

Schedule of Responses – Appendix H.1

Planning Strategy 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)
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	-The development of any sites for associated development site should maximise the potential for long term legacy benefits;	88790-130-21384			/	The proposals for the new power station at Hinkley Point C (the HPC Project) are complex – they are large scale, covering a range of sites and they potentially raise multiple planning policy considerations.
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	- The development of any sites for associated development site should maximise the potential for long term legacy benefits;	88890-130-23498			/	It is important, however, that one of the principal purposes behind the new approach to planning Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) is the single consent regime set out in the Planning Act 2008. With limited exceptions, a development consent order for an NSIP provides a single consent for the compulsory purchase of necessary land, together with the construction and operation of a NSIP, including any necessary associated development.
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	12.3 The national policies pay little attention to local impacts, the waste legacy, or mechanisms to secure committee benefit and we would wish members to raise these as serious flaws through the Select Committee process. 12.4 The EDF proposals are fairly blunt and under-developed which is disappointing at this stage of the programme. The proposals lack a coherent and evidenced based planning strategy and are poorly integrated into the a sensitive proposal which integrates into the local towns and adds long term value through design and legacy.	88900-130-3330	/			A number of representations assert the importance of individual planning policy documents. Whilst all policy can be relevant (see below), the legislation is clear that National Policy Statements (NPSs) provide the primary basis for decision making. As NPS EN-1 explains:- “1.1.1...For such applications this NPS, when combined with the relevant technology – specific energy NPS, provides the primary basis for decision by the IPC. Under the Planning Act 2008 the IPC must also have regard to any local impact report submitted by a relevant local authority, any relevant matters prescribed in regulations, the Marine Policy Statement (MPS) and any applicable Marine Plan, and any other matters which the IPC thinks are both important and relevant to its decision.”
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	The development of any site for associated development site should maximise the potential for long term legacy benefits.	88040-130-1944			/	This principle is further elaborated at 4.1.5 of NPS EN-1, as follows:- “Other matters that the IPC may consider both important and relevant to its decision – making may include
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 therefore necessary that the councils and communities they represent are able to influence decisions so that positive legacy outcomes can be achieved. The alternative scenario that must be avoided is a legacy of brownfield sites and developments that are not sited or designed in accordance with the long term spatial strategy of the district; or services and facilities that are not viable to maintain once the construction phase is completed.	88260-130-5139			/	

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 Councils are keen to promote an associated development strategy based on an objective of utilising existing sites where legacy issues and aspirations already exist. It is clear that there are certain options where EDF Energy has identified a potential legacy use through consultation, such as the refurbishment of student accommodation in the central Cannington search area CAN-C. In other cases, however, proposed legacy uses seem to be a by-product of the area of search in terms of the need to find a future use for the site once it is no longer required to support the Hinkley proposals. The Councils preference is for a long term outcomes focussed approach that ensures legacy issues are central to the overall strategy and a key consideration in site selection.	88270-130-3843	/			<i>Development Plan Documents or other documents in the Local Development Framework. In the event of a conflict between these or any other documents and an NPS, the NPS prevails for the purposes of IPC decision making given the national significance of the infrastructure. The energy NPSs have taken account of relevant Planning Policy Statements (PPSs) and older-style Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs) in England...where appropriate</i>
Minehead & District Chamber of Commerce	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The chamber is cautious of, hasty short term fixes when what is needed is significant sensible proposals to provide a lasting long term legacy for Minehead and West Somerset.	8757-130-6718	/			The weight to be attached to other policy documents needs to be considered in this context. <u>National Policy</u> Representations make direct reference to other national planning policy documents including, for instance, PPS9 which deals with Biodiversity and Geological Conservation. As the NPS explains, however, PPS 9 has been taken into account in the development of the NPS. This much is apparent, for instance, at Section 5.3 of NPS EN-1 which sets out the importance of biodiversity considerations and places requirements on the applicant to show how the project has taken advantage of opportunities to conserve and enhance biodiversity. A policy requirement is set out for the protection of habitats and species and for the necessary approach to the mitigation of any harmful effects. These principles are confirmed at Section 3.9 of NPS EN-6. There is no need, therefore, to look beyond the NPSs to ensure that the biodiversity impacts of the HPC project are fully assessed and taken into account in any decision on application for the Development Consent Order.
