so the report states there is no risk of flooding but PPS25 states there is still a low risk of flooding, however, the Agency will provide further comments upon receipt of the FRA at Stage 2 consultation.</p> | 88870-1441-2446 | | | / | <p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site.</p> |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | Bridgwater Strategic Flood Defence supplementary planning document (adopted September 2009) is relevant and is not listed. | 89203-1441-6694 | / | | | |

| 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>2.3.8 The proposed park and ride facility remains on the same site as before on the west side of the A38 at the Bridgwater Services Roundabout. The layout has been slightly altered to increase freight facilities from 45 to 55 spaces and to accommodate changes to landscaping. The number of proposed parking spaces remains at 698. Upon completion of the Hinkley Point C Station, the future of the site may be determined by the Bridgwater Gateway Development.</p> <p>2.3.9 The site lies in an area designated as Flood Zone 1.</p> | 89865-1441-9047 | | | / | <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>The current Environment Agency flood map shows that the Junction 24 site is located within an area designated as Flood Zone 1 and has therefore been assessed as having a less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of river or sea flooding in any year (<0.1%). The location of the site within Flood Zone 1 also means that all types of development are appropriate for this site, according to the current definitions in the Government's Planning Policy Statement 25 policy, 'Development and Flood Risk'.</p> <p>Although the Environment Agency map is a starting point for assessment of flood risk, additional work has been undertaken by EDF Energy in order to clarify the current baseline flood risks for the Junction 24 site. This work has included detailed assessment of available historical flooding records; review of groundwater information; review of sewer flood history and records (as recorded by Wessex Water) and consideration of the surface water flood risks for the site.</p> <p>This work has confirmed the low probability of flooding from each key flood source, and also that development at the site is unlikely to have an adverse hydrological impact upon existing drainage systems and roads (including the M5) near to the Junction 24 site. Further information regarding the current hydrological and flood risk status of the site is available in Chapter 13 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement, and the Flood Risk Assessment prepared for the Junction 24 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 | Site J24A - All flood zone 1 subject to topography checks at northern extremity -surface water disposal will be a challenge within this area. Could this site be drained effectively into the Stockmoor village housing scheme adjoining? If not, connection difficulties could be experienced for surface water due to lack of discharge points? | 88830-1446-13082 | | | / | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. |
| Environment Agency | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | A comprehensive drainage strategy will need to be submitted that assesses the development proposal on the Stock Moor catchment in full rather than restricting the assessment to the site boundary. This is because downstream of this site housing developments have recently been constructed and significant improvements to Stock Moor pumping station have been undertaken. A critical part of the drainage assessment must be able to demonstrate that the additional surface water volume created, as a result of this development, will not increase flood risks to others or pose additional operational constraints on our flood risk infrastructure. As part of the strategy we would be requiring a high quality SUDS treatment train rather than just balancing ponds to form the drainage scheme. | 89081-1446-278 | / | | | At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. |
| Environment Agency | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | We require that the surface water drainage scheme for the proposed meets the following criteria: | 89081-1446-1242 | | / | | On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. |
| Environment Agency | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | Any outflow from the site must be limited to the maximum allowable rate. In case the site discharges to the Stock Moor Rhyne, the maximum allowable discharge would be the 1 in 2 year Greenfield runoff rate of 3.2 l/s/ha calculated in Appendix C. | 89081-1446-1345 | / | | | As EDF Energy intends to use the site largely as it is, the drainage system would only require minor modifications and therefore SuDS methods have not been incorporated into the proposed drainage strategy for the site. |
| Environment Agency | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | The surface water drainage system must deal with the surface water runoff from the site up to the critical 1% Annual Probability of Flooding (or 1 in a 100- year flood) event, including an allowance for climate change (i.e. for the lifetime of the development). Drainage calculations must be included to demonstrate this (e.g. Windes or similar sewer modelling package calculations that include the necessary attenuation volume). | 89081-1446-1597 | / | | | A drainage strategy has been developed for the site which would ensure that surface water and foul water discharged from the site are managed effectively. A large majority of the site is covered with impermeable surfacing; concrete, asphalt concrete or block paving. Approximately 9% of the site comprises grass verges or soft landscaping. The proposed alterations to the site would not materially increase the impermeable |

| 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 | If there is any surcharge and flooding from the system, overland flood flow routes and "collection" areas on site (e.g. car parks, landscaping) must be shown on a drawing. | 89081-1446-2033 | / | | | area and the rate and volume of surface water run-off is not anticipated to increase as a result of the proposed development. A survey of the existing drainage system has been carried out by EDF Energy and it has been concluded that the existing system would be suitable, subject to some minor modifications. |
| Environment Agency | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | Adoption and maintenance of the drainage system must be addressed and stated. Considering the nature of the proposed development, it is likely that the surface water runoff from the site will be contaminated and may require treatment prior to discharge. | 89081-1446-2212 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Authorities position May 2010 Full details of surface water management both on and off the site will be required to ensure that only Greenfield run-off rates result and that impact on the rhyne system is minimised Update August 2010 It is recommended that a plan showing the relevant drains and watercourses is provided for clarity. The residual flood risk in the event of failure of Stock Moor Rhyne Pumping station is not discussed in the assessment or considered in the Flood Risk Study. The implications of these needs to be understood. | 89329-1446-8039 | / | | | |
| 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. The 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 have not been included. Confirmation of the agreement to permissible discharge rates is stated but there is no evidence of the agreements with the relevant agencies. | 89409-1446-3640 | / | | | |
| 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 on the residual impacts on downstream Stock Moor Pumping Station. Confirmation is required on the residual flood risk on downstream residential development Stockmoor Village. | 89409-1446-4074 | / | | | |

| 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 | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | If the Somerfield site is to be significantly demolished and redeveloped, then we expect the incorporation of Sustainable Urban Drainage (SuDs) into any new surface water drainage network, to reduce flows slightly over the existing rates by 20%. This is to off-set climate change, whilst helping with the water quality aspects (Huntworth Rhyne is known to suffer from poor water quality). | 89917-1446-1042 | | | / | |
| Environment Agency | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | If the existing site is simply to be adapted for use it would be difficult to explore SuDs, but we should advise that the condition of the existing drainage network serving the site is surveyed and any appropriate remedial maintenance work identified and carried out. | 89917-1446-1432 | | | / | |

| 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 | Junction 24 of M5, South Bridgwater search areas (J24A, 24B, 24C). We have no flood risk objection in principle to any of the sites, subject to appropriate FRA. | 88830-1444-12878 | | | / | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. |
| Environment Agency | Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 1 | Park & Ride/Freight - The site itself is outside the flood zones, however main routes in and out are within flood zone 3. | 88830-1444-13830 | | | / | At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | Stage 1 | Junction 24 of the M5 has been identified as a potentially suitable location for a park and ride facility to accommodate up to 350 cars and also a freight consolidation facility for road-borne freight in the event that EDF Energy's preferred search area at Junction 23 is not pursued. The status report noted that surface water drainage within this area is limited to minor drains that lead into the River Parrett by draining to the north-west on the west side of the M5, or to the east and north into the River Parrett on search areas to the east of the M5. The entirety of the search area falls within Flood Zone 1 so the report states there is no risk of flooding but PPS25 states there is still a low risk of flooding, however, the Agency will provide further comments upon receipt of the FRA at Stage 2 consultation. | 88870-1444-2446 | | | / | On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. |
| Tractivity 62160 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 1 | A large portion of the site is not liable to flooding and enjoys favourable ground conditions. | 8753-1444-1971 | | | / | The Overarching Flood Risk Assessment Report for all of the associated development sites, has been updated to clarify the evaluation of each of the associated developments in relation to the requirements of Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25), which sets out the Government's policy in respect of developments and flood risk. This highlights the fact that Junction 24 development is located in an area designated as Flood Zone 1 and is considered to be a 'less vulnerable' development under the definitions provided in PPS25. This means that the Junction 24 site has not required assessment of the PPS25 exception test. |
| Tractivity 1319 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 Update | it will also give and added risk of flood damage to surrounding area. | 89585-1444-1470 | | | / | The Junction 24 FRA also provides further information regarding other sources of flooding (including rainwater, sewer, groundwater and reservoir flooding). Each of these have been considered and |
| Environment Agency | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | Flood Risk Management: The scope and capacity of the drainage strategy needs to be reassessed. Insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that the development can proceed without increasing the risk of flooding to others. | 89069-1444-7265 | / | | | |

| 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 | The FRA for this site concludes that the balancing pond provided on site to meet the greenfield rate of discharge would be satisfactory to mitigate the impact of the development on the pumping station. We advise that NNB GenCo will need to contribute to the running and maintenance cost of the pumping station. The surface water outfall discharges to the Rhyne and there is no provision for on-site infiltration, therefore the volume of water flowing to the Stock Moor Rhyne will increase and this will result in additional pumping time. | 89081-1444-2653 | / | | | have been assessed as having a low probability of flooding the site. Further details are also available in Chapter 13 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement. |
| Bridgwater Town Council | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | Chosen sites in and around Bridgwater and M.5 junctions 23 and 24 must accord with planning policy requirements. Issues such as flood zone must also be taken into account given recent examples of detrimental effect upon major planning proposals. | 89263-1444-10205 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Authorities position May 2010 Full details of surface water management both on and off the site will be required to ensure that only Greenfield run-off rates result and that impact on the rhyne system is minimised Update August 2010 It is recommended that a plan showing the relevant drains and watercourses is provided for clarity. The residual flood risk in the event of failure of Stock Moor Rhyne Pumping station is not discussed in the assessment or considered in the Flood Risk Study. The implications of these needs to be understood. | 89329-1444-8039 | / | | | |
| 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 as to how the Sequential Test has been passed. | 89409-1444-3563 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 Update | The Indicative Layout Plan for the revised park and ride and freight management facility shows a surface water lagoon on the site and the site-specific Flood Risk Study undertaken for the previous layout describes how the volume and peak surface water runoff will be managed to prevent an increased risk of flooding in the area. SCC is satisfied the proposals are adequate. | 89865-1444-9567 | | | / | |

| 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 | 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 | / | | | |
| Environment Agency | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Flooding Due to the size of the site a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be required to address any risks linked with surface water drainage issues. Please confirm that the site is above 8.3m AOD since this will dictate level of risk from tidal inundation. | 89917-1444-780 | / | | | |

| 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 | Further details must be submitted to finalise the preferred option for the location of the surface water outfall and detailed surface water drainage model and design. | 89081-1442-1064 | / | | | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. |
| Environment Agency | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | <p>When Stockmoor pumping station was upgraded 1 of the existing pumps was kept (375 l/sec), 1 identical pump was added (375 l/sec) as well as a submersible pump (675 l/sec-against a head of 5.455m). This resulted in a theoretical total flow from 3 pumps of 1425 l/sec. The sequences of pump operation can be altered but this is the maximum flow from this site.</p> <p>Prior to work- max flow was 1415 l/sec, but without the level of flexibility now in place, and so neither flow regimes equal the 1840 l/sec quoted in the NNB GenCo report.</p> <p>Whilst the current capacity of the pumping station may be able to accept increased flows, the limiting factor at this asset is the ability of the siphon under the Taunton Bridgwater Canal to carry increased flows. If the pumps are working to their maximum output they will drain the feeding channel between the siphon and the pumps because the siphons capacity is not sufficient to supply the pumps at maximum output. The pumps will continue to discharge at high tidal levels, but at a reduced level.</p> <p>Action: The drainage assessment needs to assess the additional runoff volume from the site post development and the impact on the pumping station. This should include consideration on the capacity of the pumping station and cannel siphon system.</p> | 89081-1442-3194 | / | | | <p>At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>The Junction 24 Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) considers in detail the risks of flooding from a range of sources, including fluvial, tidal, rain, sewers, groundwater and reservoir failure. This assessment showed that there was a low probability of flooding from all of these sources. Full details of the drainage methodology are presented in the drainage strategy in the FRA.</p> <p>Further details are also available in Volume 9, Chapter 13 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) |
|---|---|--------------------|--|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| 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 EnvApp, although this is not explicitly stated. | 89397-1388-7913 | | | / | <p>The impact assessment provided in the Stage 2 Environmental Appraisal (Section 4.8), was undertaken in accordance with the methodology outlined in Volume 1 of the Environmental Appraisal, using the impact assessment matrix presented in Table 5.4.4.</p> <p>The methodology and impact assessment matrix have been adopted in the ES with full details presented in Chapter 7 of Volume 1 of the Environmental Statement (ES). The Chapter 12 of Volume 9 of the ES 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 Chapter 7 of Volume 1 of the ES</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 | 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. | 89239-1423-3698 | / | | | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | Based on an earlier excavation of archaeological remains of part of the settlement, which was revealed by the development of the dairy (directly opposite the EDF J24 site), a full excavation is likely to be the correct mitigation. However, at present, the submitted information does not categorically describe the significance of the heritage asset as required by PPS5. | 89239-1423-7133 | / | | | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | we consider that the baseline conditions reported in the document in general to be accurate, robust and reasonable for an initial assessment of impacts; the lack of assessment of impacts upon Historic Landscape Character (HLC), incomplete trial trenching, and the fact that the impact upon setting of heritage features has not been completed, is a significant omission, and must be addressed. | 89399-1423-5898 | / | | | On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. |
| 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. | 89399-1423-6317 | | | / | Desk-based assessment (DBA) was undertaken to collect site-specific data and establish a robust baseline with respect to the historic environment. 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. |
| 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 investigation undertaken is not sufficient to assess the on-site impact of the scheme at present. We would expect this to be remedied following completion of the trial trenching. | 89399-1423-7149 | / | | | Chapter 16 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement provides an overview of the historic environment resource and figures showing historic environment assets and features within the study area. A fully referenced list of all information sources used to establish the baseline is provided in the |

| 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 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. | 89399-1423-7476 | / | | | chapter. |
| 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 results from trial trenching is noted, and it is stated that these will be included in the ES. In the 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. | 89399-1423-8023 | | | / | |
| 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 background provided is accurate and sufficient to inform the assessment of impacts upon known heritage assets. | 89399-1423-8729 | | | / | |

| 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 discussion of cumulative impacts provided within Section 7.12 of Volume 3 to the EnvApp. | 89399-1426-14504 | / | | | <p>In response to the Stage 2 Consultation, Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council questioned the lack of discussion with regard to cumulative impacts on the historic environment in relation to the Junction 24 proposals.</p> <p>In response, and following the Stage 2 Consultation, an assessment of potential cumulative impacts on historic environment assets has now been undertaken and is provided in Volume 11 of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>In summary, it is not anticipated that there will be any cumulative impacts on historic environment assets as a result of the proposed development at Junction 24</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 | Search area J24-A contains a Site of County Importance for Archaeology. 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; | 88400-1425-4588 | | | / | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. |
| English Heritage | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | The stripping of top soil and levelling is a concern in terms of all the proposed Park and Ride sites as we understand that they will be subject to the same surface treatment as the main site thus destroying any archaeology present on these sites. | 10190-1425-14249 | | | / | At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | Junction 24 We are unable to fully assess the significance of impacts on the heritage asset as only limited geophysical survey data has been submitted and no trial trench evaluation has been carried out. This is a major concern. | 89239-1425-4201 | / | | | On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | The site at J24 is of higher significance than estimated, requiring preservation in-situ (probably a low risk but potentially a Key risk). | 89239-1425-11931 | | | / | The baseline assessment for the Somerfield site established that there is little or no potential for surviving archaeological remains on the site. It also concluded that there would be no impacts on the settings of designated heritage assets beyond the proposed development site boundary. Further information can be found in the Chapter 16 of Volume 9 of the Environment Statement. |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | The Stage 2 consultation documents fail to properly assess the potential impacts of development on the historic environment. | 89434-1425-26 | / | | | |

| 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 | Search area J24-A contains a Site of County Importance for Archaeology. 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; | 89393-1425-3427 | | | / | |
| 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 and existing baseline information. | 89399-1425-11370 | | | / | |
| 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, based upon the anticipated construction methods and existing baseline information. | 89399-1425-11820 | | | / | |
| 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. | 89399-1425-13152 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | The initial assessment of residual effects appears reasonable based on known data, however this cannot be completed until mitigation has been agreed and impacts upon HLC have been assessed. | 89399-1425-13645 | / | | | |

| 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 initial assessment of residual effects appears reasonable based on known data, however this cannot be completed until impacts upon HLC have been assessed. | 89399-1425-13992 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | The initial assessment of residual effects appears reasonable based on known data, however this cannot be completed until impacts upon HLC have been assessed. | 89399-1425-14312 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | One Grade II Listed Building, Heathfield House, is identified 400m from the development site. A minor adverse impact is predicted on its setting. No specific mitigation is proposed for this site. | 89429-1425-5175 | | | / | |
| 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 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | However, there are some key documents missing, in particular the Geophysical Survey reports from Junction 24 and the site of the proposed Cannington By-pass, which are key to assessing these proposals. Without the key documents it is not possible to evaluate the impact on the historic environment on these developments, which is a major concern. | 89192-1384-1891 | / | | | |

| 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. 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, so effective monitoring has taken place. | 89192-1424-2241 | | | / | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| 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 J24 and a statement that trial trenching will be carried out during the consultation process has subsequently been received by this office and therefore not been taken into consideration | 89239-1424-7506 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | <p>Although we accept that the DMRB approach in its prescribed form represents an appropriate impact assessment methodology, and represents best practice, Section 7.12.25 describes that the approach adopted is actually an adaptation of the DMRB methodology. 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.</p> <p>It is also noted that Table 7.12.1 shows the criteria used to determine 'importance', not 'sensitivity, as stated in the title (sensitivity of an asset is based on professional judgement).</p> | 89399-1424-9707 | / | | | <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>The scope and methodology for baseline studies and impact assessment were agreed with Somerset County Council Historic Environment Service and English Heritage. A desk-based assessment was undertaken to determine the potential for archaeological remains within the proposed development site boundary.</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 considered that the level of investigation undertaken is not sufficient to assess the on-site impact of the scheme at present; however we would expect this to be remedied following completion of the trial trenching. In the absence of trial trenching data, the EnvApp predicts an effect upon buried archaeological remains of moderate adverse. A programme of archaeological recording is proposed as mitigation for impacts upon archaeological remains, however until the trial trenching is completed it cannot be confirmed whether this approach would be appropriate. | 89429-1424-4603 | / | | | <p>All work was carried out in accordance with published standards and guidance including the Somerset County Council Heritage Service <i>Archaeological Handbook</i> (2009) and the Institute for Archaeologists' (IfA) Standards and Guidance for <i>Desk-Based Assessment</i> (2008).</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 | 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. | 89429-1424-5374 | / | | | In the absence of standards or guidance published by the IfA or English Heritage specifically relating to impact assessment for the historic environment, guidance on assessing the effects of roads schemes on heritage, given in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, Volume 11: Environmental Assessment, Section 3, Part 2, Cultural Heritage has been adapted for Chapter 16 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement . |

| 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 excavation must take place on all sites identified in the proposals, as full assessment of J24 and Cannington Bypass 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 exists based on the archaeological data. | 89192-1427-2861 | | | / | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | We consider the suggested approach acceptable in principal; the detailed methodology for preservation by record must be agreed with Somerset Historic Environment Service, with reference to the results of the trial trenching | 89399-1427-12586 | | | / | <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>No archaeological remains have been identified within the revised development site boundary, and therefore mitigation will not be required.</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 | 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. | 89399-1428-14630 | | | / | As no mitigation is proposed for impacts to heritage assets, there will be no requirement for monitoring. |

| 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: The information states that the Quantock Hills AONB is located approximately 8km to the west of Junction 24. This is incorrect as Junction 24 is approximately 4km from the AONB boundary. This baseline information must be updated to reflect the actual distance. | 8734-1414-7947 | / | | | <p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), and supporting studies and surveys, were conducted for all phases of the proposed Junction 24 park and ride facility and freight logistics facility (the proposed development). The LVIA was carried out 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 to reflect additional visual receptors.</p> <p>The relationship between the proposed development and the Quantock Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) is explored in the baseline of the LVIA in terms of both landscape character and as a visual receptor. Assessment has then been carried out of potential landscape and visual impacts both during the day and at night.</p> |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | 7.11.19 States 'due to the scale and nature of the proposed site. it was considered sufficient to identify potential viewpoints through desktop studies and site visits'. Given the close proximity and visibility of the P&R from the Quantock Hills AONB the same process of consultation should have been adopted for this site as for the main site. The Quantock AONB Service was not invited to comment on this site despite impacts on view, which is a significant omission. | 89249-1414-2926 | | | / | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | Based on the information contained within the Stage 2 consultation document there appears to be no clear rationale to the landscaping proposals at the site. The current proposals provide little consideration of existing landscape constraints and fail to demonstrate that they are consistent with wider development proposals for the area. | 89433-1414-4053 | / | | | |
| 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. | 89399-1414-48 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | M5 J24 Park & Ride Vol.3: Ch 7.1: Para 7.1.5 is unnecessary when considering that what is stated in 7.1.6 is actually what is being assessed. Both of these paragraphs are unnecessarily repeated in 7.1.39 and 7.1.40. Relevant legislation, policy and guidance at the national, regional and local level is summarised adequately, and specific policies/statements/objectives are drawn out for consideration. As set out in PPG2 Green Belts para. 3.17, there are questions as to whether non-Green Belt alternatives for the Park and Ride facility have been fully investigated. PPG2 para 3.19 states: 'In all cases, the layout, design and landscaping of the scheme must preserve, so far as possible, the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt. Particular care will be needed on matters, such as floodlighting, which are essential to the safe operation of park and ride schemes but which may be visually intrusive unless carefully designed.' We would question if the proposed scheme meets this requirement in both landscape and visual impact terms. | 89399-1414-444 | / | | | |

| 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: Reference should be made to the potential visual impacts from the Quantock Hills AONB, particularly cumulative impacts given the recent and visually prominent developments at Junction 24 which are clearly visible from within the AONB and which have had a negative impact on visual amenity. | 8734-1417-8236 | / | | | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| 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 of potential cumulative impacts between off-site accommodation works and various other screened developments has been made, but no significant adverse landscape or visual impacts have been identified. | 89399-1417-4819 | | | / | <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>The full results of the baseline survey in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in Chapter 15 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement provide a robust basis on which to assess the likely impacts of the proposed development on receptors, including those that may arise from cumulative interaction with other Hinkley Point C (HPC) and non-HPC developments. As a result of comments from the Stage 2 consultation an updated assessment of cumulative impacts on Landscape and Visual receptors is presented in Volume 11 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) |
|---|---|--------------------|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| 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 this site and the housing development and wider landscape needs to be better understood and the limited sectional drawings provided are insufficient to fully understand this. | 89329-1421-5334 | / | | | The assessment methodology and all supporting graphical material have been updated since the Stage 2 consultation. Since relocation of the Junction 24 park and ride facility and freight logistics facility to the Somerfield site (the proposed development), detailed drawings, are included in the Chapter 15 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement which give a clearer indication of the impact of the proposals on the development area. A reinstatement/restoration plan is also included. |

| 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 | The Bridgwater Vision clearly states that the M5 frontage of Bridgwater is the town's 'shop window'. The J24-B and J24-C search areas are visually prominent from the motorway and the freight consolidation and park and ride proposals are not considered appropriate in this context. Any development in this area could impact significantly on the open landscape to the east of the motorway. | 88410-1416-2969 | / | | | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 1 | There are also concerns around the impact development would have on the landscape setting of the hamlet of Huntworth. | 88410-1416-4590 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 713 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? I am concerned about the noise, pollution, amount of traffic going in and out of this site. The P&R will also change the street scene from coming down the road into the development from being quiet to lots of activity which at the moment is a lovely development. Also the Huntworth Roundabout gets congested when people are trying to access the services at this junction. | 9471-1416-5354 | / | | | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. |
| Tractivity 764 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? The Park and Ride and Freight Logistic Facilities at J.24 (Bridgwater) will have a detrimental affect on the residents of Stockmoor Village and Wilstock Village and on local wildlife. The proposed access from Stockmoor Drive will cause traffic chaos, the Huntworth roundabout already cannot cope with the high volumes of summer traffic entering the M5 services and normal commuter traffic regularly queues significantly in the immediate area of the proposed development. Noise pollution from the site will have a detrimental affect on residents of Stockmoor Village and noise and light pollution will affect wildlife. The area is a valuable habitat for bats, birds of prey and water voles. | 9522-1416-1927 | / | | | On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. |
| Tractivity 776 | Public | Stage 2 | We also think it will take away the attractive views of the area. | 9534-1416-5852 | / | | | The assessment of impacts in Chapter 15 of Volume 9 Environmental Statement has been further developed following Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultation. The proposed Junction 24 park and ride facility and freight logistics facility (proposed development) sits |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 807 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | <p>5. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The Bridgwater South site junction 24, M5, would be totally wrong for a park and ride and freight logistics facilities. It is a rural housing area, with a new school coming to the area. The use of the existing access road which leads onto the estate is totally unacceptable. It will lead to noise pollution, light pollution, criminality at the location. Increased traffic on the local main road network will lead to grid locking of a road already unable to cope with existing and transient holiday traffic. Road safety for residents and school children will be compromised. Value of houses will go down in the area</p> <p>Bridgwater North , junction 23, M5. I support this site due to it already being an industrial area with plenty of existing space to accomodate development, it will not affect the quality of life of residents as would the junction 24 proposal</p> | 9565-1416-2518 | / | | | <p>behind bunding and mature trees and shrubs screening the perimeter of the industrial park. Within the boundary of the proposed development, this would be retained specifically to screen views into the site and to minimise any lighting impacts.</p> <p>A request was made at Stage 2 that the potential visual impacts on the Quantock Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) be examined within the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The relationship between the proposed development and the Quantock Hills AONB is explored in the baseline of the LVIA in terms of both landscape character and as a visual receptor. Although views were sought of the Quantock Hills AONB from publically accessible areas, its distance from the proposed development and strong existing bunding, planted with a mature tree screen, surrounding the site prevented views of anything other than existing bunding.</p> |
| Tractivity 807 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | <p>11. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>This is wholly unacceptable. It is a residential area, it is too close to local housing and residents. The local road system is very busy and will not be able to cope with this increase in traffic. It will affect the quality of life of all people and local wild life within the area. The access road proposed which leads onto the housing estate should not be used as an access route to large industrial vehicles. This would lead to vibration and noise affecting local people and properties , leading to damage to homes and roads and ultimately loss of value to properties. It is also within half a mile from a local primary school. There will be many children and parents within the locality which would put them at risk There would be an increase in light pollution, noise pollution,potential increase in related crime due o the nature of storage of the site, which will all impact on the local population</p> | 9565-1416-7042 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 970 | Public | Stage 2 | <p>11. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Concerns of traffic congestions on Huntsworth Roundabout all directions. Concerns what will the site be used for when EDF hands over. Blot on the landscape, eating into greenbelt land added pollution in a confined area. Resale value of houses. Excessive noise levels when freight vehicles start the engines in cold climate. In conclusion there is no benfit to the residents of stockmore Village, Wilstock Village, North Petherton.</p> | 9728-1416-5419 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 999 | Public | Stage 2 | <p>11. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>I live a short distance from J24 and the proposed facilities. I am extremely concerned about the inevitable increase in traffic on M5 and A38 (the only routes out of the housing development where I live). Noise from the facilities and general disruption to my life. I understand that my house value has already decreased as a result of your proposal for J24. Is that just tough?</p> | 9757-1416-6062 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1315 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 Update | <p>DO NOT implement the park and ride facility and freight terminal at Junction 24. This will affect us with regard to house values, congestion, pollution, noise, open country views, shortage of land for food production. Developing green field sites will curtail food production.</p> | 89581-1416-845 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|-----------------------------|---|--------------------|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Junction 24 Action Group | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 1 | The Group's purpose is clear, in that its supporters oppose any further damaging expansion on 'greenfield' sites at J24, particularly on the eastern side of the M5 - which so far has remained untouched by large scale development. Our mission is to encourage sustainable development, using 'brownfield' sites wherever possible. | 9370-1416-525 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 62938 | Public | Stage 2 | Near residential area – noise and light pollution. | 10177-1416-7851 | | | / | |
| Bloor Homes Ltd | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | 4) Willstock Village currently enjoys open views of fields and the hills beyond which we understand will not be interrupted as a result of the proposals as these are limited to open car parks. However if any larger permanent buildings were proposed there could be a potential impact on views which we would raise objection to. | 10269-1416-2882 | / | | | |
| Quantock Hills AONB Service | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | 7.11.9 - reference is made to the AONB Management Policies but failure to make reference to AONB Management Plan Policy D3 - To protect views out from the AONB ...'. This is a critical piece of information and should inform treatment of the AONB in relation to visual impact (but the AONB does not figure in the viewpoint assessment). | 89122-1416-3988 | / | | | |
| Quantock Hills AONB Service | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | 7.11.45 Very simple statement related to compatibility of the scheme to the landscape. It states that capacity for development within the Quantock Foothills Sub-Area is generally considered to be low (think taken from Sedgemoor's own Landscape Character Assessment) but justification is given by stating that new housing and existing development increases compatibility. The AONB Service considers that, given the stated low capacity for development and the recent flurry and intensity of development in the area, a 'critical limit' has been reached in relation to negatively impacting on the setting of an AONB. In any case, judgements regarding compatibility should be reserved for assessing effects as opposed to forming part of the baseline information. | 89122-1416-5624 | / | | | |
| Quantock Hills AONB Service | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | Landscape Sensitivity - 7.11.48 - landscape sensitivity of the site is judged to be moderate but there is no criteria to refer to ascertain if this is the correct judgement e.g. what makes a moderately sensitive landscape? Junction 24 Park and Ride - Visual Baseline Table 7.11.4. 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. Development around Junction 24 can be seen from a number of points within the AONB and so there are very real potential visual effects as a result of more development in the area - more large scale structures in view, more lighting etc. | 89122-1416-6387 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in | Stage 2 | The use of stored soils in landscaping the Park and Ride (P&R) is implied in the Masterplan and confirmed in Vol.3, Ch 6 but key decisions and justification are lacking. Landscape and visual effects in Vol 3 Chapter 6.11 does cover the key issues, but uncertainty over the restoration of the site does not help clarity. | 89249-1416-1728 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|-------------------------|--|--------------------|--|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| | land | | | | | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | Environmental Appraisal Volume 1 Chapter No.5 - Environmental Impact Methodology is adequate other than significant points raised above. Environmental Appraisal Volume 2 - Section 2.14 acceptable other than the significant points raised above. Environmental Appraisal Volume 3 Chapter 6 is acceptable other than the significant points raised above. | 89249-1416-2277 | | | / | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | 7.11.9 - Reference is made to Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Management Policies but it fails to identify Policy D3 - 'To protect views out from the AONB ...' This is a critical piece of information and should inform treatment of the AONB in relation to visual impact. | 89249-1416-2641 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | There is insufficient recognition of the impact of this site, particularly in combination with existing recent development in the area. | 89249-1416-3599 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | Potential Operational Phase Impacts - 7.11.78. Reference is made to adverse visual impact due to lighting (including impact on the AONB), however there is no evidence of any thorough assessment of lighting or what the impacts would be. This issue needs to be addressed. | 89249-1416-3888 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | Missing data Somerset County Council (SCC) considers that the following information is missing for the Stage 2 consultation: More information required on whether the P&R facilities are to be permanent and if not a justification for this decision needs to be provided. | 89249-1416-5032 | / | | | |

| 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 fact there is other development in close proximity (not in Green Belt), some complete and some still undergoing construction, does not necessarily suggest that the proposals are more compatible with the landscape. | 89399-1416-2136 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | M5 J24 Park & Ride Vol3: Ch7 Section 11: raises a question of how the proposed lighting mentioned in para 7.11.91 will reduce its impact on the local landscape. There needs to be more clarity on assessment scores that indicates 'significant moderate beneficial residual visual effects' for the temporary works which are going to be returned to agriculture or remain in part as a legacy. Further information is required on the time limits to achieve a moderate beneficial level of effect. In addition, confirmation is sought on whether it will be possibly to deliver higher Grade Agricultural land. Furthermore, additional information is sought on whether the proposals are compatible with Landscape Character. With regards to the temporal context of potential impacts, it would support appreciation of the nature of "temporary" impacts, if the expected duration of the temporary impact were to be more clearly identified. | 89399-1416-2500 | / | | | |
| 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 a discrepancy between the summary Table 7.11.11 (which indicates adverse visual impacts during operation and removal/reinstatement) and the residual visual impact in Table 7.11.8 operational phase and Table 7.11.10 removal/reinstatement phase (which both indicate beneficial visual impacts). There are a number of cases in which the residual effects are still significant, many being indicated as Moderate Beneficial. This seems to be particularly the case for the temporary works which are going to be returned to agriculture or remain in part as a legacy. The Council do not believe that the mitigation provided will constitute a Moderate Beneficial effect when moderate significance is stated to include effects which are likely to be important considerations at a local level. Perhaps the residual effects should be neutral or at best minor beneficial following removal/reinstatement of the landscape. Once the site is reinstated there is a question as to whether the hedgerows which will receive face cutting during operation of the proposals will revert to having the tops cut too. This will ensure that they do not become leggy and bare at the base. | 89399-1416-3611 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | From a townscape perspective, the 'Somersfield' site benefits from existing landscape embankments and mature planting, so is preferable to the alternative Stockmoor site on the other side of the Huntworth roundabout. | 89956-1416-9049 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>In the Stage 2 and Proposed Changes responses, the Councils expressed concerns about the expansive land take and limited landscaping of the Park & Ride and freight management proposal for the Stockmoor site. From a townscape perspective, the 'Somerfield' site offers the following advantages: it is less prominent in views to and from the Quantocks Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB); and the site benefits from existing landscape embankments and mature planting.</p> <p>Should EDFE progress with proposals for this site, Sedgemoor DC would welcome further discussions on the layout and any modifications of the site. In accordance with EDFE's Preferred Proposals for associated development sites, the Council would encourage provision of on-site renewables to mitigate the carbon emissions of the HPC project construction stage and assist in the delivery of the vision for Huntworth:</p> <p>"New development within the area will need to reflect the areas highly visible position along the M5 corridor through high profile, contemporary and highly sustainable (zero carbon) buildings."</p> <p>The Council welcomes EDFE's proposal to provide a cycle and pedestrian link and wishes to see how this would link with a wider network of cycle paths, providing alternative routes to the heavily trafficked A38. Sign-posting and physical improvements linking the site to the Bridgwater and Taunton Canal and North Petherton - Bridgwater cycle route should be considered as part of this process.</p> | 89960-1416-18867 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>Bridgwater Vision</p> <p>All of the highway improvements are along routes identified in the Bridgwater Vision as Visually Improved Arterials, while the A38 is also designated as Key Public Transport Route. Aims for the principal arterial are to improve and transform the perception of the principal arterials through the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> significant planting, lighting, public art and landscaping to create distinctive urban boulevards where appropriate; dedicated pedestrian and cycle ways; introducing priority bus lanes; and improving pedestrian and cycle links between the railway station and the town centre. <p>The Bridgwater Vision notes that alteration and enhancement of existing highways will need to be undertaken in agreement with the Highway Authority, but works will need to be designed with highway safety requirements in mind as well as aesthetics.</p> | 89961-1416-2449 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>5.2.5 A38 Taunton Road / Marsh Lane (Scheme E)</p> <p>The Bridgwater Vision promotes Huntworth as an Enhanced Distribution Centre, where a coordinated approach to signage, lighting and general public realm and landscape treatments will improve the environmental quality of the area.</p> <p>The Brainwave Centre, (Personal information removed) and new residential development at Stockmoor Village are identified as sensitive receptors close to the junction. The significance of impacts such as air and noise pollution for these receptors should be assessed.</p> <p>Provision of a footpath/cycleway link is welcomed and EDFE should demonstrate how this will link to the wider network of cycle paths in Bridgwater to provide an attractive and safe means for travel to the town centre. The Bridgwater Vision advocates the provision of high quality, safe and legible pedestrian and cycle routes through the area strengthening links back to the town centre particularly along the Canal corridor.</p> | 89961-1416-15526 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>5.2.6 Huntworth Roundabout (Scheme F)</p> <p>Junction 24 of the M5 and the Huntworth Roundabout is identified to be a Strategic Gateway for Bridgwater in the Vision and therefore the design objectives for principle arterial routes will be of particular importance in this location.</p> <p>The Proposed Changes J24 & Highways consultation refers to the potential signalisation of the roundabout and possible works to improve access from the 'Somerfield' site to J24 of the M5. This is considered by Sedgemoor DC to be a critical highway scheme if a freight route through Bridgwater is to be utilised and therefore the current absence of any detail of proposed junction improvements is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>The operation of the service station in combination with EDFE's proposals to use the 'Somerfield' site will need to be carefully considered, given the additional car and bus movements that would arise over and above the HGV movements associated with the existing distribution use.</p> <p>It is noted that EDFE propose "to make a proportionate contribution" to highway improvements in this location. Sedgemoor District Council will seek to engage with Somerset County Council, the Highways Agency, EDFE and other developers with development proposals that would affect this junction, to work towards the identification of an appropriate junction design that is deliverable and can be financed within the timescale that improvements are required. Any proposals that come forward must be compatible with and must not prejudice other local developments.</p> <p>Should EDF Energy remain undecided about which Park & Ride and freight management site would be utilised at M5 J24, then the highways and land acquisition implications of both schemes should be consulted upon.</p> | 89961-1416-16506 | / | | | |

| 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 | 7.11.19 Reference to fact that 'due to the scale and nature of the proposed site... it was considered sufficient to identify potential viewpoints through desktop studies and site visits'. The AONB Service does not consider this to be adequate given close proximity and visibility of general area from the Quantock Hills AONB. The same process of consultation should have been adopted for this site as for the main site. If this were an application on its own, without links to the main Hinkley Site, there would be an expectation to consult (as per guidance from LI and IEMA's guidance - their ref 7.11.2). It seems that the additional sites are being compared in scale to the main site and on the basis of them being smaller and less complicated; decisions are being made to reduce consultation. This should not be the case. The AONB Service should be consulted on potential visual impacts of a park and ride scheme occurring just 3.8 km from the nationally protected landscape (based on potential impact of lighting alone - given proximity to existing highly visible development at Junction 24 (Robert Wiseman development and Regional livestock market and in relation to cumulative impact when considering the main HPC site and other ADS). | 89122-1415-4328 | / | | | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | The lack of photomontages to show how the proposed development is likely to appear within the landscape is a significant omission. | 89249-1415-1270 | / | | | There were a number of comments at Stage 2 concerning the adequacy of the methodology used for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA). The methodology for, and presentation of, the assessment of impacts in the Chapter 15 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (ES) has been further developed since the Stage 2 consultation. Concerns were raised that a viewpoint had not been provided from the Quantock Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The LVIA and supporting studies and surveys, were conducted for all phases of the proposed Junction 24 park and ride facility and freight logistics facility (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 |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | The same methodology is being used as for the main site, yet there is no information provided on criteria used for assessing sensitivity and magnitude. This is insufficient as there will be people only interested in reading about this development and the methodology should be as thorough here as with the main site. | 89249-1415-1407 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---------|------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| | | | | | | | | Landscape Character Assessment from the Countryside Agency (now Natural England) and Scottish Natural Heritage. As part of the refinement of the LVIA, and following relocation of the proposed new site to the former Somerfield storage/distribution site at Junction 24, a brownfield site, further field surveys were undertaken. As a result, a viewpoint was obtained from a Public Right of Way within Halswell House Registered Park and Garden, on the edges of the Quantock Hills AONB which was then assessed within the LVIA. |

| 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 | Opportunities should be taken to enhance wildlife habitats and increase public use of the Bridgwater and Taunton Canal that passes to the east of search area J24C. Search area J24C falls within a Local Plan Green Wedge designation. Policy CNE4 encourages positive land management for landscape, amenity and nature conservation in these areas. | 88410-1418-1029 | / | | | <p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>No specific landscape mitigation has been designed for the now proposed development. The site benefits from existing bunding and a mature tree and shrub screen at the perimeter of the industrial park. As part of the design additional tree and shrub planting has been proposed where suitable.</p> |
| Tractivity 864 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? J24 has undergone huge improvements ie cattle market, R. Wiseman, etc. Hope sufficient landscaping keeps area countryish. | 9622-1418-6064 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | If the site is to be permanent then future ownership and responsibility for maintenance of the site needs to be considered and resolved. | 89249-1418-915 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | Environmental Appraisal Volume 3 Chapters 6.6, Soil Management Plan (SMP) and Environmental Monitoring and Management Plan (EMMP) will be required to finalise mitigation measures regarding soils storage and management. | 89249-1418-2053 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | If the site is to be permanent the priority use for the areas around the parking should be landscaping rather than topsoil storage for re-use. | 89249-1418-3740 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | The level of screening of the site proposed is inadequate in view of the impact. Figure 7.11.7. Environmental Appraisal Vol 3. Landscaping on the West side is particularly important as this is the side that would screen the development from the Quantocks. The use of balancing ponds to mitigate loss of existing ditch and wetland habitat is helpful but there may be scope for additional small scale pond provision. Lighting is likely to be required and this is not addressed in the landscaping scheme. | 89249-1418-4400 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--------------------|--|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | Whilst it is recognised that the site represents a suitable location for future development the Stage 2 consultation document contains limited justification and analysis of the for need landscape mitigation. Any proposals for the site should include a commitment to ongoing landscaping management through the construction and operation phases of development in association with the wider objectives of the site. | 89433-1418-4396 | / | | | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | Overall the approach applied to landscape mitigation appears insufficient for a site such as this which requires comprehensive mitigation measures. | 89433-1418-5356 | / | | | |
| 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 May 2010</p> <p>Particular account will need to be taken of the design and impact of any development on the landscape from the Quantocks.</p> <p>Update August 2010</p> <p>There is no clear rationale to the landscaping proposals. For instance, a row of native trees is proposed along the south eastern boundary of the site, adjacent to the future development area. Assuming semi-mature trees are planted, this would provide some screening to the A38, but would frustrate the development of the frontage site, which has limited depth. In contrast, the western boundary of the site, which will be highly visible from the Quantocks, is afforded very limited tree planting.</p> | 89329-1418-5537 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | The scope for visual mitigation is limited because the site is located on a prominent hilltop. | 89399-1418-2379 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | It would be useful to have an additional reinstatement/restoration plan which shows the proposed layout with legacy elements after de-commissioning. | 89399-1418-3433 | / | | | |

| 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>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. The fact there is other development in close proximity (not in Green Belt), some complete and some still undergoing construction, does not necessarily suggest that the proposals are more compatible with the landscape.</p> <p>Likely residual effects may remain in relation to the mitigation in the form of planting which will not take full effect until well after the construction phase is over and it likely that it will not be fully effective in terms of visual screening until well into the operational phase. The scope for visual mitigation is limited because the site is located on a prominent hilltop.</p> | 89429-1418-2677 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | <p>Further reasonable measures that would allow possible residual effects to be mitigated include:-</p> <p>Implement landscape masterplan; restrict cutting, set-back planting</p> <p>Revisit operational phase assessment using more detailed iterative mitigation in the design process for especially, but not exclusively, local Landscape and Visual components</p> <p>Produce detailed plan of reinstatement/restoration linking impact with mitigation measures</p> <p>Perhaps offsite mitigation measures should be investigated to further reduce particularly the visual effects of all the proposals.</p> | 89429-1418-3753 | / | | | |
| WSC & SDC Joint Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 2 Update | <p>The site will be prominent in views from the Quantocks towards Bridgwater. Tree planting around and within the site will assist in providing screening and could contribute to the delivery of new woodland consistent with emerging Core Strategy policy D20 and proposals in the GI Strategy.</p> | 89894-1418-17752 | / | | | |

| 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 of ecological effects is not discussed within the EnvApp. | 89399-1419-5061 | | / | | Ecological monitoring is generally something undertaken; landscape management will check the maturing of the landscape in support of this. |

| 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 baseline measurements for the site appear to be adequate withstanding the following comments. An additional monitoring location at the cottages on the A38 immediately across the road from the proposed site would have been beneficial, however given that the dominant noise source is road traffic along the A38, the measurements obtained at monitoring location B are likely to be representative.</p> <p>It is noted that noise monitoring has not been conducted during the late evening (after around 20:30hrs) and therefore the baseline during the evening peak (return of workers between 22:00 and 00:00hrs) is unknown.</p> | 89395-1351-47 | / | | | <p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>Baseline noise monitoring was undertaken following consultation with the relevant councils' environmental health officers at Stage 1 consultation. The location and duration of monitoring was determined based on the proposals consulted on at Stage 1.</p> <p>Following Stage 2 consultation, further noise monitoring was undertaken to cover all hours of proposed operation of the development, including late evening and early monitoring periods. Details of the monitoring undertaken are included in Chapter 9 of Volume 9 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 1207 | Public | Stage 2 | 13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below 11 Cont. Will the site, if built, ever be reinstated to agricultural land use again - & who will foot the bill for this? Would the site, if built, be landscaped and any wildlife protected? What about noise/light pollution for people living nearby? | 9965-1359-6520 | | | / | Comments were received at Stage 2 of the consultation in respect of potential noise and disturbance from use of the proposed site at Junction 24. The pre-application stage of the proposed Hinkley Point C Project has involved extensive consultation with a wide range of stakeholders. As a result of this consultation, particularly with Sedgemoor District Council (SDC) and West Somerset Council (WSC), a robust methodology has been developed for the noise and vibration assessment of the proposed development (see Chapter 9 of Volume 11 of the Environmental Statement) |
| Tractivity 1220 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? More feasibility studies. How sustainable for future use? Light and noise pollution to local housing under pressure from locality to motorists and recent huge agri-industry development. | 9978-1359-7572 | / | | | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage/distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site in July/August 2011 as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. This site is included as part of the application for development consent, instead of the sites previously proposed. On this basis, site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. No further comments were received in relation to consultation on noise and vibration for this site. |
| Tractivity 62315 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | Plus worried about out of hours lorry movements and noise. | 10002-1359-343 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 62611 | Public | Stage 2 | 19/8/10 - He lives on the Willstock side of junction 24. He is very concerned about park & ride/ Lorries. Wants to speak to someone about roads. Also worried about pollution and house prices RE spoke to him | 10158-1359-48 | / | | | |