Tractivity 1196	Public	Stage 2	1. Any other ideas or comments? With very limited information available and with nothing capable of being confirmed it appears to me that all manner of changes could take place at the whim of EDF. I feel these proposals need overseeing by an independent body to ensure fairness in the area.	9954-130-125			/	
Tractivity 430	Public	Stage 1	4. Any other ideas or comments? * existing proposals are contrary to the planning "regime" and will destroy any village environment where associated works are proposed. *there is no need to disrupt the villages, if a dedicated road from the A38 is provided- as the Barnes Inquiries was previously assured would happen. *facilities in Bridgwater, on brown field sites would accord with the existing and emerging planning frameworks.	9111-130-1064	/			
Tractivity 62574	Public	Stage 2	The PRINCIPLE is that, in his concluding report of the 1988/89 Hinkley 'C' Enquiry, (personal details removed) stated that, in the event of a future Power Station being built. Canning ton and Stogursey should be exempt from any impact through it's construction, as they had already made their contribution at the time of construction of both Hinkley 'A' and 'B' Stations. That statement still stands!	10125-130-769		/		Similar considerations apply to other aspects of Government policy, such as the policy for flood risk in PPS 25, which is relied on by some respondents. <u>Regional Policy</u> Representations have noted and questioned the relevance of the fact that regional policy in RSS and RPG10 is to be abolished as a result of proposals within the Localism Bill. Regional policy retains its status until it is cancelled and the DCO application documents address the implications of regional policy, particularly the Planning Statement. In principle, however, issues of importance raised in regional policy will have been taken into account in the
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Industrial and commercial facilities should be integrated into existing commercial centres in Bridgwater, and the park and ride sites should be designed with the local planning authority, and not by EDF in isolation.	89185-130-4604			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Bridgwater Town Council	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	EDF constantly tout the promise of "large amounts of benefits to the local economy" from migrant construction workers and those retained at the plant. Whilst this is to be welcomed it does not constitute a compelling reason to lay down and be steamrollered at the altar of large industry. What good is clean electricity and employment for a few when the Town had died the death of other rural market towns? The phase 2 proposals barely address the problems of the NOW.	89263-130-14343			/	preparation of the NPS. The relevance of regional policy was considered by West Somerset Council in its committee report of 28 July 2011 which assessed the acceptability of the Hinkley Point C Site Preparation Proposals (the Site Preparation Committee Report). At paragraph 5.4.1, the Report noted that the RSS does not contain policies which seek to specifically resist or promote energy infrastructure at the site and that other issues raised by regional policy can be addressed by reference to local policies.
Otterhampton Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	EDF, perhaps unsurprisingly appear to 'pick and choose' which planning constraints they quote to turn down a search area and yet ignore the same restraints on a preferred site.	89272-130-2176			/	Local Development Plan Documents A number of representations, particularly from the local planning authorities, identify the importance which they attach to local planning policies and assert the need for the project to conform with local policy.
Tractivity 62898	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>Along with many other residents of Cannington I attended a meeting on Thursday 10th at the college main hall primarily to debate the "Project Supplementary Planning Document" (draft form) all of 88 pages as released 1st March, otherwise referred to as the "SPD".</p> <p>At the open session I highlighted that there were anomalies between the above publication and green & orange EdF booklet handed out at their various presentations which took place 26th Feb at Williton to 5th March at Bridgwater. My concern was that the earlier EdF presentation did not relate to the content of the SPD document.</p> <p>When I look at the EdF version and backed up by the displays at the presentations I am somewhat confused as to the validity thereof. In fact I am questioning the soundness of both publications as there are clear differences. Both are dated Feb 2011 yet give differing viewpoints on various associated developments as well as mitigation offerings.</p> <p>My initial reaction was that the SPD was council driven, and were perhaps suggestions or pointers toward the best approach to any solution or offerings by EdF. However it is clearly stated in the foreword of the SPD page 2; paragraph 1.8 "Part of a Planning Performance Agreement, in collaboration with EDF".</p> <p>So if this is a joint effort then I feel justified to be concerned.</p> <p>May I highlight examples which are particularly relevant for Cannington?</p> <p>-EdF document clearly shows a reduced park & ride for Cannington on page 21, yet the picture on the SPD page 73 is the earlier version.</p> <p>-EdF publication fails to mention the proposal for Cannington Court, however it is on page 45 of the SPD box 24 refers</p> <p>-No mention of the A39 at all in the SPD as the following text from page 19 box 8 "Minimise the volume of road traffic associated with the development of the new power station at all times, but especially during peak hours and during the peak tourism season between the months of June, July and August. The efficient and safe functioning of key routes, including the M5, A38, A361, A370, A371 and A372 must be protected. "This is a very busy road, a Red-Route meaning that investigation into a Northern By-pass should be paramount.</p> <p>There are several other discrepancies between both booklets, but as they are not Cannington related, I don't feel I'm best placed to highlight as such.</p>	89658-130-0			/	<p>Again, these issues are addressed in more detail in the Planning Statement but they have been carefully considered in the evolution of the Hinkley Point C proposals. They were also the subject of close consideration in the Site Preparation Committee Report which noted that those proposals could be considered to be generally compliant with significant elements of local policy and that, where conflicts did arise, the Council considered that there are other material considerations including the policies of the NPSs which outweigh the conflict (para. 5.4.2).</p> <p>Representations refer to the West Somerset Local Plan and to the Sedgemoor Local Plan. Both were adopted, however, well before the publication of even the draft NPS and before the identification of the site in national policy as potentially suitable for a new nuclear power station. In this critical respect, therefore, the policies are out of date and the plans are inconsistent with national policy. That is not to say that there are not important principles within the Plans which apply to all development proposals and which have a relevance to the project. These include the importance of site specific designations, particularly nature conservation designations, overall strategies for economic growth and strategies for urban concentration. Beyond the detail of the site specific designations, however, the strategies of the two plans do not raise significant issues of principle which would not arise anyway from a consideration of the project against the tests set out in the NPSs. Any site specific guidance has been taken into account in the selection and design of the project.</p> <p>Representations also attach weight to the emerging policies of the Sedgemoor Core Strategy, which has reached an advanced stage. EDF Energy has closely monitored the progress of the Core Strategy and,</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
			<p>However each document seems to have their own agenda, which is why I believe that both publications may be uncertain.</p> <p>Turning it on its head, should the SPD be an accurate appraisal of something constructed between the local authorities and EdF then I must therefore question the integrity of the EdF publication, and the accompanying open days they held. In which case EdF need to carry out another round of presentations and issue further newsletters etc. Otherwise they will not be compliant with the code of practice with regard to the IPC in respect of full and proper consultation.</p> <p>I would like to know from all this which is the correct situation and which publication is actually appropriate and possibly be used as a template.</p> <p>The SPD was signed off 7th Feb by planning executives of both WSDC & SDC, yet the EdF Pre-Application CD was created 18th Feb. Therefore I would suggest that as the SPD pre-dates the EdF documentation then the SPD is consequently irrelevant and perhaps need to be re-drafted before any further considerations take place.</p> <p>If everything in the SPD document has been in consultation with EdF then we need to know why there are two conflicting publications and strategies, and we need to know which one should be adhered to and indeed commented upon. Also if as I suspect the SPD was drafted in advance of the EdF update to changes of preferred proposals, then surely the SPD is already out of date, inapplicable and needs to be reassessed and represented.</p> <p>I did try phoning the appropriate department of Sedgemoor District Council, but the one person who could assist had finished for the day.</p>					<p>indeed, has been directly engaged in its consideration at an Examination in Public. The Inspector's Report published in September recommended specific changes. Most significant of the changes advised by the Inspector is text to be inserted at para. 4.9 of the Core Strategy which now confirms:</p> <p><i>“This Chapter of the Core Strategy deals both with those MIPs where Sedgemoor District Council is the Local Planning Authority and NSIPs, where the Council is a statutory consultee. Because NSIPs are subject to a separate planning process within the national planning regime, the Core Strategy does not set any policies, tests or requirements for the IPC/MIU/ Secretary of State to apply in deciding whether any element of the development comprised in an application for development consent is acceptable, nor the basis on which any such application should be approved. Accordingly, the Core Strategy does not have the same status for decision making by the IPC/MIU as it does for decisions under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, where the Council is the determining authority. However, this chapter of the Core Strategy will inform the Local Impact Report to be submitted by the Council to the IPC/MIU/Secretary of State in connection with the determination of any application for development consent.”</i></p> <p>Once adopted, therefore, the Core Strategy will set out how the Council intends to approach its role as an important consultee but will not set policy tests for the project itself. It will be a matter for the IPC and the Secretary of State to decide the relevance and importance of matters raised in the Council's Local Impact Report, including any references made by the Council to the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Again, this does not mean that there are no relevant elements of the Core Strategy and matters such as its focus on Bridgwater as a centre for growth and its sequential preference for brownfield land before greenfield land are clearly potentially relevant considerations. The Core Strategy does not, however, contain any detailed site specific designations and any conflict between its more general policies and those of the NPS would need to be resolved by attaching more weight to the NPS.</p>