| 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 does not assess any cumulative impacts derived from other schemes. | 89395-1354-8721 | / | | | <p>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 Volume 11 of the Environmental Statement (ES). Related 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 Volume 11 of the ES.</p> <p>The additive cumulative impacts of noise and vibration on sensitive receptors are contained in the Chapter 9 of Volume 9 of the ES.</p> <p>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.</p> |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 697 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Will cause traffic chaos, noise and pollution for the residents of the southern edge of Stockmoor Village. Cars will be forced to use the village as a cut through causing dangerous levels of traffic to vulnerable groups such as children from the new primary school and elderly residents from the sheltered housing. Not withstanding ruining a place of natural beauty. | 9457-1353-6485 | / | | | <p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>The assessment of impacts has evolved since Stage 2 consultation to quantify all activities associated with the proposed development which have the potential to generate significant noise. These include on-site vehicle movements and vehicle door slams.</p> <p>Chapter 9 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement details the potential noise and vibration impacts associated with the proposed Park and Ride and Freight Management Facility at Junction 24.</p> |
| Tractivity 713 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? I am concerned about the noise, pollution, amount of traffic going in and out of this site. The P&R will also change the street scene from coming down the road into the development from being quiet to lots of activity which at the moment is a lovely development. Also the Huntworth Roundabout gets congested when people are trying to access the services at this junction. | 9471-1353-5354 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 764 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? The Park and Ride and Freight Logistic Facilities at J.24 (Bridgwater) will have a detrimental affect on the residents of Stockmoor Village and Wilstock Village and on local wildlife. The proposed access from Stockmoor Drive will cause traffic chaos, the Huntworth roundabout already cannot cope with the high volumes of summer traffic entering the M5 services and normal commuter traffic regularly queues significantly in the immediate area of the proposed development. Noise pollution from the site will have a detrimental affect on residents of Stockmoor Village and noise and light pollution will affect wildlife. The area is a valuable habitat for bats, birds of prey and water voles. | 9522-1353-1927 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 764 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The Park and Ride and Freight Logistic Facilities at J.24 (Bridgwater) will have a detrimental affect on the residents of Stockmoor Village and Wilstock Village and on local wildlife. The proposed access from Stockmoor Drive will cause traffic chaos, the Huntworth roundabout already cannot cope with the high volumes of summer traffic entering the M5 services and normal commuter traffic regularly queues significantly in the immediate area of the proposed development. Noise pollution from the site will have a detrimental affect on residents of Stockmoor Village and noise and light pollution will affect wildlife. The area is a valuable habitat for bats, birds of prey and water voles. | 9522-1353-6227 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 776 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? We do not agree with the plans for this site for several reasons. It is in very close proximity to the housing estate where we live. This could have an effect on the value of our property. The increased traffic would bring noise and pollution closer to our house. The increased traffic will cause problems at the roundabout junction for A38/M5 motorway, already very busy. The increased traffic will make it more hazardous for children in the area with the new primary school opening soon. We also think it will take away the attractive views of the area. | 9534-1353-5326 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|--|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 777 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? See above - even using non peak periods ie overnight this will generate noise along the route | 9535-1353-5941 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 807 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? This is wholly unacceptable. It is a residential area, it is too close to local housing and residents. The local road system is very busy and will not be able to cope with this increase in traffic. It will affect the quality of life of all people and local wild life within the area. The access road proposed which leads onto the housing estate should not be used as an access route to large industrial vehicles. This would lead to vibration and noise affecting local people and properties, leading to damage to homes and roads and ultimately loss of value to properties. It is also within half a mile from a local primary school. There will be many children and parents within the locality which would put them at risk There would be an increase in light pollution, noise pollution, potential increase in related crime due o the nature of storage of the site, which will all impact on the local population | 9565-1353-7042 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 881 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? As q 10 | 9639-1353-6792 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 970 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Concerns of traffic congestions on Huntsworth Roundabout all directions. Concerns what will the site be used for when EDF hands over. Blot on the landscape, eating into greenbelt land added pollution in a confined area. Resale value of houses. Excessive noise levels when freight vehicles start the engines in cold climate. In conclusion there is no benfit to the residents of stockmore Village, Wilstock Village, North Petherton. | 9728-1353-5419 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 987 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? As before- no need to transfer people into the town - we all go to Taunton or elsewhere to shop. If this goes ahead we need very adequate noise reduction to our houses from noise/light. A large bund and trees not jsut trees and shruibs. A definite no-no for people on this estate as we have been informed the value of our houses have gone down considerably already. | 9745-1353-5781 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 989 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Havoc at roundabout (services/M5/A38/Stockmoor). havoc on A38 - another set of traffic lights to control freight entrance. Havoc on Taunton Road to Morrison Crossroads - Just ?phasing these traffic lights differently? WONT DO IT. Disruptive and antisocial for residents of Stockmoor Village, Primary School and School children wlaking to Blake Secondary School. Noise Pollution, unsocial hours why is this planned right next to and around a residential area? Move it elsewhere or expected Park/Ride/Freight at Junct 23 which is a non residential area. | 9747-1353-5847 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 999 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? I live a short distance from J24 and the proposed facilities. I am extremely concerned about the inevitable increase in traffic on M5 and A38 (the only routes out of the housing development where I live). Noise from the facilities and general disruption to my life. I understand that my house value has already decreased as a result of your proposal for J24. Is that just tough? | 9757-1353-6062 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1013 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The junction cannot cope with the volume of traffic that currently exists due to the service station. It is also a highly populated residential area and out of peak hours would affect the residents with both noise and light pollution. | 9771-1353-7712 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1080 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? this road is already congested especially at peak times with the M5 services, livestock market and wisemans dairy all accessing the road in very close proximity. your transport would have to travel through the town which would put even more pressures on the roads here. transport at off peak times would be noisy through residential areas - why have 2 park and ride facilities when 1 would suffice at J23 with bridge across the hinkley | 9838-1353-6620 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1174 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? This is a highly congested area already approaching Bridgwater. A freight logistics facility will greatly affect the occupants of the new housing estate at Stockmoor Park. by the very nature of a logistics facility the noise and disruption will be 24 hrs a day for 7 days a week. | 9932-1353-6644 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1215 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? 1) New development right on the doorstep of this proposed P&R 2) This development houses a new primary school. Traffic is cutting through and past the school already to avoid congestion on the A38. 3) Have you ever experinced existing traffic on surrounding roads? 4) Noise, dirt, traffic, effect on house prices, h and saftey concerns. Totally unacceptable! | 9973-1353-6090 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1315 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 Update | DO NOT implement the park and ride facility and freight terminal at Junction 24. This will affect us with regard to house values, congestion, pollution, noise, open country views, shortage of land for food production. Developing green field sites will curtail food production. | 89581-1353-845 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 1319 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 Update | Based on shift start and finish times and travelling times to Hinkley C it would appear that site at Junction 24 will be active between 5AM and 6AM and after midnight - living 100 yards from the site at junction 24. This is unacceptable due to noise. | 89585-1353-361 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1319 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 Update | The site will obstruct views of Quantock Hills and impact on local wildlife and the environment due to noise and pollution. | 89585-1353-1346 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 62333 | Public | Stage 2 | This proposed site would be visible from our house and we are sure there is going to be associated noise and pollution to go along with this. | 10015-1353-537 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 62384 | Public | Stage 2 | These proposed facilities are far too close to existing and planned housing and will result in many homes being devalued as well as the considerable noise and light pollution associated with the movement of large numbers of vehicles. The fact that some of these residents were unaware of the potential impact of the proposals as they had not been consulted properly shows EDF's disregard and poor organisation. Does EDF really expect local people to trust their judgement? | 10047-1353-6438 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 62578 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. At Junction 24 of the M5 we are planning a park and ride facility for workers where they will be transferred to buses. A freight logistics facility is also proposed where freight would be consolidated and sent to Hinkley Point outside peak periods. After construction of the power station is complete, this site could be used to serve Bridgwater as a park and ride facility, employment-generating use or other appropriate land use. What are your views on our plans for the site near Junction 24 of the M5? Why are you taking up more countryside when you have all that land at Hinkley? All this freight and park-and-ride vehicles are all going to have to come through Bridgwater. What about the traffic and the noise and the pollution? Has an assessment actually been done to prove that Bridgwater needs a park and ride facility once you've finished with it? | 10129-1353-11614 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 62938 | Public | Stage 2 | Near residential area – noise and light pollution. | 10177-1353-7851 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|------------------------------|--|--------------------|--|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| North Petherton Town Council | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | <p>North Petherton Town Council strongly objects to the Park & Ride and freight consolidation facility on the A38.</p> <p>This will impact heavily on the town's communities through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Substantially increased traffic congestion on an already excessively busy road. This will impact heavily on local businesses and local residents. - Make the A38 more dangerous for all local residents, especially children who have to cycle to school on this road. - Shift changeover times co-incide with school movement times adding to congestion on the A38. - Increase noise levels and disruption close to the new villages of Stockmoor and Wilstock <p>NPTC recommend that EDF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pay for a northern by-pass for Bridgwater from Junction 23, via Dunball wharf to Hinkley Point. - That all possible materials and labour be brought in to the area by sea and rail. - That temporary wharf facilities at Hinkley Point would cause the least disruption. - That the freight consolidation centre be located away from residential areas and closer to rail freight yards and wharfing facilities. - That the Park and Ride and Junction 25 could be expanded to provide facilities for workers travelling from - Contribute substantially to local community facilities throughout the district as compensation for the disruption that this construction will bring. | 10227-1353-219 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | (Editor's note: see pdf available separately. Not entered into database - table) | 89241-1353-61 | | | / | |

| 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 assessment of construction noise indicates a Minor Adverse impact at Dawes Farm and a Moderate Adverse impact at Quantock Cottage. Whilst this is correct, paragraph 7.4.76 states that the magnitude of construction noise levels are assessed as medium during construction of the site roads and parking bays and low during all other activities. This is not borne out by the noise levels presented in Table 7.4.9, which indicate medium magnitude for earthworks and site preparation and building construction, and low for fencing and lighting construction and construction of site roads and parking bays.</p> <p>The value of 53dBLAeq,12hr for construction noise at Quantock Cottage during construction of site roads and parking bays is inconsistent with the tabulated results in the appendix and should be 63dBLAeq,12hr.</p> <p>This assessment is only valid for daytime working hours and no assessment has been carried out for evening and night time working. Therefore, the limit on working hours will need to be included in the Environmental Management & Monitoring Plan.</p> <p>A qualitative assessment has been carried out for construction vibration impacts. This includes some information on magnitude of vibration from some plant equipment taken from 'Control of Vibration and Noise during Piling' (British Steel, 1998). However, no reference is made to magnitude of vibration given in BS5228-2, particularly for piling.</p> <p>BS5228-2 also includes an empirical predictor for vibration from vibratory compaction, which is not used or mentioned. Based on a separation distance of 60m to the nearest receptor, it is possible that vibration levels from a vibratory roller may exceed 1mm/s, which may be a moderate adverse impact. This has not been considered.</p> | 89395-1353-1138 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | <p>Paragraph 7.4.79 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. The report goes on to state (para. 7.4.81) that typical construction and demolition working routines are unlikely to generate levels of vibration at local receptors above which cosmetic damage would be expected to be sustained. Assuming this threshold is 5mm/s (which equates to an impact of medium magnitude) it is unclear how the impact can then be judged to be very low.</p> <p>The conclusion is that the overall impact will be Minor Adverse. The report does not make it clear how this conclusion is reached and may underestimate the impacts of some construction activities.</p> <p>The operational assessment of noise at the park and ride facility assumes that 'noise from vehicle movements on site is unlikely to be discernible and would be no more significant than the predicted impact of road traffic generation of public highways.' Whilst this is likely to be true for this particular site given the separation distances involved and the existence of busy roads between the site and the nearest sensitive receptor, it is noted that no evidence is provided to support this view.</p> | 89395-1353-2888 | / | | | |

| 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>An assessment has been carried out of car door slams and concludes that the noise level at the nearest dwellings on Taunton Crescent is well below the measured background noise level. No assessment has been made at Dawes Farm or Charolais Drive. Whilst these receptors are further away, they are significantly quieter (the noise level falls to below 40dBLA90,30min in the early evening and presumably falls lower later in the evening). As the noise level between 22:00 and 00:00hrs is unknown, it is impossible to determine the impacts at these locations and therefore the assessment may underestimate the impacts at these locations.</p> <p>The noise assessment of the Freight Facility also assesses noise from HGV door slams. Again, this assessment has not been carried out at Dawes Farm or Charolais Drive and impacts at these locations cannot be determined. The source noise levels of HGV door slams have not been described in the report.</p> <p>The assessment of operational road traffic does not appear to include the increased traffic on the A38 south of the roundabout (to assess noise from traffic using the southern site entrance on the receptor at Quantock Cottage) or increased traffic along the road between the roundabout and Stockmoor Village (to assess noise from traffic using the northern site entrance on the receptors at Dawes Farm and Charolais Drive). Given that the increase in traffic along these roads may be significant, particularly in the evening peak, the noise impact may be underestimated.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.4.121 states that the potential effects of any removal / reinstatement phase are identified and assessed. However, these are not identified or assessed in the report.</p> | 89395-1353-4195 | / | | | |
| 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 does not outline any areas of uncertainty. | 89395-1353-7616 | / | | | |
| 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 report states that with the introduction of specific working hours and standard good practice, there is a predicted residual impact from construction noise of no more than minor significance. As the assessment was effectively undertaken with these measures in place, the residual impact must be the same as the initial pre-mitigation impact. Therefore, the residual impact should be Minor to Moderate Adverse.</p> <p>For construction vibration, no specific mitigation measures have been proposed and therefore the residual impacts for both are determined to be Minor Adverse. The residual impact may be higher if vibration from certain construction activities (such as vibratory compaction) is taken into account.</p> <p>For operational noise, no specific mitigation measures have been proposed and therefore the residual impacts for both are determined to be Minor Adverse. However, the residual impacts may be underestimated due to the lack of assessment along the park and ride access roads.</p> | 89395-1353-7700 | / | | | |

| 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 noise impacts from construction activities may have been underestimated since the mitigation proposed was effectively included in the pre-mitigation assessment. There is also a lack of evidence to completely underpin the assessment of noise from cars using the park and ride site and HGVs using the freight facility. Additional residual impacts may be possible due to vibration from some construction equipment, particularly vibratory compaction, close to the receptors. Additional residual impacts may also occur due to increased traffic along the park and ride access roads, which have not been assessed. | 89428-1353-14256 | / | | | |
| Wembdon Parish Council | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | A vehemently expressed concern of local residents as a consequence of additional traffic is a marked increase in noise and environmental pollution which this council perceives as detrimental to rural village life. Whilst we note EDF's intention to schedule their traffic outside the recognised normal rush hours, it is our view that this only serves to broaden the hours of traffic noise and creates noise pollution at unsociable hours, which is not conducive to rural village life, thus adversely impacting on our quality of life. | 89921-1353-3092 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Environmental impacts for the previous site at Junction 24 were noted in the Stage 2 Preferred Proposals PEI. Pertinent impacts which remain relevant to the new site are: "Short-term noise disturbance during the construction of site roads and parking bays to properties on the opposite side of the A38 from the facility. Adherence to typical construction working hours, during which existing traffic noise from the A38 dominates, would reduce the overall potential for disturbance". | 89960-1353-20401 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - The PEI information in latest consultation on the 'Somerfield' site reiterates the notion that noise impacts on receptors will not be of significance due to close proximity and current noise impacts of the A38 and the M5. The Council does not accept this notion, and requires EDFE to assess the relative and cumulative impact of the construction and operation of the Somerfield site in conjunction with the A38 and M5 to ensure noise thresholds are not breached. | 89960-1353-20967 | | / | | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - Reference is made to the closest residential properties being located on the opposite side of the A38, however, the closest sensitive receptors in this regard are the Huntworth Cottages, located close to the assumed position of a new access link between the Somerfield site and the A38. Sedgemoor District Council would seek to ensure that impacts upon these properties, residents of the adjacent Travelodge hotel and the adjacent Brainwave Centre (that helps children with brain injuries and development problems) are robustly assessed. | 89960-1334-21437 | | | / | |

| 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 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. 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. | 89395-1352-688 | | / | | Following comments received from Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council during Stage 2 consultation, the approach used to assess the impacts from the proposed scheme, particularly with reference to hours of construction working and car door slams, was updated. Chapter 9 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement details this, including the amended significance criteria used for the assessment. |
| 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 a lack of evidence to completely underpin the assessment of noise from cars using park & ride sites and HGVs using the freight facilities at Junction 23 and 24. | 89430-1352-4621 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|---|---|--------------------|--|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 1319 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 Update | What proposals are you putting into place to compensate residents of Stockmoor Village who live opposite proposed site at Junction 24 to compensate them for decrease in property values/pollution/noise/disruption. | 89585-1355-82 | | / | | As part of the construction and operation of the proposed development, a noise management plan will be put in place. The plan will include site-specific measures contained in Chapter 9 Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement along with general control measures which define Best Practicable Means. |
| 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 EnvApp 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. These measures, and any exceptions to the Local Authority construction policies, must be agreed in advance with the Local Authority (for example through an agreement in accordance with Section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974).</p> <p>The report also gives restricted construction working hours to help mitigate the impact of construction noise. However, since the significance criteria are based on daytime working (and therefore impacts have only been assessed for daytime working) it is not clear how the imposition of these restrictions will mitigate the impact.</p> <p>No specific mitigation is recommended beyond good practice for construction vibration since the impact is assessed to be minor adverse. As discussed above, the assessment may underestimate the impact of vibration from some construction activities and no mitigation is proposed.</p> <p>For operational activities, no specific mitigation is identified because impacts are identified as minor adverse. A number of best practice management tools are identified to minimise the potential for noise nuisance. These include reduction of unnecessary idling of vehicles, education of park and ride users to reduce loud radios, revving of engines, use of horns, etc. These measures appear to be difficult to manage and the document does not identify how they will be enforced. This information must be included in the Environmental Mitigation and Monitoring Plan.</p> | 89395-1355-5913 | | | / | |
| 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 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. | 89395-1355-8825 | | / | | |

| 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 | The Agency notes the three options at J24 (A, B and C) and acknowledges that none of these options were included in the previous list of options presented to the Agency in July 2009. Furthermore, no evidence has been provided to support or justify why these sites have been chosen and how the developments may impact upon the SRN. Without the necessary evidence base the Agency is unable to make any informed or detailed comments. However, our response to the two options remains consistent with our comments provided to the J23 options above. | 88860-1331-15953 | / | | | This response addresses comments relating to the consultation on the park and ride facility, freight management facility, temporary consolidation facility for postal/courier deliveries and temporary induction centre (the Proposed Development) proposed to the north-west of Junction 24 of the M5. The Proposed Development forms part of the Associated Development to support the construction of the Hinkley Point C (HPC) power station. |
| 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 important to note, however, that the site is facing significant opposition through the consultation process and there are a number of outstanding issues that still need to be addressed, including the ability to address significant highway constraints. | 88410-1331-4332 | / | | | EDF Energy has carried out a thorough and interactive 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 2011, which related to M5 Junction 24 and Highway Improvements in the Bridgwater Area. Throughout the consultation statutory consultees, the local community and the general 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 helped refine the proposals for the Junction 24 Associated Development. |
| Tractivity 697 | Public | Stage 2 | 13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below Only one person in my road was informed about the J24 logistics site, despite the fact that it will be directly opposite us! You have shown little regard for the residents of Stockmoor Village and Bridgwater and your so called flagship public consultation plan has obviously been designed to slide under the radar no doubt hoping to arouse little opposition to your frankly idiotic scheme. I suggest you speak to the local community!!!!!! | 9457-1331-7396 | / | | | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility to 698 parking spaces and proposing 45 HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| Tractivity 746 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Good idea | 9504-1331-8817 | | | / | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage/distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the |
| Tractivity 770 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Have you considered the new Colley Lane southern access road, which will coe out just north of J24? | 9528-1331-6171 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 784 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? AS ABOVE TRAFFIC TO THE NEW VILLAGE OVERWELMS THE CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS THAT NO ONE DOES ANYTHING ABOUT | 9542-1331-6262 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 799 | Public | Stage 2 | I don't like your lack of consideration for residents in stockmoor, cannington and bridgwater. We don't want this on our back door step. I also don't trust you as a company to not move nuclear waste near residential areas, especially near a new school for our future generations that is being built in stockmoor village. I personally think you have tried to hide the fact you are building this from nearby residents and that you should just expand your site. | 9557-1331-9082 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 812 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? same as above | 9570-1331-6311 | / | | | <p>outcome of this M5 Junction 24 and Highway Improvements consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of this application for development consent, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>Consultees have raised concerns in relation to the level of information contained in the M5 Junction 24 and Highway Improvements consultation. It is considered that the document contained sufficient information for consultees to understand the nature of the proposals at this site. A full description of the development is provided in Volume 9 of the Environment Statement and the Junction 24 Design and Access Statement.</p> <p>The DCO application is accompanied by a full suite of documents and application drawings which provides information on the impacts of the Proposed Development, including the Junction 24 Associated Development. In addition to the information contained in the consultation documents for each stage of consultation, information on the Proposed Developments was also made available through newsletters, the dedicated HPC website, media and advertising and meetings with the local community and stakeholders.</p> |
| Tractivity 919 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Only if the Eastern link is used | 9677-1331-5677 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 926 | Public | Stage 2 | 1. Any other ideas or comments? The proposed plans are completely inappropriate. there is vast space between hinkley point and roads which are not in the middle of residential areas like a development would be in North Petherton. It is disgusting the proposals have got to this stage largely without the knowledge of any residents! | 9684-1331-129 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 975 | Public | Stage 2 | 13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below This has been a complete unhandled way of getting planning passed - not let us know until the last minute, increased traffic and noise. There was nothing that came up on any of our house searches, hidden no doubt it!!! Why did I buy in Stockmoor Village!!! Because the sign said a whole new place to call home in the country - surrounded by farmland and nature resevoir - as if natures animals are going to come there with an industrial car park in place. | 9733-1331-6634 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 986 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Same as previous question but I would need more information to give an opinion. | 9744-1331-9293 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1005 | Public | Stage 2 | 1. Any other ideas or comments? I did not have time to view most of your information as I was only given 7th set at Sedgemoor Auction Centre to see this information. I feel we were only given just one day as an afterthought and to minimise feedback from people who will have to live close to your associated development site. | 9763-1331-125 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1010 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? this is the same question as above | 9768-1331-5623 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1142 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Same as above | 9900-1331-7338 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1205 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Need more information on this option | 9963-1331-6451 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1220 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? More feasibility studies. How sustainable for future use? Light and noise pollution to local housing under pressure from locality to motorists and recent huge agri-industry development. | 9978-1331-7572 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1359 | Public | Stage 2 Update | PLEASE also note this significant housing development is not shown on the consultation paperwork (Fig2 page 5 and Fig 27 page 29). | 89625-1331-2286 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 339 | 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 left my card at the recent Economic Development meeting organised by Sedgemoor at which you were present. The reason for the contact is more to make you aware that I work for the owners of the Regional Rural Business Centre which includes the Livestock market site at Jct24. We note Sedgemoors wish for the park & ride and freight facilities to leave more of a legacy but wish to point out that land you dismiss (at 4.9.9) as not available to be considered is not correct. We have developed most of the site but land behind and indeed the transport cafe itself is available. We are about to deal with an interested Hotel developer on on eside and a farming outlet at the traffic lights but there is still some 5 acres or so that has nothing planned at present. If therefore you have any needs in the short to medium term before the more formal options are explored please contact us. (personal details removed) | 9027-1331-3392 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 432 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and 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? The M5 junctions should be used as sites for Park and Ride as much traffic travelling to the power station travels these routes. junction 24 picks up Taunton and the south and Jn 23 the north. this would help congestion in Bridgwater | 9352-1331-5043 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 50720 | Public | Stage 1 | 1. Transport and Parking: Doubtless you have found Bridgwater is, at best, a difficult place to go through when heading from the M5, north and south, to the A39; a vital link for Hinkley. Although the issue of park and ride was explained I cannot help but feel that the figures quoted have been well massaged to suit the plan. I think anyone local will tell you that the only sensible transport plan is to establish a new link between the M5 Junction 23 and the current link road between Cannington and Hinkley. Although this would entail a new road and bridge over the Parrett it would solve the majority of your travel problems for both people and goods. Even if it is not in the long term National or County plans at present, effective lobbying by EDF and others should be able to change this. Or, if the bridge option is too expensive a bypass route from Junction 24, past the new housing estates to the Cannington roundabout. Although a longer route probably less controversial than the J23 option and there is almost certainly already a proposed plan with the County Council. | 9390-1331-298 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 62315 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | Opposed to Jct 24 development as road is right outside his house. Lots of graffiti around neighbourhood opposing development. Worked at HP so not opposed to HPC but does have problem with Jct 24 proposals, particularly FLS because of noise and extra traffic on an already congested Taunton Road | 10002-1331-48 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 62338 | Public | Stage 2 | It is with great concern that I have been told today you propose to include a heavy goods depot in your plan for Stockmoor Village on Junction 24 of the M5. I was also surprised that even though we have lived here for 2 years this is the first that we have heard of it. We knew about the park and ride but were told it had been postponed. There is no way that the roundabout at Stockmoor can accommodate any more cars leave alone heavy goods at peak times and no park and ride is going to make any difference. As it is we get rat-runners shooting through the village trying to avoid the back-up into Bridgwater and with the new school things can only get worse. | 10018-1331-0 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 62338 | Public | Stage 2 | I hope you will have great difficulty getting your plans approved and if I have anything to do with it you will certainly fail. | 10018-1331-1505 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 62341 | Public | Stage 2 | Please consider our views about your proposal, it's in the wrong place and has been sprung on us as new home-owners in this area. We knew nothing of this when we purchased our house at the end of 2009. This home was planned to be our last and to see us well into our retirement. This plan is now in ruins | 10021-1331-1574 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 62342 | Public | Stage 2 | My parents have lived in Stockmoor Park off of Junction 24 of the M5 since July 2008 and my sister and her husband have lived there since December 2007. The first they have heard about proposals for a park and ride and freight logistics site at Junction 24 was last night when a local resident made sure they were aware the consultation is currently being undertaken. As this latest round of consultation started on 9th July we were wondering how residents of Stockmoor Park have been informed about the consultation process as my family do not recall receiving a newsletter about the consultation events. | 10022-1331-120 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 62360 | Public | Stage 2 | EDF and the council had not previously directly informed the community of their proposal, even though they were conscious, of the impact their proposed project would have. We were not aware that Stage 1 consultation had been reported on! With prior knowledge, we certainly would not have purchased on this location. | 10035-1331-470 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 62445 | Public | Stage 2 | We are writing regarding the proposed EDF development at the Stockmoor Estate, North Petherton. We live in the Wilstock Village development and are concerned that EDF appear to be in the second stage of their consultation process. We were not told of any 1st stage of the consultation process and in fact the first we heard of the planned development was when a group of concerned locals put a leaflet through our door trying to organise opposition to the plans. We have been in our home since April. 2010 but we have family that live on the Stockmoor Grange area for the last 2 years and they too had not been made aware of any consultation process. So we could not have missed the announcement by EDF. We have been told that it was an error by EDF due to some issues with new postcodes on their databases. With this in mind, as we have stated, how come our families on Stockmoor Grange didn't receive notification from EDF's Postcode database system? We feel that this may be an underhand attempt by EDF to get their plans approved with out any one who lives local getting a chance to raise their objections We have heard very little from EDF regarding their development in the way of posted information to householders, which we can only assume should be the 'norm' for families living so close to such a development. We have had information given to us by some local people who are equally concerned and are opposing this project. We are extremely disappointed at EDF's actions and we adamantly object to the plans and have written to our local council to ask that our objection to such a plan be included in the councils list of objections | 10072-1331-0 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 62603 | Public | Stage 2 | 12/8/10 - (personal details removed) has a property on the Stockmoor Estate. He attended the Community Support Meeting at the exchange last night 11/8/10He was told by a representative of the council that plans for junction 24 were afoot 10 years ago. He wanted to know if this was true and why they had not been told before | 10150-1331-48 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|---|--|--------------------|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| North Petherton Town Council | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | NPTC deplores that residents of Stockmoor & Willstock were not adequately consulted about these proposals by omitting them from the circulation of consultation materials. | 10227-1331-1551 | / | | | |
| Somerset Councils and SNEG | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | For example, the village of Stockmoor had not been made aware of the proposals relating to the Junction 24 Park and Ride site until late in Stage 2, limiting their ability to comment on, or influence, the proposals. Similarly at Combwich, significant differences in the proposals were introduced into the Stage 2 documentation (i.e. introduction of a fabrication facility and HGV maintenance area), which materially changed the content of the proposals from Stage 1. | 10240-1331-11343 | / | | | |
| Landowner - Persimmon Homes South West | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | We have not been contacted to discuss these proposals that we believe will have a significant impact on our existing development and the people who live on it. We have spent considerable time and effort in securing a comprehensive development at Stockmoor Village and firmly believe that your proposal will affect the environment we are seeking to provide. | 10250-1331-208 | / | | | |
| Somerset Wildlife Trust | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | 11) What are your views on our plans for the site near junction 24 of the M5? Insufficient ecological information has been provided against which to appraise these plans, and so we must object. | 10263-1331-17784 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council, West Somerset Council and Somerset County Council Joint Councils Response | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee (Somerset) and consultee with an interest in land (Somerset and Sedgemoor) | 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 Supporting Traffic Flow data Paramics Forecasting Report Local Model Validation Report (Saturn and Paramics) Draft Transport Assessment Legacy plans for both the proposed M5 Park & Ride sites Visitor Management Strategy Site Waste Management Plan Integrated Waste Strategy Construction Management Plan Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan Detailed 1:500 drawings of Masterplans 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 Procurement Strategy and Contract Implementation Strategy Operations Workforce Development Strategy Lighting Strategy | 10275-1331-836 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|-------------------------|--|--------------------|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| | | | Delivery Plan for the Low Carbon Business Cluster Fire and Rescue Resourcing Strategy Ambulance Resourcing Strategy Security Management Strategy Incident Management Plan Archaeology - Written Scheme of Investigation, Amec 2009 'Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment, Hinkley Point Hinkley Point Foreshore Survey, Gloucester CC Archaeology Service Intertidal and offshore Archaeology at Hinkley Point Cannington Bypass - Geophysical Survey Junction 24 P and R - Geophysical Survey Junction 23 P and R - Geophysical Survey Wiliiton - Geophysical Survey Combwich - Geophysical Survey Integrated Land Management Plan Site Drainage Management Scheme Soil Management Plan Ecology Surveys Findings BEEMS 2010. Impact of new nuclear build at Hinkley Point on intertidal food availability for birds. BEEMS 2009. The combined effects of Hinkley B + C and refuelling scenarios. BEEMS 2010. Coralline aldae thermal sensitivity report. BEEMS 2010 Hinkley Jetty Scour Assessment Amec 2010 Environmental Impact Assessment. Technical Note Radiological (CIDEN-002). Issue 04 - Preliminary. March 2010 Details of the Contractor's Charitable Trust | | | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | - Details relating to the operating hours of the FLF, how the FLF will manage the number of trips to HPC from J24, and how many trips per day are expected are not evident at this stage. | 89203-1331-7266 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|------------------------------------|--------------------|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | The process of consultation has been inadequate | 89434-1331-1653 | | | / | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | - Whilst the Stage 2 consultation document provides further environmental assessment of the site at Junction 24 the overall assessment of the proposals is still limited. | 89434-1331-1704 | / | | | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | Whilst Miller Turner intends to pursue development of their land via the District Council's emerging Core Strategy the principle of EDF's requirements at Junction 24 are however welcomed. This will of course be subject to receiving further detailed information relating to the proposed design of the development. | 89435-1331-2902 | | | / | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | Whilst Section 11 of the EDF consultation document provides some environmental information relating to those sites identified for off-site development this work appears to be limited to desk top studies in most cases. It is therefore difficult to comment in detail on EDF's preferred development sites until more robust information is available. Any supporting studies should be made publically available at the earliest opportunity and at least as part of the next stage of consultation. We can however confirm that a number of environmental studies have been commissioned by Miller Turner in relation to land at Search Area J24-A and as far as we are aware at this time there appears to be no overriding constraints to development. | 89435-1331-7031 | / | | | |
| Stop Hinkley | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | 8) Belated consultation with the community of North Petherton about the potential effect of the nearby lorry park (freight consolidation centre). 9) Lack of consultation with the residents of Stockmoor Village, outside Bridgwater near Junction 23 of the M5. Many people either living there, or planning to live there, had no idea that a large park and ride site connected to the Hinkley C development was proposed on their doorstep. The issue has also exercised the developers Persimmon Homes, who are extremely concerned that prospective home-owners will be dissuaded by the unexpected discovery of the adjacent development. | 89452-1331-3998 | / | | | |

| 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>At the North Petherton event over seventy people attended to complain that they had no prior awareness of the project. It has been brought to the attention of the authorities that residents in the North Petherton area (specifically residents of Stockmoor Village), who would be directly affected by the freight consolidation and park and ride facilities at Junction 24 of the M5, have had little or no information provided to them about the development proposals until part way into Stage 2 of the consultation process.</p> <p>One resident observed that whilst there has been a general awareness of the Hinkley Point C proposals, due to the distance of the site from Bridgwater, a full appreciation of the impact of the development in their local area was not clear.</p> <p>EDF Energy has recognised that correspondence to residents in the North Petherton area has been inadequate and letters have been sent mid August. To address this concern EDF Energy is proposing to host a further consultation event with this community.</p> <p>It is possible that, due to this issue, that EDF Energy will now be facing significant public resistance to its proposals for a freight consolidation centre at Junction 24. The authorities would therefore welcome further information regarding alternative solutions as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>This is a significant issue for the local authorities which has raised a serious question about the adequacy of the Stage 2 consultation process and therefore potentially the ability for EDF Energy to submit an acceptable application to the IPC.</p> | 89323-1331-1453 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Lack of correspondence to communities in North Petherton where a significant number of residents, mostly from new build housing developments have been found to be completely unaware of the development proposals until Stage 2; | 89323-1331-5392 | | | / | |
| 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 welcomed the proposed extension of the “inner zones” where consultation would be most intense, to cover residents living in the vicinity of all the possible development sites as well as the main site. The authorities were concerned that the level of consultation planned for the ‘inner zone’ settlements was not applied equally to those resident or businesses who live and work along the principal A38 and A39 transport corridors to and from the main site and the associated development sites. This recommendation remains in plan in particular in relation to communities at Stockmoor Village. | 89329-1331-18068 | / | | | |

| 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 of consultation with Environment Agency as well as the Somerset Drainage Boards Consortium. | 89409-1331-3445 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 62858 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 Update | Finally, I am somewhat confused as to why a separate company has submitted planning application for the Bridgwater Gateway project on the very land that EDF energy have indicated they are interested in constructing a freight park and park & ride scheme upon | 89650-1331-322 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 62923 | Public | Stage 2 Update | (personal details removed) is a new resident of the Stockmoor estate. She would like some information on the park & ride site at junction 24. | 89669-1331-0 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 62998 | Public | Stage 2 Update | Confusing site plans again, very weak. | 89692-1331-4905 | | | / | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 Update | - Inadequate baseline assessment and technical studies | 89762-1331-5005 | | | / | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 Update | - The process of consultation has been inadequate | 89762-1331-5144 | | | / | |
| Highways Agency | statutory consultee | Stage 2 Update | 2.7 Plans for the design of the Associated Development sites at M5 Junction 23 and Junction 24 are provided in the Draft Overview of Associated Development Construction document also forming part of the consultation. The plans provided are too small for the Agency to provide any comments in relation to design and as such we request 1:500 scaled plans to be issued to us in order that we can provide some feedback. The Agency also requests the Associated Development sites at Junction 23 and Junction 24 are included in the PARAMICS modelling work to be undertaken so that the Agency might have confidence that the design of the sites and associated traffic movements will not impact on the adjacent SRN network. | 89837-1331-4817 | | | / | |

| 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 | 2.136 Point 6.4 Off-site freight management facilities at J23 and J24. As construction consolidation is not being implemented, except for some small LGV loads such as post and parcels, a full explanation is required to justify why it is not being considered and what the implications are for the local and strategic road network traffic impact. | 89848-1331-9209 | / | | | |
| 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. | 89873-1331-980 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 926 | Public | Stage 2 | 1. Any other ideas or comments? The proposed plans are completely inappropriate. There is vast space between hinkley point and roads which are not in the middle of residential areas like a development would be in North Petherton. It is disgusting the proposals have got to this stage largely without the knowledge of any residents! | 9684-225-129 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1404 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Consult with the Unite the Union at Argos, to find out the thoughts of the staff there. It will affect them as well. | 89979-1331-755 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1437 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I support the new proposals as a local resident. | 90011-1331-199 | | | / | |
| Environment Agency | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | The views expressed within this letter are in response to this further consultation only and does not represent our final view in relation to any future planning / permit application made in relation to this site. Our advice is general at this stage as it is unclear from the consultation if a complete rebuild is intended or minor upgrades to the site. | 89917-1331-423 | | | / | |

| 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 | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | A detailed assessment is also still awaited of the impact upon the surrounding highway network of the proposed use of the Somerfield site for use as a Park and Ride, Freight Holding Centre and Induction Centre. | 89952-1331-2426 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | The Proposed Changes J24 & Highways consultation document is well presented and concise, however, the Councils are very concerned about the level of detail on proposals provided in the document, | 89958-1331-2611 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | EDFE have published two Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) reports covering the Junction 24 'Somerfield' site and Bridgwater Highway Improvements. These provide a helpful initial appraisal of potential environmental affects; however the Councils do have concerns about whether this material adequately addresses the requirement of the 2009 Regulations and provides a sound basis for consultation. | 89958-1331-8083 | | | / | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that Somerfield site would be suitable in highway terms. The lack of any robust baseline data undermines the consultation process and prevents meaningful comments from being made by interested parties. There is a noticeable absence of highway information in the preliminary environmental information provided. | 89948-1331-2072 | | | / | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - The impacts of using the Somerfield site have not been fully assessed and will be different to those considered in relation to the previously preferred site south of Stockmoor Village. | 89948-1331-3056 | / | | | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - The impact of the increased scale of development proposed in the early years as a result of the Junction 23 facilities not being available has not been assessed. The consultation process should set out the impacts of delivering this increased level of development at both sites in order for interested parties to compare the potential impacts of each option. | 89948-1331-3247 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| (Personal information removed) | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - For the Somerfield site, the figure drawings were difficult to interpret. Only the site itself was coloured and it was difficult to translate the technical drawing lines of the surroundings into roads, tarmac areas or green spaces, buildings etc. - There was no attempt to give elevation drawings - There was no relief map or information regarding lighting requirements | 90081-1331-361 | | | / | |
| (Personal information removed) | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - Figure 3 - Indicative plan of the Somerfield site did not extend out far enough to see the access to the roundabout and how it sits in relation to the motorway services, etc. or where the potential new vehicular link to the A38 would be. | 90081-1331-742 | | | / | |
| (Personal information removed) | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 3. "We expect these facilities to be temporarily located on the Somerfield site for about one or two years, depending on how quickly the proposal at Junction 23 can be delivered." There was no information given about what the hold up is regarding plans for Junction 23, what the hurdles were and whether 'one or two years' is a realistic delay period. | 90081-1331-3299 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 63189 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Please could you confirm that the proposal is to MOVE the facility at M5 junction 24 from the green field site west of the A38 (identified in the document "Update on and Proposed Changes to 'Preferred Proposals' February 2011") to the brown field site referred to as "Somerfield" in the document released today. As in my opinion the document released today does not make it clear enough if the Somerfield site is required INSTEAD OF or AS WELL AS the green field site identified in the document "Update on and Proposed Changes to 'Preferred Proposals' February 2011". | 90094-1331-205 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor DC | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | The opportunity to discuss the role of the induction centre with EDF Energy would be appreciated. | 90098-1331-3708 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>In the Stage 2 and Proposed Changes responses, the Councils expressed concerns about the expansive land take and limited landscaping of the Park & Ride and freight management proposal for the Stockmoor site. From a townscape perspective, the 'Somerfield' site offers the following advantages: it is less prominent in views to and from the Quantocks Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB); and the site benefits from existing landscape embankments and mature planting.</p> <p>Should EDFE progress with proposals for this site, Sedgemoor DC would welcome further discussions on the layout and any modifications of the site. In accordance with EDFE's Preferred Proposals for associated development sites, the Council would encourage provision of on-site renewables to mitigate the carbon emissions of the HPC project construction stage and assist in the delivery of the vision for Huntworth:</p> <p>"New development within the area will need to reflect the areas highly visible position along the M5 corridor through high profile, contemporary and highly sustainable (zero carbon) buildings."</p> <p>The Council welcomes EDFE's proposal to provide a cycle and pedestrian link and wishes to see how this would link with a wider network of cycle paths, providing alternative routes to the heavily trafficked A38. Sign-posting and physical improvements linking the site to the Bridgwater and Taunton Canal and North Petherton - Bridgwater cycle route should be considered as part of this process.</p> | 89960-1332-18867 | | | / | <p>The Junction 24 proposals moved from a greenfield site to an existing brownfield site following the Stage 2 Update Consultation and were consulted on at the Junction 24 / Highway Improvements Consultation. The proposed and preferred 'Somerfield' site is situated approximately 400 metres to the north-east of the previously consulted site and is located between the M5 Motorway and the A38 Taunton Road to the north of Junction 24 and access is provided from the Huntworth Roundabout. The site currently consists of a warehouse and cold store, car and HGV parking as well as ancillary structures. It is split east/west across two detached areas that are separated by the road that passes through the Huntworth Business Park.</p> <p>The site now proposed meets a number of operational requirements for EDF Energy with regard to its size and location. It is also favourable in regard to a range of environmental and planning considerations, as identified through EDF Energy's alternative sites assessment. (Please refer to the Junction 24 – Proposals – Design alternatives topic response for more detail)</p> <p>The proposed Junction 24 site's location on a brownfield site, which makes use of an existing building and infrastructure, is an inherently sustainable attribute of the site's choice and the proposals for its use and was supported by consultees. The development of the site would be designed to meet with the relevant Building Regulations requirements. As part of this, the proposals will make use of renewable energy where appropriate, amongst other energy efficiency measures, to reduce carbon in the operation of the building services in respect of the Junction 24 site to a level recognised by draft policy D3 of Sedgemoor District Council's Local Development Framework submission Core Strategy.</p> <p>It is not the case that the application of these energy technologies would mitigate the carbon embodied in construction on this site but it is relevant to note that the purpose of the site, to facilitate the construction of the Hinkley Point C development site would, once operational, provide a significant contribution to reducing greenhouse gas emissions at the national scale. The carbon embodied in construction, including that of the associated development, would be off-set within a short period of the HPC power station's operation.</p> |

| 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 | <p>Sites 3A and 3B are proposed for park and ride / freight centre sites and are both located approximately 350m to the west of Junction 24 of the M5, Site 3A is situated to the east of the A38 and is allocated within the Sedgemoor District Local Plan as land within a 'Green Wedge'. Policy CNE4 recognises such sites as predominantly open areas outside development boundaries and as such the policy does not permit developments which would have a detrimental impact on the functions of the green wedge.</p> <p>Both Sites 3A and 3B are located within designated 'Best Agricultural Land' and Policy CNE5 seeks to take this into account when considering development proposals.</p> | 88880-1329-9368 | | | / | <p>This response addresses comments received in respect of planning policy with regard to the park and ride facility, freight management facility, temporary consolidation facility for postal/courier deliveries and temporary induction centre (the Proposed Development) proposed to the north-west of Junction 24 of the M5. The Proposed Development forms part of the Associated Development to support the construction of the Hinkley Point C (HPC) power station.</p> |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 1 | <p>In planning terms, the sites should ideally be considered through the development plan process and be included as appropriate sites for development. EDF need to fully consider how the development of these sites will be brought forward effectively and how it links to the planning process.</p> | 87920-1329-4929 | | | / | <p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan.</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>- Search area J24-A contains a Site of County Importance for Archaeology. 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;</p> <p>- There may scope for ongoing legacy use of the proposed Park & Ride site to serve Bridgwater, particularly if search area J24-A was selected. The Bridgwater, Taunton and Wellington Future Transport Strategy identifies potential for a Park and Ride site to the south of Bridgwater on the A38 transport corridor. Reference should also be made to the Bridgwater Vision, which allocates the A38 as a 'key public transport corridor' and 'visually improved arterial';</p> | 88400-1329-4588 | | | / | <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of</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>- All search areas are located in 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.</p> <p>All three search areas identified by EDF fall outside the defined settlement boundary for Bridgwater set out in the Local Plan, however the scope for development in search areas J24-A and J24-C is established in the Core Strategy Preferred Option and Bridgwater Vision. The Core Strategy Bridgwater Spatial Diagram shows a southern Park & Ride site in the location of search area J24A and an employment designation of 22ha at search area J24-C. Preferred Option BW1 confirms the status of the 'Bridgwater Vision' as a material planning document.</p> <p>The Bridgwater Vision promotes the A38 corridor south of the town at Huntworth as an "Enhanced Distribution Centre." High frequency bus connections would be provided along the A38 to the town centre, together with segregated pedestrian and cycle lanes. Opportunities should be taken to enhance wildlife habitats and increase public use of the Bridgwater and Taunton Canal that passes to the east of search area J24C. Search area J24C falls within a Local Plan Green Wedge designation. Policy CNE4 encourages positive land management for landscape, amenity and nature conservation in these areas.</p> | 88410-1329-0 | | | / | <p>the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>The Planning Statement submitted with this Development Consent Order (DCO) application addresses the national, regional and local planning policies relevant to the determination of the proposals. A number of comments from consultees have referenced employment and education planning policies. It is important to clarify that all of the uses comprising the Proposed Development are <i>sui generis</i> uses. Therefore, saved policy E4 of the Sedgemoor District Local Plan (1991-2011 Adopted Version) (2004) and policy D18 of the emerging Sedgemoor District Local Development Framework Core Strategy (Proposed Submission) (March 2011) are not directly applicable to the proposed development.</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>- The land at J24-A is currently being promoted for employment development via representations on the Core Strategy Preferred Option report. This will have an impact on the sites availability in the short to medium term although could potentially provide longer term legacy benefits in terms of a serviced site.</p> | 88410-1329-2502 | / | | | <p>The induction centre is not an educational use. The site would only be used temporarily for EDF Energy's induction process for new construction workers. This process would include the verification of workers' identification, skills documentation, induction training, collection of biometric data and photos and the issuing of passes. Drug and alcohol testing would also take place and the centre would host UK Border Agency staff. Workers would arrive at the induction centre trained and ready for employment, and as such the induction centre would not be used for continued learning or professional training.</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>- Of the three search areas presented for consultation, policy support for development at J24-B is weakest as it does not fall with the settlement boundary defined in the Local Plan or Core Strategy Preferred Option. There are no future development aspirations that would support its short-term use on the basis of any long-term legacy benefit. Instead the only legacy use that could be considered here would be its future restoration which is not referred to in Table 4.9 of the Stage 1 Consultation document. In addition, the size of this area of search would restrict its use to a Park and Ride site separate from the freight consolidation facility. In principle it would be preferred if both facilities were combined within a single search area, thus minimising its overall impact.</p> | 88410-1329-3362 | / | | | <p>A full description of the induction centre and how it operates is provided in Chapters 2 and 4 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement and the Junction 24 Design and Access Statement. Further information concerning the reasons for the temporary location of the induction centre at Junction 24 is set out in the Transport Assessment.</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>- The extent to which the proposals support and further the objectives for the A38 public transport corridor and Enhanced Distribution Centre proposals set out in the Core Strategy Preferred Options, Bridgwater Vision and Future Transport Strategy;</p> | 88420-1329-135 | | | / | <p>The Transport Assessment sets out the Proposed Development's compliance with the relevant transport planning policy and provides an assessment of the construction phase of HPC. The overall objective of the park and ride strategy is to reduce the traffic related impacts of the construction of HPC. The park and ride strategy forms part of the wider transport strategy by encouraging sustainable modes of travel</p> |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--------------------|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1194 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The provision of a facility for Bridgwater after the construction is good. | 9952-1329-7676 | | | / | and reducing the number of private vehicle trips attracted by the HPC construction site. The freight management facility and temporary consolidation facilities for postal/courier deliveries would provide a physical control mechanism to regulate the flow of vehicles through Bridgwater to the HPC construction site. Additionally, in the event of an incident requiring site deliveries to be temporarily suspended, HGVs would be held at the freight management facility to avoid congesting the local network |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | The site will act as an important southern gateway for Bridgwater. The economic and social benefits of achieving such a development have previously been explored within SDC's Core Strategy evidence base and are a key objective in securing a prosperous future for Bridgwater. | 89432-1329-3127 | | | / | Once the Proposed Development is no longer required to support the construction of the HPC power station, appropriate works would be carried out to allow the site to be available for storage/distribution purposes. |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | The current proposals for this site contained within the EDF Stage 2 Consultation document are not considered to reflect the importance of this site as a southern gateway to Bridgwater, nor do they demonstrate an understanding of the baseline conditions relevant to the area. | 89432-1329-3425 | / | | | In relation to the Bridgwater Vision (2009), the Proposed Development would support further strategic development opportunities in the Huntworth area, maximising the potential afforded by its location close to the M5 and Junction 24. In relation to the 'Vision' for the Huntworth character area, the Proposed Development would support a development of national significance. The facilities would occupy a vacant site and the appearance of the development is reflective of the existing use and other commercial uses in the surrounding area. |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | - The proposals included within the Stage 2 consultation document appear to have been conceived with little regard to SDC's wider strategic proposals for the area. Indeed no reference is made to SDC's evidence base which clearly identifies this site as an area where economic development can deliver significant benefits to Bridgwater. | 89434-1329-461 | | | / | |
| 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 falls outside the defined settlement boundary for Bridgwater as set out in the Local Plan. As a result there is a policy presumption against development, as set out in policy STR3: The countryside will be protected for its own sake. Outside defined development boundaries, new house building and other new development will be strictly controlled. Development will not be permitted unless it accords with other policies in this Plan which provide, exceptionally, for development in the countryside. In general, all such development will benefit economic activity, will maintain or enhance the environment, and will not increase the need to travel. | 89393-1329-2150 | | | / | |

| 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 site also forms part of a designated Strategic Green Wedge between Bridgwater and North Petherton, adding further weight to a presumption against development. Local Plan Policy CNE4 states that “these are predominantly open areas, mostly outside development boundaries, which retain a largely rural character and appearance. Positive land management which benefits the landscape, countryside access, amenity, nature conservation or urban area containment / enhancement functions of these areas will be encouraged and developments which would have a detrimental effect on these functions will not be permitted.” | 89393-1329-2809 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Search area J24-A contains a Site of County Importance for Archaeology. 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; | 89393-1329-3427 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | All search areas are located in 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. | 89393-1329-4255 | | | / | |
| 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 scope for ongoing legacy use of the proposed Park & Ride site to serve Bridgwater. The Bridgwater, Taunton and Wellington Future Transport Strategy identifies potential for a Park and Ride site to the south of Bridgwater on the A38 public transport corridor. Reference is also made to the Bridgwater Vision, which allocates the A38 as a ‘key public transport corridor’ and ‘visually improved arterial’ route. | 89393-1329-4476 | | | / | |

| 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 site falls within the Huntworth Character Area in the Bridgwater Vision, which is promoted as a Enhanced Distribution Centre:</p> <p>Huntworth would retain and enhance its role as a distribution area with the potential to attract uses of regional/national significance offering excellent links to the M5 motorway and low density, high quality flexible business space and facilities within a secure working environment. The site could form one of several key strategic sites in the town, through which the development of the energy and low carbon cluster could further stimulate economic re-structuring and town transformation.</p> <p>Design principles could include:</p> <p>Strong focus on innovation, enterprise and economic growth, with integral employment floorspace.</p> <p>Huntworth will enhance and diversify its role as a distribution area with supporting local facilities for workers promoted in the area such as g a training centre (linked to the college skills academy for logistics), gym, restaurant and child care facilities.</p> <p>New development within the area will need to reflect the areas highly visible position along the M5 corridor through high profile, contemporary and highly sustainable (zero carbon) buildings.</p> <p>New development should provide frontage to green infrastructure and transport networks, and take the opportunity to enhance wildlife habitats and increase public use.</p> <p>A coordinated approach to signage, lighting and general public realm and landscape treatments will improve the environmental quality of the area.</p> <p>Arrival points into the area should be marked by strong gateway features which could include new landmark buildings/features and/or public art particularly at junction 24.</p> <p>Taunton Road will be promoted as a key public transport corridor with high frequency bus services giving workers in the area direct and frequent access to the town centre. .</p> <p>A Park & Ride site adjacent to the A38 Taunton Road in conjunction with enhanced bus services will also provide connections to Bridgwater town centre.</p> <p>High quality, safe and legible pedestrian and cycle routes will be created through the area strengthening links back to the town centre particularly along the Canal corridor.</p> | 89393-1329-4898 | | | / | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 Update | <p>The site is large enough to accommodate EDF's land requirements plus additional development. The site would also have the capacity to accommodate other off-site development which EDF may identify the need for in the future. We consider there are obvious socio-economic and environmental benefits in consolidating off-site development associated with Hinkley C into as few separate sites as possible. As such we would be pleased to discuss any further requirements with EDF.</p> | 89762-1329-1830 | | | / | |

| 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 | <p>Sedgemoor Local Plan (September 2004)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - STR3 - The countryside will be protected for its own sake. Outside defined settlement boundaries, new house building and other new development will be strictly controlled. - CNE4 - Areas of land which retain a largely rural character and appearance, and which have particular importance as Green Wedges, are defined on the proposals map. Positive land management which benefits the landscape, countryside access, amenity, nature conservation or urban area containment/enhancement functions of these areas will be encouraged and developments which would have a detrimental effect on these functions will not be permitted. - E4 - Industrial, warehousing, office or other business uses will be permitted within defined settlement boundaries provided that: environmental impact is compatible with adjoining uses; and in the case of industrial or warehousing development there is safe access to the national or county road network. - E6 - In the countryside beyond settlement boundaries the establishment of new employment sites and the extension of established sites will only be permitted where a countryside location is essential and no suitable alternative is available within or adjoining a local settlement. - CNE2- Development which adversely affects local landscape character or scenic quality will not be permitted. In particular, siting and landscaping should take account of visibility from publicly accessible vantage points. - CNE9 - Developers are encouraged to make positive provision for wildlife. - CNE15 - Development will not be permitted if it would increase the risk of flooding as a result of changes in surface water run-off or adversely affect water quality. | 89894-1329-5257 | | | / | |
| WSC & SDC Joint Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 2 Update | <p>Sedgemoor Core Strategy Submission (February 2011)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - D9 Sustainable Transport and Movement - Travel management schemes and development proposals that reduce congestion and encourage and improved and integrated transport network and allow for a wide choice of modes of transport as a means of access to jobs, homes, services and facilities will be encouraged and supported. The Council will seek to ensure provision is made for inclusive, safe and convenient access for pedestrians, people with disabilities, cyclists and users of public transport that addresses the needs of all. - S1 Spatial Strategy for Sedgemoor - To create the most sustainable form of growth for Sedgemoor, Bridgwater will be the focus for the District's housing and employment growth. As the principal town in the District it will accommodate the majority of new development within its urban area through the provision of a strategic urban extension, brownfield sites and at other well related Greenfield locations. - D11 Economic Prosperity - All large-scale proposals (over 1,000m2) for research and development, light industrial and distribution should be focussed at Bridgwater, Burnham-on-Sea and Highbridge in accordance with the following locational priorities: firstly on brownfield sites; secondly on preferred greenfield sites set out in Policies P1 and P3; or thirdly, | 89894-1329-6999 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| | | | <p>exceptionally, on other greenfield sites identified in the Employment Land Review. Exceptional circumstances include development that is of national or regional significance and has locational requirements that could not reasonably be accommodated on brownfield or the preferred greenfield locations. The site at Huntworth (South Bridgwater) is specifically reserved for business uses that will support Hinkley C NNB. Part of site potentially required for park and ride facility. Access constraints to be fully resolved. Likely that part of site developed in short term with P & R site developed in the long term.</p> <p>- D20 Green Infrastructure (GI) - GI will be safeguarded, maintained and enhanced as appropriate to form a multi-functional resource that provide an accessible network of green spaces. These should maintain or enhance landscape character, image, biodiversity and recreational value of an area.</p> <p>- D14 Natural Landscape - Proposals should ensure that they enhance the landscape quality wherever possible or that there is no significant adverse impact on local landscape character, scenic quality and distinctive landscape features. All development proposals should contribute to enhancing and maintaining biodiversity, taking into account climate change and the need for habitats and species to adapt to it.</p> <p>- D16 Pollution Impact of Development, Residential Amenity - Development proposals that would result in the loss of land of recreational and/or amenity value or unacceptably impact upon the residential amenity of occupants of nearby dwellings and any potential future occupants will not be supported.</p> <p>- D18 Education Provision - The Council will work with the County Council, Bridgwater College and other partners to provide, additional, extended or enhanced education facilities to address educational needs. Development proposals for education facilities will be supported where they are at suitable locations within Bridgwater, Burnham-on-Sea and Highbridge, Key Rural Settlements and Sustainable Settlements, are of high quality and sustainable design and are accessible by a range of sustainable transport modes.</p> | | | | | |
| WSC & SDC Joint Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 2 Update | <p>Bridgwater, Taunton and Wellington Future Transport Strategy</p> <p>This transport strategy identifies Park & Ride facilities at M5 Junctions 23 and 24 as potential elements of an A38 Public Transport Corridor. However, recent analysis by Somerset County Council suggests that there may be no long-term requirement for a legacy public Park & Ride at Junction 24.</p> | 89894-1329-10514 | | | / | |
| WSC & SDC Joint Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 2 Update | <p>Bridgwater Vision</p> <p>Huntworth is promoted as an Enhanced Distribution Area in the Bridgwater Vision:</p> <p>Huntworth would retain and enhance its role as a distribution area with the potential to attract uses of regional/national significance offering excellent links to the M5 motorway and low density, high quality flexible business space and facilities within a secure working environment.</p> | 89894-1329-10876 | | | / | |

| 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 | <p>Design principles set out in the Vision include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Huntworth will retain and enhance its role as a distribution area with supporting local facilities for workers promoted in the area including a training centre (linked to the college skills academy for logistics), gym, restaurant and child care facilities. - New development within the area will need to reflect the areas highly visible position along the M5 corridor through high profile, contemporary and highly sustainable (zero carbon) buildings. - New development should provide frontage to the canal network and take the opportunity to enhance wildlife habitats and increase public use. - A coordinated approach to signage, lighting and general public realm and landscape treatments will improve the environmental quality of the area. - Arrival points into the area should be marked by strong gateway features which could include new landmark buildings/features and/or public art particularly at junction 24. - Taunton Road will be promoted as a key public transport corridor with high frequency bus services giving workers in the area direct and frequent access to the town centre. - A Park & Ride site adjacent to the A38 Taunton Road in conjunction with enhanced bus services will also provide connections to Bridgwater town centre. - High quality, safe and legible pedestrian and cycle routes will be created through the area strengthening links back to the town centre particularly along the Canal corridor. - A Travel Plan would be critical to the options presented for the site, with the potential for a bespoke public transport service and connecting pedestrian and cycle infrastructure back to the town centre. | 89894-1329-11270 | | | / | |
| WSC & SDC Joint Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 2 Update | <p>Sedgemoor Green Infrastructure (GI) Strategy</p> <p>Land to the west of the proposed site is identified in the GI Strategy as Strategic Nature Area for woodland creation, as proposed in the South West Nature Map.</p> | 89894-1329-12977 | | | / | |

| 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 | <p>Emerging Bridgwater Gateway Design Principles</p> <p>In order to respond to EDFE proposals at this site, and taking account of the strategic motorway junction location and low flood risk of the land, the emerging Core Strategy identifies the site as a potential location for business and general industrial use, but with the land specifically reserved for employment uses that will support the HPC project. In accordance with the emerging Core Strategy position and to prevent ad hoc speculative development in this location, SDC are in the process of preparing a Bridgwater Gateway Design Principles document. This will be expected to inform any HPC project related development and guide legacy planning for this location.</p> | 89894-1329-13189 | | | / | |
| WSC & SDC Joint Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 2 Update | <p>SDC acknowledge that Park & Ride sites could form an important element of a transport strategy for the HPC project that accords with emerging Core Strategy policies MIP2 and D9, helping to reduce the number of vehicles travelling to Hinkley Point. The Sedgemoor Local Plan designates the area as a Green Wedge (Policy CNE4) outside the settlement boundary (Policy STR3), an approach that aims to prevent the coalescence of North Petherton and Bridgwater. While SDC continues to recognise the amenity and landscape role of the Green Wedge, the Council also acknowledges that the proposed location for the temporary Park & Ride and freight management facility is logical given its proximity to J24 of the M5 and the absence of suitable alternative sites on the A38 corridor to the south of the town centre.</p> <p>Local Plan policy E6 advises that, in the countryside beyond settlement boundaries, the establishment of new employment sites will only be permitted where a countryside location is essential and no suitable alternative is available within or adjoining a local settlement. The emerging Core Strategy identifies the site as a potential location for business and general industrial use, but with the land specifically reserved for employment uses in connection with the HPC project.</p> | 89894-1329-14613 | | | / | |
| WSC & SDC Joint Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 2 Update | <p>In this context, where there are tensions between retaining the land as Green Wedge and enabling economic development with the HPC project as a catalyst, it is considered particularly important that any development in the area should provide a high quality landscape and architectural design in this 'gateway' location that respects the semi-natural setting, protects residential amenity and contributes to SDC's corporate and economic development objectives. It is for this reason, and to prevent ad hoc development, that the Council has prepared the Bridgwater Gateway Design Principles.</p> | 89894-1329-16035 | | | / | |
| WSC & SDC Joint Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 2 Update | <p>The existing local policy framework, Bridgwater Vision, Sedgemoor Green Infrastructure Strategy and emerging Bridgwater Gateway Design Principles document all set out design objectives and cues that should inform the final proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The design should provide for buffers to nearby residential properties, so that residential amenity and outlook is protected in line with emerging Core Strategy policy D16. | 89894-1329-17088 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>EDFE have published two Preliminary Environmental Information (PEI) reports covering the Junction 24 'Somerfield' site and Bridgwater Highway Improvements. These provide a helpful initial appraisal of potential environmental affects; however the Councils do have concerns about whether this material adequately addresses the requirement of the 2009 Regulations and provides a sound basis for consultation. General comments on the PEI are set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As a consequence of the updates and accompanying consultation processes, it is deemed that the scope of proposed works and locations for development have changed substantially. To this effect, the Councils request clarification from EDFE that the original Scoping Opinion submitted to the IPC in May 2010 remains valid. - The Councils advocate that the scoping exercise needs revisiting and sensitivity testing applied to the previous assessments. Without EDFE providing this sensitivity testing and appropriate justification for the proposed changes, the Councils would call into question the statements put forward within the PEI documents. | 89958-1329-8085 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>4.2 Policy and Guidance</p> <p>National Policy Statements EN-1 and EN-6 (Approval Versions, June 2011)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EN-1, para. 5.13.4 - The applicant should provide details of proposed measures to improve access by public transport, walking and cycling, to reduce the need for parking associated with the proposal and to mitigate transport impacts. - EN-1, paras. 5.13.6 & 11 - A new energy NSIP may give rise to substantial impacts on the surrounding transport infrastructure and the IPC should therefore ensure that the applicant has sought to mitigate these impacts, including during the construction phase of the development. Where the proposed mitigation measures are insufficient to reduce the impact on the transport infrastructure to acceptable levels, the IPC should consider requirements such as: control number of HGV movements to and from the site in a specified period; make sufficient provision for HGV parking to avoid prolonged queuing on approach roads and un-controlled on-street parking; and ensure satisfactory arrangements for reasonably foreseeable abnormal disruption in consultation with network providers and the police. <p>NPS EN-1 sets out general assessment principles that are applicable, but does not set out specific advice on the siting of Park & Ride or freight management facilities for Hinkley Point. Nor does the Hinkley Point site assessment in Vol. II of EN-6 provide any commentary on associated development in Bridgwater. It is considered therefore that the following local policy does not conflict with the NPS and that it is of importance and relevance to the proposals.</p> <p>Sedgemoor Local Plan (September 2004)</p> <p>The following policies have been saved, but will be superseded when Sedgemoor DC adopts the Core Strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - E4 - Industrial, warehousing, office or other business uses will be permitted within defined settlement boundaries provided that: environmental impact is compatible with adjoining uses; and in the case of industrial or warehousing development there is safe access to the national or county | 89960-1329-1091 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|---|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| | | | <p>road network.</p> <p>- E9 - Proposals which lead to the loss of existing or committed business, industrial or warehousing land or buildings to other uses will not normally be permitted unless: clear advantages would occur which outweigh the economic disadvantages; or there is demonstrably no likelihood of a viable employment use or redevelopment; or it can be demonstrated that there would be no significant implications for the quantitative supply of employment land and buildings.</p> <p>- TM1 - Safe and Sustainable Transport will be achieved by the following means: development will only be permitted if the design makes adequate and safe provision for access by foot, cycle, public transport and vehicles so long as it's appropriate to the scale of the development in accordance with National and County Council design standards and Somerset County Council's Highway hierarchy; and the developer shall provide transport infrastructure required by the development to an agreed phased programme. Development will not be permitted for proposals which would have a significant impact on the highway network without the prior submission of a Traffic Impact Assessment.</p> <p>The following Local Plan policy is saved by the Core Strategy:</p> <p>- BE1 - To achieve sustainable and quality development, applicants will be required to submit justification as to how the proposal as considered a wider range of design criteria. These are summarised under the headings of Natural Resources; Energy and Movement; and Development Structure.</p> <p>Sedgemoor Core Strategy Submission (incorporating the Council's recommended changes, March 2011)</p> <p>- D9 Sustainable Transport and Movement - Travel management schemes and development proposals that reduce congestion and encourage and improved and integrated transport network and allow for a wide choice of modes of transport as a means of access to jobs, homes, leisure and recreation, services and facilities will be encour</p> | | | | | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>The second main factor for consideration is the loss of employment land. Saved Local Plan policy E9 and emerging Core Strategy policy D11 both seek to protect existing employment sites unless it can be demonstrated that there is no likelihood of a viable employment use or redevelopment. In this case the proposed development of the site for sui generis transport uses would be for a defined (although not insubstantial period of time) and EDFE propose that the site would be made available again for business uses once the HPC construction phase is completed. Furthermore, the Core Strategy does provide for the development of other employment sites during the plan period that could be brought forward in the interim. In particular, the Somerset Bridge site to the north along the A38 provides for 65,000sqm (net) of B8 development.</p> | 89960-1329-14702 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Although most of the land uses proposed are not strictly employment uses, the development would support the delivery of the HPC project, which in turn would provide jobs and has the potential to support economic development in the two districts. The HPC project is identified as an important catalyst for economic development and wider economic restructuring in the Sedgemoor Economic Masterplan and draft Economic Strategy. The EDFE proposals also have similar site requirements to B8 uses in terms of proximity to the strategic road network, hence the location is considered appropriate. Further land has been allocated in the Core Strategy for storage and distribution uses at Somerset Bridge, providing an alternative site for companies seeking to locate in the area for the defined period that the 'Somerfield' site would be unavailable. Finally, from an urban design perspective there are potential benefits supporting use of this site, as set out below. | 89960-1329-16016 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Core Strategy policy D18 states that development proposals for education facilities will be supported where they are at suitable locations within Bridgwater, Burnham-on-Sea and Highbridge, Key Rural Settlements and Sustainable Settlements, are of high quality and sustainable design and are accessible by a range of sustainable transport modes. Sedgemoor DC would welcome the opportunity to discuss with EDFE whether there are appropriate sites closer to the town centre, such as vacant premises in existing industrial estates within the town. Should appropriate premises be available in a location readily accessible by public transport, HPC bus routes, walking and cycling, then this would prevent the need to move the induction centre part way through the construction of HPC. There is also a concern that the provision of a temporary facility at Junction 23 would not be compatible with the strategic flood risk issues. | 89960-1329-17879 | / | | | |

| 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 | The Agency notes the three options at J24 (A, B and C) and acknowledges that none of these options were included in the previous list of options presented to the Agency in July 2009. Furthermore, no evidence has been provided to support or justify why these sites have been chosen and how the developments may impact upon the SRN. Without the necessary evidence base the Agency is unable to make any informed or detailed comments. However, our response to the two options remains consistent with our comments provided to the J23 options above. | 88860-1330-15953 | | | / | This response addresses comments relating to the principle of the park and ride facility, freight management facility, temporary consolidation facility for postal/courier deliveries and temporary induction centre (the Proposed Development) proposed to the north-west of Junction 24 of the M5. The Proposed Development forms part of the Associated Development to support the construction of the Hinkley Point C (HPC) power station. |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | Stage 1 | Our response to these sites is consistent with our approach to the sites at Junction 23. The Agency supports the principle of seeking to consolidate trips but seeks reassurance that the impact of such development would not impede the safe and efficient operation on the SRN. | 88880-1330-10041 | | | / | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| Tractivity 696 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? Satisfactory but APPREHENSIVE about the traffic problems that will arise at J24 of the M5. | 9456-1330-2471 | | | / | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. |
| Tractivity 759 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Good. | 9517-1330-5599 | | | / | On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. |
| Tractivity 776 | Public | Stage 2 | We do not agree with the plans for this site for several reasons | 9534-1330-5362 | | | / | The rationale for the location of the proposed Junction 24 site is set out in the Transport Assessment and the appended Freight Management Strategy . As stated within these documents, there is a clear strategic requirement of the HPC Project for park and ride facilities, freight management facilities, a |
| Tractivity 782 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? Traffic in Bridgwater and at junction 24 is bad enough at the best of times without adding more to it going through from Stockmoor Park. I live on the new village at Stockmoor when we bought our house there was no mention of this. I feel that now having this dropped on us, with no mention of it from EDF, you did not have the grace to consult with us before all these plans were in place. The whole idea of this village was to as ?a town place to live in a village location? this is how it was sold to us. | 9540-1330-1939 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 790 | 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 I will be objecting to and protesting every aspect of the junction 24 proposals every step of the way, I feel we have been lied to and a proposal of this scale could not be a brand new development this year. I would like to know how on earth this managed to be passed in the first instance as it is so obviously going to have a negative effect on so many peoples lives, the so far very badly let down residents of stockmoor park to name but several. I no longer feel, as I did when I bought my new home that this will be a good environment to raise my children, and for that I am thoroughly against your plans. | 9548-1330-8593 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|--|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 799 | Public | Stage 2 | Also building these facilities so close to housing, especially near North Petherton/ Stockmoor Village, will be bad for the environment. | 9557-1330-937 | | | / | temporary consolidation facility for postal/courier deliveries and the temporary induction centre to be provided close to Junction 24 of the M5 motorway. These documents also explain the size of facilities required at Junction 24. |
| Tractivity 803 | Public | Stage 2 | 13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below The sites recommended at Junc 24 are not suitable I have seen the results of lorry parks with waste urine containers rubbish and lorry drivers using side streets and estates as lorry parks and dumping grounds. The A38 in BW is a high density use road and you would be adding to the nightmare we have daily | 9561-1330-6433 | | | / | The Transport Assessment describes the analysis of the impacts of the construction and operation of the HPC Project on the local and strategic highway network. This Development Consent Order application is also accompanied by a full suite of documents which provides a robust assessment of the impacts of the Proposed Development at Junction 24. Comments have suggested that Junction 23 should be the location of more, if not all, of the park and ride facilities. EDF Energy have proposed four separate park and ride facilities which are strategically located to maximise the take up of this service, and to ensure the facilities provide coverage of a wide geographical area. To make Junction 23 the only park and ride site would undermine the purpose of the park and ride network and result in increased levels of traffic on some parts of the local road network. A full explanation of the location of the park and ride sites is set out in the Transport Assessment . Similarly, Freight Management Facilities are proposed at both Junctions 23 and 24 of the M5. The Freight Management Strategy explains how the freight management facilities at Junctions 23 and 24 of the M5 would manage HGV movements on the highway network. It also explains the combination of freight measures proposed to reduce and control the use of road freight traffic during the HPC construction phase. A site adjacent to Junction 24 of the M5 motorway is required to intercept delivery vehicles which would be travelling from the south on the M5 motorway towards the proposed HPC construction site before they reach local roads. A freight management facility in this location would therefore be well placed to provide a remote waiting area for delivery vehicles. The Freight Management Strategy also explains how in the event of an incident requiring site deliveries to be temporarily suspended, the vehicles would be held at the freight management facility to avoid congesting the local network. A total holding capacity of 140 spaces (across Junction 23 and Junction 24) would absorb three hours of the peak daily traffic on an average day during the peak quarter. The situation would be monitored and, if necessary, suppliers would be instructed to hold HGVs at their source or at |
| Tractivity 807 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? The Bridgwater South site junction 24, M5, would be totally wrong for a park and ride and freight logistics facilities. It is a rural housing area, with a new school coming to the area. The use of the existing access road which leads onto the estate is totally unacceptable. It will lead to noise pollution, light pollution, criminality at the location. Increased traffic on the local main road network will lead to grid locking of a road already unable to cope with existing and transient holiday traffic. Road safety for residents and school children will be compromised. Value of houses will go down in the area Bridgwater North , junction 23, M5. I support this site due to it already being an industrial area with plenty of existing space to accomodate development, it will not affect the quality of life of residents as would the junction 24 proposal | 9565-1330-2518 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 807 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? This is wholly unacceptable. It is a residential area, it is too close to local housing and residents. The local road system is very busy and will not be able to cope with this increase in traffic. It will affect the quality of life of all people and local wild life within the area. The access road proposed which leads onto the housing estate should not be used as an access route to large industrial vehicles. This would lead to vibration and noise affecting local people and properties , leading to damage to homes and roads and ultimately loss of value to properties. It is also within half a mile from a local primary school. There will be many children and parents within the locality which would put them at risk There would be an increase in light pollution, noise pollution,potential increase in related crime due o the nature of storage of the site, which will all impact on the local population | 9565-1330-7042 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 808 | Public | Stage 2 | 10. Any other ideas or comments? however i beleive this site should be made bigger and remove the need for the need for your diabolical plans for j24 wher you beleive it is a good idea to build an industrial site on a residential area. what idiot is possibly thinking this would be a good idea | 9566-1330-6147 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 839 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Not needed! | 9597-1330-7616 | | | / | existing network truck stops if already on route, until further notice. |
| Tractivity 853 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? Residential areas of Bridgwater should not have to suffer the imposition of the park and ride and freight logistics facilities, in particular at J24. The land is a green field site and the additional traffic on both the A38 and on the Stockmoor/Wilstock access road would be unacceptably high. The recommendations of the 1990 Barnes report should be implemented and a bypass built from Dunball to the main site. | 9611-1330-1933 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 853 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Totally unacceptable use of a green field site, too close to a residential development and primary school. Traffic congestion on the A38 and Huntworth roundabout is already a huge problem, most summer weekends it's impossible to leave the estate via the Huntworth roundabout because it is gridlocked. On weekday peak times, the journey time from J24 into the town centre is already 20-30mins, any additional traffic is just going to make that situation worse. | 9611-1330-5914 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 877 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Need for major improvements leaving J24 | 9635-1330-6048 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 898 | Public | Stage 2 | 4. Any other ideas or comments? A much better strategy altogether thankyou | 9656-1330-1927 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 900 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Please see comments for J24 Q6 or Q7, I am amazed that you think running through the center of Bridgwater is a good idea with the problems that will be encountered with the traffic. All the other sites are able to access roads which bypass the center of the town. | 9658-1330-6274 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 913 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? A good solution | 9671-1330-7714 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 922 | Public | Stage 2 | 13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below J24 is not an acceptable location for EDF the plans. | 9680-1330-5740 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 937 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? This area already has 'storage' facilities etc and the newly built auction centre for agriculture. The area is being developed for housing - already many being occupied. It is a very busy area and not suitable for your proposed use. | 9695-1330-8275 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 940 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Sounds reasonable | 9698-1330-7065 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 952 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Yes i agree as long as control of loads are managed properly | 9710-1330-6574 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 969 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Too much traffic on Huntworth Island. Don?t want unsightly car park so close to my house. Park and Ride is too close to Bridgwater - wont be used. Noise Pollution. What will happen to site after works complete - park and ride will not be used - what else is going to be built on what is currently beautiful countryside. | 9727-1330-5351 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 993 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Just about within Bridgwaters development area. | 9751-1330-6454 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 998 | Public | Stage 2 | <p>1. What are your views on the proposed arrangement and landscaping of the Hinkley Point C site?</p> <p>Box ticked: No opinion</p> <p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>No comment</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?</p> <p>Box ticked: No opinion</p> <p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>No comment</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?</p> <p>Box ticked: No opinion</p> <p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>No comment</p> | 9756-1330-0 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 999 | Public | Stage 2 | <p>11. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>I live a short distance from J24 and the proposed facilities. I am extremely concerned about the inevitable increase in traffic on M5 and A38 (the only routes out of the housing development where I live). Noise from the facilities and general disruption to my life. I understand that my house value has already decreased as a result of your proposal for J24. Is that just tough?</p> | 9757-1330-6062 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1043 | Public | Stage 2 | <p>11. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Traffic coming into this function is really great especially at early morning and evening. To get through Bridgwater from that junction is traumatic at any time of day. Not a good idea.</p> | 9801-1330-7382 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1053 | Public | Stage 2 | <p>11. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>good idea</p> | 9811-1330-6226 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1076 | Public | Stage 2 | <p>11. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Why do you need two facilities? The one at junction 23 seems the best</p> | 9834-1330-7769 | | / | | |

| 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 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The traffic between J24 and Bridgwater is usually bad at peak times. The best option would be to continue to J23 and use the park and ride facility there. This would be enhanced even further if a new bridgwater bypass was built from the A38 north of Bridgwater to the Hinkley Point road. | 9839-1330-8583 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1091 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? J24 as a park and ride would not be necessary if adequate and substantial development occurred at J23. However if this were to go ahead, further transport appraisals need to consider the congestion on Taunton Rd presently and the traffic light sector by Morrisons. Extra HGVs and buses could cause gridlock if left unchanged. | 9849-1330-13046 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1122 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The massive scale of this unnecessary and expensive project make it inappropriate and unwelcome from all points of view. | 9880-1330-7633 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1166 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Same comments as question 10 | 9924-1330-7047 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1180 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The people that moved to the village nearby would never have done so if they knew what was in the pipeline. | 9938-1330-7433 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1182 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? This is lunacy. The route from this facility into Bridgwater and along the A39 to site is already a major traffic problem as it is, it requires resolving not compounding. | 9940-1330-7349 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1185 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? See Q10 | 9943-1330-6222 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1186 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Wholly unsatisfactory. The route between this site and Hinkley C is already oversubscribed, particularly the section between Junct 24 and Bridgwater. | 9944-1330-7259 | | | / | |

| 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 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? One park and ride at Junction 23 should be sufficient and see point 10 for my comments on freight logistic facilities. | 9948-1330-7711 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1318 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 Update | Q1 Do you have any comments on our proposals for the workforce and for employment, skills and business engagement? NO TO JUNCTION 24 Q2 Do you have any comments on our updated accommodation proposals? NO TO JUNCTION 24 Q3 Do you have any comments on our proposed community mitigation and benefits? NO TO JUNCTION 24 Q4 Do you have any comments on our working hours proposals? NO TO JUNCTION 24 Q5 What are your views on the proposed changes to our transport proposals? NO TO JUNCTION 24 Q6 What are your views on the proposed changes to our main site plans? NO TO JUNCTION 24 Q7 Do you have any other comments? NO TO JUNCTION 24 | 89584-1330-0 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 432 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and 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? The M5 junctions should be used as sites for Park and Ride as much traffic travelling to the power station travels these routes. junction 24 picks up Taunton and the south and Jn 23 the north. this would help congestion in Bridgwater | 9352-1330-5043 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 62338 | Public | Stage 2 | I can't see if you want to put industrial premises on our junction it can't go the other side of the road at the market where the road infrastructure is already in place, you propose to have the entrance to the heavy goods depot on the other side of the road with all the noise pollution on level with all our residencies. Don't get me wrong I grew up in the local area when Hinkley A and B were being built and I can remember how beneficial the extra buying power was to the local community especially Bridgwater, but you can't expect to inflict such an industrial use on land right next to a new development and for people to take it lying down there is going to be a wetland centre just down over the hill from your proposed site, but I can't see the wading birds coming to take up residence if the extra traffic you will bring occurs. | 10018-1330-662 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 62578 | Public | Stage 2 | <p>11. At Junction 24 of the M5 we are planning a park and ride facility for workers where they will be transferred to buses. A freight logistics facility is also proposed where freight would be consolidated and sent to Hinkley Point outside peak periods. After construction of the power station is complete, this site could be used to serve Bridgwater as a park and ride facility, employment-generating use or other appropriate land use. What are your views on our plans for the site near Junction 24 of the M5?</p> <p>Why are you taking up more countryside when you have all that land at Hinkley? All this freight and park-and-ride vehicles are all going to have to come through Bridgwater. What about the traffic and the noise and the pollution? Has an assessment actually been done to prove that Bridgwater needs a park and ride facility once you've finished with it?</p> | 10129-1330-11614 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 62598 | Public | Stage 2 | 9/8/10 - Not happy about the proposals for junction 24 park and ride plus freight terminal. Asked someone to call as not happy. (personal details removed) phoned | 10146-1330-48 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 62611 | Public | Stage 2 | 19/8/10 - He lives on the Willstock side of junction 24. He is very concerned about park & ride/ Lorries. Wants to speak to someone about roads. Also worried about pollution and house prices. (personal details removed) spoke to him | 10158-1330-48 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|--------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 62671 | Public | Stage 2 | <p>We would hereby like to formally complain about the proposals that EDF are putting forward, on 5 counts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plans for a storage and fabrication site at Combwich - The refurbishment of the wharf at Combwich for use by EDF to bring in All's and other freight - The plans for transporting some 5000 employees, 120 HGV's, an unspecified number of park-and-ride buses and up to 120 daily visitors to Hinkley C along the C182 - The plans for the developments at Williton and Junction 24 of the M5 - We would also like to formally complain about the way EDF have "consulted" - we believe it has been inadequate, secretive and underhand <p>Our letter to EDF (attached) (Editor's note: letter not included in pdf, entered as separate enquiry) is self explanatory but we would like to point out the effect that their plans will have on the lovely village of Combwich in particular.</p> <p>1. Buildings</p> <p>The construction of 5 buildings on the edge of Combwich on 80 acres of land, just as you come into the village, of the following sizes will be noisy, will be a blot on this beautiful landscape, will be a pollutant to the countryside, a disturber of both peace and wildlife and an unmanageable nightmare for our country roads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 30m x 10m x 3m high - 60m x 15m x 3m high - 60m x 30m x 12m high, containing 2x 10-tonne cranes - 80m x 40m x unspecified height fabrication shed - 40m x 40m x 12 metre high fabrication shed - Plus 4 large areas totalling almost 14 acres of outdoor storage and parking <p>2. Utilities</p> <p>During the building period of these structures, EDF claim "it is likely that new power, drainage, potable water and possibly gas infrastructure services will need to be extended from existing networks to serve the site'. We can therefore look forward to frequent traffic jams and upheaval on Rodway whilst the road is being ripped to shreds by the utility companies. We can find no risk assessment for this work.</p> <p>3. Operations</p> | 10180-1330-0 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|--|--------------------|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 40248 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | I am writing as agent on behalf of (Personal information removed), the owner of land proposed for a park & ride and freight consolidation facility at Junction 24, south of Bridgwater. (Personal information removed) is aware of the statement of representations submitted by IJP on behalf of Bridgwater Gateway Ltd, who hold an option to purchase his land, and fully supports their objection. As previously stated in response to the first consultation, (Personal information removed) would object to the acquisition of his freehold interest by compulsory purchase, and would like EDF to come to an arrangement which suits all parties. | 10243-1330-160 | / | | | |
| Landowner - Persimmon Homes South West | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | We have not been contacted to discuss these proposals that we believe will have a significant impact on our existing development and the people who live on it. We have spent considerable time and effort in securing a comprehensive development at Stockmoor Village and firmly believe that your proposal will affect the environment we are seeking to provide. | 10250-1330-208 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 62469 | Public | Stage 2 | k) The Colley Lane relief road to/from Junction 24 hasn't been built yet. The Junction 24 park and ride and freight logistics facilities are unacceptable. That junction has traffic coming off the motorway for the service station and for Wiseman Dairy/livestock market as it is, as well as through town. The loss of more green land is unjustified and would give a terrible impression coming from that junction. It would erode the separation of Bridgwater and North Petherton that needs to be preserved. There's been enough development there as it is. Those at the new Stockmoor Village development must be horrified at your proposals. It completely negates the concept of a village. The scale is overwhelming. It has no long-term benefit and will blight the whole area: reducing appeal, house prices, etc. | 89469-1330-10038 | / | | | |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | The Agency has reviewed the Flood Risk Study Reports and Appendix C of the Transport Appraisal focussing on flood risk and the potential impact on the SRN. It is noted that Hinkley Point C and the on-site associated development is located within Flood Zone 1 and is not at risk of flooding, however, the main access road (C182) is at risk. As such, the Agency requires details of the strategy that EDFE has in place should this road flood and what the potential impact is on the SRN. Confirmation is also required that in the event of a road closure any freight storage sites have the capacity to store the additional material being delivered to the holding sites but not being taken onwards. | 89174-1330-448 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | - The Stage 1 consultation report shows evidence that public comments have been fed into the planning/design process. At Stage 1 concern was raised over a large freight logistics storage facility at J24 and that this should be placed at J23. The Stage 2 development therefore has placed a larger freight and storage area at J23 so as to minimise the size at J24. | 89203-1330-5150 | | | / | |

| 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 | - J24 is a smaller site than J23 and does not include a FLF storage building, yet is estimated to take 6 months longer to construct than J23. The justification for this is unclear. | 89203-1330-5780 | | | / | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | - The documentation refers to "a small number of residential properties lie to the south of the site." Dawes Farm is almost immediately to the north, and the residential properties at Stockmoor village are in close proximity in the north western area. As the site is alongside the access to the Stockmoor development there needs to be an appropriate consideration of the impact and relationship upon this residential area. | 89203-1330-5964 | | | / | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | The construction phasing is a concern as it appears that not all freight facilities; HPC jetty, Combwich wharf, J23 and J24 logistics facilities will be available for use prior to the construction phase commencing. | 89234-1330-4201 | | | / | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | The extent of Miller Turner's land control at Junction 24 could accommodate park and ride and freight consolidation facilities without undermining the wider development proposals for the site. The current proposals contained within the Stage 2 consultation document fail to consider the strategic importance of this site as set out in the emerging Sedgemoor District Council Core Strategy | 89432-1330-3704 | | | / | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | Following a full review of the Stage 2 consultation document, a comprehensive objection is also raised on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of justification for the proposed layout and scale of development - Inadequate baseline assessment and technical studies - Legacy proposals are inconsistent with SDC's strategic proposals for the site - The process of consultation has been inadequate - Failure to consider reasonable alternatives | 89432-1330-4741 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|------------------------------------|--------------------|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | <p>- It is considered that further detailed justification is required in order to demonstrate that this level of development is necessary as part of any off-site development. No information is included to assess the impact of either increasing or decreasing the overall scale of development on site or any alternatives that have been considered.</p> <p>- It is unclear whether any contingency has been built in to the proposals to allow for future variations in the scheme prior to submission of the Development Consent Order, or indeed any necessary variations to the site during operation.</p> | 89433-1330-990 | / | | | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | - In general it is considered that the information contained within the Stage 2 consultation documents fails to provide sufficient technical information to quantify the potential impact of development at Junction 24 nor does it demonstrate that all reasonable alternatives have been considered. In particular the following comments are made: | 89433-1330-1634 | / | | | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | - In our view no attempt has been made to integrate the EDF proposals within either the current setting or the proposed development, thus making legacy usage of the site at the end of the construction period far more problematic. | 89434-1330-976 | | | / | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | - It is clear that EDF's proposals fall short of a scheme which will secure comprehensive development of the site in a manner consistent with SDC's wider objectives for the area. The lack of credible baseline assessments raises further doubt over the robustness of the proposals. | 89434-1330-3048 | | | / | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | - It is well documented that the site at junction 24 provides an important gateway to Bridgwater. This key site would provide opportunities to provide High quality employment floorspace, corporate training facilities, sport and recreation facilities, a hotel, and green infrastructure. The proposals and legacy plan for the site fail to recognise these wider benefits. | 89434-1330-4509 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--------------------|--|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | - As such the current proposals will undermine the integrity of the site as a key destination and could discourage investment. Although alternative proposals have been discussed the Stage 2 process has not allowed proper consideration of all reasonable alternatives. | 89434-1330-4879 | | | / | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | - On the basis of the above Bridgwater Gateway Limited wish to strongly object to the current proposals whilst reiterating their willingness to agree terms with EDF based on a logical site layout which is compatible with the wider emerging development proposals for the site. | 89434-1330-6605 | / | | | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | Following our own initial consultation it is clear that development south of the current settlement limits of Bridgwater is a sensitive issue. Specifically we are aware of considerable local opposition to development which would result in the currently strong physical barrier of the M5 being breached. This is understandable as any precedent for breaching that barrier will encourage future promotion of other development east of the motorway leading to the creeping urbanisation of the countryside. Notably the Inspector's Report on the Sedgemoor District Local Plan (August 2003) previously considered the allocation of land at Huntworth for employment purposes, but found this to be a harmful intrusion into the countryside. We believe that circumstances have not changed so significantly that development east of the motorway would now be considered acceptable. | 89435-1330-1424 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | At Stage 1 the Council stated a preliminary view that the M5 J24 search area (J24-A) was the preferred location for a Park and Ride to the south of Bridgwater, when compared to the alternative J24 search areas located on the eastern side of the M5. The preference was stated for freight consolidation to be sited at J23, rather than J24. It is acknowledged that these views have informed the Stage 2 proposals, with the exception that freight logistics facilities are now proposed at both M5 junctions. | 89393-1330-1531 | | | / | |
| 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 no current planning applications for the site and no recent planning applications considered to be of significance to the EDF Energy proposals, other than those relating to the construction of housing (Stockmoor Village) on land to the north. | 89393-1330-7150 | | | / | |

| 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>It is the Council's view that the development of a Park and Ride and freight logistics/storage facility would be acceptable providing the following criteria are met:</p> <p>It must be demonstrated that the proposal forms part of a robust transport/logistics strategy and investment package that prevents adverse impacts arising and which contributes to the achievement of wider transport objectives. These include delivery of the A38 public transport corridor, enhanced public realm as set out in the Bridgwater Vision and delivery of improved walking and cycle routes in Bridgwater.</p> <p>Residents in Stockmoor Village and North Petherton will experience disturbance impacts during the construction, operation and removal of the freight logistics/consolidation facility, such as increased traffic movements and noise. EDF should demonstrate that measures are taken to avoid and minimise harm, and that residual negative impacts are compensated such that the overall balance of outcomes is positive for the community at Cannington.</p> | 89393-1330-7908 | | | / | |
| Quantock Hills AONB | statutory consultee | Stage 2 Update | <p>The AONB Service is concerned that the comments it has previously made in respect of EDF's proposals for a park and ride and freight logistics facility at Junction 24 of the M5 may no longer apply. This is in light of the fact that a separate planning application has been submitted for the Bridgwater Gateway Development (which also includes a park and ride and freight logistics facility and which may be given consent before the EDF application for Hinkley C goes to the IPC).</p> <p>We do not understand how a proposed site directly linked to the construction and operation of Hinkley C can form part of a separate planning application that will not be subject to scrutiny by the IPC as part of the wider application for Hinkley C. We seek clarification on this point.</p> | 89713-1330-1335 | | | / | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 Update | <p>Miller Turner wishes to ensure that the development potential of the site is not unnecessarily prejudiced by the location of the park and ride and freight uses. Previous discussions have identified a willingness by EDF to consider revised proposals and an alternative layout.</p> | 89762-1330-2324 | / | | | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 Update | <p>The reference at Page 24 of the February 2011 consultation document to the current planning application (37/10/0016) is welcomed. However, the proposals, in their current form, are not considered appropriate, would conflict with Sedgemoor District Council's vision for the site and would unnecessarily sterilise this important strategic mixed-use site.</p> | 89762-1330-2603 | / | | | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 Update | <p>The current proposals for the site do not reflect the significance of this site as the southern gateway to Bridgwater, nor do they demonstrate an understanding of the baseline conditions or policy framework relevant to the area.</p> | 89762-1330-4254 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| 27 | Comments received under the EIR from the IPC | Stage 2 | <p>We would hereby like to formally complain about the proposals that EDF are putting forward, on 5 counts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plans for a storage and fabrication site at Combwich - The refurbishment of the wharf at Combwich for use by EDF to bring in ALL's and other freight - The plans for transporting some 5000 employees, 120 HGV's, an unspecified number of park-and-ride buses and up to 120 daily visitors to Hinkley C along the C1S2 - The plans for the developments at Williton and Junction 24 of the M5 - We would also like to formally complain about the way EDF have "consulted" - we believe it has been inadequate, secretive and underhand <p>Our letter to EDF (attached) is self explanatory but we would like to point out the effect that their plans will have on the lovely village of Combwich in particular.</p> <p>1. Buildings The construction of 5 buildings on the edge of Combwich on 80 acres of land, just as you come into the village, of the following sizes will be noisy, will be a blot on this beautiful landscape, will be a pollutant to the countryside, a disturber of both peace and wildlife and an unimaginable nightmare for our country roads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 30m x 10m x 3m high - 80m x 15m x 3m high - 60m x 30m x 12m high, containing 2x 10-tonne cranes - 80m x 40m x unspecified height fabrication shed - 40m x 40m x 12 metre high fabrication shed - Plus 413 large areas totalling almost 14 acres of outdoor storage and parking <p>2. Utilities During the building period of these structures, EDF claim nit is likely that new power, drainage, potable water and possibly gas infrastructure services will need to be extended from existing networks to serve the site". We can therefore look forward to frequent traffic jams and upheaval on Rodway whilst the road is being ripped to shreds by the utility companies. We can find no risk assessment for this work.</p> | 89816-1330-0 | / | | | |
| WSC & SDC Joint Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 2 Update | <p>Reference is made in the Proposed Changes to the pending planning application for the site and it is encouraging that EDFE state that they would be willing to explore working with the applicant. The application for Bridgwater Gateway includes temporary park and ride and freight facilities which could be subject to the resolution of final design and associated obligations and conditions. The detailed planning and implementation of the site would need to be consistent with the Council's approved design principles.</p> | 89875-1330-5796 | | | / | |

| 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 | 9.4.2.1 Principle of Development It is the view of SDC that the proposed changes to the M5 Junction 24 proposals remain materially unchanged, with the exception of some minor adjustments to layout and relatively small increase in freight holding capacity. The logic for the broad location of the proposed Park & Ride site and freight management facility is understood. | 89894-1330-13912 | | | / | |
| WSC & SDC Joint Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 2 Update | Reference is made in the Proposed Changes to the pending planning application for the site and it is encouraging that EDFE state that they would be willing to work with the applicant. This application will need to take account of drainage matters as well as provide a satisfactory transport solution at the A38 roundabout. | 89894-1330-14287 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 926 | Public | Stage 2 | 1. Any other ideas or comments? The proposed plans are completely inappropriate. There is vast space between hinkley point and roads which are not in the middle of residential areas like a development would be in North Petherton. It is disgusting the proposals have got to this stage largely without the knowledge of any residents! | 9684-225-129 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1446 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | We do not want a hotel for 500 works or a park and ride on our doorstep | 90020-1330-442 | | / | | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | On balance, it is the view of officers that the proposal to provide a Park & Ride and freight management facility at the Somerfield site is acceptable in principle, subject to the assessment and agreement of a robust, deliverable and effective transport strategy for the Hinkley Point C project, and specifically for this site. Any proposals that come forward, for example, at the Huntworth roundabout and M5 Junction 24, must be compatible with and must not prejudice or compromise existing business operations (e.g. Argos) or the delivery of other proposed developments in this locality. | 89956-1330-7559 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|---|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>5.2.6 Huntworth Roundabout (Scheme F)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Junction 24 of the M5 and the Huntworth Roundabout is identified to be a Strategic Gateway for Bridgwater in the Vision and therefore the design objectives for principle arterial routes will be of particular importance in this location. - The Proposed Changes J24 & Highways consultation refers to the potential signalisation of the roundabout and possible works to improve access from the 'Somersfield' site to J24 of the M5. This is considered by Sedgemoor DC to be a critical highway scheme if a freight route through Bridgwater is to be utilised and therefore the current absence of any detail of proposed junction improvements is unsatisfactory. - The operation of the service station in combination with EDFE's proposals to use the 'Somersfield' site will need to be carefully considered, given the additional car and bus movements that would arise over and above the HGV movements associated with the existing distribution use. - It is noted that EDFE propose "to make a proportionate contribution" to highway improvements in this location. Sedgemoor District Council will seek to engage with Somerset County Council, the Highways Agency, EDFE and other developers with development proposals that would affect this junction, to work towards the identification of an appropriate junction design that is deliverable and can be financed within the timescale that improvements are required. Any proposals that come forward must be compatible with and must not prejudice other local developments. - Should EDF Energy remain undecided about which Park & Ride and freight management site would be utilised at M5 J24, then the highways and land acquisition implications of both schemes should be consulted upon. | 89961-1330-16506 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 63152 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>4. If the (Plan H) proposal is being cited as a Section 106 condition by the Planning Authorities for Hinkley C consent, we urge EDF not to agree to such a condition. It would be acceding to a wrongful application of planning law, a waste of money which would ultimately rebound on the energy consumer, and bring no benefit whatever to the project.</p> <p>5. On p.7 of your Pre-Application Consultation information handout dated July 2011, col.2 (at top) you state:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - M5 Junction 24 (Scheme H) Improving the slip roads.. prior to the other associate development sites becoming operational. <p>I/we have no knowledge at this time of any such development sites to the south or east of Junction 24. It therefore seems wholly inappropriate that EDF should be expected to fund this unnecessary exercise.</p> | 90078-1330-1526 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 63159 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>5. On p.7 of your Pre-Application Consultation information handout dated July 2011, col.2 (at top) you state:</p> <p>- M5 Junction 24 (Scheme H) Improving the slip roads.. prior to the other associated development sites becoming operational</p> <p>I/we have no knowledge at this time of any such development sites to the south or east of Junction 24. It therefore seems wholly inappropriate that EDF should be expected to fund this unnecessary exercise.</p> | 90084-1330-1880 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 63173 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>4. This whole scheme seems to be an excessive waste of money, for which I am sure there are far more worthy causes.</p> <p>5. On p.7 of you Pre-Application Consultation information handout dated July 2011, you state:</p> <p>- M5 Junction 24 (Scheme H) Improving slip roads prior to the other associated development sites becoming operational.</p> <p>I have no knowledge at this time of any such development sites to the south or east of Junction 24. It therefore seems wholly inappropriate that EDF should be expected to fund this unnecessary exercise.</p> | 90086-1330-1570 | | | / | |

| 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 construction of associated development sites at both J23 and J24, the Agency notes that the construction phase is set to commence in 2011 for J23 and 2012 at J24. The Agency welcomes a staggered approach and would seek to ensure that the construction periods do not coincide in order to minimise any cumulative impact. | 88860-1327-16887 | / | | | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the |
| Tractivity 898 | Public | Stage 2 | 4. Any other ideas or comments? A much better strategy altogether thankyou | 9656-1327-1927 | | | / | |
| Highways Agency | Statutory consultee | Stage 2 Update | 2.8 The Associated Development Construction document indicates that construction of the facilities at M5 Junction 23 and Junction 24 will occur at the same time. EDF Energy will need to demonstrate to the Agency that the construction of these facilities in parallel will not cause detrimental impact to the SRN. Detailed negotiations will be required with the Agency along with the agreement of appropriate traffic management schemes to ensure the safety and free-flow of traffic on the SRN is not affected by the construction proposals. Furthermore, EDF Energy will need to liaise with the Agency to agree the timing of the construction works at Junction 23 and Junction 24 for the Associated Development sites to ensure that these works do not conflict with other Agency and third party highway works on the SRN. | 89837-1327-5534 | / | | | |

| 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 | 2.113 Para 3.5.8 indicates that the main construction access would be off of the A38, it would seem more sensible for the access for construction traffic to be off of the Stockmoor distributor road, as this would minimise disruption to the A38 during the construction period. | 89848-1326-1104 | / | | | <p>outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>The Junction 24 site includes a park and ride facility, freight management facility, temporary consolidation facility for postal/courier deliveries and temporary induction centre. Its construction will be phased before the Junction 23 site and would accommodate additional park and ride spaces and HGV spaces prior to Junction 23 becoming fully operational.</p> <p>The staggering of the construction of the Junction 23 and 24 sites would help to minimise any cumulative impact that HPC construction operations may have on the existing road network. Ongoing liaison with the local authorities and Highways Agency would help EDF Energy to further alleviate potential issues on the strategic road network.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of Volume 7 of the Environmental Statement provides further details.</p> |