Tractivity 62913	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>A main sports hub for construction workers, based at the main site or in surrounding settlements, due to the location of the A39 and C182 is planned for Cannington according to the Hinkle Point C Project-Supplementary Planning Document. This isn't mentioned in this pre-application consultation document. How open and transparent is that? When, how and by whom was this decided?</p>	89665-130-3014			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
								<p>Consultees also raised issues relating to a consultation draft of the Hinkley Point C Supplementary Planning Document produced jointly by SDC and WSC in early 2011. The SPD is no more able to set policies for Hinkley Point C than the Core Strategy. No significant weight attaches to the draft SPD and EDF Energy has not sought to test its proposals against the terms of the SPD.</p> <p><u>Informal Policy</u></p> <p>Many of the representations raise issues relating to a range of local non-statutory planning and other policies. These range from the corporate strategies of the two local authorities to Sustainable Communities Strategies, economic masterplans, a Regeneration Service Plan, emerging Green Infrastructure Strategies, Infrastructure Strategies and the Bridgwater Vision, as well as County Council Transport Strategies.</p> <p>None of these documents have statutory weight as part of the Development Plan, although it will be for the IPC to determine whether they consider the documents important and relevant. The documents are addressed in the Planning Statement but even there only briefly. This is not because EDF Energy regards them as irrelevant but because the issues which they raise are already issues which EDF Energy has been taking carefully into account in the development of the Hinkley Point C project. These issues include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recognising the regeneration ambitions for Bridgwater set out in Bridgwater Vision; ▪ The importance which the strategies attach to urban concentration, regeneration and growth in Bridgwater; ▪ The recognition in the Economic Masterplan of the importance of the Hinkley Point C project to long-term strategies to achieve a restructuring and sustainable growth in the local economy - particularly a focus on the low carbon economy; ▪ The importance of sustainability; ▪ The importance of ensuring that all significant environmental effects are identified and mitigated where practical; ▪ The preference for the use of brownfield land before the use of greenfield land;

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
								<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The importance of stimulating housing development, ensuring a continuing housing supply and avoiding undue pressure on the low cost housing sector; ▪ The rural and socio characteristics of West Somerset District and the consequences of those including the importance of tourism and the challenges faced in achieving access to adequate jobs and housing. <p>All these and a great many more planning considerations have been directly taken into account in the development of Hinkley Point C project. Their application is explained in a number of documents including, for instance, the Alternative Sites Assessment, the Sustainability Strategy, the Planning Statement, the Accommodation Strategy, the Transport Assessment, etc.</p> <p>Similar considerations arise in relation to the strategies of Statutory Consultees. As this Consultation Report explains, extensive engagement has taken place with Statutory Consultees in order to gain a full understanding of their concerns. That understanding has been applied in the development of the project and mitigation strategies.</p> <p>The local planning authorities put particular emphasis on Visions for the project set out in the Planning Performance Agreement or Visions for the project which were discussed and agreed at the 'Dillington Workshop' in June 2010. The content, nature and influence of those visions on the project's development is addressed in full at Chapter 3 of the Project Wide Design and Access Statement which explains how EDF Energy's own Vision for the project has been derived from engagement with the authorities and the recognition of the part which the project needs to play in the achievement of wider Visions for the area. In so far as those matters are within the control of EDF Energy they are reflected in the project Vision, which seeks to develop Hinkley Point C to the highest standards of safety, security and sustainability, to mitigate significant environmental effects and to maximise the inherent benefits of the project to the local community, taking full account of the aspirations of local stakeholders. EDF Energy has held true to this Vision throughout the development of the project.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Policy Issues</u></p> <p>Apart from identifying the relative importance of local and other policy documents, the representations raise some direct policy issues. In particular, a number 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>consultees are concerned about the identification of associated development sites outside existing settlement boundaries, whilst others are concerned about potential conflict with local housing strategies.</p> <p>The Alternative Sites Assessment explains site selection in detail. It identifies the critical importance of associated development to ensure the effective construction and operation of the Hinkley Point C and to limit the impacts of the construction and operation of the power station. Sites for associated development must meet fundamental operational requirements and some have very specific locational criteria. For instance, there is no purpose served in meeting the need for a Cannington-based park and ride anywhere other than in Cannington, where there are no brownfield sites available.