| 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 | For information, J24 was not identified as a potential site for signalisation. | 88870-1323-6946 | | | / | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| Tractivity 62160 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 1 | <p>Site 24-A South Bridgwater</p> <p>We write to supplement representations already made on our behalf (Personal details removed).</p> <p>We hold an option for 10 years on 34 ha of agricultural land currently owned (Personal details removed), which we are promoting for mixed use within the currently emerging Local Development Framework.</p> <p>We are uniquely situated to be able to cooperate with EDF in satisfying their stated needs for park and ride and freight consolidation uses upon the site but we would suggest that we could also accommodate a number of the other declared site needs including a residential campus, high quality hotel, serviced offices for sub-contractors and leisure and retail facilities to serve the campus and the adjacent neighbourhood.</p> <p>The subject site is shown on the attached drawings which indicate a variety of potential layouts each of which would portray the companies operations in a favourable light through high quality design, landscaping, estate management, security, ease of access and prominence. An ongoing legacy could also be created for the town through the availability of low cost housing, ample park and ride, leisure and retail facilities and employment space as EDF active requirements diminish.</p> | 8753-1323-536 | / | | | <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site.</p> |
| Tractivity 62160 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 1 | <p>We can offer a 34ha site in single control.</p> <p>Our highways experts have already produced evidence that the site is the most suitable in South Bridgwater in terms of accessibility and traffic impact.</p> <p>A large portion of the site is not liable to flooding and enjoys favourable ground conditions.</p> <p>We are already seeking to construct a high quality hotel to form a gateway presence at the Huntworth roundabout frontage.</p> <p>We have level sites for park and ride and freight transfer use and could accommodate larger areas than those already suggested.</p> <p>We have a close relationship with the providers of temporary storage and transfer space and believe a particularly efficient solution to the companies storage needs could be delivered.</p> <p>We believe innovation is necessary to satisfy the companies short term residential accommodation needs and in conjunction with a registered social landlord could fund and create a campus which would create the legacy of a major addition to the towns affordable housing supply.</p> <p>To consolidate many of the off site requirements of the company on a single well managed , integrated and secure "village" site could well be an innovation that would be repeated in future similar schemes and we are keen to contribute fully to explore the possibilities.</p> <p>We have also incorporated an illuminated cycle and footway to link the scheme with Bridgwater, the Country Park and North Petherton.</p> | 8753-1323-1768 | / | | | <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>Given the existing infrastructure already available on the 'Somerfield' site it could be used earlier than the other proposed associated development sites. EDF Energy is therefore proposing to use this site before the other park and ride sites and the freight management facility are built.</p> <p>A temporary induction centre and a temporary postal consolidation facility for courier deliveries would also be located on the 'Somerfield' site. Once the Junction 23 facilities become fully operational, the number of spaces at the 'Somerfield' site would be reduced. The temporary induction centre and temporary consolidation facility for courier deliveries would also be removed and located at Junction 23.</p> <p>The 'Somerfield' site would be available for another commercial purpose once it is no longer required by</p> |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|------------------------------------|--------------------|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1020 | Public | Stage 2 | What are your views on our plans for the site near Junction 24 of the M5? Box ticked: Satisfactory 11. Any other ideas or comments? May wish to ask the highways department to change signage that reflects the use of J24 and J25? | 9778-1323-6247 | | | / | EDF Energy. A number of consultees have also suggested alternative access arrangements to and from the 'Somerfield' site. Suggestions for a new junction onto the M5 Motorway would not comply with the requirements of the national design standards applicable to determining the minimum distance required between Motorway junctions, and on this basis alone would not be considered further. Other suggestions for access to be provided to the north of the site closer to the town of Bridgwater would be contrary to the purpose of the park and ride facility, which is to intercept cars arriving from the M5 Motorway and before they enter Bridgwater along the A38 Taunton Road. |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | The amount of land-take which results from the layout is considered excessive and fails to minimise the impact of the proposals on the wider development objectives for the site. As will be demonstrated further on in these representations a more efficient layout, which applies a more logical approach to landscaping and drainage, can easily be achieved. | 89433-1323-633 | / | | | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | Failure to consider reasonable alternatives - As discussed above it is considered that EDF have failed to demonstrate why the scale of development proposed is required. This matter should be considered as part of a further consultation staged if the resulting Development Consent Order application is to be considered robust. | 89434-1323-3679 | / | | | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | - Notwithstanding this the proposed location and layout of development fails to demonstrate that there are no reasonable alternatives available. Following initial discussions with EDF it is clear that the proposals contained within the Stage 2 consultation document can be altered without detriment to the EDF's ability to accommodate essential infrastructure. It is however clear that in order to secure a comprehensive strategy for this site, amendments to the current proposals must be made. | 89434-1323-4011 | / | | | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | Discussions with Sedgemoor District Council and other stakeholders have been ongoing for some time. Based on our initial work we consider the site represents a more suitable alternative than land currently identified for development in the emerging Core Strategy east of Junction 24 at Huntworth. | 89435-1323-1124 | | | / | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | It is important to note that generally the site represents an excellent opportunity to deliver a much needed 'gateway' development and local landmark. In this regard careful design will be required by EDF to ensure that any development is suitably located on site to avoid causing a negative experience for visitors to the area. We have considered the possibility of a high quality hotel use in this location. We would also point out that given the excellent ground conditions and lack of threat from flooding parts of the site would be well suited to temporary or permanent residential use. | 89435-1323-3214 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|------------------------------------|--------------------|--|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | It is noted that a maximum of 12 hectares of land will be required by EDF in the event that both the park and ride and freight consolidation uses are located at Junction 24. Miller Turner currently control approximately 34.1 hectares (84.2 acres) of land to the south of Stockmoor Village in the area referred to as Search Area J24-A. The site is therefore large enough to accommodate EDF's land requirements plus additional development. The extent of Miller Turner's land control at Junction 24 would allow some flexibility in the overall design of the proposals should more land be required than currently envisaged. The site would also have the capacity to accommodate other off-site development which EDF is unable to deliver elsewhere. We consider there are obvious socio-economic and environmental benefits in consolidating any off-site development into as few separate sites as possible. As such we recommend that the potential of land at Junction 24 to accommodate other uses is investigated further. | 89435-1323-4624 | | | / | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | Based on Miller Turner's controlled land area a minimum of approximately 26.4 hectares (65.2 acres) of land is available for development. Sedgemoor District Council currently proposes a 22 hectare regional logistics centre at Huntworth. As discussed above our view is that land south of Stockmoor Village provides a more suitable alternative. The site could accommodate both the District Council's regional logistics requirement and the park and ride facility proposed by EDF. Furthermore, it is likely that any such logistics development will be phased. Therefore the opportunity exists to accommodate EDF's proposed freight consolidation requirements at the same time as providing a first phase of a regional logistics centre with the final phase being available once EDF have vacated the site. This would represent a logical approach to development in the area which would result in less landscape or traffic impact than development on both sides of the Motorway. | 89435-1323-5636 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 62998 | Public | Stage 2 Update | Hotel @ Junction 24 too big, wrong position should be in centre of Bridgwater to stimulate town centre and create status if planners can pass a decently designed building. I would suggest the proposed Tesco site, so that the pedestrian flow across Brewery fields is retained, car parking under or over building, service boutiques could really develop around the hotel to complement Angel Place which would continue the flow for visitors into the centre of town for entertainment etc. | 89692-1323-4188 | | | / | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 Update | The land south of Stockmoor Village (referred to as J24 by EDF) has good accessibility to the M5 and would result in a logical extension to Bridgwater. Development here would accord with the District Council's objectives for the area as set out in the Bridgwater Vision document, Economic Strategy and emerging Core Strategy. The site is also the subject of a draft design principles document. It will be critical that any proposals at the site reflect this important policy framework. | 89762-1323-1341 | | | / | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 Update | - Failure to consider reasonable alternatives | 89762-1323-5196 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|---|--|--------------------|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 684 | 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 I think nuclear power is only logical way forward. I am happy that this site is being proposed and it appears that EDF have thought through the process carefully. I am a little concerned about the impact that park and ride and freight areas would have upon the relatively quiet and peaceful area where I live (M5 J24 proposal) and I would most definitely like to have written guarentees from EDF that such schemes would be done tastefully and with the minimum of distress and upset. | 9444-1324-6687 | | | / | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| Tractivity 1207 | Public | Stage 2 | 13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below 11 Cont. Will the site, if built, ever be reinstated to agricultural land use again - & who will foot the bill for this? Would the site, if built, be landscaped and any wildlife protected? What about noise/light pollution for people living nearby? | 9965-1324-6520 | / | | | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | - Master plans showing existing and proposed site layout uses are useful and of good quality. However a plan identifying which trees/hedgerows to be removed along with their species, age, etc is required to enable full consideration of impacts in this respect. | 89203-1324-5516 | / | | | On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Authorities position May 2010 Landscape proposals and the siting and design of buildings would need to be informed by a masterplanning approach that considers linkages with planned residential development and The Meads and South Bridgwater Country Park open space proposals. Future of the land parcel north of Dawes Farm would also be considered as part of this exercise, as it is expected to come under pressure for development. Update August 2010 The relationship between this site and the housing development and wider landscape needs to be better understood and the limited sectional drawings provided are insufficient to fully understand this. | 89329-1324-4873 | / | | | Existing mature planting on bunding around the perimeter of the industrial park and within the boundaries of the proposed development would be retained as part of the landscape scheme. Additional tree and shrub planting has been proposed. |
| 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 clear rationale to the landscaping proposals. For instance, a row of native trees is proposed along the south eastern boundary of the site, adjacent to the future development area. Assuming semi-mature trees are planted, this would provide some screening to the A38, but would frustrate the development of the frontage site, which has limited depth. In contrast, the western boundary of the site, which will be highly visible from the Quantocks, is afforded very limited tree planting. | 89393-1324-16513 | / | | | |

| 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 landscape plan shows large areas of mixed native shrub planting, which would offer little value in terms of visual screening or amenity. | 89393-1324-17014 | / | | | |
| 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 is welcomed. | 89393-1324-17167 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | The proposals for exterior lighting that meet the 'dark sky' concept is supported. | 89393-1324-17303 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | The fencing arrangement proposed for the site, which comprises security fencing (assumed to be 3m) around the freight logistics facility only, and 1.2m post and rail fencing around the perimeter of the combined Park and Ride / freight logistics centre, is considered an appropriate solution. | 89393-1324-17391 | | | / | |
| WSC & SDC Joint Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 2 Update | - The site will be prominent in views from the Quantocks towards Bridgwater. Tree planting around and within the site will assist in providing screening and could contribute to the delivery of new woodland consistent with emerging Core Strategy policy D20 and proposals in the GI Strategy. | 89894-1324-17752 | / | | | |

| 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 | - There may scope for ongoing legacy use of the proposed Park & Ride site to serve Bridgwater, particularly if search area J24-A was selected. The Bridgwater, Taunton and Wellington Future Transport Strategy identifies potential for a Park and Ride site to the south of Bridgwater on the A38 transport corridor. Reference should also be made to the Bridgwater Vision, which allocates the A38 as a 'key public transport corridor' and 'visually improved arterial'; | 88400-1325-4906 | | | / | This response addresses comments relating to the post-operational use of the park and ride facility, freight management facility, temporary consolidation facility for postal/courier deliveries and temporary induction centre (the Proposed Development) proposed to the north-west of Junction 24 of the M5. The Proposed Development forms part of the Associated Development to support the construction of the Hinkley Point C (HPC) power station. |
| Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 1 | - J24-A presents the greatest opportunity for a legacy public transport use on the basis that is located on the A38 public transport corridor and directly adjacent to employment uses and the major residential development of Stockmoor. | 88410-1325-2264 | | | / | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 1 | - Search area J24-C is identified in the Core Strategy Preferred Option report for employment development (22ha), meaning there could be potential for a serviced site as a legacy. | 88410-1325-4152 | | | / | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. |
| Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 1 | - The ongoing viability of the Park and Ride site beyond the Hinkley Point C construction period and the implications this could have for legacy and restoration proposals; - Full restoration or legacy proposals should be presented where temporary Park and Ride and freight consolidation sites are to be located on agricultural land; | 88420-1325-387 | | | / | On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. |
| Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 1 | - The provision of fully serviced employment sites may represent an appropriate legacy use, depending on the acceptability of employment site allocations in the Core Strategy. | 88420-1325-726 | | | / | Once the Proposed Development is no longer |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|--|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 808 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? totally unsatisfactory how can you possibly think that building a park a ride for 650 cars , 48 lorry spaces a freight handy terminal and a facilities building so close to a new residential development at j24 to be acceptable. do you even care that you will simply wipe off tens of thousands of pounds of the value of our homes thus plunging all the residents into difficult financial positions. your plans will also create horrendous traffic problems, be a health hazzard with exhaust fumes, noise pollution at all hours of the day and night, why cant you build this all at j23 there is enough land and will not effect any residential areas and the road layout is better with the dual carridge way. i beleive you simply do not care | 9566-1325-2313 | / | | | <p>required to support the construction of the HPC power station, appropriate works would be carried out to allow the site to be available for storage/distribution purposes. This is consistent with the post-operational use for the site that EDF Energy has formally consulted upon. It is likely that any landscaping and perimeter fencing associated with EDF Energy's use of the site would however remain in place. The temporary postal/courier consolidation facility and worker induction centre would be removed by EDF Energy during the operational phase of the site.</p> <p>It would also be possible for EDF Energy or other parties to make alternative planning applications for the future use or development of the site, which would be determined through the planning process in the normal way. This route may be used, for example, if in the future, an alternative scheme for the reuse of the development on site was granted planning permission.</p> <p>Further information on the post-operational use of the Proposed Development at Junction 24 can be found in the Chapter 5 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement.</p> |
| Tractivity 808 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? why do you think that bridgwater needs 2 park and ride facillities. do not want you at j24 nor do the other 1500 homes at stockmoor park , your propsals will reduce our homes by tens of thousands of pounds and our quality of life will be effected whos paying for this . YOU DO NOT CARE. if this is built rip it up and return it back to what it is now. | 9566-1325-6988 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 891 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? As above | 9649-1325-5660 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 927 | Public | Stage 2 | I would like to see better reuse of the areas you are using (freight cetres and park and ride areas) once the build project has finished. This would leave a lasting legacy for the local area. | 9685-1325-9002 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1041 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? See comment to 10 | 9799-1325-6105 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1166 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Same comments as question 10 | 9924-1325-7047 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1194 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The provision of a facility for Bridgwater after the construction is good. | 9952-1325-7676 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|-------------------------|--|--------------------|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 204 | 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>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.</p> | 9335-1325-5609 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 281 | 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>Yes, at J23 and J24.</p> <p>Could local residents be provided with passes to use buses, perhaps at off-peak times?</p> | 9344-1325-3940 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 583 | 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>Good overall</p> <p>I feel the environmental impact must be minimised and a long term view of the needs of the community after the build considered (such as whether the park and ride/ hostels/ frieght handling areas should be returned to their original use (or even better)</p> | 9252-1325-4317 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 585 | 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>The most lasting legacy that EDF can leave for local residents and the tourists that visit the area or pass through it, would be to return all the land (apart from the power station compound and the small accommodation facility for Cannington College) to its former landuse.</p> | 9364-1325-4126 | | | / | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | <p>Further work is needed on the proposed legacy plans for the accommodation and park & ride and freight transfer sites to assess their potential for an economic/tourism legacy.</p> | 89210-1325-5037 | / | | | |

| 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 | 9. The proposed Legacy Plans for the accommodation and park & ride/freight sites should set out, prior to the DCO submission, how they will provide long term economic/tourism mitigation, compensation and legacy for Somerset communities through entrepreneurial approaches, such as joint ventures, and contribute to the low carbon Unique Selling Proposition of Somerset. | 89211-1325-4136 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | 1.29 The County Council is unable to come to a definitive view regarding the potential legacy uses of the P&R sites at M5 J23 and J24 at this stage, since further work is required to identify whether there may be a long-term demand for these facilities. Any such proposals for legacy use will need to be considered in the policy context for Bridgwater such as the Bridgwater Vision | 89220-1325-8185 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | The County Council is unable to come to a definitive view regarding the potential legacy uses of the P&R sites at M5 J23 and J24 at this stage, since further work is required to identify whether there may be a long-term demand for these facilities. Any such proposals for legacy use will need to be considered in the policy context for Bridgwater such as the Bridgwater Vision; the County Council will require further discussions with EDF on this matter. | 89225-1325-1619 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | Legacy strategy has yet to be developed, but there are indications of legacy in the Transport Appraisal. Figure 5.2 identifies the J23 and J24 P&R sites as part of the potential project legacy. The County Council is unable to come to a definitive view regarding the potential legacy uses of the P&R sites at M5 J23 and J24 at this stage, since further work is required to identify whether there may be a long-term demand for these facilities. Any such proposals for legacy use will need to be considered in the policy context for Bridgwater such as the Bridgwater Vision; the County Council will require further discussions with EDF on this matter. The legacy of any bus priority measures and bus infrastructure enhancements will also need to be considered. The benefits of providing these network improvements should be maintained post-construction. | 89227-1325-8413 | / | | | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | Legacy proposals are inconsistent with SDC's strategic proposals for the site | 89434-1325-380 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--------------------|--|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | - In order to secure legacy uses it is critical that EDF consider the strategic requirements of Bridgwater. This has clearly been omitted from the proposals at Junction 24. | 89434-1325-800 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | No legacy strategy has yet been provided and the approach of EDF Energy is that legacy uses can be determined and agreed post submission and determination of a DCO application. The local authorities disagree with this approach and believe that agreement to potential legacy uses for the associated development sites should be the starting point for considering the design and layout of the sites. | 89325-1325-2240 | / | | | |
| 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 scope for some ongoing legacy use of the proposed Park & Ride site to serve Bridgwater, particularly if search area J24-A was selected. Scale would be a key issue to be resolved. The Bridgwater, Taunton and Wellington Future Transport Strategy identifies potential for a Park and Ride site to the south of Bridgwater on the A38 transport corridor. Reference should also be made to the Bridgwater Vision, which allocates the A38 as a 'key public transport corridor' and 'visually improved arterial'; | 89393-1325-3743 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | A legacy plan for the site and surrounding area should be agreed by Sedgemoor District Council, landowners, EDF Energy and Bridgwater Town Council prior to the submission of the DCO application. | 89393-1325-8938 | | | / | |
| 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 end of the operational use by EDF Energy, the current proposals are for the Park and Ride and freight logistics facility to be left in place to allow for continued use. The principle reasons for this decision set out by EDF Energy are listed below, together with responses by the Council. | 89393-1325-9155 | | | / | |

| 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 | existing development in the area should not set a precedent for future proposals that should be aligned with the design principles set out in the Bridgwater Vision. | 89393-1325-9514 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Taking account of the site location, it is expected to come under considerable pressure for development, potentially from the supply chain itself. However, the site is considerably larger than the 3.5ha allocation set out in the Core Strategy. There will be a priority for the regeneration of brownfield employment sites prior to the release of further greenfield land. | 89393-1325-9846 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Analysis by Somerset CC reveals that there is no short-term requirement for a general Park and Ride site in this location, and the site may not be appropriate for a Park and Ride even in the long term. Given that this proposal is for 60-160 years, the business model should be reviewed, given the potential up front capital costs will be sunk by EDF Energy and an on-going maintenance agreement has not yet been discussed in relation to servicing the site and its workforce in the medium to long term. | 89393-1325-10301 | | | / | |
| 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 the site to greenfield land may be the only acceptable legacy use for the site and the authorities would ensure that this is secured through planning requirements or a Development Consent Obligation. Nevertheless, there remains a concern that once developed, the site would come under pressure for alternative development that would not in normal circumstances be acceptable. For this reason, the Council are in the process of developing a masterplan for J24, in consultation with Bridgwater Town Council and North Petherton Parish Council, to ensure that any development is planned comprehensively rather than coming forward in an ad hoc manner. | 89393-1325-10804 | | | / | |

| 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>A masterplan would seek to site new buildings sensitively within a country park setting that retains a semi-rural character and maintains views to the Quantocks. Land use options being considered include:</p> <p>Park and Ride - The long term case for a Park and Ride site has yet to be fully evidenced and agreed, however, there may be potential for a scaled down Park and Ride scheme, forming a component of a transport strategy for Bridgwater and a high quality, high frequency public transport corridor along the A38 between Bridgwater and Taunton. This could include provision made further north on the A38 as part of the South Bridgwater scheme, to increase the scale of provision for the longer term.</p> <p>High quality office space - The Bridgwater Vision options appraisal did explore the need for a high tech park close to Junction 24 but, at the time, it was thought undeliverable. Given the supply chain demand that could arise from Hinkley Point C, it does seem appropriate to re-visit this and apply the concept to the site in question as it provides travel planning opportunities. Such a high tech site could feature as part of a range of sites within a cluster both in the town centre, in industrial parks, and on land intensive sites such as Puriton.</p> <p>Corporate training facilities - it is understood that there will be a demand for training buildings arising from the development of Hinkley Point C. Junction 24 is considered an appropriate location for such uses, with good access to the site utilising the proposed Park and Ride</p> <p>Sports Hub and Hotel - Appropriate development may include a strategic community sports hub incorporating reprovision of pitches for the relocated Bridgwater Rugby Club, a South West Velodrome and facilities for the Hinkley Point C workforce, together with development that would cross-subsidise the sports facilities, including a hotel, spa and retail.</p> <p>Green Infrastructure - Community woodland, informal open space and multi-use paths connecting the site to the South Bridgwater Country Park and The Meads EcoPark.</p> <p>Proposals for renewable energy technologies such as photovoltaics, solar thermal collectors and ground source heat pumps at the site are welcomed, and the authorities would be interested to investigate with EDF Energy how this infrastructure might be retained beyond the Hinkley Point C construction period.</p> | 89393-1325-11473 | | | / | |
| 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 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.</p> | 89429-1325-1506 | | | / | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 Update | <p>- Legacy proposals are inconsistent with SDC's strategic proposals for the site</p> | 89762-1325-5062 | | | / | |

| 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 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. | 89837-1325-7218 | / | | | |
| Highways Agency | statutory consultee | Stage 2 Update | 3.24 EDF Energy state that they will cease operating the park and ride facilities in 2020, however no information is provided as to the action EDF Energy will be taking to restore these sites post 2020. Further information is required in respect of legacy and restoration. | 89839-1325-2934 | / | | | |
| Highways Agency | statutory consultee | Stage 2 Update | 3.32 The Stage 2a Consultation document states that 'some of the facilities could remain in place for future use' however EDF Energy does not provide any information as to their intentions for restoration of the site or for the submission of future planning applications. Clarity is required on this matter. | 89839-1325-4892 | / | | | |
| WSC & SDC Joint Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 2 Update | Bridgwater, Taunton and Wellington Future Transport Strategy This transport strategy identifies Park & Ride facilities at M5 Junctions 23 and 24 as potential elements of an A38 Public Transport Corridor. However, recent analysis by Somerset County Council suggests that there may be no long-term requirement for a legacy public Park & Ride at Junction 24. | 89894-1325-10514 | | | / | |
| WSC & SDC Joint Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 2 Update | With respect to the legacy of the site, the Proposed Changes advise that some of the facilities could remain in place for future use subject to the appropriate planning permission or the land could be reinstated as a greenfield site. This approach corresponds in terms of basic principles with that set out in the Draft HPC SPD, which states that part or all of the site could potentially be used for alternative development as a legacy, if approved during the construction stage of the HPC project: - Subject to further assessment by SCC, the trialling of a public Park & Ride site. - Refurbishment of sites and buildings or new development, assessed with respect to the planning policy context at that time. - Permanent legacy uses relating to the delivery of the low carbon cluster, with proposals being assessed with respect to the planning policy context at that time. Retention of hardstandings and buildings on a speculative basis are not considered an acceptable legacy proposal. Therefore, if none of the three options set out above is considered acceptable then the site should be reinstated to greenfield land, with only flood risk management and planting to be retained where appropriate. | 89894-1325-18262 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1443 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | It is good that the site will be eventually available for a future commercial purpose. | 90017-1325-153 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - There is an outstanding concern about proposals for a temporary induction centre. Little information has been provided about how this would function in the short and then medium term, and it is questioned whether this could be provided in existing industrial estates within the town. This could bring an active use closer to the town centre and prevent temporary provision at Junction 24 and later relocation to provide a further temporary facility at Junction 23 as currently proposed by EDFE, which may not be compatible with the strategic flood risk issues, nor will it leave any legacy opportunities in the town from any such facility. | 89956-1325-9270 | | / | | |

| 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 | 1.38. J24-A Search Area (Figure 4.11) - Two potential access points have been identified; one from the A38 presumably to join the existing signals at the Regional Rural Business Centre (RRBC) junction and a second via a new distributor road serving Persimmon/Bloor residential development. There are outstanding works required on the A38 roundabout (signalisation) that are likely to be triggered by further development. | 88010-1326-1952 | / | | | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| Tractivity 1255 | Public | Stage 2 Update | Dunball NOT profits - listen to the residents of Cannington | 89521-1326-118 | | | / | |
| 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. | 10200-1326-180 | / | | | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | 3.111 In accordance with the DMRB, the Agency would expect that Stage One and Stage Two Road Safety Audits are undertaken should any alterations be proposed on the SRN. This should also include a non motorised user audit. | 89174-1326-6689 | | | / | On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | - A waste storage area is referred to, however there is limited detail (e.g. type of waste is proposed to be stored; if there will be any other treatment/processing/handling of waste). | 89203-1326-6506 | | | / | Given the existing infrastructure already available on the 'Somerfield' site it could be used earlier than the other proposed associated development sites. EDF Energy is therefore proposing to use this site before the other park and ride sites and the freight management facility are built. |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | - Some details of potentially visually intrusive aspects of the development have not been provided (e.g. boundary treatment). The lighting strategy is also an important consideration in terms of the visual impact of the development. | 89203-1326-7030 | / | | | Until the Junction 23 site becomes available, the 'Somerfield' site would provide car parking spaces and HGV holding spaces. A temporary induction centre, with car parking spaces, and a temporary postal consolidation facility for courier deliveries would also be located on the 'Somerfield' site. Once the Junction 23 facilities become fully operational, the number of parking and HGV spaces at the 'Somerfield' site would be reduced. The temporary induction centre and |

| 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 impact upon the residential amenity of properties at Stockmoor village (north of site), Dawes Farm (north east of site) and properties to the south, especially during the construction phase, need full consideration and where possible mitigation. | 89203-1326-7455 | / | | | temporary consolidation facility for courier deliveries would also be removed and located at Junction 23 as previously consulted upon. The 'Somersfield' site would be available for another commercial purpose once it is no longer required by EDF Energy. A number of consultees have suggested alternative access arrangements to and from the 'Somersfield' site. Suggestions for a new junction onto the M5 Motorway would not comply with the requirements of the national design standards applicable to determining the minimum distance required between Motorway junctions, and on this basis alone would not be considered further. Other suggestions for access to be provided to the north of the site closer to the town of Bridgwater would be contrary to the purpose of the park and ride facility, which is to intercept cars arriving from the M5 Motorway and before they enter Bridgwater along the A38 Taunton Road. |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | - The proposed development site would contribute to the built development merging of South Bridgwater and North Petherton. | 89203-1326-7710 | / | | | It should also be noted that EDF Energy is not proposing to undertake alterations within the public highway at either the existing HGV access point or the existing car park into the 'Somersfield' site. To enable the HGV parking requirement to be provided within the 'Somersfield' site, EDF Energy would need to remove two existing small structures located on the eastern facade of the main warehouse building at its southern end. The temporary consolidation facility for courier deliveries would be located within the southern half of the existing car park and the remainder of the car park would be used for either induction centre parking or mini-bus/van parking. The temporary induction centre would be located within an existing building located to the west of the existing car park area and would be provided with a pedestrian link between the car park and the building entrance. |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | The County Council previously recommended that provisions for 'kiss and ride' be incorporated into the P&R sites, to allow for safe drop-off / pick-up points. This does not appear to have been accommodated in any of the P&R facilities and we recommend this be considered. | 89222-1326-9802 | / | | | The workforce car parking spaces would be located within the confines of the existing warehouse building with access at its northern end. In order to provide a ventilation system for fume and smoke extract, the western facade of the warehouse building would be modified to include ventilation louvers along its length. As proposed for the originally envisaged site, EDF Energy would also incorporate drop-off and pick-up points within the 'Somersfield' site where the workforce arriving as passengers in cars could be accommodated. Pedestrian access to the site would be by means of |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | Comments submitted in relation to the EDF Stage 1 Consultation process confirmed that whilst the principal of accommodating EDF's requirements on the site were welcomed Miller Turner intended to pursue development of their land via the District Council's emerging Core Strategy. A coordinated and complimentary approach was therefore required. Importantly support for EDF's proposals was subject to receiving further detailed information relating to the proposed design of the development. Furthermore, it was made clear that careful design would be required by EDF to avoid causing a negative experience for visitors to the area. | 89432-1326-2264 | / | | | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | - It is unclear on what basis the proposed scale of development on site has been derived. | 89433-1326-74 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--------------------|---|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | - The proposed layout will significantly compromise future development at the site. Centrally locating the park and ride and freight consolidation facilities prejudices the ability to achieve a comprehensive form of development on site. | 89433-1326-396 | / | | | an existing footway on the public highway alongside the eastern boundary of the site and a public footpath between Marsh Lane and the existing road to the north of the site. The existing site comprises significant areas of hardstanding which would be utilised for HGV and bus parking along with internal access roads. EDF Energy proposes to leave the existing hardstanding and surface water drainage in place with minimal alterations. The existing surface water drainage already incorporates pollution control measures by means of oil interceptors. |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | - The opportunity to accommodate EDF's requirements as part of a comprehensive development proposal has not been properly considered. | 89433-1326-4813 | / | | | EDF Energy would consult with the various Statutory Undertakers (SUs) with regard to any new services that would be required for the operation of the proposed development, including improvements that may be required to the existing services infrastructure where there may be insufficient capacity to serve the development proposals. EDF Energy would also consult the SUs to determine what, if any, services diversions would be required as a result of the construction works. |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | Matters such as exterior lighting, boundary treatment and compatibility with the wider proposals for the area require more detailed assessment in relation to the sites overall landscape context. | 89433-1326-4947 | / | | | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | - Whilst EDF have sought to accommodate minor changes to the published Stage 2 consultation document proposals these amendments still fail to deliver a scheme which acknowledges the wider development proposals for the area. | 89434-1326-2525 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Authorities position May 2010 The principal pedestrian and cycle routes to and through the site should be identified and linkages with the surrounding and proposed pedestrian and cycle network should be shown. Update August 2010 Not provided. | 89329-1326-7607 | / | | | |
| 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. | 89393-1326-13928 | | | / | |

| 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 | Due to the elevated nature of the site, it is crucial that the development both in terms of its internal arrangement and landscaping is such that visual impact is minimised as much as possible. The current layout does not achieve this, as the internal layout of the site is somewhat dispersed. The park and ride car park is pushed to the western boundary of the site which is the most prominent location. The north-western corner of the park and ride car park is so close to the site boundary that effective boundary landscaping is clearly not possible. | 89393-1326-14076 | / | | | |
| 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 appear to be large areas within the site which are unused such as between the park and ride car park and the freight facilities. It is suggested that the internal layout of the site is re-examined so that a more consolidated, more efficient use of the land is explored. This would enable the park and ride car park to be moved away the northern and western boundaries of the site and would thus enable improved landscaping. The built form should be concentrated on the eastern and central parts of the site whilst still maintaining a landscaped buffer to the A38. | 89393-1326-14633 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Topographical details should include sections not only through the site itself, but through the site and the adjacent Stockmoor Village housing development and agricultural land to the north and west. The relationship between this site and the housing development and wider landscape needs to be better understood and the limited sectional drawings provided are insufficient to fully understand this. | 89393-1326-15212 | / | | | |
| 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. The site will clearly generate substantial run-off which may create surface water management issues off-site. The incorporation of sustainable drainage measures such as balancing ponds, swales and filter drains etc. are therefore encouraged in order that impacts on the rhyne system are minimised. | 89393-1326-15616 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | The rationale for the distribution of spoil in the locations proposed is not explained. The potential for contours to provide screening for residential development and reduce noise impacts should be explored further. | 89393-1326-16057 | / | | | |

| 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 single storey welfare and security office building (3m x 15m x 8m) is of modest scale and considered acceptable in this context; | 89393-1326-16293 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Very little information is provided on the materials and detailing of the buildings, other than a series of design principles. Objectives to provide buildings that relate to the context of the site, use locally sourced materials and incorporate renewable sources of energy are supported. | 89393-1326-17733 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | The design objective that “buildings, irrespective of type, should be of good quality, both in terms of their sustainability credentials and architectural interest”, is also supported. | 89393-1326-18024 | | | / | |
| 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 use of sustainable urban drainage techniques, such as permeable paving, is supported providing it can demonstrated that there will be no contamination of groundwater or watercourses as a result. | 89393-1326-18212 | / | | | |
| 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 temporary nature of the car park consideration should be given to the use of porous granular materials for the car parking stalls. This will reduce the carbon footprint of the development and aid drainage and re-instatement. | 89394-1326-8304 | / | | | |

| 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 | statutory consultee | Stage 2 Update | The AONB Service is concerned that the comments it has previously made in respect of EDF's proposals for a park and ride and freight logistics facility at Junction 24 of the M5 may no longer apply. This is in light of the fact that a separate planning application has been submitted for the Bridgwater Gateway Development (which also includes a park and ride and freight logistics facility and which may be given consent before the EDF application for Hinkley C goes to the IPC). We do not understand how a proposed site directly linked to the construction and operation of Hinkley C can form part of a separate planning application that will not be subject to scrutiny by the IPC as part of the wider application for Hinkley C. We seek clarification on this point. | 89713-1326-1335 | / | | | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 Update | The current proposals for the site do not reflect the significance of this site as the southern gateway to Bridgwater, nor do they demonstrate an understanding of the baseline conditions or policy framework relevant to the area. | 89762-1326-4254 | / | | | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 Update | - Lack of justification for the proposed layout and scale of development | 89762-1326-4930 | / | | | |
| Highways Agency | statutory consultee | Stage 2 Update | 2.7 Plans for the design of the Associated Development sites at M5 Junction 23 and Junction 24 are provided in the Draft Overview of Associated Development Construction document also forming part of the consultation. The plans provided are too small for the Agency to provide any comments in relation to design and as such we request 1:500 scaled plans to be issued to us in order that we can provide some feedback. | 89837-1326-4817 | | | / | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 Update | 2.114 The red line plan for this scheme appears to show the Stockmoor / Wilstock distributor road as adopted highway. This road has not been adopted and is unlikely to be adopted in the near future. There also seems to be an indication on the red line plans to widen the M5 northbound 'off-slip' but only as far the roundabout. No explanation is given as to why this is the case. | 89848-1326-1383 | / | | | |
| WSC & SDC Joint Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 2 Update | With respect to the design of the proposed Park & Ride and freight management facility, it is considered that there has been only one minor improvement. This involves the setting back of the boundary of the freight parking area slightly further from the distributor road to the north. The overarching design concerns raised at Stage 2, such as the expansive green field land take and inadequate landscaping and screening on a highly visible site, still apply and are a serious concern for nearby residents and the Council. | 89875-1326-5270 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|--|--|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | The amount of land-take which results from the layout is considered excessive and fails to minimise the impact of the proposals on the wider development objectives for the site. As will be demonstrated further on in these representations a more efficient layout, which applies a more logical approach to landscaping and drainage, can easily be achieved. | 89433-1371-633 | / | | | |
| WSC & SDC Joint Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 2 Update | <p>With respect to the design of the proposed Park & Ride and freight management facility, it is considered that there has been only one minor improvement. This involves the setting back of the boundary of the freight parking area slightly further from the distributor road. The overarching concerns raised at Stage 2, such as the expansive land take and inadequate landscaping and screening, therefore still apply.</p> <p>The existing local policy framework, Bridgwater Vision, Sedgemoor Green Infrastructure Strategy and emerging Bridgwater Gateway Design Principles document all set out design objectives and cues that should inform the final proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The design should provide for buffers to nearby residential properties, so that residential amenity and outlook is protected in line with emerging Core Strategy policy D16. - The layout should facilitate safe and attractive cycle and pedestrian links between North Petherton and Bridgwater, including connections to existing public rights of way and the proposed parkland at South Bridgwater Country Park and The Meads. - The site will be prominent in views from the Quantocks towards Bridgwater. Tree planting around and within the site will assist in providing screening and could contribute to the delivery of new woodland consistent with emerging Core Strategy policy D20 and proposals in the GI Strategy. - Proposals should contribute to enhancing public realm along the A38 and delivering a high quality public transport corridor in line with the Bridgwater Vision and Future Transport Strategy. | 89894-1326-16672 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1404 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>Finish the road around the back of the Argos warehouse, this will reduce the amount of traffic going to the roundabout.</p> <p>put parking restrictions on the road to Argos it is bad enough now. There have been accidents there as well, because of parking on the road.</p> | 89979-1326-4 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1423 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I wonder if any thought had been given to opening up the lower end of the Somerfield site - so that traffic flowed in from the south (servcies) and where travelling to Bridgwater as opposed to the motorway - it left via showground road/ the roundabout to speed up travel/ease traffic flow. | 89998-1326-4 | | / | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1435 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | To alleviate traffic is it not possible to operate a loop road to come out at the BMW roundabout. is it also possible to investigate a connection off Junct 24 direct into the estate rather than use the roundabout on A38 | 90009-1326-67 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1456 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | better to make use of the 'Somerfield' brownfield site, with an alternative exit/entrance elsewhere than the current M5 roundabout one. | 90030-1326-141 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1472 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Access arrangements need to be further considered | 90046-1326-45 | | / | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 1.4 A significant increase in the size of the J24 Park and Ride and Freight Holding Centre is proposed, in addition to an Induction Centre which was not previous proposed in this area. | 89953-1326-1263 | | | / | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 2.15 A significant increase in the size of the Park and Ride and Freight Holding Centre is proposed (an additional 602 car parking spaces and 85 freight holding spaces respectively), in addition to an Induction Centre with 75 car parking spaces which was not previous proposed in this area. | 89953-1326-4480 | | | / | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 2.18 Furthermore, in order to comment on the suitability of the proposed access arrangements into the 'Somerfield' site, technical drawings should be provided at a scale of 1:500. | 89953-1326-6095 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Western Power Distribution | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | With regard to the proposals for the 'Somerfield' site, again more detailed information of any alterations to the site layout, use etc. is required before we can ascertain the implications on our network. I would point out that there are a number of our assets including substations and underground cables on this site. If any diversion or mitigation of our assets is required on this site to accommodate your proposals then this would be done at your cost. | 89930-1326-655 | | | / | |
| Wales & West Utilities Limited | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>We enclose an extract from our mains records of the area covered by your proposals together with a comprehensive list of General Conditions for your guidance. This plan shows only those pipes owned by Wales and West Utilities in its role as a Licensed Gas Transporter (GT). Gas pipes owned by other GT's and also privately owned may be present in this area. Information with regard to such pipes should be obtained from the owners. The information shown on this plan is given without obligation, or warranty and the accuracy thereof cannot be guaranteed. Service pipes, valves, syphons, stub connections, etc., are not shown but their presence should be anticipated. No liability of any kind whatsoever is accepted by Wales and West Utilities, its agents or servants for any error or omission.</p> <p>YOU WILL NOTE THE PRESENCE OF OUR INTERMEDIATE I HIGH PRESSURE GAS MAIN(S) IN PROXIMITY TO YOUR SITE. NO EXCAVATIONS ARE TO TAKE PLACE ABOVE OR WITHIN 10m OF THE CONFIRMED POSITION OF THESE MAINS WITHOUT PRIOR CONSULTATION WITH WALES & WEST UTILITIES.</p> <p>The Wales & West Utilities Intermediate I High Pressure Network may be affected by your proposals and a copy of the information you have provided has been forwarded to Asset Management for their comment. They will then contact you as necessary. Please note, 7 days notice is required if you require a site visit from an Engineer.</p> <p>Safe digging practices, in accordance with HS(G)47, must be used to verify and establish the actual position of mains, pipes, services and other apparatus on site before any mechanical plant is used. It is your responsibility to ensure that this information is provided to all persons (either direct labour or contractors) working for you on or near gas apparatus.</p> | 89938-1326-211 | | | / | |
| GTC Pipelines Ltd | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>Re: Hinkley Point C In reply to your communication dated 29/06/2011, stating your intention to execute works at the above site, please find attached a plan showing the appropriate location of GTC Pipelines/ENC existing apparatus in the area of your works. We have also enclosed a proposed plan of the infrastructure as the area in question is not yet complete.</p> <p>This information is for guidance only and the precise position of the plant must be established, prior to your works, using hand-digging methods only. The contractor will be held responsible for any damage caused to GTC Pipelines Limited/ENC apparatus. Should you require further assistance with locating our plant please contact GTC UC on (Personal information removed)</p> <p>All works in the vicinity of gas and/or electricity mains should be undertaken in accordance with the attached document, IN0003. Reference should also be made to HSG47 Avoiding Danger from Underground Services.</p> | 89941-1326-64 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - Figure 3 'Indicative Plan of 'Somerfield' site' - it is assumed from this plan that EDFE are not proposing any external alterations to the layout and appearance of the landscaping and buildings on the site, as there is no commentary or drawings expressing what changes may occur. Importantly, the plan does not indicate where the proposed 'new vehicular link from the 'Somerfield' site to the A38 would be provided. | 89958-1326-2823 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>Located within the industrial area of Huntworth at the southern extent of Bridgwater, the 'Somerfield' site has direct access to the roundabout at the junction of the A38 and M5 Junction 24. The site is bounded to the northwest by the A38, screened from view by an embankment and mature landscape planting; to the northeast and southeast by further substantial distribution warehouses and commercial units; and to the southwest by the Bridgwater motorway services (including a multi-storey car park and hotel) and access to the Huntworth A38/M5 J24 roundabout.</p> <p>The current use of the 'Somerfield' site is for storage and distribution (B8 Land Use Classification), while the EDFE proposals will comprise a number of land uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Park & Ride - sui generis(Sui generis - use does not fall within a defined Use Class, as set out in the Use Classes Order 2010.) - Lorry park (HGV freight management) - sui generis - Training centre (Induction Centre) - D1 Non-residential Institutions - Courier service goods storage of distribution place - B8 Storage or Distribution <p>Figure 3 "Indicative plan of the 'Somerfield' site" provided in the consultation document suggests that external modifications of the site would be limited, however, the change of land uses from B8 to predominantly sui generis uses means that planning consent would be required. This could be pursued by EDFE through a Town & Country Planning Application Act application submitted to Sedgemoor District Council, or proposals could be incorporated with the Development Consent Order application to be submitted to the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) or successor body.</p> | 89960-1326-11749 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1478 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | However, access to this site needs to be direct from M5. Original access to services and business park should never have been made via 'Foxwells roundabout' on A38. | 90053-1326-124 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|-----------------------|---|--|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| National Grid | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>A standard assessment has been carried out with respect to our operational gas and electricity apparatus.</p> <p>National Grid's records show no apparatus in the vicinity of your enquiry.</p> <p>This location falls outside the National Grid Gas Distribution Network area. This means that another Gas Distribution company operates in this area.</p> <p>See the assessment below for full details.</p> <p>Apparatus owned by other operators may be present in this area. It is your responsibility to make contact with these operators.</p> | 90077-1326-78 | | / | | |
| Sedgemoor DC | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>In order that the Council can form a final view on this matter, it would be grateful for additional information on the proposals, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the amount and types of floorspace that are proposed for the induction centre; | 90098-1326-3043 | / | | | |
| Southern Gas Networks | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>I write with reference to the above site, please note that Southern Gas Networks do not cover this area.</p> | 90107-1326-21 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1319 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 Update | Based on shift start and finish times and travelling times to Hinkley C it would appear that site at Junction 24 will be active between 5AM and 6AM and after midnight - living 100 yards from the site at junction 24. This is unacceptable due to noise. | 89585-1766-361 | | / | | This response addresses consultation comments about the operation of the park and ride facility, freight management facility, temporary consolidation facility for postal/courier deliveries and temporary induction centre (the Proposed Development) proposed to the north-west of Junction 24 of the M5. The Proposed Development forms part of the Associated Development to support the construction of the Hinkley Point C (HPC) power station. |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 Update | 2.136 Point 6.4 Off-site freight management facilities at J23 and J24. As construction consolidation is not being implemented, except for some small LGV loads such as post and parcels, a full explanation is required to justify why it is not being considered and what the implications are for the local and strategic road network traffic impact. | 89848-1766-9209 | / | | | The way in which the Proposed Development at Junction 24 would operate is set out in the Chapter 4 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (ES) . This provides information on the operating hours of the Proposed Development. Chapter 9 of Volume 9 of the ES considers the noise impacts of the Proposed Development during operation. |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | 3.97 The Agency has reviewed the Flood Risk Study Reports and Appendix C of the Transport Appraisal focussing on flood risk and the potential impact on the SRN. It is noted that Hinkley Point C and the on-site associated development is located within Flood Zone 1 and is not at risk of flooding, however, the main access road (C182) is at risk. As such, the Agency requires details of the strategy that EDFE has in place should this road flood and what the potential impact is on the SRN. Confirmation is also required that in the event of a road closure any freight storage sites have the capacity to store the additional material being delivered to the holding sites but not being taken onwards. | 89174-41-443 | / | | | In response to the Stage 2 Update consultation, consultees have requested more information as to why material consolidation is not being implemented at the Junction 24 site. EDF Energy has considered the possibility of consolidation of the construction materials in a dedicated off-site consolidation centre, however, this solution has not been adopted for the HPC Project. The Freight Management Strategy which is appended to the Transport Assessment explains that a key principle of consolidation is to significantly reduce the number of multiple part loads by combining them into full load shipments in order to decrease the number of freight vehicles directed to and from a construction site. However, due to the large quantities required for the majority of the material groups to construct the HPC Project it is anticipated that deliveries would be predominantly on a complete load basis hence limiting the requirement for further consolidation. |
| Tractivity 1391 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | How much of the planned operations at J23 will be absorbed by the J24 facility? | 89967-1766-182 | | | / | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 2.17 We query why such a large facility is being proposed at J24, when its intended use is only for the 'early years' (i.e. around 2013 while the J23 facility is being built). We are concerned that should there be difficulties in delivering the J23 facility for any reason, the J24 facility may continue to be used at full capacity during the peak of construction around 2016. We therefore require EDF to provide and commit to a timescale of when each Associated Development site will be in operation and at what scale. The County Council seeks clarification as to how the number of parking spaces will be scaled back as other transport facilities come on stream. Conditions would need to be applied to this scaling back approach. | 89953-1766-5361 | | / | | A description of the Proposed Development at Junction 24 is provided in Chapter 2 of Volume 9 of the ES . This explains what the Proposed Development would comprise of until the Junction 23 Associated Development site becomes operational. The Junction 24 site would comprise a park and ride facility; a freight management facility; and a temporary |

| 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 | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 2.21 We formally request that the assessment includes the following key items (without prejudice to further requests for clarification): - Clear statement on proposed 'early years' strategy, including timeline showing the number of workers and proposed level of infrastructure in place during each quarter throughout the construction period; | 89953-1766-7184 | | | / | consolidation facility for postal/courier deliveries and temporary induction centre until the facilities at Junction 23 become available. Chapter 2 of Volume 9 of the ES and application drawings also provide a description of the functions of the induction centre and information on the internal arrangement of the induction centre. The Transport Assessment provides an analysis of the impacts of the construction and operation of the HPC Project on the local and strategic highway network. |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - There is an outstanding concern about proposals for a temporary induction centre. Little information has been provided about how this would function in the short and then medium term, and it is questioned whether this could be provided in existing industrial estates within the town. This could bring an active use closer to the town centre and prevent temporary provision at Junction 24 and later relocation to provide a further temporary facility at Junction 23 as currently proposed by EDFE, which may not be compatible with the strategic flood risk issues, nor will it leave any legacy opportunities in the town from any such facility. | 89956-1766-9270 | | / | | Once the Junction 23 site becomes operational, the induction centre function would be transferred from Junction 24 to Junction 23. The reasons for the relocation of the induction centre function to Junction 23 include that 75% of transport movements are likely to access the area from the north, along the M5. Junction 23 therefore provides the most suitable long-term location for workers accessing the facility. Additionally, given the need for EDF Energy to provide an induction centre as expediently as possible, the temporary induction centre at Junction 24 would be located in an existing building, whilst the induction centre at Junction 23 is being built. The location of the induction centre within the existing building would not however provide the permanent solution for EDF Energy's requirements which require a high quality, public facing and bespoke facility to ensure that the induction process runs as efficiently as possible. |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - Construction Working Hours at the main site will influence the hours of operation and potential for disturbance impacts at associated development sites and on the principal transport routes. No information is provided on the hours of operation of the 'Somersfield' site. | 89959-1766-16824 | | | / | |
| (Personal information removed) | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | If The Bridgwater Gateway application was turned down on the grounds it was a greenfield site, the same could apply to your plans at Junction 23. Also, if you establish such extensive facilities at Junction 24, what incentive would you have to pursue plans at Junction 23? Therefore, there is a real prospect that the Junction 24/Somersfield facilities will be the sole location for the duration of the entire new nuclear build project. I object to this. | 90081-1766-3654 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor DC | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | In order that the Council can form a final view on this matter, it would be grateful for additional information on the proposals, including: - the amount and types of floorspace that are proposed for the induction centre; - an overview of what the induction process is expected to encompass (e.g. Health & Safety, accommodation, Code of Conduct etc.) - the durations of typical induction processes and any follow-on courses and training that would be held at this facility; and - the anticipated origins and modal split of trips to the induction centre (e.g. direct from the motorway or from accommodation in Bridgwater and other nearby settlements). | 90098-1766-3043 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--|---|--------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 790 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? highly unsatisfactory. The residents of the new stockmoor park were not all informed and therefore the whole undertaking of these plans has been very underhand and deceitful. I feel the park and ride facility will adversely affect the roads leading up to the sites and continue to destroy the valued countryside. while the freight logistics location was merely changed to hush up the residents of cannington and the residents of stockmoor park were either not taken into consideration or deliberately deceived. our homes will be devalued and our overall quality of live severely impacted by the 24 hour movement of heavy good vehicles right on our doorstep. I am extremely unhappy about the whole situation and am thoroughly unconvinced that this was a decision made after the purchase of our brand new home. EDF should not even be entertaining the idea on the existing site, it its ludicrous, the residents are furious and understandably so. | 9548-22-2148 | / | | | This response addresses consultation comments relating to the siting of the park and ride facility, freight management facility, temporary consolidation facility for postal/courier deliveries and temporary induction centre (the Proposed Development) proposed to the north-west of Junction 24 of the M5. The Proposed Development forms part of the Associated Development to support the construction of the Hinkley Point C (HPC) power station. At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. The rationale for the location of the proposed Junction 24 site is set out in the Transport Assessment and the appended Freight Management Strategy . The use of an employment site to accommodate the proposals is addressed in the Planning Statement . As stated within these documents, there is a clear strategic requirement of the HPC Project for park and ride facilities, freight |
| Tractivity 1388 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I feel that the use of the existing Somerfield site at junction 24 makes sound financial and economic sense for EDF. It will put to good use the use of an already existing infra structure and facilities. By not having to build any further and by using the site which is ideally built and situated for EDF, will reduce futher erosion of the green field site where it was proposed to put it and will significantly reduce further unnecessary disrupton to the area. | 89965-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1390 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Better than a greenfield site | 89966-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1391 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Sensible use of an existing commercial site | 89967-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1395 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I am pleased that EDF are looking at the Somerfield site. It makes far more sense than the other site. Once Somerfield leave the premises would have been vacant and no doubt attacked by drug addicts stealing scrap metal to feed their habits. The Somerfield site is already used for LGV?s so should be able to accomodate EDF?s needs. It also keeps industrial units to the East of the A38 rather than destroying more fields. | 89970-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1396 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Q1 Good news | 89971-1328-0 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1397 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Yes...I am pleased you have found a new proposed site being the old Somerfield site. This makes so much more sense using a brown unseed site, rather a green site! This will have no efect on local residents unlike the previous site, it also has roads, already in place. This has to be the right choice! | 89972-1328-4 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 1398 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Congratulations to EDF on being big enough to accept the need to make use of existing developed brownfield sites over new undeveloped greenfield ones. As a local resident I am very pleased to see the Somerfield site being used in a positive. However, I do a few concerns the current proposals do not appear to address. | 89973-1328-4 | | | / | management facilities, a temporary consolidation facility for postal/courier deliveries and the temporary induction centre to be provided close to Junction 24 of the M5 motorway. The Transport Assessment provides an analysis of the impacts of the construction and operation of the HPC Project on the local and strategic highway network. The park and ride facilities are not intended to serve workers living on the proposed accommodation campus associated development sites. |
| Tractivity 1398 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I would also like to commend EDF for taking the bold step of moving its proposed freight park from the green field site at Jct 24 to the brownfield one. Apart from good common sense, it demonstrates a sense of social responsibility which I think bodes well for the future of a visiting body. | 89973-1328-2058 | | | / | EDF Energy has proposed four separate park and ride facilities, which are strategically located to maximise the take up of this service, and to ensure the facilities provide coverage of a wide geographical area. To make Junction 23 the only park and ride site (as suggested by some consultees) would undermine the purpose of the park and ride network and result in increased levels of traffic on some routes of the local road network. The park and ride facilities have been sized to accommodate HPC construction worker requirements; as such they are not available for public use. A full explanation of the location of the park and ride sites is set out in the Transport Assessment . |
| Tractivity 1400 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Site appears OK, so long as road links by Motorway only. A38 already overloaded. | 89975-1328-4 | | | / | Similarly, Freight Management Facilities are proposed at both Junctions 23 and 24 of the M5. The Freight Management Strategy explains how the freight management facilities at Junctions 23 and 24 of the M5 will manage HGV movements on the highway network. A site adjacent to Junction 24 of the M5 is required to intercept delivery vehicles which will be travelling from the south on the M5 towards the HPC construction site before they reach local roads. A freight management facility in this location would therefore be well placed to provide a remote waiting area for delivery vehicles. |
| Tractivity 1401 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I think that the proposal to use the Somerfield site is a good proposal. Far better to use brownfield land than destroy greenfield land close to my home. | 89976-1328-4 | | | / | In response to the Stage 2 consultation, consultees requested a comprehensive assessment of alternative sites to justify the site selection process. This information can be found in the Alternative Site Assessment which is appended to the Planning Statement . The Alternative Site Assessment sets out the site selection methodology and explains the justification for discounting alternative sites. The Alternative Site Assessment explains that sites around Junction 24 were considered during the project evolution, having regard to existing areas of commercial and residential development in the vicinity of the Junction. The sites were then 'filtered' by applying the three key criteria: size/availability, location and access to determine the most suitable |
| Tractivity 1403 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | The Somerfield site is far better than the originally proposed (greenfield) site. The best option would be a site closer to the power station or solely to the north of Bridgwater making better use of junction 23. | 89978-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1407 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | there is no need to use this site if a bypass was built | 89982-1328-4 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1410 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I agree that using the Somerfield site at M5 Junction 24 would be much more preferable to using the proposed greenfield site to the west across the A38. | 89985-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1413 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Do not agree with this as Taunton Road (A38) entrance into Bridgwater is already a major problem. Everything should be concentrated off Junction 23 and a bypass built near there direct as near as possible to Hinkley. | 89988-1328-4 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1414 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | This site is ok BUT: This roundabout and link road to M5 jams up with traffic (as does road to North petherton and Bridgwater). | 89989-1328-4 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--|--|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1417 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I believe that this proposal, to use an existing industrial site, is more acceptable than the alternative greenfield site in this immediate area. | 89992-1328-4 | | | / | <p>location. The Alternative Site Assessment clearly demonstrates that certain sites had fundamental flaws in terms of either size, existing/active uses, location, accessibility and accessibility (or a combination of those factors), such that these sites were fundamentally unsuitable and/or inappropriate. For EDF Energy to have pursued them any further would have been illogical as they do not meet the defined key operational prerequisites.</p> <p>Two of the sites were both available to EDF Energy for the period required and were fit for purpose in terms of size, location and accessibility. Crucially however, one of these sites (the Somerfield site) was a located on previously developed land, rather than being a greenfield site. The buildings on the site could be reused and the site could be brought forward early in the HPC construction phase which would offer operational advantages to EDF Energy.</p> <p>The Alternative Site Assessment explains the requirement for the induction centre at an associated development site and at a motorway junction. Due to the functions accommodated as part of EDF Energy's induction process, including drug and alcohol testing, the collection of biometric data and the hosting of UK Border Agency staff, EDF Energy require the induction centre to be in an accessible, secure and well defined location and remote from the HPC development site. A bespoke building is required to ensure the efficient movement of workers through the process and to provide secure storage of the data collected</p> <p>The Alternative Site Assessment also explains that once the Junction 23 site becomes operational, the induction centre function will be transferred from Junction 24 to Junction 23. The reasons for the relocation of the induction centre function to Junction 23 include that 75% of transport movements are likely to access the area from the north, along the M5. Junction 23 therefore provides the most suitable long-term location for workers accessing the facility. Additionally, given the need for EDF Energy to provide an induction centre as expediently as possible, the temporary induction centre at Junction 24 would be located in an existing building, whilst the induction centre at Junction 23 is being built. The location of the induction centre within that building would not however provide the permanent solution for EDF Energy's requirements, which necessitate a high quality, public facing and bespoke facility to ensure that the induction process runs as efficiently as</p> |
| Tractivity 1419 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Using the Somerfield site is a sensible option. | 89994-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1420 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | The Greenfield site should be left rural for the wildlife and the residents. i strongly oppose any development of the green field site. | 89995-1328-321 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1425 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | This would provide an excellent use of an existing development that when converted to the proposed use minimises the impact on the area. | 89999-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1427 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Prefer this option but am concerned that this will still have a significant impact on people living in N Petherton attempting to join the M5 or go to Bridgwater. | 90001-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1429 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | The previous site was wrong as it was on greenfield/open countryside and was not well sited. The new site at Somerfields is better being a brownfield site but you will still not be able to move vehicles up the A38 towards Bridgwater as it will be too congested and will be completely solid with traffic | 90003-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1430 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I think it is a far better site to use than your previous choice next to the new housing estate because you would no longer be destroying designated green belt, thus avoid causing far reaching destruction of local wildlife views across the Quantocks and unnecessary building on land that should NEVER be developed. At least the Somerfield site is a brownfield site, BUT I still maintain that Junction 24 is the wrong place for your depot as it will still cause disastrous traffic problems through Bridgwater. | 90004-1328-4 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1432 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Somerfield site would be better than to build yet another site on this roundabout at Hintworth. | 90006-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1433 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | The congestion of traffic lights is not going to solve this problem and could create queues on the motorway waiting to come off. I think that moving the park and ride to Somerfield site is better than existing proposed site. | 90007-1328-393 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1434 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | It is SO MUCH better. please follow this one through as it would make good use of brownfield site and also leave the green field as the strategic green wedge/agricultural land which was one of the main concerns and stumbling blocks. | 90008-1328-4 | | | / | possible. |
| Tractivity 1434 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | My preference would be to see the temporary P and R/freight consolidation across the motorway (in Huntsworth) - this then restored to farm land - this could reduce traffic impact on Huntworth Roundabout. i understand this may not be feasible but if circumstances changed please dont dismiss it. The Somerfield site is much better than greenfield - so thanks - but if permanent employment (eg Bridgwater Gateway Consortium) could go there it would be better still. | 90008-1328-793 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1435 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | A better idea than the original one, to use a brownfield site. | 90009-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1437 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Prefer use of this site to previous Greenfield site | 90011-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1438 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Please go ahead, extra jobs, security and no windfarms. | 90012-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1440 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | It seems a better idea to use this site. | 90014-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1441 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I think this would be a good solution, as these warehouses/offices will be vacant in the near future with access already onto the roundabout | 90015-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1442 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I think this is a far better location for this proposal as it will have a far lesser impact on the local residents. | 90016-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1442 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Whilst this will help with the building of Hinkley I still have major concerns over the Bridgwater Gateway scheme for Junction 24 which I still believe to be unnecessary. it is not just the location but the actual need. We already have 5 filling stations and 2 hotels and empty business units so why do we need more? And who will stay in an upmarket hotel when one in North Petherton already struggles> Please leave the Green field site as intended. | 90016-1328-347 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--|--|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1443 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | It would seem that this ?Somerfield? sitewill be a great asset to EDF. | 90017-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1445 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Good idea | 90019-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1446 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | leaving Junction 24 alone. We want the countryside to be left and not made into an industrial estate. | 90020-1328-332 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1448 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | it is right to use brown field site , but the road inforstudture needs to be right. | 90022-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1449 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | This seems to be an improvement over the previous plan | 90023-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1450 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Whilst understanding the need for a facility to reduce the number of vehicular movements around the Bridgwater area, using the Somerfield site seems a logical choice, but then simply ?bussing? huge numbers of workers through a town already massively congested at rush hour periods, is simply illogical. | 90024-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1454 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I do not have specific objections to the Somerfield site. | 90028-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1455 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | A very good idea | 90029-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1456 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Inevitably this has to be an improvement on the inappropriate and visually intrusive suggestions for the ?Bridgwater Gateway? site. Yes, better to make use of the ?Somerfield? brownfield site, with an alternative exit/entrance elsewhere than the current M5 roundabout one. | 90030-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1457 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | An improvement over the original proposal | 90031-1328-4 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--|--|--------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 1460 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | It would be a good use for this site. | 90034-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1462 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Good site. | 90036-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1464 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Seems sensible to make use of a brownfield site rather than green. | 90038-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1465 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Looks to be a sound idea | 90039-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1467 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | The proposal to use the 'Somerfield' site as opposed to the greenfield site adjacent to Junction 24 previously consulted on is a good 'common-sense' solution to EDF's requirements. | 90041-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1468 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | The Somerfield site is preferable to the Bridgwater Gateway | 90042-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1469 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Much better using brown field sites as opposed to green land. | 90043-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1472 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I welcome the use of the brownfield site. | 90046-1328-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1474 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I am in favour of this as it maintains greenfields. | 90048-1328-4 | | | / | |

| 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 | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>2.12 The County Council appreciates the planning advantages of the 'Somerfield' site, given its Brownfield status in comparison to the Greenfield site previously consulted on by EDF.</p> <p>2.13 However, in transport terms, the 'Somerfield' site is likely to have greater a transport impact than the previous J24 site, given it is much larger. The proposed use consolidates the "early years" traffic at one site rather than the two park and ride sites that have previously been proposed in the vicinity of the motorway.</p> | 89953-1328-3747 | | | / | |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | We note that the previous site identified at J24 for freight and a park & ride facility is Greenfield and that the new proposed site is brownfield. Whilst we are generally supportive of the principle of using brownfield sites before Greenfield sites this will not be at a cost to the strategic road network. We are concerned about the proposed relocation of the freight, post consolidation, induction centre and park & ride facilities to the "Somerfield" site which is accessed from the Huntworth Roundabout. This brings the facility closer to the motorway junction and will increase the possibility of vehicles queuing back to the junction with the risk the mainline being adversely affected. | 89924-1328-480 | | | / | |
| Bridgwater College | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>Question 1</p> <p>We generally support the proposal to support the 'Somerfield Site' as a Park and Ride and freight management facility at Junction 24 as it is already a brownfield site and would have less impact on local residents.</p> | 89937-1328-176 | | | / | |
| (Personal information removed) | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>Statutory Consultee (Personal information removed), Plot No J24 - A 1 Proposed Changes To The Preferred Proposals</p> <p>I am writing to you on behalf of (Personal information removed) regarding his views on the 'Somerfield site'. (Personal information removed) considers the Somerfield site to be a sound alternative to the greenfield site previously consulted upon near J24. (Personal information removed) supports the possible use of the Somerfield site.</p> | 89939-1328-0 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>Proposals for the 'Somerfield' site</p> <p>On balance, it is the view of officers that the proposal to provide a Park & Ride and freight management facility at the Somerfield site is acceptable in principle, subject to the assessment and agreement of a robust, deliverable and effective transport strategy for the Hinkley Point C project, and specifically for this site. Any proposals that come forward, for example, at the Huntworth roundabout and M5 Junction 24, must be compatible with and must not prejudice or compromise existing business operations (e.g. Argos) or the delivery of other proposed developments in this locality.</p> <p>The following matters are taken into account in reaching this conclusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The park and ride and freight management proposals would result in the loss of an existing employment site for a temporary, although not insubstantial period of time. Although the proposed uses are not strictly employment uses, they would support the development of HPC, an important catalyst for economic development and re-structuring of the wider economy, as set out in the Economic Masterplan and Economic Strategy (WSC). - Further land has been allocated in the SDC Core Strategy for storage and distribution uses that could come forward during the HPC construction phase, in particular the Somerset Bridge site. - EDFE's proposals have similar requirements to the existing storage and distribution use of the site, such as access to the strategic road network, hence the site is considered appropriate. - From a townscape perspective, the 'Somerfield' site benefits from existing landscape embankments and mature planting, so is preferable to the alternative Stockmoor site on the other side of the Huntworth roundabout. - There is an outstanding concern about proposals for a temporary induction centre. Little information has been provided about how this would function in the short and then medium term, and it is questioned whether this could be provided in existing industrial estates within the town. This could bring an active use closer to the town centre and prevent temporary provision at Junction 24 and later relocation to provide a further temporary facility at Junction 23 as currently proposed by EDFE, which may not be compatible with the strategic flood risk issues, nor will it leave any legacy opportunities in the town from any such facility. | 89956-1328-7520 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>From a land use perspective there are two main factors influencing Sedgemoor DC's view on the appropriateness of proposed relocation of the Park & Ride and freight management facility from the Stockmoor greenfield site to the 'Somerfield' site.</p> <p>Firstly, the relocation enables the use of brownfield site within the settlement boundary that is due to become vacant, meaning that in broad terms the new proposal would accord with the objective of focussing development at Bridgwater. As the principal town in the District, Bridgwater is expected to accommodate the majority of new development at brownfield sites within its urban area, through the provision of a strategic urban extension, and at other well related Greenfield locations (Core Strategy Policy S1). More specifically, re-use of brownfield land is consistent with emerging Core Strategy policy D11, which sets out a sequential approach to site selection that favours use of previously developed sites. There is a question of whether these policies strictly apply to proposals that are dominated by transport sui generis uses, although it would be reasonable to suggest that these have similar locational requirements to storage and distribution uses.</p> <p>The second main factor for consideration is the loss of employment land. Saved Local Plan policy E9 and emerging Core Strategy policy D11 both seek to protect existing employment sites unless it can be demonstrated that there is no likelihood of a viable employment use or redevelopment. In this case the proposed development of the site for sui generis transport uses would be for a defined (although not insubstantial period of time) and EDFE propose that the site would be made available again for business uses once the HPC construction phase is completed. Furthermore, the Core Strategy does provide for the development of other employment sites during the plan period that could be brought forward in the interim. In particular, the Somerset Bridge site to the north along the A38 provides for 65,000sqm (net) of B8 development.</p> | 89960-1328-13483 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>On balance it is the view of the Councils that the proposal to provide a Park & Ride and freight management facility at the Somerfield site is acceptable in land use terms, subject to the agreement of a robust, deliverable and effective transport strategy for the Hinkley Point C project and an assessment of the environmental impacts. Any proposals that come forward, for example, at the Huntworth roundabout, must be compatible and must not prejudice local developments.</p> <p>Although most of the land uses proposed are not strictly employment uses, the development would support the delivery of the HPC project, which in turn would provide jobs and has the potential to support economic development in the two districts. The HPC project is identified as an important catalyst for economic development and wider economic restructuring in the Sedgemoor Economic Masterplan and draft Economic Strategy. The EDFE proposals also have similar site requirements to B8 uses in terms of proximity to the strategic road network, hence the location is considered appropriate. Further land has been allocated in the Core Strategy for storage and distribution uses at Somerset Bridge, providing an alternative site for companies seeking to locate in the area for the defined period that the 'Somerfield' site would be unavailable.</p> | 89960-1328-15540 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|---|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>One outstanding reservation concerns the proposal for a temporary induction centre on the Somerfield site at M5 Junction 24, prior to its being moved to Junction 23. Within the Proposed Changes consultation response (March 2011, page 86-87), the following advice was provided:</p> <p>'The Councils appreciate that there could be a need for a HPC project induction point at an accessible location, such as M5 Junction 23, but with respect to the training element of the proposal, further information should be provided on day to day operation and the types of facilities and function of the centre.</p> <p>The provision of a training facility is supported in principle, but there is a preference for a large facility of the type indicated to be provided as a refurbished or new permanent building closer to the town centre that would contribute to wider regeneration plans.'</p> <p>Core Strategy policy D18 states that development proposals for education facilities will be supported where they are at suitable locations within Bridgwater, Burnham-on-Sea and Highbridge, Key Rural Settlements and Sustainable Settlements, are of high quality and sustainable design and are accessible by a range of sustainable transport modes. Sedgemoor DC would welcome the opportunity to discuss with EDFE whether there are appropriate sites closer to the town centre, such as vacant premises in existing industrial estates within the town. Should appropriate premises be available in a location readily accessible by public transport, HPC bus routes, walking and cycling, then this would prevent the need to move the induction centre part way through the construction of HPC. There is also a concern that the provision of a temporary facility at Junction 23 would not be compatible with the strategic flood risk issues.</p> | 89960-1328-17010 | | / | | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - The impacts of using the Somerfield site have not been fully assessed and will be different to those considered in relation to the previously preferred site south of Stockmoor Village. | 89948-1328-3056 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1424 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Your proposals for Somerfield site Jct 24 are satisfactory. | 90049-1328-6 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1477 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | This is a better option as the river, railway and canal are already bridged by the M5 motorway. But do we already need this land grab for a new road to Hinkley C? | 90052-1328-5 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1478 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Q1. Support use of old somerfield (brownfield) site to be used instead of building on green field site previously proposed. | 90053-1328-0 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Avon and Somerset Police | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | ASP have no objection to the proposed changes and in terms of using an existing urban Brownfield site will in our view have less impact within the community as opposed to a new Greenfield proposal and thus support the change. | 90054-1328-280 | | | / | |
| Bridgwater Town Council | Dual - Statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | As far as the latest proposed changes are concerned, the Council support the intention to utilise a brown field site i.e. the former 'Somersfield' site rather than the previously consulted green field site at Junction 24. | 90056-1328-1190 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 63091 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I note that there are two park and ride options near the M5 Junction 24. The latest of these being the Somersfield site, which appears logical to meet the identified need, and as such I wish to support the Somersfield site. | 90058-1328-66 | | | / | |
| Bridgwater College | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | We generally support the proposal to support the 'Somersfield Site' as a Park and Ride and freight management facility at Junction 24 as it is already a brownfield site and would have less impact on local residents. | 90065-1328-12 | | | / | |
| (Personal information removed) | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 5. If you took over the 'Somersfield' brownfield site it would deny Bridgwater the opportunity to have 'sustainable' development move in there that would potentially offer far more jobs and variety of businesses. I oppose your occupying this site. | 90081-1328-4480 | | / | | |
| (Personal information removed) | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | In conclusion, I object to all your plans. I object to any development at Junction 24 irrespective of where it is sited. | 90081-1328-7558 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 63159 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Whilst I/we welcome the alternative to the park and ride and freight transfer facility formerly proposed north west of the A38 ("Bridgwater Gateway") now proposed to move to the Somersfield site | 90084-1328-0 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 63173 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | It is with some relief to know that someone has come to their senses and has decided to use the soon to be vacated Somersfield site for the park and ride and freight transfer facility. | 90086-1328-84 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 63174 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Using a brownfield site is much more acceptable than a green field site, however the location of this site is most inappropriate considering the nearby services. | 90087-1328-128 | | / | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|---|--|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 63192 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I am writing to register my complete opposition to the siting of a Park & Ride and Freight Depot, in connection with the proposed new Hinkley power station development, at J 24 of the M5. | 90097-1328-0 | | / | | |
| Sedgemoor DC | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | During the Executive meeting, Councillors wanted to understand in more detail whether the induction centre would be an appropriate use for an industrial location or brownfield site closer to the town centre. It was also raised that relocation could generate additional trips to and from the Park & Ride sites. | 90098-1328-2734 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 63194 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Has two warehouses on Huntworth site. Happy with the proposed change and thinks it a much better solution, | 90099-1328-0 | | | / | |

| 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 data informing this element of the appraisal is considered satisfactory. | 89400-1432-1430 | | | / | The baseline environmental characteristics for the Junction 24 development site and surrounding areas with specific reference to amenity and recreation were identified through a review of existing information, including Ordnance Survey (OS) maps and websites, carried out in March 2010; consultation with appropriate statutory consultees, other relevant stakeholders including Somerset County Council's Rights of Way Team and local sports and recreation clubs that may be affected by, or have an interest in the proposed development; and information extracted from the Bridgwater and Wembdon Green Space Strategy. |

| 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>Disturbance impacts on nearby PRow are classified as Negligible adverse impacts, on the basis of the relatively short-term reversible nature of any impacts. Following the implementation of an EMMP as mitigation, effects are expected to remain as Negligible adverse for all other PRow. It is recommended that these assumptions are tested with reference to other EnvApp chapters relating to visual impact, noise and air quality etc. It is also questioned whether it is reasonable to conclude the impacts are short-term, considering the construction and operation phases will last for a number of years. The role of design measures such as landscaping and layout should also be given further consideration.</p> <p>Disturbance impacts on nearby sports and recreation facilities are classified as negligible adverse impacts, for the reason that the facilities are located some distance away and construction hours will not coincide with the peak usage time for the sports and recreation venues. Following the implementation of an EMMP as mitigation, effects are expected to remain as Negligible adverse. It is recommended that these assumptions are tested with reference to other EnvApp chapters relating to visual impact, noise and air quality etc. The role of design measures such as landscaping and layout should also be given further consideration.</p> | 89400-1434-3260 | / | | | <p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</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>Disturbance impacts on nearby PRow are classified as Negligible adverse impacts, due to the timing of main periods of activity on the site. No mitigation measures are proposed. It is recommended that these assumptions are tested with reference to other EnvApp chapters relating to visual impact, noise and air quality etc. The role of design measures such as landscaping and layout should also be given further consideration.</p> <p>Disturbance impacts on nearby sports and recreation facilities are classified as negligible adverse impacts, due to the timing of main periods of activity on the site. No mitigation measures are proposed. It is recommended that these assumptions are tested with reference to other EnvApp chapters relating to visual impact, noise and air quality etc. The role of design measures such as landscaping and layout should also be given further consideration.</p> | 89400-1434-4628 | / | | | <p>With respect to cumulative impacts, Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council commented on the potential cumulative impacts on the amenity and recreation resource associated with Junction 24.</p> <p>With regard to this, any cumulative impacts on amenity and recreation resource, including Public Rights of Way, associated with the Junction 24 park</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 appraisal of impacts at the removal/reinstatement phase has been provided. Agreement to the appropriate legacy use of the site will be required to inform this element of the appraisal work. | 89400-1434-5545 | / | | | <p>With respect to cumulative impacts, Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council commented on the potential cumulative impacts on the amenity and recreation resource associated with Junction 24.</p> <p>With regard to this, any cumulative impacts on amenity and recreation resource, including Public Rights of Way, associated with the Junction 24 park</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 | With respect to the cumulative impacts of EDF Energy 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 disturbance 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. | 89400-1434-6754 | | | / | and ride development are identified and assessed in Volume 11 of the Environmental Statement |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - D16 Pollution Impact of Development, Residential Amenity - Development proposals that would result in the loss of land of recreational and/or amenity value or unacceptably impact upon the residential amenity of occupants of nearby dwellings and any potential future occupants will not be supported. | 89960-1434-8050 | | | / | |

| 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. 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.). | 89400-1433-2439 | | | / | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| 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. | 89429-1433-5853 | | | / | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council made a number of comments during the Stage 2 consultation regarding cross-referencing sections of the Environmental Appraisal and gauging the significance of impacts. In preparing Chapter 17 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (ES) , EDF Energy had regard to appropriate guidance in determining the magnitude of an impact or disturbance on amenity or recreational resource that could be affected by the Junction 24 park and ride development. In assessing the potential impact of the construction and operation phases for the Junction 24 development site on amenity and recreation, the chapter of the ES takes into consideration the impacts of noise, air quality and visual disturbance. |

| 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>Authorities position May 2010</p> <p>The provision of a public footpath to the existing river side public right of way should be explored.</p> <p>Update August 2010</p> <p>Not provided.</p> | 89329-1436-7862 | / | | | <p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan.</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>The implementation of an EMMP represents the minimum acceptable mitigation to limit disturbance impacts for users of the PRoW network and nearby sports and recreation facilities. As referred to in other sections of the EnvApp, it is considered that landscaping should also be utilised at the J24 site to minimise visual impacts. Other sections of the EA relating to noise and light pollution should be cross-referenced to understand whether further design measures need to be adopted at the site to reduce disturbance.</p> <p>It is considered by the Councils that further mitigation and compensation will be required to address residual effects, which could include:</p> <p>Improvements to the connectivity and quality of the wider PRoW network in the area.</p> <p>Alternative compensation for the loss of amenity experienced by PRoW users.</p> | 89400-1436-5765 | | | / | <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A 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 | <p>Mitigation measures are restricted to the EMMP. Landscaping measures should be explored further and 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.</p> | 89429-1436-6329 | | | / | <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>The requirement for any mitigation has been considered in Chapter 17 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (ES).</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 | 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. | 89400-1437-7557 | | / | | <p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any 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) |
|---|---|--------------------|--|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| 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 park and ride and freight consolidation centre. Insufficient attention has been paid to the assessment of local economic impacts of a significant change to the local transport context. | 89394-1333-5247 | | | / | 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. |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 281 | 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? Yes, at J23 and J24. Could local residents be provided with passes to use buses, perhaps at off-peak times? | 9344-1340-3940 | | | / | EDF Energy has committed to return the Junction 24 site to a state suitable for previous use as a storage and distribution facility. Therefore, the site will not continue to be used as a park and ride facility following completion of the construction of Hinkley Point C. EDF Energy does not have further plans to operate the site and future use would be subject to plans of site owners, operators and the local authority at that stage. |
| Tractivity 318 | Public | Stage 1 | Q7b,c,d more than one option ticked. Park and ride off M5 Junctions 24 and 23 would benefit the local community for environmentally friendly sharing of cars for Bristol/Exeter etc that will be encouraged by government in the future. | 9006-1340-3757 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 684 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? I live on the main feeder road into Stockmoor Park, a few hundred yards down from the proposed park and ride and freight areas. I have no objection per se to these being built but I am deeply concerned about noise and traffic. I currently have views of the fields from the front of my house and I would not be happy with these being replaced by large sterile areas of tarmac interspersed with orange street lighting. I would be looking for written assurances from EDF that the proposed areas would be more than adequately landscaped and that the relatively peaceful setting we have recently moved to will remain calm and tranquil. | 9444-1336-5350 | / | | | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| Tractivity 713 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? I am concerned about the noise, pollution, amount of traffic going in and out of this site. The P&R will also change the street scene from coming down the road into the development from being quiet to lots of activity which at the moment is a lovely development. Also the Huntworth Roundabout gets congested when people are trying to access the services at this junction. | 9471-1336-5354 | / | | | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. |
| Tractivity 775 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The idea of having nearly a thousand cars extra going to a car park in this area is just ludicrous. It is difficult enough as it is to get through this area as it stands as every morning and evening it is gridlock. Also as a resident of Stockmoor Village I would be very dissatisfied to only just have bought a house here that there is going to be construction of this nature as the village area is slowly coming to an end. I purposely moved to this area as it is a quiet out of the way location and a safe area for my children and do not desire having up to a 1000 extra vehicles coming here not to mention the 120 LGVs leaving here during day and night! | 9533-1336-5324 | | | / | On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. |
| Tractivity 803 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? The A38 at Junction 24 is already very congested you will only add to this, building a freight terminal in a brand new residential area is stupidity, there is a new school and large vehicles will use the estate as a dumping ground. Again this will have a major impact on brand new house prices | 9561-1336-2071 | / | | | Responses were received at Stage 2 from a number of residents, who are concerned about the impact of the additional traffic (cars, buses and goods vehicles) on Stockmoor Village, including noise, pollution, road safety (including routes to school) and amenity. |
| Tractivity 803 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? This is now a residential area and it will affect house values and be unsafe for the new school, it is also already highly congested and it would be made worse | 9561-1336-5881 | / | | | EDF Energy is committed to measures to mitigate the potential adverse effect on residential amenity caused by additional traffic, and associated noise and |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 807 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | <p>5. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The Bridgwater South site junction 24, M5, would be totally wrong for a park and ride and freight logistics facilities. It is a rural housing area, with a new school coming to the area. The use of the existing access road which leads onto the estate is totally unacceptable. It will lead to noise pollution, light pollution, criminality at the location. Increased traffic on the local main road network will lead to grid locking of a road already unable to cope with existing and transient holiday traffic. Road safety for residents and school children will be compromised. Value of houses will go down in the area</p> <p>Bridgwater North , junction 23, M5. I support this site due to it already being an industrial area with plenty of existing space to accomodate development, it will not affect the quality of life of residents as would the junction 24 proposal</p> | 9565-1336-2518 | | | / | <p>pollution.</p> <p>Traffic issues are covered in the baseline of the Transport Assessment, although it is recognised that increase in traffic may have a socio-economic impact on businesses and residents. This assessment is reliant on transport modelling. Residents and businesses in the area and more widely in Sedgemoor will be encouraged and supported to secure economic benefits from the development at Hinkley Point C – including jobs and supply chain opportunities. The workforce requirements for Associated Development sites including J24, are incorporated into the Construction Workforce Development Strategy to maximise recruitment of Somerset residents.</p> |
| Tractivity 807 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | <p>11. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>This is wholly unacceptable. It is a residential area, it is too close to local housing and residents. The local road system is very busy and will not be able to cope with this increase in traffic. It will affect the quality of life of all people and local wild life within the area. The access road proposed which leads onto the housing estate should not be used as an access route to large industrial vehicles. This would lead to vibration and noise affecting local people and properties , leading to damage to homes and roads and ultimately loss of value to properties. It is also within half a mile from a local primary school. There will be many children and parents within the locality which would put them at risk There would be an increase in light pollution, noise pollution,potential increase in related crime due o the nature of storage of the site, which will all impact on the local population</p> | 9565-1336-7042 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 964 | Public | Stage 2 | <p>11. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>With signiificant concerns about traffic volumes on the A38 and why so close to domestic housing site?</p> | 9722-1336-5542 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 970 | Public | Stage 2 | <p>11. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Concerns of traffic congestions on Huntsworth Roundabout all directions. Concerns what will the site be used for when EDF hands over. Blot on the landscape, eating into greenbelt land added pollution in a confined area. Resale value of houses. Excessive noise levels when freight vehicles start the engines in cold climate. In conclusion there is no benfit to the residents of stockmore Village, Wilstock Village, North Petherton.</p> | 9728-1336-5419 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 975 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The site is completely unsatisfactory there is already traffic chaos most of the time in this area, if they say traffic will be moving early morning, that means there will be no let up during the night or early morning like there is at the moment. Stockmoor and Wilstock was advertised as a village location not as an industrial site or huge car park, let alone the already amount of traffic that is around - pollution is going to be increased. What about our children - this is not satisfactory for them to play out with the amount of traffic going around. | 9733-1336-5690 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 989 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Havoc at roundabout (services/M5/A38/Stockmoor). havoc on A38 - another set of traffic lights to control freight entrance. Havoc on Taunton Road to Morrison Crossroads - Just ?phasing these traffic lights differently? WONT DO IT. Disruptive and antisocial for residents of Stockmoor Village, Primary School and School children wlaiking to Blake Secondary School. Noise Pollution, unsocial hours why is this planned right next to and around a residential area? Move it elsewhere or expected Park/Ride/Freight at Junct 23 which is a non residential area. | 9747-1336-5847 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 997 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? You will place many of the residents of Stockmoor park into financial hardship due to the negative impact this facility will have on our homes and life. Ask yourselves would you want to live 50 yards from it? | 9755-1336-6220 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 998 | Public | Stage 2 | 13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the box below The use of J24 M5 would not be good for Bridgwater on North Petherton residents. J23 using the new minehead link road would take it away from Bridgwater. | 9756-1336-6631 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 999 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? I live a short distance from J24 and the proposed facilities. I am extremely concerned about the inevitable increase in traffic on M5 and A38 (the only routes out of the housing development where I live). Noise from the facilities and general disruption to my life. I understand that my house value has already decreased as a result of your proposal for J24. Is that just tough? | 9757-1336-6062 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1112 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? I suspect the people on the new Stockmoor Vilage feel much the same as Cannington people on this point on their lives being turned upside down because of a development several miles away. | 9870-1336-6159 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1174 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? This is a highly congested area already approaching Bridgwater. A freight logistics facility will greatly affect the occupants of the new housing estate at Stockmoor Park. by the very nature of a logistics facility the noise and disruption will be 24 hrs a day for 7 days a week. | 9932-1336-6644 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1213 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? This development would double the current population in this area and would put intense pressure on infrastructure, resources and public services. | 9971-1336-8542 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1215 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? 1) New development right on the doorstep of this proposed P&R 2) This development houses a new primary school. Traffic is cutting through and past the school already to avoid congestion on the A38. 3) Have you ever experinced existing traffic on surrounding roads? 4) Noise, dirt, traffic, effect on house prices, h and saftey concerns. Totally unacceptable! | 9973-1336-6090 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1315 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 Update | The transport facility proposed at Juction 24 is of a negative nature to residents of Stockmoor Village, Wilstock Village and North Petherton. | 89581-1336-657 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1315 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 Update | DO NOT implement the park and ride facility and freight terminal at Junction 24. This will affect us with regard to house values, congestion, pollution, noise, open country views, shortage of land for food production. Developing green field sites will curtail food production. | 89581-1336-845 | / | | | |
| Junction 24 Action Group | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 1 | Thirdly, as a matter of principle, we believe that EDF - as a responsible organisation - should deliver on its own claims to be 'passionate about sustainability' and to recognise 'environmental and social concerns are as important as financial ones'. This should mean prioritising 'brownfield' sites for the types of developments you are proposing | 9370-1336-1967 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 62341 | Public | Stage 2 | Please consider our views about your proposal, it's in the wrong place and has been sprung on us as new home-owners in this area. We knew nothing of this when we purchased our house at the end of 2009. This home was planned to be our last and to see us well into our retirement. This plan is now in ruins | 10021-1336-1574 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|---|--|--------------------|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 62360 | Public | Stage 2 | It appears EDF have paid little regard to the safety and proximity of the local school and families living in the nearby development. The inception of the project strategy is ill informed and ill advised. | 10035-1336-792 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 62384 | Public | Stage 2 | These proposed facilities are far too close to existing and planned housing and will result in many homes being devalued as well as the considerable noise and light pollution associated with the movement of large numbers of vehicles. The fact that some of these residents were unaware of the potential impact of the proposals as they had not been consulted properly shows EDF's disregard and poor organisation. Does EDF really expect local people to trust their judgement? | 10047-1336-6438 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 62611 | Public | Stage 2 | 19/8/10 - He lives on the Willstock side of junction 24. He is very concerned about park & ride/ Lorries. Wants to speak to someone about roads. Also worried about pollution and house prices RE spoke to him | 10158-1336-48 | | | / | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | - The impact upon the Compass Tavern pub/restaurant on Taunton Road (east of the proposed development site) has not been noted or assessed, however it is located in relatively close proximity to the site. | 89203-1336-6822 | | | / | |
| 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. | 89360-1336-12756 | | | / | |
| 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. | 89394-1336-4772 | | | / | |

| 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 impacts and therefore no residual effects have been assumed for the operational phase of the park and ride and freight consolidation centre. Insufficient attention has been paid to the assessment of local economic impacts of a significant change to the local transport context. | 89394-1336-5247 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | The best mitigation for loss of the land would be good quality restoration to agriculture, which is the scenario assumed in parts of the report. This is described as being managed by good practice measures in the EMMP and Site Restoration Plan. It is essential that strong contractual mechanisms are in place to ensure effective delivery of these controls However, restoration to agriculture does not take account of wider socio-economic issues. In other parts of the report it is stated that the site would remain as local amenity, however this does not appear to have been the subject of consultation and is currently undeveloped. It is stated (7.1.5) that EDF Energy would work with stakeholders 'at the relevant time' (implied to be in the future) to identify appropriate future land uses. | 89396-1373-7566 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1388 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | By occupying this building, will stop the site from becoming derelict and run down, will stop any anti social behaviour at the site, potential crime such as burglaries into the site and thefts, including metals etc. from within. | 89965-1336-716 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1438 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Please go ahead, extra jobs, security and no windfarms. | 90012-1336-4 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - The park and ride and freight management proposals would result in the loss of an existing employment site for a temporary, although not insubstantial period of time. Although the proposed uses are not strictly employment uses, they would support the development of HPC, an important catalyst for economic development and re-structuring of the wider economy, as set out in the Economic Masterplan and Economic Strategy (WSC). - Further land has been allocated in the SDC Core Strategy for storage and distribution uses that could come forward during the HPC construction phase, in particular the Somerset Bridge site. | 89956-1336-8229 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Although most of the land uses proposed are not strictly employment uses, the development would support the delivery of the HPC project, which in turn would provide jobs and has the potential to support economic development in the two districts. The HPC project is identified as an important catalyst for economic development and wider economic restructuring in the Sedgemoor Economic Masterplan and draft Economic Strategy. The EDFE proposals also have similar site requirements to B8 uses in terms of proximity to the strategic road network, hence the location is considered appropriate. Further land has been allocated in the Core Strategy for storage and distribution uses at Somerset Bridge, providing an alternative site for companies seeking to locate in the area for the defined period that the 'Somerfield' site would be unavailable. | 89960-1336-16016 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 63192 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I am sure I do not have to point out to you the knock-on effect this has on the shops in both North Petherton and Bridgwater, preventing and discouraging shoppers from accessing them. | 90097-1336-1084 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|---|--|--------------------|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1146 | Public | Stage 2 | 7. Any other ideas or comments? The lack of a local workforce, as evidenced by the need for the associated development sites, is indicative of the fact that this is the wrong location for this development. | 9904-1337-4314 | | | / | Significance criteria are based on the resultant effect on the observed local baseline and are therefore considered an appropriate estimate of impact. 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. |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | - The impact upon the Compass Tavern pub/restaurant on Taunton Road (east of the proposed development site) has not been noted or assessed, however it is located in relatively close proximity to the site. | 89203-1337-6822 | / | | | The approach has been based on the best possible information on the likely number and location of construction workers in the area during the construction phase (based on EDF Energy's vast experience of their other projects, experience from Sizewell B and Flammerville, and based on initial assumptions on workforce from Civils bidders, and from Site Preparation experience), and mitigation has been identified where effects are considered adverse (EDF Energy note the level of uncertainty, and propose a continuous monitoring and review mechanism). Uncertainties have been recognised and mitigation has been proposed where impacts are potentially adverse. Mitigation is also planned where effects cannot be accurately quantified. Monitoring will be undertaken to identify and target mitigation approaches to where they are needed. Monitoring will be built into the proposals to respond to adverse effects that arise with appropriate mitigation. Several issues of uncertainty have been identified and /or cannot be quantitatively measured. Mitigation will be responsive and in some cases will pre-empt impacts to prevent escalation in significance. |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Much of the analysis 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 park and ride construction based on a small sample of projects presented in Technical Appendix 2.2.1. Given the reliance on secondary evidence. The assessment of total employment impacts is therefore subject to a high degree of uncertainty. | 89394-1337-41 | | | / | |
| 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 employment impacts are 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 parts of Sedgemoor, Huntworth and Thurloxtan. | 89394-1337-1060 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | These proportions are well above the aspirational 40% local (CDCZ) employment share for the construction of the power station itself. 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 and freight consolidation centre. 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. | 89394-1337-1598 | | | / | |

| 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 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 (namely the impact on local traders) of increases in the level of traffic congestion. | 89394-1337-2513 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | The 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. | 89394-1337-3369 | | | / | |
| 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 casts significant uncertainty on the delivery of an enhanced level of local labour within the development. | 89394-1337-3768 | | | / | |
| 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. | 89428-1337-12387 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|---|---|--------------------|---|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1319 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 Update | What proposals are you putting into place to compensate residents of Stockmoor Village who live opposite proposed site at Junction 24 to compensate them for decrease in property values/pollution/noise/disruption. | 89585-1338-82 | / | | | <p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</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 mitigation measures are proposed for socio-economic aspects of the Junction 24 proposals. Measures related to local recruitment, training, and purchasing which are in place for the construction of the power station, would not be available for park and ride 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. | 89394-1338-2812 | | | / | |
| 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. | 89428-1338-12792 | | | / | |

| 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 | In addition, no details are currently provided as to how the Park & Ride proposals will fit around existing business uses on site. If the businesses would be displaced, EDFE will be required to set out what arrangements are being put in place to provide for relocation. | 89895-1338-6859 | | | / | <p>If development consent is granted, a Community Fund and a Housing Fund will be incorporated and directed through a monitoring and review process to mitigate effects on the housing market and community facilities / public services. It is anticipated that there will be no displacement of existing businesses.</p> <p>Activities would also be established to maximise the economic benefits of the development, as outlined through Stage 2 Update Consultation. These measures will 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 trainings 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 (undertaking an outreach programme with local businesses); and a series of 'supply chain' events for local businesses to provide a clear understanding of EDF Energy's requirements from suppliers.</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 baseline assessment has been carried out based on appropriate use of detailed source references, and no further survey information is needed. The baseline assessment is therefore acceptable. | 89396-1369-4810 | | | / | <p>Sedgemoor District Council's consultation response at Stage 2 noted that the baseline survey was acceptable, with no need for further survey information.</p> <p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility to 698 parking spaces and proposing 45 HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>However, in agreement with the consultee comment, the site is classified as non-agricultural land, and does not contain any areas of best and most versatile land (BMVL). As a result, it has not been necessary to carry out a soil survey or Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey.</p> |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Junction 24 Action Group | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 1 | First, these sites constitute land which will be required to feed future generations as populations grow and resources become increasingly scarce. Only last week, the Government introduced a new UK food strategy which raised the spectre of future food shortages - and the need now to consolidate and invest in food production that is locally sourced. It is our firm conviction that vital farmland must be preserved. | 9370-1377-1307 | / | | | In direct response to a comment made during the Stage 1 Consultation by the Junction 24 Action Group, the proposed development would not affect any agricultural grade land or 'natural' soils, as the proposals submitted for Development Consent make use of an existing site which has already been developed (the "Sommerfield" site). |

| 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 cumulative element from this element of the proposed scheme on soil and land use impacts is described consistently in Volume 4 with the assessment in Volume 3 discussed here. | 89396-1372-9250 | | | / | <p>The local authority consultation response at Stage 2 noted that the cumulative element had been described consistently with other elements of the assessment.</p> <p>As already described, the site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>Within-development additive impacts on soils and land use are assessed within the Soils and Land Use chapter (Chapter 11, Volume 9) of the Environmental Statement and cumulative impacts with other developments are assessed in Volume 11 of the Environmental Statement. As this is a site currently in industrial use and not classified as or used as agricultural land, there would be no cumulative construction, operation or post-operation phase impacts on soil, land use and agricultural receptors.</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 | - All search areas are located in 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. | 88410-1371-0 | / | | | Statutory and public consultee responses throughout the consultation expressed concern at the proposal to use greenfield agricultural land of high quality and lack of clarity in its intended final use following deconstruction. As already described, the site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. |
| Tractivity 1315 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 Update | DO NOT implement the park and ride facility and freight terminal at Junction 24. This will affect us with regard to house values, congestion, pollution, noise, open country views, shortage of land for food production. Developing green field sites will curtail food production. | 89581-1371-845 | / | | | The site is classified as non-agricultural land, and does not contain any areas of Best and Most Versatile land (BMVL), nor any lower grade agricultural land. The assessment of impacts is contained in the Impacts Section of the Soils and Land Use Chapter (Chapter 11, Volume 10) of the Environmental Statement. The site is not subject to any agri-environment scheme. As a result, there would be no impacts on agricultural land use or environmental protection schemes. The proposed development is expected to be operational for approximately seven-and-a-half years. Once the proposed facilities are no longer required to support the construction of the Hinkley Point C power station, the site would be restored to a storage and distribution centre. |
| 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 in the construction phase for 'permanent landtake' (Table 7.6.4) may be reasonable, based on the partial criteria proposed. However, this cannot be confirmed as the criteria are not fully developed. | 89396-1371-6050 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | which is not consistent with the rest of the assessment, as there will be a period of approximately seven years for operation of the park-and-ride facility. There are also contradictions as to the exact area 11.3 ha (7.1.10) or 5.4 ha (Table 7.1.6). Hence there are inconsistencies in the assessment which need to be clarified. | 89396-1371-6386 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Furthermore there are contradictions as to whether the site will be restored to agriculture (temporary land take) in section 7.1.4 and 7.1.40, or be converted for legacy uses (permanent land take) in section 7.6.43. These contradictions affect the assessment of significance. From the point of view of land use, full reinstatement represents the best scenario, and this is what the assessment refers to. Assessment of significance of other effects as Minor Adverse with good site management as part of the EMMP are generally reasonable (but see comments below on mitigation). The significance of dust on human receptors (rather than agricultural receptors) during construction has not been assessed (please refers to the response on the Air Quality chapter). The significance assessment therefore needs completion. | 89396-1371-6717 | / | | | |

| 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 the significance of environmental impacts of land use cannot be completed while the final use of the site is undetermined. | 89396-1371-8665 | / | | | |
| 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 Moderate Adverse residual impact from the temporary landtake of agricultural land may be reasonable, although further work is needed as described above in order to confirm this. It should be noted however that if the site were to be restored for legacy use, as is stated in parts of the report, the residual effect on soil and land use might be more adverse. | 89396-1371-8835 | / | | | |
| Junction 24 Action Group | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 1 | 3. But another has not changed. It has assumed added importance. Every hectare of Grades 1 and 2 farm land will be needed for food or fuel. | 9370-293-3339 | / | | | |
| Junction 24 Action Group | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 1 | 4. Grade 1 land is located at all three of the EDF "Search Areas" A, B and C. These are shown in the EDF pre-consultation document (map 10.16). J24A- is a greenfield site forming a major part of North Petherton's green wedge. No development consent should be given here without a cast iron condition that it will not be tarmacked over but restored to farm land after 10 years. | 9370-293-3487 | / | | | |
| Junction 24 Action Group | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 1 | J24C - 33 hectares of prime farm land (grades 1 & 2) which should remain so. To designate for any other use when such land is in shortening supply would be a terrible planning decision. | 9370-293-4340 | / | | | |

| 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 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'.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Stage 1 review requested a full assessment of the location option north of the A38. Although this option is listed in the consideration of alternatives it is described as too small and there is only a brief assessment.</p> <p>The methodology therefore needs completion with regard to criteria for the magnitude of effects of poorer quality agricultural land and consideration of alternatives.</p> | 89396-1370-5031 | / | | | <p>A consultation response expressed concern on the completeness of information provided and the rationale for rejecting a potential option.</p> <p>As already described, the site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>The Methodology section of the Soils and Land Use chapter 11, Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement includes a description of the criteria used for the assessment of the magnitude of effects on identified soils and land use receptors.</p> <p>The Methodology section addresses the following issues as they may be affected by construction, operation and post-operation restoration of the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> soil types, their quality and Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) grades likely to be affected by the development; the type of farm enterprises present and farming practices including any agri-environment schemes; and the possible presence of crop/soil/animal diseases or noxious weeds. <p>The criteria used in the assessment are the ALC Grades as set out by the former Ministry for Agriculture, Food and Farming which includes Best and Most Versatile land (BMVL) at ALC Grades 1, 2 and 3a, but also lower grade agricultural soils (Grades 3b and 4).</p> <p>However, the site now proposed is classified as non-agricultural land and does not contain any areas of BMVL, nor any lower grade agricultural land.</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 | - Full restoration or legacy proposals should be presented where temporary Park and Ride and freight consolidation sites are to be located on agricultural land; | 88420-1373-562 | / | | | Consultee responses regarding previous proposals sought preservation of high quality agricultural land and application of best practice in restoration. As already described, the site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. |
| Junction 24 Action Group | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 1 | First, these sites constitute land which will be required to feed future generations as populations grow and resources become increasingly scarce. Only last week, the Government introduced a new UK food strategy which raised the spectre of future food shortages - and the need now to consolidate and invest in food production that is locally sourced. It is our firm conviction that vital farmland must be preserved. | 9370-1373-1307 | / | | | For this site, no significant impacts on soils and land use have been identified during the assessment, and no specific mitigation is required. Environmental impacts and disturbance arising from construction activities would be managed through a range of control measures and monitoring procedures which are outlined in the Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (EMMP) and topic-specific management plans described in the Mitigation and Impacts section of the Soils and Land Use chapter (Chapter 11, Volume 9) of the Environmental Statement and detailed in associated Subject-Specific Management Plans (SSMPs) for the site. General good practice measures implemented as part of these plans for the site would ensure that all impacts on soils and land use are avoided or minimised as far as possible. |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Further measures to mitigate residual effects relate to strong contractual mechanisms to ensure best practice in delivery of the restoration of the site to agriculture. It should be noted that if the site were restored for legacy use the residual effects on soil and land use might be more adverse. | 89428-1373-15543 | / | | | Mitigation relating to access and leisure facilities is addressed in Chapters 8 and 17 in Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement on Transport and Amenity and Recreation respectively. The site has already been developed and subjected to extensive ground disturbance, and potential impacts upon archaeology and the historic environment due to earthworks and soil removal is addressed in the Chapter 16, Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement on the Historic Environment. |

| 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 monitoring requirements have been identified. | 89396-1374-9452 | / | | | <p>No monitoring requirement was identified in consultation responses.</p> <p>As already described, the site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site.</p> <p>For this new site, no significant impacts on soils and land use have been identified during the assessment, and no specific mitigation is required. Despite this, potential environmental impacts and disturbance arising from construction activities would be managed through a range of control measures and monitoring procedures which are outlined in an Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (EMMP) and its subsidiary topic-specific management plans described in the Mitigation and Impacts Section of the Soils and Land Use chapter (Chapter 11, Volume 9) 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) |
|---|---|--------------------|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Environment Agency | Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 1 | Water Quality -Park and Ride Facility (350 cars): As above Park and Ride response. -Freight Consolidation Facility: As above freight consolidation response. | 88830-1396-14412 | | | / | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| 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 recommended that a plan showing the relevant drains and watercourses is provided for clarity. | 89398-1396-778 | / | | | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Flood risk from fluvial, tidal and combined sources is not a key consideration according to the assessment report. However, the residual flood risk in the event of failure of Stock Moor Rhyne Pumping station is not discussed in the assessment or considered in the Flood Risk Study. The implications of this needs to be understood. | 89398-1396-1188 | / | | | |

| 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 key receptor is the ditch located across the site. This is reported to have low sensitivity and is considered appropriate.</p> <p>It is reported that this ditch has no connection to the Stock Moor Rhyne (SMR), this is not correct, although, there is a considerable distance between the drain and the SMR.</p> | 89398-1396-1825 | / | | | <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>The baseline surface water consultation comments cover a wide range of drainage, flood risk, mapping, hydrology and drainage and water quality issues. Chapter 13 of Volume 9 of the Environment Statement (ES) details the baseline conditions and impact assessment for the new site at Junction 24.</p> <p>The existing Somerfield site is serviced with both surface drainage and foulwater drainage systems that have been assessed to have sufficient capacity to accommodate the change in use. Therefore these systems will be adopted for the proposed development. Some upgrade of oil interceptors within the drainage system are proposed for the redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>The use of conservative surface water runoff from the site was adopted to ensure that the capacity of the surface drainage system was sufficient to prevent localised flooding on the Somerfield site and areas beyond 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) |
|---|---|--------------------|--|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| 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 Minor Adverse effect assigned to the impacts associated with release of contaminants and sediments is considered to be representative.</p> <p>The Negligible significance assigned the release of contaminated soils is not consistent with the assessment of other potentially polluting matter.</p> <p>The Moderate Adverse assessment of flood risk associated impacts underestimates the potential effects. This should be a major adverse impact in line with the assessments at Cannington Park and Ride and Junction 23 Freight Logistics and Park and Ride, where a similar impact has been described.</p> | 89398-1398-3259 | / | | | <p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan.</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>The significance of effect assigned to flood risk and increased sedimentation is reported as 'no impact'. This conclusion is based on mitigation implemented during construction, which is based on the implementation of sustainable drainage including storage ponds. However, the level of detail provided in this report and the accompanying Flood Risk Study (FRS) does not make it clear if incorporation of sustainable drainage is technically feasible.</p> | 89398-1398-4137 | | | / | <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</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>The assessment does not take the risk of mobilising sediments at this stage of the project into account. However, the impacts identified above have been assessed correctly.</p> | 89398-1398-4888 | | | / | <p>The current Environment Agency Flood Map shows that this site is located within Flood Zone 1 and has therefore been assessed as having a less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of river or sea flooding in any year (<0.1% AEP).</p> <p>Additional work has been undertaken to clarify the current baseline flood risks for the proposed Junction 24 development. This work has included detailed assessment of available historical flooding records; review of groundwater information; review of sewer flood history and records (as recorded by Wessex</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>The EnvApp's prediction that all construction impacts can be mitigated to negligible levels is generally a fair reflection of the situation. However, the impact to the drainage network caused by mobilisation of sediments is underestimated and does require positive mitigation. Even with mitigation in place a minor adverse impact is likely.</p> <p>It is reported that the only operational and removal/reinstatement impacts after mitigation will be due to accidental discharges and that this will be negligible;</p> <p>This relies on an effective surface water management system reducing surface water runoff and the contaminants contained within it and so removing all effects caused by routine runoff. The assessment does not consider the effectiveness of surface water management systems nor their threshold to failure and totally ignores the of mobilisation of sediments during the removal/reinstatement process. This is considered to be a minor adverse impact even with an Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (EMMP).</p> | 89429-1398-24 | / | | | <p>The current Environment Agency Flood Map shows that this site is located within Flood Zone 1 and has therefore been assessed as having a less than 1 in 1000 annual probability of river or sea flooding in any year (<0.1% AEP).</p> <p>Additional work has been undertaken to clarify the current baseline flood risks for the proposed Junction 24 development. This work has included detailed assessment of available historical flooding records; review of groundwater information; review of sewer flood history and records (as recorded by Wessex</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 (Table 7.1.5), which is appropriate. However it should be noted that in Table 7.6.5 mitigation for damage to field drainage is proposed only by part of EMMP, which is not sufficient. | 89396-1373-8366 | / | | | <p>Water) and consideration of the surface water flood risks for the site.</p> <p>This work has confirmed the low probability of flooding from each key flood source, concluding development at the site is unlikely to have an adverse hydrological impact upon existing drainage systems and infrastructure roads (including the M5) near the site. The development and implementation of a drainage strategy for the Junction 24 site will also help to reduce the likelihood of flooding from surface water sources.</p> <p>Further information regarding the current hydrological and flood risk status of the site is available in the in the Chapter 13 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement (ES) and the Junction 24 Flood Risk Assessment (FRA).</p> <p>All impacts have been re-evaluated for the ES in order to ensure a consistent and robust impact assessment. The revised Surface Water chapter contains a greater justification of those decisions made during the impact assessment process than was previously made available.</p> <p>The assessment of surface water quality impacts has assumed that good construction site practice will be adopted. This assumption is central to the magnitude ratings that have been allocated. A water management plan will detail measures which will ensure the careful management and monitoring of construction practices at the Junction 24 site. Due regard for the Environment Agency Pollution Prevention Guidelines will be made.</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 methodology 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. | 89398-1397-2156 | | / | | The only methodology comment received at Stage 2 consultation related to a request by a consultee for additional information regarding the Significance Criteria considered in the impact assessment. The methodology to assess the predicted significance of impacts is fully explained in Chapter 7 of Volume 1 of the Environmental Statement . |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - The Councils note that EDFE propose to combine Surface Water quality impact assessment with those for Flood Risk, Hydrology and Drainage. The Council seeks to ensure that EDFE present the outputs of these assessments in a clear and easy to understand manner, so as not to confuse/obfuscate impacts. | 89960-1397-22490 | / | | | The only methodology comment received at Stage 2 Update consultation related to a request by a consultee for additional information regarding the evaluation of the value/sensitivity of each of the receptors considered in the impact assessment. These details are provided in tabular format within the Chapter 13 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement and the ratings are justified for the water quality, hydrology/drainage receptors and indirect population receptors. The structure of the chapter ensures that the assessment is presented in a clear and easily understood manner. |

| 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 | -Site J24A - All flood zone 1 subject to topography checks at northern extremity -surface water disposal will be a challenge within this area. Could this site be drained effectively into the Stockmoor village housing scheme adjoining? If not, connection difficulties could be experienced for surface water due to lack of discharge points? | 88830-1400-13082 | | | / | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| Environment Agency | Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 1 | -Sites J24B and 24C - All flood zone 1 - surface water disposal issues. The only difficulties envisaged here relate to how any new surface water drainage system will be connected to an adequate discharge point, as there is nothing obvious nearby with spare capacity. A full infiltration and/or greenfield runoff limitation scheme is envisaged if the site can not be connected to an adequate discharge point | 88830-1400-13422 | | | / | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site. |
| Parrett Internal Drainage Board | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | These sites are located within the Parrett Internal Drainage Boards Boundary. Within this area the board have jurisdiction over matters relating to all Ordinary Watercourses. 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. This will require surface water run off to be managed and for drainage features to be maintainable. Any change to the drainage network in these areas will require Land Drainage Consent from the Board. Any work or features proposed within 9m of any watercourse will require Land Drainage Consent from the Board. | 10189-1400-2071 | | | / | On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. |
| Environment Agency | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | Potential 106 agreements Main site: Potential 106 requirements involving the sea wall (if there is to be land take). Junction 24: Depending on the final drainage strategy of this site contributions may be required for our pumping station within this area. | 89089-1400-431 | | | / | EDF Energy intends to adopt the existing drainage system and discharges from the Junction 24 site as levels are assessed to be consistent with current runoff rates. Full details of the strategy are provided |

| 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 | <p>Draft Conditions: Junction 24</p> <p>Please note that these recommendations are subject to addition and change. Before final conditions are established the Environment Agency should be re- consulted. Please be aware we will have additional conditions to these as proposals develop further.</p> <p>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</p> <p>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> | 89091-1400-0 | | | / | in the Junction 24 Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) . The assessment of surface water quality impacts has assumed that good construction site practice will be adopted. Due regard for the Environment Agency Pollution Prevention Guidelines will be made. |
| 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 methods described appear appropriate to manage water quantity and quality discharges.</p> <p>The approach to mitigating loss of drainage/increased surface water runoff/flood risk requires more detail to determine if it is technically feasible or practical.</p> | 89398-1400-5479 | | | / | |
| 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 operational phase mitigation is a surface water system designed to manage quantity and quality. This is appropriate. However, details of this system would be required and should be available within the accompanying FRS.</p> | 89398-1400-5759 | | / | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | <p>This focuses on measures to control mobilisation of sediment and other pollutants with a reliance on management plans. The philosophy is sound.</p> | 89398-1400-6018 | | / | | |

| 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>It is reported that all construction impacts can be mitigated to Negligible. On the whole the residual impacts are probably an accurate reflection of this assertion. However, there will be residual impacts to the receiving ditch caused by mobilisation of sediments that is not described or assessed.</p> <p>It is reported that all the operational impacts can be mitigated to Negligible. This relies on an effective surface water management system reducing all residual impacts. The level of available makes it difficult to determine whether sustainable drainage techniques are practical or feasible. Furthermore, the assessment does not consider the effectiveness of the systems available nor what would happen if the system were to fail.</p> <p>It is reported that all the removal/reinstatement impacts can be mitigated to Negligible. This is probably a fair assessment but does ignore release of sediments.</p> | 89398-1400-6193 | | / | | |
| 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 EnvApp's prediction that all construction impacts can be mitigated to negligible levels is generally a fair reflection of the situation. However, the impact to the drainage network caused by mobilisation of sediments is underestimated and does require positive mitigation. Even with mitigation in place a minor adverse impact is likely.</p> <p>It is reported that the only operational and removal/reinstatement impacts after mitigation will be due to accidental discharges and that this will be negligible;</p> <p>This relies on an effective surface water management system reducing surface water runoff and the contaminants contained within it and so removing all effects caused by routine runoff. The assessment does not consider the effectiveness of surface water management systems nor their threshold to failure and totally ignores the of mobilisation of sediments during the removal/reinstatement process. This is considered to be a minor adverse impact even with an Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (EMMP).</p> | 89429-1400-24 | | / | | |
| 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. | 89717-1400-5685 | | | / | |
| Environment Agency | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | We would not wish to see increased culverting of the drainage channel that runs along the roadside past Somerfield. | 89917-1400-1716 | | | / | |

| 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 | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Thus If the drainage in the area is to be considered for possible redevelopment it must incorporate the findings of ecological studies in order for the local ecology to be maintained and opportunities for enhancements taken. | 89917-1400-2000 | / | | | |
| Environment Agency | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Pollution Prevention For this site we would be looking for appropriate pollution preventions measures to be put in place especially for surface water run off to the local water courses. We would also expect pollution risks to be managed through an appropriate Construction Environment and Management Plan. | 89917-1400-2800 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | In terms of flood risk and drainage the Councils advise that the EIA methodology should look to reduce surface water run-off as a priority, and look to deliver associated mitigation measures to manage flood risk. Only after these two options have been explored should surface water run-off into sewer systems be explored, and only then as a last resort. | 89960-1400-22792 | / | | | |

| 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. | 89398-1401-7307 | | | / | <p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent Order, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>Monitoring of the discharges made to surface waters will take place, as will monitoring of construction procedures and practices. Details regarding the surface water monitoring programmes and responsibilities will be contained within the site specific water management plan.</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 | -Biodiversity J24 A - A small section of Stockmoor Rhyne County Wildlife Site is located within the western corner of the potential development area. Stockmoor Rhyne is an interconnecting rhyne network with legally protected species and nationally rare and nationally notable invertebrates; also ponds with legally protected species and stretches of adjacent hedgerows. Water voles have been recorded in the vicinity of the drain adjacent to the site. | 88830-1405-13956 | / | | | <p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>Comments received from the Environment Agency, during the Consultation on Junction 24 Proposals and Highway Improvements in the Bridgwater Area, requested that appropriate surveys should be carried out to determine the presence of valuable species with development proposals adapted accordingly in response to the findings.</p> <p>A desk study and an extended Phase 1 habitat survey were undertaken for this new site as the first stage in establishing a robust ecological baseline for the site, in line with the Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management's (IEEM's) Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA) guidelines (2006). Further detailed species-specific survey work has been undertaken in 2011 to establish a robust baseline dataset, both to inform the design of the development</p> |
| Somerset Wildlife Trust | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | The ecological baseline at sites around West Somerset and Sedgemoor remains undefined, and thus it is impossible for consultees to undertake a safe, robust analysis of potential impacts to our locally, nationally and internationally important species, habitats and sites. The Trust does not share EDF's confidence in the unverified opinions of consultants regarding likely species presence and abundance at ancillary development locations, or unsubstantiated estimates regarding the extent and duration of impacts to wildlife at these sites. It is of extreme concern that EDF deem acceptable the use of a "best guess" on ecological impacts in a landscape where protected and priority species and habitats find haven. Without ecological data, it is difficult to see how EDF have applied the principles of sustainable development to their proposals. | 10263-180-3346 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 764 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The Park and Ride and Freight Logistic Facilities at J.24 (Bridgwater) will have a detrimental affect on the residents of Stockmoor Village and Wilstock Village and on local wildlife. The proposed access from Stockmoor Drive will cause traffic chaos, the Huntworth roundabout already cannot cope with the high volumes of summer traffic entering the M5 services and normal commuter traffic regularly queues significantly in the immediate area of the proposed development. Noise pollution from the site will have a detrimental affect on residents of Stockmoor Village and noise and light pollution will affect wildlife. The area is a valuable habitat for bats, birds of prey and water voles. | 9522-1405-6227 | | | / | |
| Somerset Wildlife Trust | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | a lack of information at this stage prevents meaningful consultation. | 10263-1405-11493 | / | | | |
| Somerset Wildlife Trust | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | In the case of ecology, substantial information gaps still exist for the foreshore/coastal and marine environments of the Severn Estuary, and the terrestrial environments of sites at Bridgwater, Cannington, Coombwich, Junction 23, Junction 24, and Williton. In the absence of survey data and interpretation upon which to base impact predictions, it is not possible to fully analyse or assess the implications of this development for Somerset's wildlife. | 10263-1405-12078 | / | | | |
| Somerset Wildlife Trust | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | Insufficient ecological information has been provided against which to appraise these plans, and so we must object. | 10263-1405-16660 | / | | | |

| 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 | Protected Species Further surveys are being undertaken for hedgerow, breeding birds. Water vole. Otter, dormouse, badger, Great Crested Newts, reptiles, invertebrates and bats. The Phase 1 surveys did not reveal any obvious impacts on protected species: The results of the 2010 surveys will confirm that. | 89115-1405-142 | | | / | <p>proposals and to provide a robust basis on which to assess the impacts of the proposed development.</p> <p>As the scheme ecologists have played an integral role in the process of scheme design it has been possible to ensure that the implications of the baseline results (which are presented in the Chapter 14 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement) have been addressed in the final design proposals for this site, with potential impacts on ecological receptors avoided through design wherever this has been achievable.</p> |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | Similar comments to those made above apply to the EclA contained in section 7.10. In this instance fewer surveys are outstanding, yet the need has been identified (in paragraph 7.10.53) for surveys in relation to Great Crested Newts, Badgers & hedgerows and for Roesel's Bush-cricket (a Somerset BAP Priority Species). Judgements regarding anticipated impacts upon biodiversity must be regarded as preliminary at this stage pending completion of the necessary surveys. | 89262-1405-1700 | / | | | |
| 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 data for the site is incomplete (surveys are still ongoing) and relies on an initial Phase 1 Habitat Survey undertaken out of season. There is enough information to characterise the general ecological status of the selected locations, although further survey work is recognised as being required | 89398-1405-7720 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | The validity of the evidence base produced by EDF Energy for terrestrial ecology for the site is on the whole considered sound enough to come to an initial evaluation. | 89398-1405-8299 | | | / | |
| 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. | 89429-1405-1080 | / | | | |

| 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 baseline data for the site is incomplete (surveys are still ongoing) and relies on an initial Phase 1 habitat survey undertaken outside of optimal season. - The bat assemblage valuation of 'low' instead of 'medium' is inconsistent with the Hinkley assessment, and there are other valuation inconsistencies. | 89429-1405-1898 | / | | | |
| Environment Agency | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | The existing "Estate" SuD further down the rhyne is now an extremely good wetland with valuable species present e.g. snipe. We would not wish to see this altered | 89917-1405-1835 | | | / | |
| Environment Agency | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Further to this Water Voles have been found in the vicinity, appropriate surveys should ascertain there presents and development proposals adapted accordingly. | 89917-1405-2228 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - EDFE's statement of severity and scale of ecology impacts are stated as fact without the supporting evidence justification. Council advocates EDFE undertake a tree survey on-site as part of the overall EIA. | 89960-1405-23149 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 1207 | 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>11 Cont. Will the site, if built, ever be reinstated to agricultural land use again - & who will foot the bill for this? Would the site, if built, be landscaped and any wildlife protected? What about noise/light pollution for people living nearby?</p> | 9965-1413-6520 | / | | | The location of the Junction 24 site has been revised since the earlier stages of the consultation process. The proposal for facilities near Junction 24 is to make use of an existing development rather than a greenfield site. Comments in relation to the potential impact on green field land are therefore no longer relevant. |

| 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 consideration of the impacts of increased traffic from the cumulative projects (Hinkley A-C; the Associated Developments and other local and strategic projects). 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). Toads which are a UK BAP species are in decline nationally because of traffic mortality and there is no consideration of them in the current assessment even though they are recorded at the development site. 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. | 89398-1408-13411 | / | | | The full results of the baseline survey programme in respect of the Junction 24 site provide a robust basis on which to assess the likely impacts of the proposed development on ecological receptors, including those that may arise from cumulative interaction with other Hinkley Point C (HPC) and non-HPC developments. An updated assessment of cumulative impacts on terrestrial ecology and ornithology receptors, including bats and other UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UKBAP) species referenced in the Stage 2 consultation, is presented in Chapter 14 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement . |

| 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 | 19. M5 Junction 24 This motorway junction provides the only known site in Somerset for the rare Roesel's Bush-cricket. The whole area is thought to be likely to support foraging bats, while there is a roost record for Whiskered Bat from a veteran tree in J24-C. Great Crested Newts occur in ponds close to J24-A. Protected species surveys and, possibly, targeted invertebrate surveys may be required. | 87980-1407-2221 | | | / | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| Tractivity 764 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? The Park and Ride and Freight Logistic Facilities at J.24 (Bridgwater) will have a detrimental affect on the residents of Stockmoor Village and Wilstock Village and on local wildlife. The proposed access from Stockmoor Drive will cause traffic chaos, the Huntworth roundabout already cannot cope with the high volumes of summer traffic entering the M5 services and normal commuter traffic regularly queues significantly in the immediate area of the proposed development. Noise pollution from the site will have a detrimental affect on residents of Stockmoor Village and noise and light pollution will affect wildlife. The area is a valuable habitat for bats, birds of prey and water voles. | 9522-1407-1927 | / | | | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent, instead of the J24-A site. |
| Tractivity 839 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? Park and Ride on the motorway Junctions seems practical, however the one at Cannington is completely un-needed. the freight/logistics at Combwich is completely un-needed. The frieght/logisitcs at Combwich is completely opposed as this is putting far too much stress on the residents and countryside and flora and fauna. There is sufficient redundant land between the ?C? site and the ?A? station to accomodate the freight logisitcs and pre-fabrication sheds now recently announce for Combwich! | 9597-1407-2899 | | | / | On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. |
| Tractivity 1319 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 Update | The site will obstruct views of Quantock Hills and impact on local wildlife annd the environment due to noise and pollution. | 89585-1407-1346 | / | | | A desk study and an extended Phase 1 habitat survey were undertaken for the Somerfield site as the first stage in establishing a robust ecological baseline, in line with the Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management's (IEEM's) Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) guidelines (2006). Further detailed species-specific survey work has also been undertaken in 2011 to establish a robust baseline dataset, both to inform the design of the development proposals and to provide a robust basis on which to assess the impacts of the proposed development. |
| Tractivity 62333 | Public | Stage 2 | We moved here due to the location, our property is overlooking the fields and could not ask for a better view. This purposed site would be visible from our house and we are sure there is going to be associated noise and pollution to go along with this. Not to mention harm this will cause to the great deal of wildlife that we see daily, it's their home you will be digging up too! | 10015-1407-426 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|---|--|--------------------|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 62338 | Public | Stage 2 | I can't see if you want to put industrial premises on our junction it can't go the other side of the road at the market where the road infrastructure is already in place, you propose to have the entrance to the heavy goods depot on the other side of the road with all the noise pollution on level with all our residences. Don't get me wrong I grew up in the local area when Hinkley A and B were being built and I can remember how beneficial the extra buying power was to the local community especially Bridgwater, but you can't expect to inflict such an industrial use on land right next to a new development and for people to take it lying down there is going to be a wetland centre just down over the hill from your proposed site, but I can't see the wading birds coming to take up residence if the extra traffic you will bring occurs. | 10018-1407-662 | | | / | Comments received from the Environment Agency, during the Consultation on Junction 24 Proposals and Highway Improvements in the Bridgwater Area, requested that findings from ecological studies should be taken into account during any redevelopment of the site drainage. As 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 (which are presented in the Chapter 14 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement) have been addressed in the final design proposals for this site, with potential impacts on ecological receptors avoided through design wherever this has been achievable. |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | Similar comments to those made above apply to the EclA contained in section 7.10. In this instance fewer surveys are outstanding, yet the need has been identified (in paragraph 7.10.53) for surveys in relation to Great Crested Newts, Badgers & hedgerows and for Roesel's Bush-cricket (a Somerset BAP Priority Species). Judgements regarding anticipated impacts upon biodiversity must be regarded as preliminary at this stage pending completion of the necessary surveys. | 89262-1407-1700 | / | | | |
| 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 evaluation of the value of receptors and the assigning of magnitude to potential effects is considered robust and consistent subject to the further survey work to be carried out. The Phase 1 Habitat Survey was undertaken in January and therefore the botanical information is recognised as being preliminary. The valuation on the various species groups should be clearly indicated as provisional, subject to the surveys still to be completed. They are generally consistent with the valuations used for the well surveyed Development Site. However there are one or two inconsistencies, mostly minor in nature. The key inconsistency is the bat assemblage valuation which on no direct survey information values the assemblage here as 'low' instead of 'medium'. Given that the bat species recorded at Hinkley were commuting as well as foraging and included species known to have large ranges (e.g. the two horseshoe bat species) a precautionary approach should be taken here. It is recognised within the assessment generally construction effects could affect commuting and foraging activity. | 89398-1407-9530 | / | | | |

| 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 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, but should be used to guide the design outcomes for the site.</p> <p>The legacy strategy and the ecological element of this does not address the wider context of the proposed site. The final confirmation of site design and legacy issues should take into account the ecological context and reference the evolving Green Infrastructure Strategy. It is appropriate to build in ecological benefit arising from retained habitat and other mitigation/enhancement. Currently, the EDF Energy evaluation is that the re-instatement of the site is a minor benefit, although given the disruption and disturbance without further clarity on enhancements this should be viewed as neutral overall. Indeed in the summary table (see Table 7.10.8) there are as many adverse effects associated with potential removal/ re-instatement as with construction.</p> | 89398-1407-11885 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 764 | Public | Stage 2 | <p>11. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The Park and Ride and Freight Logistic Facilities at J.24 (Bridgwater) will have a detrimental affect on the residents of Stockmoor Village and Wilstock Village and on local wildlife. The proposed access from Stockmoor Drive will cause traffic chaos, the Huntworth roundabout already cannot cope with the high volumes of summer traffic entering the M5 services and normal commuter traffic regularly queues significantly in the immediate area of the proposed development. Noise pollution from the site will have a detrimental affect on residents of Stockmoor Village and noise and light pollution will affect wildlife. The area is a valuable habitat for bats, birds of prey and water voles.</p> | 9522-1028-6227 | / | | | |
| Environment Agency | Dual – Statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Thus If the drainage in the area is to be considered for possible redevelopment it must incorporate the findings of ecological studies in order for the local ecology to be maintained and opportunities for enhancements taken. | 89917-1407-2000 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1388 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | By using the Somerfield site will also keep all industry to the east of the A38. This is a good idea ,as, although traffic flow will be higher, it will not have a huge impact ,as it will just replace the previous traffic flow of Somerfield vehicles. | 89965-1344-465 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1395 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | There would need to be improvements to the roundabout system and the A38 into Bridgwater as traffic can be extremely heavy at peak time and weekends in the summer. | 89970-1344-435 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1399 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | EDF still does not get it, The traffic problems at Junction 24 needs to be addressed first. Any extra traffic coming on to the roundabout will just make congestion worse. | 89974-1344-4 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1411 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | It will cause allout chaos in Bridgwater especially Taunton road where I live | 89986-1344-4 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1420 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Changing from the Greenfield Site to the Somerfield site at J 24 will cause as much congestion if not more on the services R/about. I would like to see a road built alongside the M5 to link up with J 23. | 89995-1344-4 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1427 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Prefer this option but am concerned that this will still have a significant impact on people living in N Petherton attempting to join the M5 or go to Bridgwater. | 90001-1344-4 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1429 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | The new site at Somerfields is better being a brownfield site but you will still not be able to move vehicles up the A38 towards Bridgwater as it will be too congested and will be completely solid with traffic | 90003-1344-97 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1430 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | BUT I still maintain that Junction 24 is the wrong place for your depot as it will still cause disastrous traffic problems through Bridgwater. As far as i am concerned the only acceptable site is at Junction 23 or near Hinkley Point itself and all your traffic should be routed along the northern bypass as originally suggested many years ago. nothing else will do!!! | 90004-1344-370 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1432 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Mainly its all about traffic for myself. The Hunsworth Roundabout has already become extremely dangerous. This park and ride will cause more mayhem. | 90006-1344-761 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1442 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | It is possible that the traffic will still increase especially initially but hopefully this will not be too extreme. | 90016-1344-120 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1443 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | It is already a very busy junction so traffic congestion could be experienced | 90017-1344-75 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1446 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | the A38 road cannot cope with more traffic. I do not want more lorries going through the town, we already have lots of accidents. | 90020-1344-514 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|-------------------------|--|--|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1458 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | How will vehicles from this site travel to the Point? They will clog the NDR or the Taunton Road, either way they will meet at the roundabout at the end of the NDR, and will make travel impossible along the A39. | 90032-1344-187 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1463 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Build a northern bypassto consider taking traffic from junction 24 to the site only be a disaster. Even with your traffic improvement plan!!! I fail to see how it will work, it will most certainly create gridlock and to begin any works before any bypass is built will only be a disaster for the local population. | 90037-1344-4 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1466 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | This will not work because this extra traffic produced by EDF still needs to go through Bridgwater and the A39 which will contribute to gridlock. | 90040-1344-4 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1469 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Problem still exists with traffic flow. Welcome route from Junction 24 to Junction 23 although temporary. | 90043-1344-65 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1474 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I believe the improvements will cause a dangerous situation at the top of the sliproad if widened. This is the only crossing point between Huntworth Lane and the Parish of North Petherton and the Agricultural Centre. I strongly oppose the alterations to junction 24. | 90048-1344-63 | | / | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | A detailed assessment is also still awaited of the impact upon the surrounding highway network of the proposed use of the Somerfield site for use as a Park and Ride, Freight Holding Centre and Induction Centre. | 89952-1344-2426 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 1.3 In order to comment on the suitability of the 'Somerfield' site for use as Park and Ride, Freight Holding Centre and Induction Centre during the early part of the Hinkley Point C construction phase, we require an assessment of the impact this will have on the surrounding highway network. This has not yet been provided by EDF and therefore our response is limited to high-level comments and clarification on what information we require. | 89953-1344-818 | / | | | |

| 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 | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 1.4 A significant increase in the size of the J24 Park and Ride and Freight Holding Centre is proposed, in addition to an Induction Centre which was not previously proposed in this area. Clearly, this will have a greater impact on the highway network at M5 J24 and surrounding local roads than previously envisaged, however we are unable to comment on the extent of the impact until the modelling work has been completed by EDF. | 89953-1344-1263 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 2.13 However, in transport terms, the 'Somerfield' site is likely to have greater a transport impact than the previous J24 site, given it is much larger. The proposed use consolidates the "early years" traffic at one site rather than the two park and ride sites that have previously been proposed in the vicinity of the motorway. | 89953-1344-3933 | | | / | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 2.16 Clearly, EDF's revised proposals will have a greater impact on the highway network at M5 J24 and surrounding local roads than previously envisaged. | 89953-1344-4774 | | | / | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | it should be recognised that the local highway network in the vicinity of the site is already extremely congested, in particular A38 Taunton Road and Huntworth Roundabout The impact and mitigation of Hinkley traffic needs to be carefully considered, in consultation with the County Council as local highway authority. | 89953-1344-5039 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Wembdon Parish Council | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>This Parish Councils concerns reflect the assumption that these alterations (reference point D) will allow a greater volume of traffic at this roundabout and accommodate an increased number of HGV's.</p> <p>This is detrimental to our community and disregards the safety of pedestrians and cyclists; and significantly the children having to negotiate this roundabout and feeder roads in order to access their school placements - Haygrove, St. Mary's Primary, St Joseph's Primary - and the play facilities located on Alfoxton Road. A public footpath provides a route for residents in Old Wembdon to this area, for access into the Durleigh district and facilities.</p> <p>With no safe pedestrian facility proposed this is extremely hazardous. We propose a safe crossing facility for all residents to access; appropriate for use by pedestrians, school children, cyclists, mobility scooters, pushchairs and wheelchairs, as the only reliably safe option in the face of additional traffic flow and size / tonnage of vehicle. Furthermore, if alterations at this point were to infringe on our open green spaces either side of the BNDR, this would be a significant loss to the residents and families accessing these vital (and ever diminishing) recreational areas, affecting residents life style and well being within the community.</p> | 89921-1344-4393 | | / | | |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | We are concerned about the proposed relocation of the freight, post consolidation, induction centre and park & ride facilities to the "Sommerfield" site which is accessed from the Huntworth Roundabout. This brings the facility closer to the motorway junction and will increase the possibility of vehicles queuing back to the junction with the risk the mainline being adversely affected. | 89924-1344-788 | | / | | |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | We consider the supporting information to be inadequate as it does not include any evidence or assessment of the highway impacts of the proposed changes. No assessment is made of the impact of the requirement for HGVs using the J24 facility to use the M5 to travel to J23 and then follow HGV Route 1 (as set out in the Stage 2 Update Consultation) nor is there any evidence to demonstrate the need for or the adequacy of proposed improvements to slip roads at M5 J24 (Scheme H) and improvements to M5 J23 (Scheme P). This is very disappointing as we have been working with you and your consultants since 2008 and have made it clear throughout that full and robust assessment of highway impacts arising from this project should be provided with any consultations. | 89924-1344-1644 | / | | | |
| Moto Hospitality Ltd | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | We wish to object to your proposals to use the 'Sommerfield' site and the proposed highway improvements in the vicinity of our MSA and junction 24 of the M5 Motorway in that they could have a detrimental effect on traffic coming to the MSA and returning to the motorway thus decreasing the safety of motorists on the M5 Motorway and in addition prevent expansion capabilities of the MSA in response to increases in traffic on the M5 Motorway and therefore motorists needs. | 89927-1344-1282 | | / | | |
| Royal Mail Group | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - Whilst Royal Mail notes that if this proposed change goes ahead, the loss of Sommerfield traffic may be a benefit, but this change would only impact on the immediate highway network i.e. M5 Junction 24 and the Huntworth Roundabout. | 89928-1344-2088 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Royal Mail Group | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - The proposed use of the Somerfield site in place of the Dawes Farm site would have minimal beneficial impact on the local highway network in Bridgwater. The local routes (i.e. Taunton Road) are not/would not have been used by Somerfield vehicles because a distribution depot is aimed primarily towards the strategic trunk road network (the M5). It is therefore considered that this change would have a negligible benefit on Royal Mail operations. | 89928-1344-2323 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - Proposals for up to 1,375 car parking spaces and 140 HGV holding spaces represents an intensification of use at the 'Somerfield' site and no preliminary transport assessment information has been provided to support the consultation. | 89956-1344-6257 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - Taunton Road / Marsh Lane (Scheme E) - The Brainwave Centre (Personal information removed) are identified as sensitive receptors in this location that could be significantly affected by proposals to provide a link from the 'Somerfield' site to the A38. Provision of a footpath/cycleway link is welcomed and EDFE should demonstrate how this would link to the wider network of cycle paths in Bridgwater. | 89956-1344-13458 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - Huntworth Roundabout (Scheme F) - Should EDFE remain undecided about which Park and Ride / freight management site would be utilised they should consult on the highways and land acquisition implications of both schemes. The Council remains very concerned at the lack of detail on highway improvements at this critical junction, with reference only being made to 'signalisation' and works to improve access to the 'Somerfield' site (see also comments above on accommodation and not prejudicing or compromising other businesses or proposed developments in the locality). | 89956-1344-13862 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - M5 Junction 24 (Scheme H) - Works to the motorway junction southbound slip-road for joining the motorway will require further import of material to create the embankment and will need to be timed to avoid disruption. | 89956-1344-15100 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - There is no Transport Assessment information to support the proposals for the 'Somerfield' site that are expected to represent an intensification of use, particularly with respect to the numbers of car and bus movements. There is also no comparison of the respective strengths and weaknesses of the 'Somerfield' site and alternative to the west of Huntworth roundabout. | 89958-1344-3244 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - Proposals for up to 1,375 car parking spaces and 140 HGV holding spaces represents a significant intensification of use at the 'Somerfield' site and no preliminary transport assessment information has been provided to support the consultation. As identified by the County Council in their response, there is a concern that should there be any difficulties in delivering the Junction 23 facility for any reason, the 'Somerfield' site may continue to be used at full capacity during the peak of construction around 2016. Commitments to a timescale of when each Associated Development site will be available for use may therefore be required. | 89959-1344-14380 | / | | | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - A detailed assessment of the Huntworth Roundabout is required to evaluate its performance and safety. | 89948-1344-1964 | / | | | |
| Bridgwater Town Council | Dual - Statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Of particular concern is the traffic which will be generated onto the M24 junction, especially the entrance roundabout at the A38. This roundabout is notorious for the congestion caused particularly in the summer months by traffic utilising the motorway services. We therefore seek further detail on essential improvements, to the roundabout, the motorway slip road and the plans for an additional access into the 'Somerfield' site. Exactly how this will be provided and the route must be clarified as soon as possible. It is noted that the use of this site will not affect earlier plans for both park and ride and freight transfer to be split between routes through Bridgwater to Hinkley Point via Motorway junctions 23 and 24 and the A38 Bristol Road / NDR and A38 Taunton Road / Broadway. | 90056-1344-1662 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 63102 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I am writing to voice my concern regarding the proposed transport infrastructure at J24 M5. Although, you may feel that having a freight management depot and park and ride will alleviate the problem navigating through Bridgwater during peak time, you haven't considered that all you are doing is spreading the congestion problem over a longer period of the day. | 90063-1344-0 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 63152 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | we the undersigned wish to object in the strongest possible terms only to plan H of this proposal for the following reasons: 1. Your plan appears to remove completely the footpath which links the residents of Huntworth with the main part of their parish which is North Petherton. This footpath is well used by many local residents, members of Bridgwater Tennis Club (sited nearby) and visitors to the area on holiday. Huntworth Lane itself is subject to increased traffic since the opening of Sedgemoor's Auction Centre in North Petherton, thus making the retention of this footpath more vital than ever. 2. I/we cannot see how any such widening of the J24 slip road on to the M5 south has any bearing on assisting the smooth running of freight to Hinkley Point or of shift changes. There might be a case for widening the access slip roads to the J24 roundabout to minimise the risk of traffic "stacking up" on the motorway at peak times, but joining the M5 in either direction has never been a problem, nor is it likely to be. | 90078-1344-196 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 63159 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I/we the undersigned wish to object in the strongest possible terms only to plan H of this proposal for the following reasons: 1. Your plan appears to remove completely the footpath which links the residents of Huntworth with the main part of their parish which is North Petherton. This footpath is well used by many local residents, members of Bridgwater Tennis Club (sited nearby) and visitors to the area on holiday. Huntworth Lane itself is subject to increased traffic since the opening of Sedgemoor's Auction Centre in North Petherton, thus making the retention of this footpath more vital than ever. | 90084-1344-195 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 63173 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I find it somewhat alarming to discover that there is a proposal to widen the southbound slip road from Junction 24 roundabout on to the M5. BUT WHY? | 90086-1344-280 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 63173 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I can only think of a number of reasons why this is not a rational proposal: - 1. The proposed plan seems to completely erase the two footpath links to the A38 i.e. The one which runs from the top of Huntworth Lane, parallel with the motorway to the bridge over the motorway to get to North Petherton, OS grid ref: ST 306333-304332 and the footpath that goes directly over the junction, to connect with the A38 at the roundabout, OS grid ref: ST 306339-305340. Both of which are the only pedestrian links for those of us on the East side of the Motorway. 2. I do not understand how the widening of this particular slip road is going to be of any benefit to anybody, either now, or in the event of any future development of the immediate area. | 90086-1344-436 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 63194 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Has two warehouses on Huntworth site. Happy with the proposed change and thinks it a much better solution, but concerned about traffic on entrance to site, especially Friday afternoons and Saturdays during the summer when the access to the services get snarled. | 90099-1344-0 | | / | | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - Reference is made to the closest residential properties being located on the opposite side of the A38, however, the closest sensitive receptors in this regard are the Huntworth Cottages, located close to the assumed position of a new access link between the Somerfield site and the A38. Sedgemoor District Council would seek to ensure that impacts upon these properties, residents of the adjacent Travelodge hotel and the adjacent Brainwave Centre (that helps children with brain injuries and development problems) are robustly assessed. | 89960-1334-21437 | / | | | |

| 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 summer survey for habitats and other surveys should be completed | 89398-1406-8873 | / | | | At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan. |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Overall, the assessment methodology is considered adequate once gaps in the baseline are dealt with. SDC have commissioned a Green Infrastructure Strategy which is still being completed. The ecological (and Landscape strategy) for the final design and also the approach to legacy issues should draw on this evolving strategy. | 89398-1406-9069 | | | / | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent, instead of the J24-A site. On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail. Comments received from Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council on the Stage 2 Consultation considered the methodology adequate once gaps in baseline data were dealt with. The same methodology has been used for the Somerfield site with a desk study and an extended Phase 1 habitat survey undertaken as the first stage in establishing a robust ecological baseline, in line with the Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management's (IEEM's) Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) guidelines (2006). Further detailed species-specific survey work has been undertaken in 2011 to establish a robust baseline dataset, both to inform the design of the development proposals and to provide a robust basis on which to assess the impacts of the proposed development. Details of the methodology and baseline data are presented in the Chapter 14 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement. |

| 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. | 88830-1409-26395 | / | | | <p>At the Stage 1 consultation, EDF Energy identified three search areas (J24-A, J24-B and J24-C) around Junction 24 of the M5 as potentially suitable for a park and ride facility and a facility for road-borne freight. At the Stage 2 consultation, EDF Energy identified the J24-A search area as its 'preferred site' in the vicinity of M5 Junction 24. The scale of development in this location was refined, increasing the size of the park and ride facility and proposing HGV parking spaces. At the Stage 2 Update consultation, further amendments were made to the 'preferred site' masterplan.</p> <p>Following the Stage 2 Update consultation, EDF Energy became aware that the existing Somerfield storage / distribution site at Junction 24 would be vacated by the current occupier towards the end of 2011. Given that the Somerfield site was a brownfield site, due to become vacant and could come forward earlier than the other proposed associated development sites, EDF Energy consulted on the Somerfield site as a potential alternative to the preferred proposals at Junction 24. Following the outcome of this consultation, EDF Energy took the decision to include the Somerfield site as part of the application for Development Consent, instead of the J24-A site.</p> <p>On this basis, a number of site-specific concerns relating to the development of a park and ride facility and freight management facility on the J24-A site have been addressed through the relocation of the proposals to the Somerfield site. Specific concerns raised by consultees during the Stage 1, Stage 2 and Stage 2 Update consultations associated with the development of the site previously proposed are therefore not addressed in any further detail.</p> <p>Comments were received during Stage 1 and Stage 2 from Natural England, the Environment Agency, Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council, which stated that an Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan should be produced with mitigation incorporated for impacts that can't be designed out</p> <p>As 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 (which are presented in the Chapter 14 of Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement) have been fully addressed in the final design proposals for the Somerfield site, with potential impacts on ecological receptors avoided through design wherever</p> |
| Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 1 | Opportunities should be taken to enhance wildlife habitats and increase public use of the Bridgwater and Taunton Canal that passes to the east of search area J24C. Search area J24C falls within a Local Plan Green Wedge designation. Policy CNE4 encourages positive land management for landscape, amenity and nature conservation in these areas. | 88410-1409-1029 | / | | | |
| Natural England | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | Protected species Surveys for great crested newts and badger are ongoing to be completed in Autumn 2010. The results of these surveys is needed to fully assess impacts but it states that the results will inform the detailed design of the development. Great crested newt habitat is protected so NE will expect an appropriate mitigation strategy. *A licence will be needed if GCN are present. Current Natural England advice is that there should be no net loss in the local population status of the species concerned, taking into account factors such as population size, viability and connectivity. Hence, when it is unavoidable that an activity will affect an EPS population, the mitigation should aim to maintain a population of equivalent status on or near the original site appropriate. | 89115-1409-719 | | | / | |
| 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 Environmental Management & Monitoring Plan (EMMP) should assist in the avoidance of potential impacts from the construction and also for operation (disturbance). The details of the EMMP should be agreed with key consultees. Despite the lack to date of evidence of significant ecological receptors on site, the landscape and ecological plans should aim to maintain and enhance the local environment. Where appropriate the local ecological (green infrastructure) context should inform the proposals on site. There are opportunities to provide an ecological benefit as a lasting legacy from the scheme. Given the current low level of ecological interest on site, even minor improvements will be locally significant. However, at present there is uncertainty relating to the legacy elements being incorporated into the design process. The landscape strategy and planting plans which will provide the ecological mitigation should be established as a firm commitment and with more detailed plans once route is confirmed and designs finalised. | 89398-1409-10657 | / | | | |

| 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 would need to be incorporated for impacts that cannot be designed out late on in the process. | 89429-1409-1398 | | | / | this has been achievable. An Environmental Management and Monitoring Plan (EMMP) has been produced which includes ecological mitigation and habitat management covering the new site. |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | - Mitigation should be provided as a firm commitment once sites baseline is completed. - The landscape and ecological plans should aim to maintain and enhance the local environment, using the local ecological (green infrastructure) context. - At present there is little evidence of legacy elements being incorporated into the design process. | 89429-1409-2217 | | | / | |
| Environment Agency | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Thus If the drainage in the area is to be considered for possible redevelopment it must incorporate the findings of ecological studies in order for the local ecology to be maintained and opportunities for enhancements taken. | 89917-1409-2000 | | / | | |
| Natural England | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | However, we advise that where EDF intends on removing existing habitat, this is quantified and clearly explained/justified - i.e. the type of habitat effected, the likelihood of protected/BAP species being present and the rationale for undertaking/not undertaking protected species surveys (see NE guidance). Furthermore, we encourage EDF to seek, wherever possible, improvement/enhancement of existing habitat (whether effected or not) on land within its control. | 90067-1409-660 | / | | | |

| 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 | Any commitment to monitoring has not been incorporated into the assessment. Our evaluation is that unless significant interest is encountered during the summer 2010 surveys that monitoring required for this site is limited to water quality monitoring during the construction and removal phases. However, the bat assemblage may require monitoring depending on the survey results to ensure that the boundary habitats are used during the operational phase. Depending on design for balancing ponds, amphibian monitoring during migration to and from ponds may be required to assess mortality effects, dependent on survey results. | 89398-1410-14340 | / | | | Proposals for monitoring the impacts of the proposed development are set out in the outline ecology management plan for the Junction 24 site. |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | - Commitment to monitoring has not been incorporated into the assessment. | 89429-1410-2568 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| RAC Foundation | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 1 | Junction 24 Off-site Associated Development (Figure 10.16) 4.1 The A38 between Junction 24 of the M5 and central Bridgwater is already prone to congestion. Traffic backs up from central Bridgwater to the Showground Roundabout in the period round the morning and evening rush hours. Junction 24 is at present designated as the motorway exit for westbound A39 traffic from North and South but for M5 (N) traffic this is a long way round and already questionable route, one probably avoided by many local drivers. The A39 towards Hinkley C beyond The Broadway dual carriageway in central Bridgwater comprises residential streets, unlike the Northern Distributor Road (BNDR - Western Way). | 8776-1342-8146 | | | / | Consultees expressed concerns about the coverage of the baseline analysis, specifically with regards to seasonal changes in the baseline traffic associated with tourism and agriculture. It was agreed with the relevant authorities (Highways Agency, Somerset County Council, Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset District Council) that the appropriate tool to use to assess the traffic impact of the Hinkley Point C (HPC) Project is a Paramics microsimulation model. This model simulates the movement of traffic on a network and gives an indication of factors such as journey times and queues at junctions. |
| Tractivity 696 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Traffic problems already exist at this junction because of motorway services, argos and co-op distribution centres and the Charles Church new housing adding to the vehicle count. | 9456-1342-6251 | | | / | The Paramics Base Model was calibrated against extensive traffic surveys carried out within the selected study area, again agreed in consultation with the authorities. The observed traffic data around Junction 24 was increased based on all known committed developments and alterations to the highway network within the vicinity to create a reference case. Further details of the Paramics model validation are contained in the Transport-Transport Assessment-Methodology response . |
| Tractivity 784 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? AS ABOVE TRAFFIC TO THE NEW VILLAGE OVERWELMS THE CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS THAT NO ONE DOES ANYTHING ABOUT | 9542-1342-6262 | | | / | The baseline analysis undertaken as part of the Transport Assessment included seasonality. Traffic flow data (automatic traffic count data) for April, August and October was reviewed for the key links to determine if there is any seasonal variation in the baseline traffic flows. From the analysis it was considered that there is no seasonality in Bridgwater with traffic flows following a similar temporal profile throughout the year. |
| Tractivity 838 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? But Taunton road into Bridgwater has queues throughout the day | 9596-1342-6732 | | | / | Consultees also raised concerns about the existing highway safety within the vicinity of the M5 Junction 24. |
| Tractivity 862 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The A38 into Bridgwater from J24 is constantly busy and stopped at various times. Not enough thought has gone into updating the road to take extra traffic. A consultation with the local council should be arranged to sort out these problems. | 9620-1342-5333 | / | | | Personal injury accident (PIA) analysis was undertaken as part of the Transport Appraisal. Data was assessed for a five year period (August 2004 to July 2009) for the links within the vicinity of the M5 Junction 24 Associated Development site forming part of the Transport Appraisal. The analysis of the PIAs recorded during the study period indicated that there were no inherent safety issues on the existing network within the vicinity of Junction 24. |
| Tractivity 900 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? The proposed J24 Bridgwater. The investigation into the road facilities is not correct. the roads at the moment have difficulty in coping with the amount of traffic throughout the day, and when the rush hour starts its almost dead stop in town. When the kids are off to school the roads are almost dead stop. When the summer traffic starts the roads are almost dead stop, I can?t see how the extra traffic from the J24 site will not have a serious affect to the traffic flow and as for running though Bridgwater, well, the traffic lights at the A38/A39 are a nightmare at the best of times, and then the next two sets and the negotiating the Minehead road, residential with cars parked would be a nightmare to. The idea of running this route seems to me to be lacking in forethought and will cause upset not only to the residents but be totally inefficient to the construction traffic and the work force trying to get to the work site. | 9658-1342-1931 | | | / | Further PIA analysis was undertaken as part of the Transport Assessment for a five and a half year period from January 2005 to June 2010. Accident data was reviewed for the main links, slip roads and junctions of the M5 motorway between Junction 22 and Junction 25. The analysis concluded that “whilst some sections of the M5 motorway experience |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|--|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 923 | Public | Stage 2 | Have you not seen the current traffic chaos that already exists around J24 and Taunton Road !!!!!!!!!!! | 9681-1342-6495 | | | / | <p>accident rates higher than the national average, the impact of HPC flows on mainline flows will be very small. Therefore it is not considered that any highway safety measures are required as a result of HPC.”</p> <p>Consultees questioned the difference between the baseline traffic associated with the Somerfield distribution centre and the Junction 24 park and ride and freight management facility trip generation.</p> <p>The traffic associated with a park and ride and freight management facility would have different profiles and compositions compared to a distribution centre. The traffic impacts of the proposed facility at Junction 24 are considered within the Transport Assessment and the transport chapter of the Environmental Statement for the Junction 24 Somerfield site.</p> |
| Tractivity 948 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Good as Park and Ride for Bridgwater, but the route through town is already heavily congested. Saturdays in Summer the roundabout is AWFUL with traffic from the motorway to the services and local traffic to the market. Traffic backs up in both directions along the A38 and off the M5 | 9706-1342-5418 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 989 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? NOT BEEN ADEQUATELY THOUGHT ABOUT OR PLANNED. J24 totally unsuitable for park and ride. Roundabout already gridlocked. Taunton Road/Morrisons Crossroads totally unsuitable to take even ONE extra vehicle. Park and ride opposite residential area. Freight turning off A38 will cause havoc! | 9747-1342-1927 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 998 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? Bridgwater Roads from JCT 24 is at full capacity now. Have you even tried to get from JCT24 into Bridgwater on the A38 at any time of day. the roundabout on the A38 just off J24 is gridlocked at rush hours and at weekends the impact of any more vehicles at any time of day would find traffic backing onto the motorway slip roads. I use this roundabout four times a day and find it a problem. | 9756-1342-1923 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 998 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? This site next to private housing in open countryside would not be any good due to poor road network into Bridgwater. The traffic lights next to Morrisons back up to the M5 J24 that is over 1 1/2 miles now at not only rush hour, all over the day. To add more traffic would be a disaster to locals. | 9756-1342-5950 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1035 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Junction already busy | 9793-1342-5538 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1042 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The A38 into Bridgwater is over congested now. The traffic will not move on the road. | 9800-1342-5783 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1065 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The A38 is jammed already. | 9823-1342-6121 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 1079 | Public | Stage 2 | Secondly, what impact will this have on the roundabout currently serving the Stockmoor village development/M5/A38 and services? This roundabout is already heavily congested at peak times (for example 5pm Monday -Friday, weekends throughout the summer due to access to the services) Has this been considered or monitored with regard to the likely impact of further increased traffic on this junction | 9837-1342-6048 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1080 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? this road is already congested especially at peak times with the M5 services, livestock market and wisemans dairy all accessing the road in very close proximity. your transport would have to travel through the town which would put even more pressures on the roads here. transport at off peak times would be noisy through residential areas - why have 2 park and ride facilities when 1 would suffice at J23 with bridge across the hinkley | 9838-1342-6620 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1083 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The Taunton Road from junction 24 to Bridgwater already has the greatest build up of traffic all day long. This will become a night mare | 9841-1342-7417 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1124 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The roads are already at full capacity, a bypass north of Bridgwater is the only acceptable route | 9882-1342-6954 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1145 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Junction 24 is already a bottleneck. I can't see that a park and ride would alleviate this. | 9903-1342-7493 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1147 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Already problems with congestion. | 9905-1342-5739 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1167 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? How do workers get to the park and ride. Where are they living. What is access to park and ride - another set of traffic lights? In the summer the roundabout near to junction gets completely blocked as motorists access the services, it can take half an hour to access the motorway from Petherton. If there are problems on the motorway due to accidents or excess traffic the whole area can become congested. | 9925-1342-7610 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 1174 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? This is a highly congested area already approaching Bridgwater. | 9932-1342-6644 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1175 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Again all of this traffic will pass through Bridgwater. Taunton Road is already congested, throughout the day. Bristol Road also! | 9933-1342-8072 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1200 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The Stockmoor/Huntworth roundabout often gridlocks. This is largely due to the poor access to the motorway services. The new ?facility? near J24/A38 is a good idea but access should be off the Stockmoor road - not the A38. And a new road is needed from there to Cannington. This would be a Southern Bridgwater Bypass. | 9958-1342-5537 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1207 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? I don?t think more green belt land should be buried under concrete. It feels like North Petherton and its environs are rapidly swallowed up by major developments quite inappropriate for the area. We are losing our village. The A38 is already overloaded, especially at Junction 24 - there are no off-peak times for traffic as far as local people are concerned. Even side roads are being used as ?rat runs? now to get to/from Bridgwater. the market and dairy - I know because I live on one. This will only get worse if there are more vehicles/lorries using the proposal facilities at Junction 24. | 9965-1342-5494 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1218 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? TRAFFIC, the roads around this area already gridlocked, especially at holiday times. | 9976-1342-7813 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 62338 | Public | Stage 2 | It is with great concern that I have been told today you propose to include a heavy goods depot in your plan for Stockmoor Village on Junction 24 of the M5. I was also surprised that even though we have lived here for 2 years this is the first that we have heard of it. We knew about the park and ride but were told it had been postponed. There is no way that the roundabout at Stockmoor can accommodate any more cars leave alone heavy goods at peak times and no park and ride is going to make any difference. As it is we get rat-runners shooting through the village trying to avoid the back-up into Bridgwater and with the new school things can only get worse. | 10018-1342-0 | | / | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|--|--------------------|--|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 62456 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Junction 24 traffic will have to negotiate Bridgwater to get to A39. This is at gridlock at times now. Any further traffic will make this worse. | 10080-1342-6753 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 62573 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Comment As before. A39 is a red route. Accidents block the road for hours and there is no alternative route. Grain is transported to stores on H Point Road below Rodway Hill at all hours during summer months. Lots of hold ups. | 10124-1342-7553 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 62574 | Public | Stage 2 | Further more, the suggestion to encourage extra traffic into Bridgwater from the Junction 24 area at North Petherton, is absolutely ludicrous. Total gridlock already exists with traffic entering Bridgwater from North Petherton for much of every day of the week. With the prospect of many more new houses, and more schools to support those houses along the EDF proposed route, it really is impossible to take these EDF proposals seriously! | 10125-1342-3287 | | | / | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | The Bridgwater, Taunton and Wellington Future Transport Strategy identifies the potential for a Park and Ride site to the south of Bridgwater on the A38 transport corridor. The Bridgwater Vision, allocates the A38 as a key public transport corridor and visually improved arterial route. | 89433-1342-1992 | / | | | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | - The EDF Stage 2 consultation documents fail to provide sufficient baseline assessment to demonstrate that the proposals can be developed without impact to the highway network. | 89433-1342-2372 | / | | | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | - The baseline transport situation relating to the Huntworth roundabout is currently unclear. A scheme for the signalisation of the roundabout has not yet been implemented and it is understood that discussions with the relevant authorities are ongoing. - Analysis of the existing situation in and around junction 24 is considered inadequate and fails to recognise the transport complexities of the area. A more comprehensive solution is considered necessary in order to reflect the existing local situation. | 89433-1342-3308 | / | | | |

| 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 the Transport chapter of the Environmental Appraisal the 24 hour link flows are provided at specified locations for both the existing situation and for 2016. The authorities are 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. | 89394-1342-5568 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1393 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | yes I worked for somerfield on that site for 6 years in the transport department and the problems on entering the road from the roundabout and the use of that road with the holiday transport re the services is absolutely awful. | 89968-1342-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1393 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 1. the traffic coming in from the roundabout at the top of the road causes repeated traffic jams on the roundabout obstructing traffic from Bridgwater for motorway and A38 to Taunton,also obstructing traffic into Bridgwater making life even more diffacult for local residents all through the summer months. | 89968-1342-231 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1393 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 2. the road to Somerfield site is lined both sides with Holiday traffic during summer months,people picnicing and walking dogs who when they leave motorway exspecting nice big service station car park realise there is not one, so therefore just park on side of road, if u dont believe me check with police, we use to ring them regulary when services first opened, your park and ride will b somewhere to park. | 89968-1342-541 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1393 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | maybe someone should do some checking over the school holidays and see that I am right. and please remember the M5 is often closed due to accidents and all traffic has to come through Bridgwater if Junction 23 and 24 are involved. | 89968-1342-957 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1400 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Site appears OK, so long as road links by Motorway only. A38 already overloaded. | 89975-1342-4 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1409 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Problem with unction 24 - Taunton Rd into Bridgwater often gridlocked with todays ?normal? traffic. | 89984-1342-167 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1410 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Usage of the A38 and the M5 is a very heavy for morning and evening and school rush hours and requent congestion and accidents on both the routes often cause long delays. Careful timing of the increased traffic is vital. | 89985-1342-157 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--|--|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1413 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Taunton Road (A38) entrance into Bridgwater is already a major problem. | 89988-1342-30 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1414 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | This roundabout and link road to M5 jams up with traffic (as does road to North petherton and Bridgwater). the same access roundabout is dangerous and frightening for pedestrians and cyclists! However all traffic then has to go through Bridgwater. Slow congested roads! Too many bottle-neck junctions = Pollution because of stagnant traffic. | 89989-1342-25 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1432 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | My concerns are the volume of traffic from the M5 J24 through to Bridgwater and out to Cannington. We already have gridlock problems at J24 Huntworth Roundabout with traffic coming off the M5. Plus ones in and out of Huntworth Roundabout and Bridgwater along the A38 (+A39 Junctions) To travel a 4 mile journey AM rush Hr takes approx 45 mins to 60 mins. This is not just weekdays (Rush hour) it is also Saturday - all morning. | 90006-1342-100 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1433 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | There are already very bad delays on the A38 from J24 to traffic light junctions with A39 throughout the day (0800 to 1800) Monday to Friday. it is near impossible on Saturday during Summer months to access J24 because of traffic from motorway accessing the service area. The volume of cars leaving and entering J24 at shift change over time is estimated to be in the region of 1300 cars. The congestion of traffic lights is not going to solve this problem and could create queues on the motorway waiting to come off. | 90007-1342-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1436 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Service Station jams roundabout as too many cars coming off the motorway which impact on North Petherton and Bridgwater traffic. Long tail backs over the summer at weekends whole junctions like a parking lot. | 90010-1342-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1446 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Yes A38 into Bridgwater is one of the busiest roads in Bridgwater and there is always congestion on the road in both directions. I live on Stockmoor Village and both exit from the estate is always busy. We have a problem when there is an accident on the M5. | 90020-1342-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1471 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Junction 24 is already a bottle-neck during peak summer weekends with queues extending right through N. Petherton. Extra traffic will exacerbate the problem. | 90045-1342-4 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 63174 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | There are numerous queues at the RAB from all directions during the summer months as cars, lorries and caravans using the services stop off here and can cause long delays and congestion around the junction and surrounding roads and this is without the added problem of the motorway being shut and traffic going onto other roads. As this is on a surrounding warehouse development, there will be Lorries coming and going all the time to their warehouse units. To add further congestion by adding further freight traffic for hinkley point would make the matter worse. | 90087-1342-290 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 63192 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | The existing road system struggles to cope with current traffic levels let alone any increase, and tinkering with the existing junctions cannot hope to make any material improvement. I regularly drive or cycle into and from Bridgwater (my place of work). On most mornings there is a queue from the roundabout at J 24 into Bridgwater, and in the afternoon the traffic is usually backed up again to the roundabout. In addition on recent Fridays and Saturdays I have queued from the BMW roundabout on the A38 OUT of Bridgwater when the roundabout is blocked by traffic queuing around it. Again on Fridays and Saturdays, the traffic is queuing northbound from well beyond North Petherton due to traffic avoiding the M5 because of heavy traffic volumes, frequent accidents and lane/road closures. The new housing estate on the left of the A38 on Stock Moor has exacerbated these existing problems. | 90097-1342-188 | | | / | |

| 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 | 1.38. J24-A Search Area (Figure 4.11) - Two potential access points have been identified; one from the A38 presumably to join the existing signals at the Regional Rural Business Centre (RRBC) junction and a second via a new distributor road serving Persimmon/Bloor residential development. There are outstanding works required on the A38 roundabout (signalisation) that are likely to be triggered by further development. | 88010-1350-1952 | | | / | At the time of the Stage 1 consultation land around Junction 24 of the M5 motorway had been identified as potentially being suitable for a park and ride (P&R) facility, accommodating up to 350 cars, and a freight consolidation facility. Three sites were reviewed; J24-A, J24-B and J24-C. Following the Stage 1 consultation J24-A was selected as the preferred site location due to its access to the motorway and strategic road network as well as potential legacy options. The Environmental Appraisal provided along with the Stage 2 consultation documents detailed the rationale for discounting the J24-B and J24-C sites. |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 1 | 1.39. J24-B Search Area (Figure 4.12) - This land has previously been considered for a Freight Layover Facility, with the same access location previously considered by SCC. | 88010-1350-2380 | / | | | Following the Stage 2 Update consultation the existing Somerfield distribution site on the Huntworth Business Park became available and EDF Energy consequently considered altering the proposed location for the Junction 24 P&R and freight management facility to this brownfield site from the previously proposed J24-A Greenfield site. A supplementary consultation was held in relation to this revision to the proposals and to describe some proposed highway improvements in and around Bridgwater. |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 1 | 1.40. J24-C Search Area (Figure 4.13) - This land has previously been considered for Use Classes B1 and B8. Access is achievable. | 88010-1350-2560 | / | | | Consultees expressed a number of concerns specific to the previously proposed J24-A site during the Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultation periods which are not considered further as part of this response following the change in site location. Concerns were also expressed by a number of local residents regarding the consultation process at Stage 2 of the consultation. EDF Energy addressed these concerns and carried out additional public events in the locality. |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 1 | 1.41. It is noted that the previously established P&R site to the land northwest of the A38 roundabout is not proposed due to possible early morning disruption on nearby residences. Clarification is sought as to whether these issues have also been considered for all other P&R proposals such as Cannington & Williton and how this has been quantified (4.9.9). | 88010-1350-2697 | | | / | Consultees expressed concerns about the scale of the proposed development and requested further clarification on the justification for the proposed parking provision. The P&R strategy was developed to intercept EDF Energy employees travelling by road at strategically located sites and therefore reduce the impact on the local highway network. Junction 24 was identified as a suitable location from which northbound traffic could be attracted from the M5, as well as intercepting local traffic from the Bridgwater area. A gravity model was used to analyse the anticipated locations of the construction workforce and thus their likely journey patterns. As a result of this analysis Junctions 23 and 24 were considered to be the most appropriate places to locate the larger two P&R facilities due to their proximity to the M5. The methodology used to establish the anticipated demand on the park and ride facilities is covered further within the Transport |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 1 | Detailed traffic impact assessments should be provided (p. 227). | 88030-1350-1393 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 62160 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 1 | We are uniquely situated to be able to cooperate with EDF in satisfying their stated needs for park and ride and freight consolidation uses upon the site | 8753-1350-857 | | | / | <p>Assessment (Annex 4 to the Environmental Statement).</p> <p>It is proposed that prior to the Junction 23 P&R and freight management facility becoming available the Junction 24 'Somerfield' site would provide up to 1,300 parking spaces and up to 140 HGV holding spaces. In addition to this there would be a further 75 parking spaces associated with a temporary induction centre and a temporary consolidation facility for postal/courier deliveries will also be located at this site. Following the completion of the Junction 23 facilities the parking spaces would be reduced to 698 and the HGV holding spaces to 55. The temporary induction centre and consolidation facilities would be moved to the Junction 23 facilities.</p> <p>Consultees requested further detail on the rationale for the site selection following the proposed site location change to the 'Somerfield' site.</p> <p>The 'Somerfield' site has been considered as a preferred option for a number of key reasons. The brownfield nature of the site would enable construction to occur faster and sooner than that of the previously proposed Junction 24 site. Being located on a business park suitable infrastructure is already in place. In comparison to the previous Greenfield proposal, it is in a less prominent location which benefits from mature landscaping and the environmental impacts are reduced.</p> <p>Some consultees felt that insufficient evidence was provided to comment fully on the proposed developments presented prior to this application for development consent.</p> <p>EDF Energy acknowledged that work was ongoing through the stages in order to refine elements of the Transport Strategy following consultation feedback and on-going technical studies following Stage 1. It was ensured that at each stage sufficient information was provided to enable stakeholders to gain an informed understanding of Hinkley Point C (HPC) traffic generation and effects, proposed mitigation and take a view on the validity of the Transport Strategy.</p> <p>Statutory consultees expressed specific concerns about commenting on the proposals prior to the production of a full impact assessment.</p> |
| Tractivity 784 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? AS ABOVE TRAFFIC TO THE NEW VILLAGE OVERWELMS THE CURRENT ARRANGEMENTS THAT NO ONE DOES ANYTHING ABOUT | 9542-1350-6262 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 862 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The A38 into Bridgwater from J24 is constantly busy and stopped at various times. Not enough thought has gone into updating the road to take extra traffic. A consultation with the local council should be arranged to sort out these problems. | 9620-1350-5333 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 912 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Good place | 9670-1350-5358 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 921 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Potentially OK, but again a temporary road from Jnt 23 Dunball to Hinkley C would alleviate so many of the anticipated traffic congestion problems. | 9679-1350-6360 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 924 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The same effect as the freight coming off at juncton 23 | 9682-1350-6236 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 934 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? As before | 9692-1350-6804 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 948 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Good as Park and Ride for Bridgwater, but the route through town is already heavily congested. Saturdays in Summer the roundabout is AWFUL with traffic from the motorway to the services and local traffic to the market. Traffic backs up in both directions along the A38 and off the M5 | 9706-1350-5418 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 950 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Junction 24 has problems with traffic flow at present due to recent building of Cattle Market - Robert Wisemans - Moto Services and large housing development. Traffic is gridlocked through North Petherton A38 as often as it was before the Motorway was built. This is totally the wrong place for a park and ride, etc. | 9708-1350-5514 | | | / | Discussion with the highway authorities has been ongoing throughout the consultation periods up to the submission of this application for development consent, enabling feedback to be given. Consultees queried how the Junction 24 development proposals integrate with the existing walking and cycling routes. A Walking and Cycling Strategy for HPC has been prepared which considers the scope for walking and cycling as a means of transport to and from HPC and the proposed associated developments. The existing conditions were audited and EDF Energy has proposed some improvements in order to facilitate and encourage greater levels of walking and cycling. This is discussed further in the Transport Assessment , which has been submitted with this application for development consent. |
| Tractivity 967 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Not Acceptable Road Structure not suitable | 9725-1350-5382 | | | / | Consultees felt that the residents of Stockmoor Park were not sufficiently consulted about the original proposals for the J24-A site. This matter is addressed within the Transport - Other - Consultation topic response. Consultees requested further information on the proposed legacy option for the proposed development. |
| Tractivity 989 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Havoc at roundabout (services/M5/A38/Stockmoor). havoc on A38 - another set of traffic lights to control freight entrance. Havoc on Taunton Road to Morrison Crossroads - Just phasing these traffic lights differently? WONT DO IT. Disruptive and antisocial for residents of Stockmoor Village, Primary School and School children walking to Blake Secondary School. Noise Pollution, unsocial hours why is this planned right next to and around a residential area? Move it elsewhere or expected Park/Ride/Freight at Junct 23 which is a non residential area. | 9747-1350-5847 | | / | | Following the completion of the HPC construction it is anticipated that the 'Somerfield' site would be available for another commercial purpose from 2022 onwards. |
| Tractivity 1006 | Public | Stage 2 | 10. Any other ideas or comments? Better access to the northern distributor road dfrom this site then from junction 24 of the M5 | 9764-1350-5548 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1013 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The junction cannot cope with the volume of traffic that currently exists due to the service station. It is also a highly populated residential area and out of peak hours would affect the residents with both noise and light pollution. | 9771-1350-7712 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1052 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? As above, good idea. | 9810-1350-6263 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1068 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? This is the incorrect location for this facility and would serve no useful purpose on an all ready overcrowded road network. | 9826-1350-5875 | | / | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1073 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? This development is too close to the houses currently under construction and which will be occupied by the time work commences on HP. See answer to 10 above. | 9831-1350-6891 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1079 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? We would specifically like to comment on the planned junction 24 park and ride and the planning that has occurred in relation to this. Firstly, what is the justification for including an access road from the stockmoor village entrance, what will be done to insure stockmoor village does not become a ?rat run? for those using the park and ride, what will be the impact on the residential area (in particular in such close proximity of the school), what will be the impact environmentally on a residential area where the planning permission has sought to maintain some areas of natural beauty???? All of these questions are unclear in the current documents. Continues in later box. | 9837-1350-1923 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1079 | Public | Stage 2 | Thirdly, the manner in which this consultation has occurred is creating a level of distrust amongst local residents who are investing in a new local development. The manner in which the consultation came to light, the certainty with which the consultation documents have been written do not promote a sense of true consultation but suggest a tick box exercise. Forthly what justification is there that this park and ride facility will be useful after it is required by EDF? Is a park and ride facility in demand for Bridgwater | 9837-1350-6450 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1106 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Would question the need for this with facility proposed in question 10. Spend the money on the dedicated bypass from Junction 23 instead. If EDF wish to give something back to the Community later, then allow for this route to be used for West Somerset tourism at a later date. Is it possible to build a new railway station for Bridgwater at this point? | 9864-1350-6392 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1111 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? see above. taking a route through taunton road, even if the colley lane bridge is built, will cause bad traffic problems. J24 park and ride buses should go north to J23 then over the new bypass. | 9869-1350-6367 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1137 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? greenfield site | 9895-1350-5685 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|---|---|--------------------|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 1156 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Surely a park and ride will continue to be needed for HInkley Point workers once the site is operational? If this does not take place, the traffic in Bridgwater and the A39 will be unsustainable. What is the evidence to support the notion that a park and ride is needed for Bridgwater for non Hinkley Point purposes? | 9914-1350-7495 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1162 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Use of junction 23 should be mandatory. | 9920-1350-5929 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1199 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Good idea | 9957-1350-6193 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1217 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? It still means a large volume of traffic going through Bridgwater. When is ?outside peak periods?? 2 AM? | 9975-1350-7232 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1222 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Due to the existing traffic conditions in peak times | 9980-1350-5343 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 62384 | Public | Stage 2 | The road network around Junction 24 leading to the Taunton Road is often queued right up to the Stockmoor Village roundabout. Does EDF really think that the additional traffic caused by the freight and park & ride facilities can be easily absorbed? Far better to route all this traffic back down the motorway to Junction 23 where it could pick up the new northern Bridgwater bypass. | 10047-1350-6914 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 62588 | Public | Stage 2 | Gerald Ford contacted us regarding the Transport and Logistics Assessments for Junction 24.He has been on the website, but has been unable to find the information he was looking for. | 10139-1350-0 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | -Authorities position May 2010 Bus pick up point closer to A38 Update August 2010 The bus facility is in a central location on the eastern site boundary. Authorities position May 2010 Pedestrian and cycle links through the site should be identified and linkages with the surrounding area made Update August 2010 Routes internally are shown but no connectivity shown. | 89329-1350-0 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| | | | <p>Authorities position May 2010</p> <p>Provision for replacement parking requested</p> <p>Update August 2010</p> <p>No information provided.</p> <p>Authorities position May 2010</p> <p>Provision of 0.5 parking spaces per worker needs to be explained</p> <p>Update August 2010</p> <p>Noted in the Masterplan that due to the constrained nature of the site, parking provision on the basis of 2.5 persons per car is not possible. The focus on bus services is referenced to support this position.</p> <p>Authorities position May 2010</p> <p>Requirement for contribution to Parrett Barrier requested</p> <p>Update August 2010</p> <p>No information available to date.</p> <p>Authorities position May 2010</p> <p>Requested a commitment from EDF Energy to replace the recreational open space in a suitable alternative location</p> <p>Update August 2010</p> <p>No information provided.</p> <p>Authorities position May 2010</p> <p>Suggestion that a shared facility for Bridgwater A and C be considered</p> <p>Update August 2010</p> <p>No proposals made.</p> <p>Authorities position May 2010</p> <p>What facilities will be provided for workers on site?</p> <p>Update August 2010</p> <p>Canteen dining and kitchen with capacity for up to 75 workers (max), WCs, food storage, staff welfare and delivery areas, small kiosk and lounge bar area.</p> <p>Gym with WCs, showers and changing areas.</p> <p>Authorities position May 2010</p> <p>Information about how 10% energy standards and or Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM standards will be achieved</p> <p>Update August 2010</p> <p>No information provided.</p> <p>M5 J23-A, Dunball</p> <p>Authorities position May 2010</p> <p>Suggestions made for a legacy park and ride use including provision of</p> | | | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| | | | <p>HGV over-nighting, PFS, diesel facilities and service area with food facilities Update August 2010</p> <p>Proposed that the land would be used for potentially a park and ride facility to serve Bridgwater, employment generating uses or other appropriate uses in line with Bridgwater Vision. Authorities position May 2010</p> <p>May be an opportunity for a serviced employment site Update August 2010</p> <p>No commitment to a particular use proposed Authorities position May 2010</p> <p>No details on the design of a gateway access from J23 and down the A38 corridor Update August 2010</p> <p>No information provided and suggested that this would be brought forward by another party. The layout has been amended to omit a triangle of land immediately to the West of Dunball Roundabout to enable a permanent development of this nature to be advanced by another party. Authorities position May 2010</p> <p>Internal layout should be re-examined to mitigate landscape impact to provide for landscaping and natural screening and to take account of the ecological value of the site Update August 2010</p> <p>Landscape mitigation design is still ongoing. Authorities position May 2010</p> <p>Need to show how access to Bowerings Mill is to be retained and to identify how utilities connections can be extended to that site Update August 2010</p> <p>It has been noted that the assessment methodology is totally inadequate and no reliance can be placed on the assessment of impacts or their significance. Authorities position May 2010</p> <p>Access need to comply with Highways standards Update August 2010</p> <p>It has been noted that the assessment methodology is totally inadequate and no reliance can be placed on the assessment of impacts or their significance. Authorities position May 2010</p> <p>Need to show principal pedestrian and cycle routes to and through the site should be identified and linkages with the surrounding and proposed pedestrian and cycle network Update August 2010</p> <p>Not provided.</p> | | | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|--|--|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1398 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 1. Does the overall strategy for taking staged Hinkley traffic from the Somerfield site up the M5 to jct 23 and then via the Northern Distributor road to Hinkley meet with the approval of the Highways Agency? | 89973-1350-949 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 2.10 In order to comment on the suitability of the 'Somerfield' site for use as Park and Ride, a Freight Holding Centre and Induction Centre during the early part of the Hinkley Point C construction phase, we require an assessment of the impact this will have on the surrounding highway network. 2.11 This has not yet been provided by EDF and therefore our response is limited to high-level comments and clarification on what information we require for the assessment. | 89953-1350-3249 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | We are unable to comment on the extent of the impact until the modelling work has been completed by EDF | 89953-1350-4927 | / | | | |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | We also note that the consultation includes a red line plan showing proposed improvements to M5 Junction 24. We consider the supporting information to be inadequate as it does not include any evidence or assessment of the highway impacts of the proposed changes | 89924-1350-1532 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 5.3.1 M5 Junction 24 (Scheme H) - Junction 24 of the M5 and the Huntworth Roundabout is identified to be a Strategic Gateway for Bridgwater in the Bridgwater Vision and therefore the design objectives for principle arterial routes will be of particular importance in this location. - The consultation document refers to improving the slip roads, while the red line plan indicates that land would only be required in relation to the southbound slip road for joining the motorway. Without further commentary and transport assessment work, the extent of EDFE proposed interventions and what these will achieve is not clear. | 89961-1350-19585 | / | | | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - EDF's agreement to contribute towards works to Huntworth Roundabout is welcomed, although in order to enable a proper assessment of the proposals clarification is required as to level of contribution and the mechanism for delivery. | 89948-1350-2433 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--|--|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 63194 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Thinks EDF should liaise with Moto to see what improvements to site/ services can be made to alleviate this. | 90099-1350-265 | | | / | |

| 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 construction period for the employee accommodation, it is noted that this is due to commence in 2011. The Agency seeks further clarification as to any potential cumulative impact with the development proposed at J23, J24 and the wider Cannington proposals. | 88860-1345-18194 | | | / | Consultees were concerned about the cumulative impacts associated with additional developments within Bridgwater and phasing of the Hinkley Point C (HPC) Main Site and associated development construction. |
| Tractivity 868 | Public | Stage 2 | 10. Any other ideas or comments? Bridgwater roads are already congested with traffic. 11. At Junction 24 of the M5 we are planning a park and ride facility for workers where they will be transferred to buses. A freight logistics facility is also proposed where freight would be consolidated and sent to Hinkley Point outside peak periods. After construction of the power station is complete, this site could be used to serve Bridgwater as a park and ride facility, employment-generating use or other appropriate land use. What are your views on our plans for the site near Junction 24 of the M5? Box ticked: Unsatisfactory 11. Any other ideas or comments? as question 10 | 9626-1345-5583 | | | / | 'Reference Case' (future year base) traffic models were utilised to establish future year performance of the highway network thereby allowing the impact of 'with-development' scenarios to be assessed. The Reference Case models assumed traffic flows from committed developments (i.e. those with planning permission) and committed highway improvements. The derivation of the 2013, 2016 and 2021 Reference case models are described in the Transport Assessment . The 'with-development' transport models contain the traffic generated by the various stages of construction of the HPC site and associated development as detailed in this application for development consent. This has enabled a full assessment of the cumulative effects of the HPC Project. |
| Tractivity 900 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? The proposed J24 Bridgwater. The investigation into the road facilities is not correct. the roads at the moment have difficulty in coping with the amount of traffic throughout the day, and when the rush hour starts its almost dead stop in town. When the kids are off to school the roads are almost dead stop. When the summer traffic starts the roads are almost dead stop, I can't see how the extra traffic from the J24 site will not have a serious affect to the traffic flow and as for running through Bridgwater, well, the traffic lights at the A38/A39 are a nightmare at the best of times, and then the next two sets and the negotiating the Minehead road, residential with cars parked would be a nightmare to. The idea of running this route seems to me to be lacking in forethought and will cause upset not only to the residents but be totally inefficient to the construction traffic and the work force trying to get to the work site. | 9658-1345-1931 | | | / | The construction programme indicates that only limited construction would be required to transform the existing 'Somerfield' site into the Junction 24 Park & Ride and freight management facility. Junction 24 will be the first of the proposed Park & Ride and Freight Management facilities that would become operational. The assessment of cumulative impacts is detailed within the Environmental Statement (Transport Chapter) . |
| Tractivity 950 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Junction 24 has problems with traffic flow at present due to recent building of Cattle Market - Robert Wisemans - Moto Services and large housing development. Traffic is gridlocked through North Petherton A38 as often as it was before the Motorway was built. This is totally the wrong place for a park and ride, etc. | 9708-1345-5514 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1073 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? This development is too close to the houses currently under construction and which will be occupied by the time work commences on HP. See answer to 10 above. | 9831-1345-6891 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|---|---|--------------------|--|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 340 | 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 must consider the direct route from junction 23. Junction 24 is already stressed due to new housing, livestock market and creamery. | 9028-1345-3971 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 62574 | Public | Stage 2 | Further more, the suggestion to encourage extra traffic into Bridgwater from the Junction 24 area at North Petherton, is absolutely ludicrous. Total gridlock already exists with traffic entering Bridgwater from North Petherton for much of every day of the week. With the prospect of many more new houses, and more schools to support those houses along the EDF proposed route, it really is impossible to take these EDF proposals seriously! | 10125-1345-3287 | | | / | |
| Landowner - Persimmon Homes South West | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | We are intending to oppose this scheme given the effect it will have on our development and the surrounding highways which we have an existing agreement with both Sedgemoor and the County Council to deliver an improved highway scheme. A package we will not deliver if the effect is to enable your scheme to effect the existing property owners who have bought houses on this scheme or affect the ability to complete the development in line with the current approved plans. | 10250-1345-873 | / | | | |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | - The Agency is aware of an existing section 106 agreement to signalise Huntworth roundabout as part of a committed development scheme. Bearing in mind the vast majority of Hinkley related traffic using M5 J24 will route through Huntworth roundabout, the Agency is keen to understand if there will be an impact during the construction phase as a result of the aforementioned highway improvements combined with the proposed development traffic. | 89169-1345-2983 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Authorities position May 2010 The current Huntworth roundabout is at capacity and the South Bridgwater development was restricted to 810 dwellings on the basis of a Highways Agency direction. A scheme for the signalisation of the roundabout has not yet been implemented in breach of the Section 106 agreements with Persimmon and Mead Realisations. In any event, the roundabout improvements would not be adequate to cater for the additional development proposed by EDF. Update August 2010 The previous assessment of access is still relevant and the concerns have not been addressed. | 89329-1345-6608 | | / | | |

| 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 impacts of other developments are addressed, albeit on the basis of the incorrect 24 hour assessment period. | 89394-1345-9714 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 806 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? Junction 24 M5 Traffic flow is not great in this area, particularly at rush hour and seasonal holiday traffic. Further new housing in this area will add to this. Your proposal in my opinion would make this considerable worse. This is illustrated by estate agents devaluing local houses by Â£25,000 on news of your proposal. TRANSPORT NOT ACCOMMODATION | 9564-15-2093 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|---|--|--------------------|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Royal Mail | Statutory Consultee | Stage 1 | By virtue of its location, the Hinckley Point C development will place heavy reliance on the A38 and A39 through Bridgwater (which are already at or close to capacity during some periods) and on Junctions 23 and 24 of the M5 Motorway. Royal Mail Group Ltd relies on the A38/A39 and M5 Junctions 23/24 for the trunking of mail between Mail Centres and for local deliveries / collections of mail. Any substantial added congestion on these key elements of the road network could interfere with Royal Mail Group Ltd's day to day operations. | 8704-1344-1101 | | | / | Many comments from consultees at Stage 2 related to the use of a greenfield site at Huntworth, the recent change to adopt the Somerfield site for J24 facilities addresses the site specific comments. Consultees expressed concerns about the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network and the impacts that the proposed Hinkley Point C (HPC) development could have upon the surrounding area, particularly during peak hours. |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | Stage 1 | The Agency's main concern is the potential impact on the SRN of the two proposed construction worker Park & Ride sites and a freight consolidation centre proposed, which are in close proximity to Junctions 23 and 24 of the M5. | 88860-1344-8388 | | | / | It has been agreed with the authorities (Highways Agency; Somerset County Council; Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset District Council) that the appropriate tool to use to assess the traffic impact of HPC is a Paramics microsimulation model. This model simulates the movement of traffic on a network and gives an indication of journey times and queues at junctions and has been utilised to inform the Transport Assessment submitted with this application for development consent. |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | Stage 1 | The Agency is however, concerned at the locations of J24-B and J24-C which are sited on the eastern side of the M5. This could potentially generate a greater impact on the junction given the need for vehicles to travel across the M5. We await findings from the modelling exercise to ascertain any such impact and will provide further comments when this information becomes available. | 88860-1344-16500 | / | | | The modelled network included within the Paramics model included M5 junctions 23 and 24; the Bridgwater road network and Cannington. |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | Stage 1 | Our response to these sites is consistent with our approach to the sites at Junction 23. The Agency supports the principle of seeking to consolidate trips but seeks reassurance that the impact of such development would not impede the safe and efficient operation on the SRN. | 88880-1344-10041 | | | / | The model was used to test the HPC development traffic impact in comparison to reference case traffic flows (future year traffic flows including committed development and highway improvements) for the assessment years of 2013, 2016 and 2020. From this analysis a package of mitigation measures were developed to ensure that the operation of the highway network would not be compromised. |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 1 | 1.67. The potential adverse impacts of the P&R site on J23 and Dunball roundabout and J24 is noted. | 88030-1344-1293 | | | / | The traffic analysis, detailed within the Transport Assessment , indicates that for 2016 (peak construction) traffic flows would increase on the main routes from Junction 23 and 24 to HPC. Overall, the highway improvement package would increase capacity in Bridgwater and with regards to delay the improvements mitigate the impact of HPC traffic. |
| Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 1 | The rationale for providing a Park and Ride site and consolidation facility at J24 would appear appropriate on the basis that vehicle movements throughout the rest of the highways network in the centre of Bridgwater and to the western parts of Sedgemoor would be reduced. There would also be opportunities for the proposals to contribute towards the achievement of non-car transport infrastructure and public realm proposals set out in the Core Strategy Preferred Options, Bridgwater Vision and Future Transport Strategy. | 88410-1344-1375 | | | / | During the key network peak hours the mitigation measures would lead to an improvement in average speeds according to the results of the statistical analysis. Junction performance was also assessed and it was concluded that there would be no material change in queuing at Junction 24 based on the comparison of the reference case against the with-development case (including mitigation measures). |

| 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 | - A Park & Ride site located to the east of the M5 at J24-B or J24-C would be likely to increase the number of vehicle movements across Junction 24. | 88410-1344-2817 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 62160 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 1 | Our highways experts have already produced evidence that the site is the most suitable in South Bridgwater in terms of accessibility and traffic impact. | 8753-1344-1815 | | / | | |
| RAC Foundation | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 1 | Junction 24 Off-site Associated Development (Figure 10.16) 4.1 The A38 between Junction 24 of the M5 and central Bridgwater is already prone to congestion. Traffic backs up from central Bridgwater to the Showground Roundabout in the period round the morning and evening rush hours. Junction 24 is at present designated as the motorway exit for westbound A39 traffic from North and South but for M5 (N) traffic this is a long way round and already questionable route, one probably avoided by many local drivers. The A39 towards Hinkley C beyond The Broadway dual carriageway in central Bridgwater comprises residential streets, unlike the Northern Distributor Road (BNDR - Western Way). | 8776-1344-8146 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 697 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Will cause traffic chaos, noise and pollution for the residents of the southern edge of Stockmoor Village. Cars will be forced to use the village as a cut through causing dangerous levels of traffic to vulnerable groups such as children from the new primary school and elderly residents from the sheltered housing. Not withstanding ruining a place of natural beauty. | 9457-1344-6485 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 701 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The same comments as No 10. Consider the amount of heavy construction traffic which will use the A39 and then travel DIRECTLY through the centre of the village where pedestrians will be walking to the local shops, surgery and school. It would be an extremely dangerous exercise to undertake. No traffic calming measures could be put in place until all this large machinery is moved. The noise would be intolerable for residents living alongside the village road. | 9461-1344-7860 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 709 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? OK for FL storage but not for P&R. The A39 is already congested from J24 to Bridgwater at the times being considered | 9467-1344-6178 | | / | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 713 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? I am concerned about the noise, pollution, amount of traffic going in and out of this site. The P&R will also change the street scene from coming down the road into the development from being quiet to lots of activity which at the moment is a lovely development. Also the Huntworth Roundabout gets congested when people are trying to access the services at this junction. | 9471-1344-5354 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 714 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Does nothing to solve problem of traffic flow through Bridgwater. Still have to negotiate A38 & A39 route Bridgwater traffic is at best slow, at worst grid locked. This will only add to problem | 9472-1344-7035 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 771 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Again - traffic congestion - Taunton Road is one of the worst! | 9529-1344-5955 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 774 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? This junction is already gridlocked with traffic using the services and the cattle market. Friday afternoons and Saturdays sees traffic at a standstill for hours. You say freight would be sent at off peak hours. What are those? Workers using the Park & Ride will still need to get there thus creating more traffic and more gridlocked hours! | 9532-1344-5326 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 775 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The idea of having nearly a thousand cars extra going to a car park in this area is just ludicrous. It is difficult enough as it is to get through this area as it stands as every morning and evening it is gridlock. Also as a resident of Stockmoor village I would be very dissatisfied to only just have bought a house here that there is going to be construction of this nature as the village area is slowly coming to an end. I purposely moved to this area as it is a quiet out of the way location and a safe area for my children and do not desire having up to a 1000 extra vehicles coming here not to mention the 120 LGVs leaving here during day and night! | 9533-1344-5324 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 776 | Public | Stage 2 | The increased traffic would bring noise and pollution closer to our house. The increased traffic will cause problems at the roundabout junction for A38/M5 motorway, already very busy. The increased traffic will make it more hazardous for children in the area with the new primary school opening soon. | 9534-1344-5551 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 795 | Public | Stage 2 | 2. Any other ideas or comments? Your proposed site at JUNC24 is ludicrous, an additional 3 housing estates have and will continue to add to traffic problems on the A38, and a new school opening on these estates is an additional increase in traffic again without your cars, buses and lorries. | 9553-1344-459 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|--|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 803 | Public | Stage 2 | 4. Any other ideas or comments? The site at stockmoor park is unsuitable and will reduce the value of my home, crime will increase along with noise issues | 9561-1344-1518 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 803 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? The a38 at Junc 24 is already very congested you will only add to this, building a freight terminal in a brand new residential area is stupidity, there is a new school and large vehicles will use the estate as a dumping ground. Again this will have a mayor impact on brand new house prices | 9561-1344-2071 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 803 | Public | Stage 2 | What are your views on our plans for the site near Junction 24 of the M5? Box ticked: Satisfactory 11. Any other ideas or comments? This is now a residential area and it will affect house values and be unsafe for the new school, it is alos already highly congested and it would be made worse | 9561-1344-5776 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 807 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? The Bridgwater South site junction 24, M5, would be totally wrong for a park and ride and freight logistics facilities. It is a rural housing area, with a new school coming to the area. The use of the existing access road which leads onto the estate is totally unacceptable. It will lead to noise pollution, light pollution, criminality at the location. Increased traffic on the local main road network will lead to grid locking of a road already unable to cope with existing and transient holiday traffic. Road safety for residents and school children will be compromised. Value of houses will go down in the area Bridgwater North , junction 23, M5. I support this site due to it already being an industrial area with plenty of existing space to accomodate development, it will not affect the quality of life of residents as would the junction 24 proposal | 9565-1344-2518 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 807 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? This is wholly unacceptable. It is a residential area, it is too close to local housing and residents. The local road system is very busy and will not be able to cope with this increase in traffic. It will affect the quality of life of all people and local wild life within the area. The access road proposed which leads onto the housing estate should not be used as an access route to large industrial vehicles. This would lead to vibration and noise affecting local people and properties , leading to damage to homes and roads and ultimately loss of value to properties. It is also within half a mile from a local primary school. There will be many children and parents within the locality which would put them at risk There would be an increase in light pollution, noise pollution,potential increase in related crime due o the nature of storage of the site, which will all impact on the local population | 9565-1344-7042 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 838 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? But Taunton road into Bridgwater has queues throughout the day | 9596-1344-6732 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 853 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? Residential areas of Bridgwater should not have to suffer the imposition of the park and ride and freight logistics facilities, in particular at J24. The land is a green field site and the additional traffic on both the A38 and on the Stockmoor/Wilstock access road would be unacceptably high. The recommendations of the 1990 Barnes report should be implemented and a bypass built from Dunball to the main site. | 9611-1344-1933 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 853 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Totally unacceptable use of a green field site, too close to a residential development and primary school. Traffic congestion on the A38 and Huntworth roundabout is already a huge problem, most summer weekends it's impossible to leave the estate via the Huntworth roundabout because it is gridlocked. On weekday peak times, the journey time from J24 into the town centre is already 20-30mins, any additional traffic is just going to make that situation worse. | 9611-1344-5914 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 874 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Again traffic problems referred to previously | 9632-1344-7309 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 875 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? BUT: The problem with J24 - traffic is very slow from J24 to bridgwater. | 9633-1344-6291 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 879 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Would cause additional traffic problems on the A38 Taunton Road Bridgwater. | 9637-1344-5843 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 881 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? As q 10 | 9639-1344-6792 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 882 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Am I right to assume that traffic from these facilities will use Taunton Road into Bridgwater then the A39? Total madness! | 9640-1344-5708 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 886 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? As it stands. But put a road across from Dunball | 9644-1344-6165 | | / | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|--|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 889 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? See previous comment of difficulties getting through Bridgwater | 9647-1344-6404 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 942 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? As question 10! | 9700-1344-6787 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 950 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Junction 24 has problems with traffic flow at present due to recent building of Cattle Market - Robert Wisemans - Moto Services and large housing development. Traffic is gridlocked through North Petherton A38 as often as it was before the Motorway was built. This is totally the wrong place for a park and ride, etc. | 9708-1344-5514 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 951 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Road from junction 24 is already overcrowded. | 9709-1344-5975 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 959 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Same comments as for No 10 except even more congestion on the A38 Taunton Road, North Street, Quantock Road, etc. which are all very narrow and already congested. | 9717-1344-7645 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 987 | Public | Stage 2 | <p>1. What are your views on the proposed arrangement and landscaping of the Hinkley Point C site?</p> <p>Box ticked: Don?t know</p> <p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>No comment</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?</p> <p>Box ticked: Satisfactory</p> <p>2. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>No comment</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?</p> <p>Box ticked: Don?t know</p> <p>3. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>No comment</p> | 9745-1344-0 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 987 | Public | Stage 2 | <p>5. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Facilities at J24 are totally wrong. The A38 is a bottleneck at this junction at the present. Lorries and buses adding to the holdups are a big no-no. Has anyone done a traffic survey at weekends and busy times? If there is an accident on the motorway everything comes off at the junction to go through town.</p> | 9745-1344-1929 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 989 | Public | Stage 2 | <p>5. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>NOT BEEN ADEQUATLEY THOUGHT ABOUT OR PLANNED. J24 totally unsuitable for park and ride. Roundabout already gridlocked. Taunton Road/Morrisons Crossroads totally unsuitable to take even ONE extra vehicle. Park and ride opposite residential area. Freight turning off A38 will cause havoc!</p> | 9747-1344-1927 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 989 | Public | Stage 2 | <p>11. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>Havoc at roundabout (services/M5/A38/Stockmoor). havoc on A38 - another set of traffic lights to control freight entrance. Havoc on Taunton Road to Morrison Crossroads - Just ?phasing these traffic lights differently? WONT DO IT. Disruptive and antisocial for residents of Stockmoor Village, Primary School and School children wlaiking to Blake Secondary School. Noise Pollution, unsocial hours why is this planned right next to and around a residential area? Move it elsewhere or expected Park/Ride/Freight at Junct 23 which is a non residential area.</p> | 9747-1344-5847 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--------------------|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 999 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? I live a short distance from J24 and the proposed facilities. I am extremely concerned about the inevitable increase in traffic on M5 and A38 (the only routes out of the housing development where I live). Noise from the facilities and general disruption to my life. I understand that my house value has already decreased as a result of your proposal for J24. Is that just tough? | 9757-1344-6062 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1006 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Will add to traffic congestion in Bridgwater. | 9764-1344-6224 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1013 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The junction cannot cope with the volume of traffic that currently exists due to the service station. It is also a highly populated residential area and out of peak hours would affect the residents with both noise and light pollution. | 9771-1344-7712 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1069 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Direct link needed from the motorway. A stupid idea, the town will be gridlocked. These roads are gridlocked now at peak times. | 9827-1344-6762 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1070 | Public | Stage 2 | the additional bus and freight traffic will only extend the peak periods. | 9828-1344-7579 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1079 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? ...Cont. Secondly, what impact will this have on the roundabout currently serving the Stockmoor village development/M5/A38 and services? This roundabout is already heavily congested at peak times (for example 5pm Monday -Friday, weekends throughout the summer due to access to the services) Has this been considered or monitored with regard to the likely impact of further increased traffic on this junction. Thirdly, the manner in which this consultation has occurred is creating a level of distrust amongst local residents who are investing in a new local development. The manner in which the consultation came to light, the certainty with which the consultation documents have been written do not promote a sense of true consultation but suggest a tick box exercise. Forthly what justification is there that this park and ride facility will be useful after it is required by EDF? Is a park and ride facility in demand for Bridgwater | 9837-1344-6003 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 1080 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? this road is already congested especially at peak times with the M5 services, livestock market and wisemans dairy all accessing the road in very close proximity. your transport would have to travel through the town which would put even more pressures on the roads here. transport at off peak times would be noisy through residential areas - why have 2 park and ride facilities when 1 would suffice at J23 with bridge across the hinkley | 9838-1344-6620 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1083 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The Taunton Road from junction 24 to Bridgwater already has the greatest build up of traffic all day long. This will become a night mare | 9841-1344-7417 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1091 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? J24 as a park and ride would not be necessary if adequate and substantial development occurred at J23. However if this were to go ahead, further transport appraisals need to consider the congestion on Taunton Rd presently and the traffic light sector by Morrisons. Extra HGVs and buses could cause gridlock if left unchanged. | 9849-1344-13046 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1124 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? The roads are already at full capacity, a bypass north of Bridgwater is the only acceptable route | 9882-1344-6954 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1145 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? I cannot see how this would work. Bridgewater is already a bottleneck. the whole area between Junctions 23 and 24 and Hinckley would become gridlocked. | 9903-1344-2682 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1145 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Junction 24 is already a bottleneck. I can't see that a park and ride would alleviate this. | 9903-1344-7493 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1148 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? With Hinkley traffic having to negotiate Bridgwater I can see untold problems such as traffic queues backing up on to the motorway and total grid lock at times. | 9906-1344-8206 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|--|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1167 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? How do workers get to the park and ride. Where are they living. What is access to park and ride - another set of traffic lights? In the summer the roundabout near to junction gets completely blocked as motorists access the services, it can take half an hour to access the motorway from Petherton. If there are problems on the motorway due to accidents or excess traffic the whole area can become congested. | 9925-1344-7610 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1175 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Again all of this traffic will pass through Bridgwater. Taunton Road is already congested, throughout the day. Bristol Road also! | 9933-1344-8072 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1182 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? This IS lunacy. The route from this facility into Bridgwater and along the A39 to site is already a major traffic problem as it is, it requires resolving not compounding. | 9940-1344-7349 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1186 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Wholly unsatisfactory. The route between this site and Hinkley C is already oversubscribed, particularly the section between Junct 24 and Bridgwater. | 9944-1344-7259 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1188 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Will impact greatly on Bridgwater itself. See comment for 9iii | 9946-1344-6657 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1193 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? If you build the northern bridgwater route you wouldn't need this. Have you seen the A38 from North Petherton into Bridgwater - already congested. you will then block Bridgwater from the southside and the northside then. | 9951-1344-6179 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1195 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? As 10. As the transport policy is vague proper consideration is not possible. It would appear however that Bridgwater can expect increased traffic volumes with no improvements. | 9953-1344-9422 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|--|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 1207 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? I don't think more green belt land should be buried under concrete. It feels like North Petherton and its environs are rapidly swallowed up by major developments quite inappropriate for the area. We are losing our village. The A38 is already overloaded, especially at Junction 24 - there are no off-peak times for traffic as far as local people are concerned. Even side roads are being used as 'rat runs' now to get to/from Bridgwater. the market and dairy - I know because I live on one. This will only get worse if there are more vehicles/lorries using the proposal facilities at Junction 24. | 9965-1344-5494 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1215 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? 1) New development right on the doorstep of this proposed P&R 2) This development houses a new primary school. Traffic is cutting through and past the school already to avoid congestion on the A38. 3) Have you ever experienced existing traffic on surrounding roads? 4) Noise, dirt, traffic, effect on house prices, h and safety concerns. Totally unacceptable! | 9973-1344-6090 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1216 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Traffic is again the issue Bridgwater cannot cope with any more. | 9974-1344-6532 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1219 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Too close to the new housing development. Is there scope for this to be closer to other units opposite instead. The route into Bridgwater is too busy as it is and would cause further congestion. | 9977-1344-6514 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1235 | Public | Stage 2 Update | Q7 Do you have any other comments? I think your overall plans are disgusting. The local community hear in bridgwater/north petherton will stop you from building your lorry park and park & ride next to our homes. | 89501-1344-926 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1315 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 Update | DO NOT implement the park and ride facility and freight terminal at Junction 24. This will affect us with regard to house values, congestion, pollution, noise, open country views, shortage of land for food production. Developing green field sites will curtail food production. | 89581-1344-845 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 205 | 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? Yes it would be a good idea J24 M5 | 8911-1344-2990 | | | / | |

| 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 | 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? Yes at Cannington, junction 24 and junction 23 | 9049-1344-2651 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 670 | Public | Stage 1 | 8. What do you think of our proposals for the use of Combwich Wharf? Q8b. Either or both must satisfy planning policy requirements particularly at Junction 24, although both significantly impact on traffic as existing routes into and through Bridgwater are only accessible without Bridgwater north bypass. Most Sensible | 9333-1344-3600 | | | / | |
| Junction 24 Action Group | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 1 | Second, we also believe that our roads simply won't be able to cope with the considerable volumes of cars and trucks that your proposed developments will generate. Roads around J24 are already approaching limits of saturation and safety. | 9370-1344-1726 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 62315 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | Opposed to Jct 24 development as road is right outside his house. Lots of graffiti around neighbourhood opposing development. Worked at HP so not opposed to HPC but does have problem with Jct 24 proposals, particularly FLS because of noise and extra traffic on an already congested Taunton Road | 10002-1344-48 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 62333 | Public | Stage 2 | We moved here due to the location, our property is overlooking the fields and could not ask for a better view. This proposed site would be visible from our house and we are sure there is going to be associated noise and pollution to go along with this. Not to mention harm this will cause to the great deal of wildlife that we see daily, it's their home you will be digging up too! There is also the issue of potential danger to pedestrians taking their children to the new school. | 10015-1344-426 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 62338 | Public | Stage 2 | It is with great concern that I have been told today you propose to include a heavy goods depot in your plan for Stockmoor Village on Junction 24 of the M5. I was also surprised that even though we have lived here for 2 years this is the first that we have heard of it. We knew about the park and ride but were told it had been postponed. There is no way that the roundabout at Stockmoor can accommodate any more cars let alone heavy goods at peak times and no park and ride is going to make any difference. As it is we get rat-runners shooting through the village trying to avoid the back-up into Bridgwater and with the new school things can only get worse. | 10018-1344-0 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 62573 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 2 | 11. Comment As before. A39 is a red route. Accidents block the road for hours and there is no alternative route. Grain is transported to stores on H Point Road below Rodway Hill at all hours during summer months. Lots of hold ups. | 10124-1344-7553 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Tractivity 62578 | Public | Stage 2 | <p>11. At Junction 24 of the M5 we are planning a park and ride facility for workers where they will be transferred to buses. A freight logistics facility is also proposed where freight would be consolidated and sent to Hinkley Point outside peak periods. After construction of the power station is complete, this site could be used to serve Bridgwater as a park and ride facility, employment-generating use or other appropriate land use. What are your views on our plans for the site near Junction 24 of the M5?</p> <p>Why are you taking up more countryside when you have all that land at Hinkley? All this freight and park-and-ride vehicles are all going to have to come through Bridgwater. What about the traffic and the noise and the pollution? Has an assessment actually been done to prove that Bridgwater needs a park and ride facility once you've finished with it?</p> | 10129-1344-11614 | / | | | |
| Cheddar Parish Council | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | <p>The proposed 'Park & Ride' schemes to the north and south of Bridgwater are fundamentally flawed, as anyone who has tried to get through Bridgwater around the peak periods would realise, a bypass would be the only feasible option although this also is rejected by EDF as too expensive, and taking too long to construct. How any emergency situation could be handled either during the construction phase, or when 'on line' is too horrible to imagine, if no bypass is present.</p> | 10222-1344-3137 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| North Petherton Town Council | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | <p>North Petherton Town Council strongly objects to the Park & Ride and freight consolidation facility on the A38.</p> <p>This will impact heavily on the town's communities through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Substantially increased traffic congestion on an already excessively busy road. This will impact heavily on local businesses and local residents. - Make the A38 more dangerous for all local residents, especially children who have to cycle to school on this road. - Shift changeover times co-incide with school movement times adding to congestion on the A38. - Increase noise levels and disruption close to the new villages of Stockmoor and Wilstock <p>NPTC recommend that EDF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pay for a northern by-pass for Bridgwater from Junction 23, via Dunball wharf to Hinkley Point. - That all possible materials and labour be brought in to the area by sea and rail. - That temporary wharf facilities at Hinkley Point would cause the least disruption. - That the freight consolidation centre be located away from residential areas and closer to rail freight yards and wharfing facilities. - That the Park and Ride and Junction 25 could be expanded to provide facilities for workers travelling from - Contribute substantially to local community facilities throughout the district as compensation for the disruption that this construction will bring. | 10227-1344-219 | / | | | |
| Wembdon Parish Council | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | <p>A cornerstone of the EDF transport strategy, to mitigate congestion on the A39, is the provision of park and ride facilities, however, with the vast majority of the labour force now being based in Bridgwater, these facilities will be of little benefit to the flow of traffic on the A39 as the car based travellers from Bridgwater (now the great majority) will, by preference, travel to the Cannington park and ride rather than travel back "out of town" to the Jn23 or Jn24 park and ride facilities, only to travel back through the town again to travel to Hinkley Point.</p> <p>This will have the effect of increasing traffic movements on the A39.</p> | 10236-1344-1448 | | | / | |
| Bloor Homes Ltd | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | <p>2) We are concerned that the overall scale of the proposed facility may have an impact on the free flow of traffic at Junction 24 and the adjoining Huntworth Roundabout.</p> | 10269-1344-2598 | | | / | |

| 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 | <p>3.16 At present there is no contingency plan in place should the SRN junctions 23 or 24 become unavailable, for example, if there is an incident on the circulating carriageway of the junction which blocks the movement of traffic.</p> <p>3.17 There are no junction capacity assessments included within the Transport Appraisal. The Agency requires capacity assessments to be provided within the Transport Assessment in accordance with Circular 02/2007 'Planning and the strategic road network' and the DfT 'Guidance on Transport Assessments'.</p> | 89168-1344-9111 | / | | | |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | Issues are likely to revolve around capacity of the key junctions especially at peak times and the accumulation of slow moving HGVs on the network and their impact on road safety. Until the final trip generation and distribution figures are agreed, the level of impact on the SRN will not be known and therefore appropriate mitigation measures will have to be agreed with the Agency in due course. | 89168-1344-10173 | | | / | |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | - The Agency is aware of an existing section 106 agreement to signalise Huntworth roundabout as part of a committed development scheme. Bearing in mind the vast majority of Hinkley related traffic using M5 J24 will route through Huntworth roundabout, the Agency is keen to understand if there will be an impact during the construction phase as a result of the aforementioned highway improvements combined with the proposed development traffic. | 89169-1344-2983 | | | / | |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | 3.100 The results show that the greatest impact for an increase in modelled NO2 and PM10 concentrations occur in the vicinity of M5 J23 and J24, however, these increases are deemed to be negligible using the ADMS-Roads dispersion modelling software. However, the impact significance has not been determined in accordance with current guidance, Development Control: Planning for Air Quality (2010 Update) published by EPUK in April 2010. The report states that the impact significance will be determined using current guidance when the final EIA is undertaken and ES prepared which will be submitted as part of the DCO. This work must be undertaken and submitted to the Agency to allow a reappraisal of the impact on the SRN. | 89174-1344-1786 | / | | | |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | At present, there is insufficient information provided to enable the Agency to make any constructive comments on these suggestions. Further information is required to demonstrate why the impact cannot be completely resolved through the Transport Strategy and only then why highways works are suggested. | 89174-1344-5034 | / | | | |

| 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 | - Detail to provide justification for the scale of the site and the number of spaces proposed would be welcomed. | 89203-1344-6390 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | 2.34 At M5 J24, we are concerned that the access to the P&R is restrictive in length and has the potential to create queuing onto Huntworth Roundabout and also further back towards the M5 J24, especially during early mornings and early afternoons when the development peak traffic is likely to conflict with market traffic associated with the nearby Regional Rural Business Centre. It should be noted that the access to the J24 P&R from Stockmoor Village access road does not currently form adopted highway. | 89222-1344-12045 | | | / | |
| Bridgwater Town Council | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | Park and Ride schemes are not a solution in provincial market towns, and this has been proven in numerous studies. | 89263-1344-10809 | | / | | |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | In addition to the potential landscape impact referred to above development east of the M5 will result in a number of practical difficulties. In essence development at either J24-B or J24-C will result in a freestanding element of development detached from the urban area. Providing utilities infrastructure as well as safe and accessible pedestrian and cycle routes will be problematic and is unlikely to encourage users of the development to consider modes of transport other than the private motor vehicle. On the basis of the above we consider that Search Areas J24-B and J24-C should be disregarded. | 89435-1344-2294 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | Authorities position May 2010 It is not clear why two accesses are required for the site, one from the A38 and one from the spine road for the residential development. The access from the A38 in particular could lead to further congestion in the area and may raise safety issues with HGVs turning onto and from the A38. Update August 2010 Again, the same concern is raised by the authorities. | 89329-1344-7202 | | | / | |

| 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 not clear why two accesses are required for the site, one from the A38 and one from the spine road for the residential development. The access from the A38 in particular could lead to further congestion in the area and may raise safety issues with HGVs turning onto and from the A38. Heavy use of the alternative access from the road serving residential areas raises concerns about residential amenity. | 89393-1344-18927 | / | | | |
| 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. However, any assessment of significance is meaningless because of the fundamental flaws in the methodology. In addition, the 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. | 89394-1344-8565 | / | | | |
| 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. 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. | 89394-1344-9185 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | Stage 2 | No capacity assessment is provided therefore no assessment of residual effects can be made. | 89394-1344-9590 | / | | | |
| Highways Agency | statutory consultee | Stage 2 Update | 2.8 The Associated Development Construction document indicates that construction of the facilities at M5 Junction 23 and Junction 24 will occur at the same time. EDF Energy will need to demonstrate to the Agency that the construction of these facilities in parallel will not cause detrimental impact to the SRN. Detailed negotiations will be required with the Agency along with the agreement of appropriate traffic management schemes to ensure the safety and free-flow of traffic on the SRN is not affected by the construction proposals. Furthermore, EDF Energy will need to liaise with the Agency to agree the timing of the construction works at Junction 23 and Junction 24 for the Associated Development sites to ensure that these works do not conflict with other Agency and third party highway works on the SRN. | 89837-1344-5534 | | | / | |

| 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 | 2.110 The proposed layout conflicts with emerging County Council aspirations for capacity improvements at J24, and with the live planning application currently under consideration by Sedgemoor District Council. | 89848-1326-0 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 717 | Public | Stage 2 | 4. Any other ideas or comments? I am concerned that the P&R facility at J24 and the freight logistics facility will severely impact on the traffic along Taunton Rd. I am concerned that the movement of freight will mean greater parking restrictions and consequent pressure on local side streets, which are already suffering and have a high parking density. There will be an increase in traffic noise and exhaust pollution. I appreciate that there will be a P&R facility, but am not convinced that this will be fully used unless there are restriction to parking placed at the Hinkley site | 9475-22-1490 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 801 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? I believe that the roundabout connecting the A38, stockmoor village and the road adjoining to the motorway is already to busy due to the high volume of traffic using the services, and that the park and ride traffic and freight facility would cause gridlock. I would be in support of a similar facility on the other side of the motorway roundabout, allowing the same service for EDF, without the same potential traffic problems. | 9559-41-1931 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 801 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? at the moment the traffic situation on the a38 roundabout is not capable of supporting the addition of this facility due to the high use of the services and Taunton road. I would support this proposal on the other side of the motorway roundabout however. | 9559-41-5999 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 998 | Public | Stage 2 | 13. Please let us have your overall views on our proposals and any other general comments in the bo/ below The use of J24 M5 would not be good for Bridgwater on North Petherton residents. J23 using the new minehead link road would take it away from Bridgwater. | 9756-41-6631 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1388 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | By using the Somerfield site will also keep all industry to the east of the A38. This is a good idea ,as, although traffic flow will be higher, it will not have a huge impact ,as it will just replace the previous traffic flow of Somerfield vehicles. | 89965-1344-465 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1395 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | There would need to be improvements to the roundabout system and the A38 into Bridgwater as traffic can be extremely heavy at peak time and weekends in the summer. | 89970-1344-435 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|-----------------|--|---|----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1399 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | EDF still does not get it, The traffic problems at Junction 24 needs to be addressed first. Any extra traffic coming on to the roundabout will just make congestion worse. | 89974-1344-4 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1411 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | It will cause allout chaos in Bridgwater especially Taunton road where I live | 89986-1344-4 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1420 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Changing from the Greenfield Site to the Somerfield site at J 24 will cause as much congestion if not more on the services R/about. I would like to see a road built alongside the M5 to link up with J 23. | 89995-1344-4 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1427 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Prefer this option but am concerned that this will still have a significant impact on people living in N Petherton attempting to join the M5 or go to Bridgwater. | 90001-1344-4 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1429 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | The new site at Somerfields is better being a brownfield site but you will still not be able to move vehicles up the A38 towards Bridgwater as it will be too congested and will be completely solid with traffic | 90003-1344-97 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1430 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | BUT I still maintain that Junction 24 is the wrong place for your depot as it will still cause disastrous traffic problems through Bridgwater. As far as i am concerned the only acceptable site is at Junction 23 or near Hinkley Point itself and all your traffic should be routed along the northern bypass as originally suggested many years ago. nothing else will do!!! | 90004-1344-370 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1432 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Mainly its all about traffic for myself. The Hunsworth Roundabout has already become extremely dangerous. This park and ride will cause more mayhem. | 90006-1344-761 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1442 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | It is possible that the traffic will still increase especially initially but hopefully this will not be too extreme. | 90016-1344-120 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1443 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | It is already a very busy junction so traffic congestion could be experienced | 90017-1344-75 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1446 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | the A38 road cannot cope with more traffic. I do not want more lorries going through the town, we already have lots of accidents. | 90020-1344-514 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|-------------------------|--|--|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1458 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | How will vehicles from this site travel to the Point? They will clog the NDR or the Taunton Road, either way they will meet at the roundabout at the end of the NDR, and will make travel impossible along the A39. | 90032-1344-187 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1463 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Build a northern bypassto consider taking traffic from junction 24 to the site only be a disaster. Even with your traffic improvement plan!!! I fail to see how it will work, it will most certainly create gridlock and to begin any works before any bypass is built will only be a disaster for the local population. | 90037-1344-4 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1466 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | This will not work because this extra traffic produced by EDF still needs to go through Bridgwater and the A39 which will contribute to gridlock. | 90040-1344-4 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1469 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Problem still exists with traffic flow. Welcome route from Junction 24 to Junction 23 although temporary. | 90043-1344-65 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1474 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I believe the improvements will cause a dangerous situation at the top of the sliproad if widened. This is the only crossing point between Huntworth Lane and the Parish of North Petherton and the Agricultural Centre. I strongly oppose the alterations to junction 24. | 90048-1344-63 | | / | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | A detailed assessment is also still awaited of the impact upon the surrounding highway network of the proposed use of the Somerfield site for use as a Park and Ride, Freight Holding Centre and Induction Centre. | 89952-1344-2426 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 1.3 In order to comment on the suitability of the 'Somerfield' site for use as Park and Ride, Freight Holding Centre and Induction Centre during the early part of the Hinkley Point C construction phase, we require an assessment of the impact this will have on the surrounding highway network. This has not yet been provided by EDF and therefore our response is limited to high-level comments and clarification on what information we require. | 89953-1344-818 | / | | | |

| 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 | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 1.4 A significant increase in the size of the J24 Park and Ride and Freight Holding Centre is proposed, in addition to an Induction Centre which was not previous proposed in this area. Clearly, this will have a greater impact on the highway network at M5 J24 and surrounding local roads than previously envisaged, however we are unable to comment on the extent of the impact until the modelling work has been completed by EDF. | 89953-1344-1263 | / | | | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 2.13 However, in transport terms, the 'Somerfield' site is likely to have greater a transport impact than the previous J24 site, given it is much larger. The proposed use consolidates the "early years" traffic at one site rather than the two park and ride sites that have previously been proposed in the vicinity of the motorway. | 89953-1344-3933 | | | / | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 2.16 Clearly, EDF's revised proposals will have a greater impact on the highway network at M5 J24 and surrounding local roads than previously envisaged. | 89953-1344-4774 | | | / | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | it should be recognised that the local highway network in the vicinity of the site is already extremely congested, in particular A38 Taunton Road and Huntworth Roundabout The impact and mitigation of Hinkley traffic needs to be carefully considered, in consultation with the County Council as local highway authority. | 89953-1344-5039 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Wembdon Parish Council | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>This Parish Councils concerns reflect the assumption that these alterations (reference point D) will allow a greater volume of traffic at this roundabout and accommodate an increased number of HGV's.</p> <p>This is detrimental to our community and disregards the safety of pedestrians and cyclists; and significantly the children having to negotiate this roundabout and feeder roads in order to access their school placements - Haygrove, St. Mary's Primary, St Joseph's Primary - and the play facilities located on Alfoxton Road. A public footpath provides a route for residents in Old Wembdon to this area, for access into the Durleigh district and facilities.</p> <p>With no safe pedestrian facility proposed this is extremely hazardous. We propose a safe crossing facility for all residents to access; appropriate for use by pedestrians, school children, cyclists, mobility scooters, pushchairs and wheelchairs, as the only reliably safe option in the face of additional traffic flow and size / tonnage of vehicle. Furthermore, if alterations at this point were to infringe on our open green spaces either side of the BNDR, this would be a significant loss to the residents and families accessing these vital (and ever diminishing) recreational areas, affecting residents life style and well being within the community.</p> | 89921-1344-4393 | | / | | |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | We are concerned about the proposed relocation of the freight, post consolidation, induction centre and park & ride facilities to the "Sommerfield" site which is accessed from the Huntworth Roundabout. This brings the facility closer to the motorway junction and will increase the possibility of vehicles queuing back to the junction with the risk the mainline being adversely affected. | 89924-1344-788 | | / | | |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | We consider the supporting information to be inadequate as it does not include any evidence or assessment of the highway impacts of the proposed changes. No assessment is made of the impact of the requirement for HGVs using the J24 facility to use the M5 to travel to J23 and then follow HGV Route 1 (as set out in the Stage 2 Update Consultation) nor is there any evidence to demonstrate the need for or the adequacy of proposed improvements to slip roads at M5 J24 (Scheme H) and improvements to M5 J23 (Scheme P). This is very disappointing as we have been working with you and your consultants since 2008 and have made it clear throughout that full and robust assessment of highway impacts arising from this project should be provided with any consultations. | 89924-1344-1644 | / | | | |
| Moto Hospitality Ltd | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | We wish to object to your proposals to use the 'Sommerfield' site and the proposed highway improvements in the vicinity of our MSA and junction 24 of the M5 Motorway in that they could have a detrimental effect on traffic coming to the MSA and returning to the motorway thus decreasing the safety of motorists on the M5 Motorway and in addition prevent expansion capabilities of the MSA in response to increases in traffic on the M5 Motorway and therefore motorists needs. | 89927-1344-1282 | | / | | |
| Royal Mail Group | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - Whilst Royal Mail notes that if this proposed change goes ahead, the loss of Sommerfield traffic may be a benefit, but this change would only impact on the immediate highway network i.e. M5 Junction 24 and the Huntworth Roundabout. | 89928-1344-2088 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Royal Mail Group | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - The proposed use of the Somerfield site in place of the Dawes Farm site would have minimal beneficial impact on the local highway network in Bridgwater. The local routes (i.e. Taunton Road) are not/would not have been used by Somerfield vehicles because a distribution depot is aimed primarily towards the strategic trunk road network (the M5). It is therefore considered that this change would have a negligible benefit on Royal Mail operations. | 89928-1344-2323 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - Proposals for up to 1,375 car parking spaces and 140 HGV holding spaces represents an intensification of use at the 'Somerfield' site and no preliminary transport assessment information has been provided to support the consultation. | 89956-1344-6257 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - Taunton Road / Marsh Lane (Scheme E) - The Brainwave Centre (Personal information removed) are identified as sensitive receptors in this location that could be significantly affected by proposals to provide a link from the 'Somerfield' site to the A38. Provision of a footpath/cycleway link is welcomed and EDFE should demonstrate how this would link to the wider network of cycle paths in Bridgwater. | 89956-1344-13458 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - Huntworth Roundabout (Scheme F) - Should EDFE remain undecided about which Park and Ride / freight management site would be utilised they should consult on the highways and land acquisition implications of both schemes. The Council remains very concerned at the lack of detail on highway improvements at this critical junction, with reference only being made to 'signalisation' and works to improve access to the 'Somerfield' site (see also comments above on accommodation and not prejudicing or compromising other businesses or proposed developments in the locality). | 89956-1344-13862 | / | | | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - M5 Junction 24 (Scheme H) - Works to the motorway junction southbound slip-road for joining the motorway will require further import of material to create the embankment and will need to be timed to avoid disruption. | 89956-1344-15100 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - There is no Transport Assessment information to support the proposals for the 'Somerfield' site that are expected to represent an intensification of use, particularly with respect to the numbers of car and bus movements. There is also no comparison of the respective strengths and weaknesses of the 'Somerfield' site and alternative to the west of Huntworth roundabout. | 89958-1344-3244 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - Proposals for up to 1,375 car parking spaces and 140 HGV holding spaces represents a significant intensification of use at the 'Somerfield' site and no preliminary transport assessment information has been provided to support the consultation. As identified by the County Council in their response, there is a concern that should there be any difficulties in delivering the Junction 23 facility for any reason, the 'Somerfield' site may continue to be used at full capacity during the peak of construction around 2016. Commitments to a timescale of when each Associated Development site will be available for use may therefore be required. | 89959-1344-14380 | / | | | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - A detailed assessment of the Huntworth Roundabout is required to evaluate its performance and safety. | 89948-1344-1964 | / | | | |
| Bridgwater Town Council | Dual - Statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Of particular concern is the traffic which will be generated onto the M24 junction, especially the entrance roundabout at the A38. This roundabout is notorious for the congestion caused particularly in the summer months by traffic utilising the motorway services. We therefore seek further detail on essential improvements, to the roundabout, the motorway slip road and the plans for an additional access into the 'Somerfield' site. Exactly how this will be provided and the route must be clarified as soon as possible. It is noted that the use of this site will not affect earlier plans for both park and ride and freight transfer to be split between routes through Bridgwater to Hinkley Point via Motorway junctions 23 and 24 and the A38 Bristol Road / NDR and A38 Taunton Road / Broadway. | 90056-1344-1662 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 63102 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I am writing to voice my concern regarding the proposed transport infrastructure at J24 M5. Although, you may feel that having a freight management depot and park and ride will alleviate the problem navigating through Bridgwater during peak time, you haven't considered that all you are doing is spreading the congestion problem over a longer period of the day. | 90063-1344-0 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 63152 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | we the undersigned wish to object in the strongest possible terms only to plan H of this proposal for the following reasons: 1. Your plan appears to remove completely the footpath which links the residents of Huntworth with the main part of their parish which is North Petherton. This footpath is well used by many local residents, members of Bridgwater Tennis Club (sited nearby) and visitors to the area on holiday. Huntworth Lane itself is subject to increased traffic since the opening of Sedgemoor's Auction Centre in North Petherton, thus making the retention of this footpath more vital than ever. 2. I/we cannot see how any such widening of the J24 slip road on to the M5 south has any bearing on assisting the smooth running of freight to Hinkley Point or of shift changes. There might be a case for widening the access slip roads to the J24 roundabout to minimise the risk of traffic "stacking up" on the motorway at peak times, but joining the M5 in either direction has never been a problem, nor is it likely to be. | 90078-1344-196 | | | / | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|--|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 63159 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I/we the undersigned wish to object in the strongest possible terms only to plan H of this proposal for the following reasons: 1. Your plan appears to remove completely the footpath which links the residents of Huntworth with the main part of their parish which is North Petherton. This footpath is well used by many local residents, members of Bridgwater Tennis Club (sited nearby) and visitors to the area on holiday. Huntworth Lane itself is subject to increased traffic since the opening of Sedgemoor's Auction Centre in North Petherton, thus making the retention of this footpath more vital than ever. | 90084-1344-195 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 63173 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I find it somewhat alarming to discover that there is a proposal to widen the southbound slip road from Junction 24 roundabout on to the M5. BUT WHY? | 90086-1344-280 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 63173 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | I can only think of a number of reasons why this is not a rational proposal: - 1. The proposed plan seems to completely erase the two footpath links to the A38 i.e. The one which runs from the top of Huntworth Lane, parallel with the motorway to the bridge over the motorway to get to North Petherton, OS grid ref: ST 306333-304332 and the footpath that goes directly over the junction, to connect with the A38 at the roundabout, OS grid ref: ST 306339-305340. Both of which are the only pedestrian links for those of us on the East side of the Motorway. 2. I do not understand how the widening of this particular slip road is going to be of any benefit to anybody, either now, or in the event of any future development of the immediate area. | 90086-1344-436 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 63194 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Has two warehouses on Huntworth site. Happy with the proposed change and thinks it a much better solution, but concerned about traffic on entrance to site, especially Friday afternoons and Saturdays during the summer when the access to the services get snarled. | 90099-1344-0 | | / | | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - Reference is made to the closest residential properties being located on the opposite side of the A38, however, the closest sensitive receptors in this regard are the Huntworth Cottages, located close to the assumed position of a new access link between the Somerfield site and the A38. Sedgemoor District Council would seek to ensure that impacts upon these properties, residents of the adjacent Travelodge hotel and the adjacent Brainwave Centre (that helps children with brain injuries and development problems) are robustly assessed. | 89960-1334-21437 | / | | | |

| 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 | The Agency notes the three options at J24 (A, B and C) and acknowledges that none of these options were included in the previous list of options presented to the Agency in July 2009. Furthermore, no evidence has been provided to support or justify why these sites have been chosen and how the developments may impact upon the SRN. Without the necessary evidence base the Agency is unable to make any informed or detailed comments. However, our response to the two options remains consistent with our comments provided to the J23 options above. | 88860-1343-15953 | / | | | Consultees expressed concerns in regard to the methodology used to assess the impacts of the Hinkley Point C (HPC) development as detailed at the Stage 2 consultation. The assessment detailed within the Transport Appraisal and Environmental Appraisal that was submitted at the Stage 2 consultation was undertaken on a daily (24 hour) basis using Annual Average Weekday Traffic flows (AAWT). This was considered suitable for analysis at a strategic level in order to identify key infrastructure interventions which may be required. At the Stage 2 consultation it was stated that further analysis of the hourly flows would be ongoing in order to further identify more detailed mitigation measures that would be required within the study area. |
| RAC Foundation | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 1 | 4.1.1 We suggest that the results of the baseline traffic flow studies are compared with observation and experience of road conditions (3.10.13 of the Assessment). | 8776-1343-8837 | / | | | |
| Landowner - Persimmon Homes South West | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | I am yet to understand how such a proposal without our knowledge or input especially when it seeks to utilise our highway as part of the access has been able to develop. I would be interested in your comments on that specific item as I am somewhat interested in how the land delivery has been secured. | 10250-1343-568 | | | / | The Transport Assessment which has been submitted with this application for development consent confirms that extensive discussions took place with the highway authorities on the method in which the impact of HPC on the highway network should be assessed. The criteria to be assessed (such as journey times on specific routes, queuing at junctions and overall network statistics) were agreed. The information is presented for the network peak periods as well as for the entire modelled period. This detailed traffic analysis has also informed the Junction 24 Volume 9 of the Environmental Statement . |
| Bloor Homes Ltd | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | 1) We are not clear that you have investigated the impact of these proposals on J24 Huntworth Roundabout and identified any appropriate mitigation measures. | 10269-1343-2440 | | | / | Consultees requested further clarity on the assessment of receptor sensitivity specific to Junction 24. Sensitivity criteria has been established following the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) Guidelines. A desktop exercise augmented by a number of site visits has been undertaken to identify the sensitive receptors in the study area. All road links within the study area have been assessed and assigned sensitivity. Recognising the quantity of road links within the study area, for ease of review, the assessment narratives have focused on the road links that will lead to highest impact. |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | It is stated that HGV freight will be channelled through one of the logistic facilities at M5 J23 or J24. It is assumed that 75% of freight HGVs will enter the model from M5 north (zone 20) and 25% from M5 south (zone 25). This traffic will then be split 65% to J23 facility and 35% to the J24 facility and then from the facility it will travel on to HPC. It is not clear whether these HGVs will stop at a logistics facility on the return leg of their journey (however, from the matrices it appears that this is the case). | 89236-1343-5060 | / | | | Consultees queried the methodology used to establish the freight distribution to and between the Junction 23 and Junction 24 freight management facilities. It was not possible to identify the source of the |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | - Bridgwater Gateway Ltd also question the robustness of data presented by EDF which lacks clarity on the modeling methodology applied and a lack of assessment of the transport impacts at all stages of the project. | 89433-1343-3822 | / | | | |
| NHS Somerset Primary Care Trust | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | 4.14 We are concerned that the potential for walking and cycling, in particular to park and ride sites, but also on the minor roads appears to have been largely dismissed. | 89460-1343-7373 | | | / | |

| 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 | Authorities position May 2010 Existing and proposed site levels should be provided Update August 2010 Levels have been provided, however residents have queried the accuracy of the information presented. | 89329-1343-6393 | | | / | <p>materials or the suppliers as contracts were not being awarded prior to the submission of this application for development consent. The HGVs have been distributed based on an assumption that 75% will be coming from the north towards Junction 23 and 25% from the south towards Junction 24. This assumption reflects views of the likely origin of the majority of road freight movements to the site. Of the 75% heading towards Junction 23 from the north, 15% have been diverted to the Junction 24 freight management centre via the M5. The total proportion of HGVs at each freight management centre would therefore be 60% at Junction 23 and 40% at Junction 24 in 2016.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment and Freight Management Strategy provide further detail on the purpose of the freight management facilities, the selection of the HGV routes and trip generation analysis.</p> <p>Consultees requested that road safety audits be undertaken. Independent safety audits have been carried out in preparing the application for development consent. The Transport Assessment contains a section on highway safety.</p> |
| 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. 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 could apply to the J24 site. | 89394-1343-6559 | | | / | |
| 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. At Junction 24 the A38 Huntworth Roundabout and M5 Junction 24 are both assessed as "moderate" in terms of receptor sensitivity, though on what basis is not stated. | 89394-1343-7100 | / | | | |
| 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. Assessment is based on 24 hour flows with no development peak or highway peak hour modelling. The IEMA Guidance specifically refers to assessment of the hours of greatest traffic change being required. This will particularly apply to the early morning and late evening periods. Alternatives around J24 have been considered but ruled out. In transport terms their rejection is not based on a quantified assessment of traffic impacts. In summary, the assessment methodology is totally inadequate and no reliance can be placed on the assessment of impacts or their significance. | 89394-1343-7385 | / | | | |
| 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 a number of design issues relating to the chosen site: No capacity calculations are provided for the adequacy of the site access junctions. Given the temporary nature of the car park consideration should be given to the use of porous granular materials for the car parking stalls. This will reduce the carbon footprint of the development and aid drainage and re-instatement. | 89394-1343-8148 | / | | | |

| 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 impacts is poor, with only 24 hour flows being presented. This means that highway and environmental impacts cannot be correctly assessed | 89428-1343-13592 | | | / | |
| Highways Agency | statutory consultee | Stage 2 Update | 2.7 Plans for the design of the Associated Development sites at M5 Junction 23 and Junction 24 are provided in the Draft Overview of Associated Development Construction document also forming part of the consultation. The plans provided are too small for the Agency to provide any comments in relation to design and as such we request 1:500 scaled plans to be issued to us in order that we can provide some feedback. The Agency also requests the Associated Development sites at Junction 23 and Junction 24 are included in the PARAMICS modelling work to be undertaken so that the Agency might have confidence that the design of the sites and associated traffic movements will not impact on the adjacent SRN network. | 89837-1343-4817 | | | / | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 2.19 EDF's consultation document states that two HGV routes from the J24 facility to the Hinkley Point C site are proposed; one along the M5 motorway and through Bridgwater from the north (route 1) and the other along Taunton Road through Bridgwater from the south (route 2). Route 1 is significantly longer than Route 2 and traverses both motorway junctions and whereas Route 2 is shorter, avoids the motorway junctions but impacts upon other busy junctions within Bridgwater such as A38 Taunton Road / A39 Broadway junction. A decision on the split of HGV routes should be based on modelling results, to ensure delays on the highway network, both local and strategic, are minimised at all times. | 89953-1343-6278 | / | | | |

| 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 | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>Information Requirements</p> <p>2.20 We request that the scope of the 'early years' transport assessment, which we understand will occur around 2013/2014, be established and agreed with the County Council.</p> <p>2.21 We formally request that the assessment includes the following key items (without prejudice to further requests for clarification):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clear statement on proposed 'early years' strategy, including timeline showing the number of workers and proposed level of infrastructure in place during each quarter throughout the construction period; - Assessment years and time periods; - Trip generation methodology and assumptions; and <p>Trip distribution methodology and assumptions, including gravity model; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clarity and evidence to support preferred transport strategy including the routing for buses and HGVs (i.e. to be based on modelling results). <p>2.22 We request an 'early years' assessment scope, followed by the full assessment, to be prepared and issued to us for agreement, as a matter of urgency.</p> | 89953-1343-6979 | / | | | |
| Highways Agency | Statutory Consultee | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | nor is there any evidence to demonstrate the need for or the adequacy of proposed improvements to slip roads at M5 J24 (Scheme H) and improvements to M5 J23 (Scheme P). | 89924-1343-1992 | / | | | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - No evidence has been provided to demonstrate that Somerfield site would be suitable in highway terms. The lack of any robust baseline data undermines the consultation process and prevents meaningful comments from being made by interested parties. There is a noticeable absence of highway information in the preliminary environmental information provided. | 89948-1343-2072 | / | | | |
| (Personal information removed) | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | 4. At the exhibition, when I asked what Somerfield's vehicle movements were in comparison with your proposals, you didn't know. It is a rather fundamental point to ascertain how many more vehicles it will mean coming out of the Somerfield site. How can I judge the change to traffic usage on the roundabout and beyond when you can't answer such an obvious question? | 90081-1343-4111 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|----------------------|--|--------------------|--|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 62160 | Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public | Stage 1 | We have level sites for park and ride and freight transfer use and could accommodate larger areas than those already suggested. | 8753-1346-2194 | | | / | Consultees requested clarity on how the use of the Junction 24 park and ride facility would be enforced. During the construction phase the on-site parking provision would be restricted in order to minimise the number of vehicle trips to Hinkley Point C (HPC). In addition a 24-hour rural clearway would be introduced between Cannington and Hinkley Point with associated parking and waiting restrictions in the lay-bys along the route. |
| Tractivity 809 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Although, as mentioned highways needs reviewing. | 9567-1346-7277 | | | / | Workers would be assigned to a specific park and ride (P&R) site to ensure appropriate splits between the four sites and to encourage compliance with car sharing targets. Further details are contained in the Framework Travel Plan . Consultees requested clarity on contingency plans associated with road traffic incidents. |
| Tractivity 1091 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? J24 as a park and ride would not be necessary if adequate and substantial development occurred at J23. However if this were to go ahead, further transport appraisals need to consider the congestion on Taunton Rd presently and and the traffic light sector by Morrisons. Extra HGVs and buses could cause gridlock if left unchanged. | 9849-1346-13046 | | / | | In the event of an incident HGVs would be held at the freight management facilities to avoid congesting the network. The situation would be monitored and if it was considered necessary suppliers would be instructed to hold HGVs either at source or at existing truck stops if already en-route, until further notice. Buses would be held back at the P&R site to minimise their impact upon the incident related congestion. |
| Tractivity 1142 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Same as above | 9900-1346-7338 | | | / | Consultees expressed concerns about pedestrian and cyclist safety with regards to the proposed development. |
| Tractivity 1167 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? How do workers get to the park and ride. Where are they living. What is access to park and ride - another set of traffic lights? In the summer the roundabout near to junction gets completely blocked as motorists access the services, it can take half an hour to access the motorway from Petherton. If there are problems on the motorway due to accidents or excess traffic the whole area can become congested. | 9925-1346-7610 | | | / | The proposed highway mitigation works at Huntworth roundabout incorporate a number of measures which would improve the pedestrian and cycling environment in this area. A pedestrian island would be provided on the southern approach to the roundabout from the M5. This would form part of the proportionate contribution by EDF Energy to the highway authorities existing scheme to introduce traffic signals at this roundabout. |
| Tractivity 1185 | Public | Stage 2 | 5. Any other ideas or comments? It would be a good idea to construct a road from J24 to the A39 near Cannington. This would stop most of the construction traffic going through Bridgwater and be a lasting benefit to the town. | 9943-1346-2270 | | / | | Consultees requested further clarification on the mitigation measures associated with the proposed development, with particular regards to the proposed widening of the Junction 24 slip roads. |
| Tractivity 1221 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Agree, great idea, although would like to ensure all site traffic goes via Bridgwater, NOT A38/39. | 9979-1346-7224 | | / | | Improvements to the Junction 24 slip roads are proposed in order to accommodate extra vehicle movements associated with the use of the 'Sommerfield' site. |
| Tractivity 62456 | Public | Stage 2 | 11. Any other ideas or comments? Junction 24 traffic will have to negotiate Bridgwater to get to A39. This is at gridlock at times now. Any further traffic will make this worse. A new road would need to be built from Junction 24 across Stockmoor to Rhode Lane at Greenway Farm, to Durleigh, to Dawesborough joining A39 at Greenway Garage on A39. | 10080-1346-6753 | | | / | In order to mitigate the impacts of the P&R vehicles upon the highway network, the construction shifts seek to avoid the network peaks hours as far as practical and the bus services will operate to a timetable centred around the shift times, as well as operating at a |

| 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 | Buses from the two M5 P&R sites, the two residential campuses and the bus and rail stations could be used to connect most residential areas in Bridgwater with the HPC development site. | 89227-1346-5101 | | | / | reduced service outside these periods. The shift patterns were amended after the Stage 2 consultation in order to improve the overall efficiency of the programme and facilitate a more gradual arrival and departure of workers to and from the main site therefore reducing the impact upon the highway network. Details of the proposed bus timetables can be found within the Transport Assessment . |
| Bridgwater Town Council | Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 | On the subject of legacy issues it is this Council's opinion that the benefits of a couple of park and rides is risible and simply not good enough. | 89263-1346-6762 | | | / | The proposed Bridgwater highway improvement package (presented alongside the new proposals for the Junction 24) will mitigate the development's traffic impacts on the wider network and are discussed within the Bridgwater Highway Improvement – Mitigation topic response . Consultees requested further clarification on the phasing of the mitigation measures. The timing of the highway improvements are to be agreed with the highway authorities and works will be coordinated with other non-HPC highway works as well as HPC construction activities in order to minimise disruption. The associated development programme has been developed to deliver the proposed developments as fast as possible in order to mitigate transport related impacts. |
| Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd) | Consultee with an Interest in Land | Stage 2 | Existing analysis contained within the Stage 2 consultation documents fail to demonstrate how the proposals will form part of a robust transport strategy for the area contributing to the achievement of wider transport objectives. No information is provided on how the proposals will integrate or enhance the existing public transport corridor, or improve walking and cycle routes in Bridgwater. | 89433-1346-2631 | / | | | |
| NHS Somerset Primary Care Trust | Non-Statutory Consultee | Stage 2 | 4.14 We are concerned that the potential for walking and cycling, in particular to park and ride sites, but also on the minor roads appears to have been largely dismissed. | 89460-1346-7373 | | | / | |
| 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 is proposed for transport effects. The validity of this cannot be tested due to the fundamental flaws in the assessment. | 89394-1346-9027 | | | / | |

| 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>2.111 It appears that the form of the junction onto the A38 is intended to be Traffic Signals, with this being the sole access / egress from this junction into the Freight Management facility as well as a secondary access to the Park & Ride. This would mean a substantial percentage of the HGV vehicles using the Freight Management facility undertaking a right turn into the site assuming that they are heading to the site from J24.</p> <p>2.112 The design of the junction and the timing of the signals will need to reflect the likely heavy HGV right turn flow at the junction. Consideration will also need to be given to the committed developments locally and their S106 obligations to provide highway improvements to the Huntworth Roundabout. The site access should also take account of the traffic signal controlled junction into the RRBC (market/dairy etc.) and consider 'linking' them.</p> | 89848-1346-214 | | | / | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory and consultee with an interest in land | Stage 2 Update | 2.115 It should be noted that a preferred strategic solution to improve the future operation of the road layout in this area and access proposed development areas will be included in design guidance being prepared by Sedgemoor District Council. | 89848-1346-1766 | | | / | |
| WSC & SDC Joint Response | Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only) | Stage 2 Update | - The layout should facilitate safe and attractive cycle and pedestrian links between North Petherton and Bridgwater, including connections to existing public rights of way and the proposed parkland at South Bridgwater Country Park and The Meads. | 89894-1346-17502 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1200 | Public | Stage 2 | <p>11. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>The Stockmoor/Huntworth roundabout often gridlocks. This is largely due to the poor access to the motorway services. The new ?facility? near J24/A38 is a good idea but access should be off the Stockmoor road - not the A38. And a new road is needed from there to Cannington. This would be a Southern Bridgwater Bypass.</p> | 9958-1323-5537 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 1403 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Junction 24 gets heavily congested. Steps to mitigate the impact of the development on this issue should include staggering power station / construction working hours and delivery times. | 89978-1346-225 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1404 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>Finish the road around the back of the Argos warehouse, this will reduce the amount of traffic going to the roundabout.</p> <p>put parking restrictions on the road to Argos it is bad enough now. There have been accidents there as well, because of parking on the road.</p> | 89979-1346-4 | | / | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|--|--|--|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------|---|
| Tractivity 1434 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Please ensure that traffic works on the huntworth Roundabout would not leave residents ?trapped? in Stockmoor or North Petherton eg Yellow box junctions? Also wherever build, please ensure locals can cross the roads safely as we walk/run/cycle in the area. | 90008-1346-237 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1437 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | Road improvements needed at Juncion 24 due to volume of traffic. traffic problems also with lights not managed for traffic flow. | 90011-1346-63 | | / | | |
| Tractivity 1445 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | More improvement (space) needed at Huntworth Roundabout | 90019-1346-21 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 1448 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | it is right to use brown field site , but the road inforstudture needs to be right. | 90022-1346-4 | | | / | |
| Somerset County Council | Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | it should be recognised that the local highway network in the vicinity of the site is already extremely congested, in particular A38 Taunton Road and Huntworth Roundabout The impact and mitigation of Hinkley traffic needs to be carefully considered, in consultation with the County Council as local highway authority. | 89953-1346-5039 | | | / | |
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - Detailed assessment of the Huntworth roundabout is required to evaluate its performance and safety. It is noted that EDFE propose "to make a proportionate contribution" to highway improvements in this location. Sedgemoor District Council will seek to engage with Somerset County Council, the Highways Agency, EDFE and other developers with development proposals that would affect this junction, to work towards the identification of an appropriate junction design that is deliverable and can be financed within the timescale that improvements are required. | 89956-1346-6497 | / | | | |

| Respondent Reference | Respondent Type | Consultation Stage | Comment | Comment ID | Change | No Change | Noted | EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic) |
|--|---|--|---|------------------|--------|-----------|-------|--|
| Sedgemoor and West Somerset District Council's | Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor) | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>5.2.5 A38 Taunton Road / Marsh Lane (Scheme E)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Bridgwater Vision promotes Huntworth as an Enhanced Distribution Centre, where a coordinated approach to signage, lighting and general public realm and landscape treatments will improve the environmental quality of the area. - The Brainwave Centre, (Personal information removed) and new residential development at Stockmoor Village are identified as sensitive receptors close to the junction. The significance of impacts such as air and noise pollution for these receptors should be assessed. - Provision of a footpath/cycleway link is welcomed and EDFE should demonstrate how this will link to the wider network of cycle paths in Bridgwater to provide an attractive and safe means for travel to the town centre. The Bridgwater Vision advocates the provision of high quality, safe and legible pedestrian and cycle routes through the area strengthening links back to the town centre particularly along the Canal corridor. | 89961-1346-15526 | | | / | |
| Miller Turner Investments | Consultee with an interest in land | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | - In the event that other developments in the vicinity of Junction 24 do not result in improvements to the Huntworth Roundabout clarification is required as to the extent of EDF's proposed works. Clearly it is for EDF to demonstrate that the highway impact of their proposals on this roundabout is acceptable and that all necessary mitigation will be delivered in a timely manner. | 89948-1346-2671 | / | | | |
| Tractivity 63159 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>2. I/we cannot see how any such widening of the J24 slip road on to the M5 south has any bearing on assisting the smooth running of freight to Hinkley Point or of shift changes.</p> <p>There might be a case for widening the access slip roads to the J24 roundabout to minimise the risk of traffic "stacking up" on the motorway at peak times, but joining the M5 in either direction has never been a problem, nor is it likely to be.</p> | 90084-1346-809 | | | / | |
| Tractivity 63159 | Public | M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements | <p>4. If the (Plan H) proposal is being cited as a Section 106 condition by the Planning Authorities for Hinkley C consent, we urge EDF not to agree to such a condition. It would be acceding to a wrongful application of planning law, a waste of money which would ultimately rebound on the energy consumer, and bring no benefit whatever to the project.</p> | 90084-1346-1527 | | | / | |

| 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. 11.9 | 89394-1347-9858 | / | | | <p>Consultees requested further clarity on how the use of the Junction 24 park and ride facility would be monitored.</p> <p>The application Framework Travel Plan defines, in an integrated approach, how the transport demand created by the Hinkley Point C (HPC) Project will be managed.</p> <p>The Framework Travel Plan would incorporate a Workplace Travel Plan for the construction of the HPC Development Site (to include Preliminary Works), referred to as the HPC Construction Site Travel Plan;</p> <p>The HPC Construction Site Travel Plan will include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HPC Construction Targets (Action Plan and Aim Targets) in relation to mode shift from baseline mode share; • Management Structure; • Travel Plan measures associated with the journey to work and work associated trips; • Site specific measures - identification of appropriate measures to be implemented for each of the sites; • Remedial measures and enforcement of targets; • Monitoring and Review; and • An Action Plan which sets out the measures to be applied throughout the duration of the construction period at the HPC Development Site. <p>Monitoring surveys will be undertaken each year thereafter until the construction phase is complete.</p> <p>In addition to the annual survey, the Smartcard technology will be used to get an appreciation of the workforce trips by mode and the success of the Travel Plan against the agreed mode share targets.</p> <p>Key performance indicators could include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traffic generation (Automatic Traffic Count and multi modal counts); • car occupancy at park and ride facilities (park and ride monitoring); • car share (car share database); • bus patronage (Smartcard information); • cycle parking utilisation (on-going monitoring by the Transport Manager); and <p>walking (annual survey).</p> |

| 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 Update | 2.4 The red line plan for Junction 24 indicates a strip of land required on the northbound off slip on approach to the junction, however the Stage 2a Consultation document indicates that EDF Energy is proposing only minor improvements to this junction (e.g. traffic signals if required). The land indicated within the red line plan for Junction 24 is therefore at odds with the supporting text and the Agency requests clarification on this matter. | 89837-1348-3774 | / | | | The Transport - Other - Documentation topic response addresses consultee comments raised about wider documentation issues related to transport. |