</p> <p>As the Alternative Sites Assessment explains, where operational flexibility has allowed brownfield sites to be identified, they have been selected. Indeed, consultation responses and other factors have led to changes in the proposals which have favoured the use of brownfield sites at Junction 24 and at Williton over previously proposed greenfield sites. Where the selection of greenfield sites is necessary, it is predominantly for a temporary period during construction (at Cannington, Junction 23 and at Combwich - as well as the accommodation campus on the main Hinkley Point C site) and the proposed Post Operational Strategy promotes the full restoration of those sites, unless the planning authorities wish subsequently to approve the full or partial retention of facilities constructed for Hinkley Point C.</p> <p>Housing issues are addressed at length in the Accommodation Strategy and responded to elsewhere in this Consultation Report. In principle, however, great care has been taken to ensure only a sustainable use of the existing accommodation stock (to the extent that this will create benefit for the local housing economy and tourist economy, rather than adverse impact) and the construction of purpose-built campus accommodation in sustainable locations to meet the residual requirement for accommodation and the operational need for contractors to have a base element of campus style accommodation for temporary workers needs.</p> <p>Section 106 proposals for a Housing Fund are proposed to be deployed early in the construction period in order to off-set any potential risks of adverse housing impacts. This is considered to be a conservative, comprehensive and beneficial approach which takes full account of local concerns.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Mitigation of Impacts</u></p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
								<p>A number of representations raise the need for mitigation and compensation and several rely upon interpretations of Circular 5/2005 which, together with the NPSs contain Government policy on planning obligations. Paragraph 4.1.8 of NPS EN-1 advises:</p> <p><i>“The IPC may take into account any development consent obligations that an applicant agrees with the local authorities. These must be relevant to planning, necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development and reasonable in all other respects.”</i></p> <p>In considering the approach to impacts of NSIP development, Part 5 of NPS EN-1 and Part 3 of NPS EN-6 set out, on a topic-by-topic basis, the approach which the IPC should take to the consideration of impact and to mitigation. Only in relation to the question of compensatory habitat where significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided or mitigated is a requirement for compensation raised (NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.3.7).</p> <p>There is, therefore, no generalised requirement for compensation to be paid or provided in relation to NSIP proposals. The obligation instead is to limit and mitigate significant effects and then for any residual effects to be considered in the balance by the IPC and the Secretary of State when addressing whether the adverse impact of the proposed development would outweigh its benefit, within the policy framework provided by the NPS.</p> <p>This question is directly addressed in the Planning 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	1.National Policy Statements Since this document was produced the government released a number of draft National Policy Statement (NPS) for consultation. Therefore proposals and supporting studies will need to be updated in the light of these documents.	88820-132-205	/			Introduction The Planning Act 2008 provides that the primary basis for the determination of applications for development consent for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) is provided by a series of National Policy Statements. Two NPSs are of particular relevance to the proposed new power station at Hinkley Point C (the HPC Project): EN-1 which provides the <i>Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy</i> and EN-6 which provides the <i>National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation</i> . These NPSs were formally designated in July 2011. The designation of the NPS represents the culmination of at least 3 years policy development by central government. In the case of nuclear power stations, this began in 2008 with consultation on criteria for the Strategic Siting Assessment so that Government could begin to identify potentially suitable locations for new nuclear power stations. Subsequently the Government undertook a consideration of alternative sites, Appraisal of Sustainability and a Habitat Regulations Screening report, as well as extensive consultation on successive drafts of the NPSs themselves.
Countryside Council for Wales	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	We refer you to our comments relating to the Hinkley proposals contained in our response to the Appraisal of Sustainability (AoS) and the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) for the nuclear National Policy Statement, which can be obtained from the Cabinet Office or will be available at the end of the public consultation period on the 22nd of February 2010. We recommend that the issues raised are addressed in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).	87810-132-658	/			NPS EN-6 identifies Hinkley Point C as one of eight potentially suitable sites for new nuclear power station development (para 2.3.2 and Part 4), whilst confirming that the Government believes that only those sites listed are potentially suitable for the deployment of new nuclear power stations in England and Wales by the end of 2025.
Countryside Council for Wales	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	3.35 - 3.38: CCW acknowledges that there is a degree of uncertainty over the nature, scale and footprint of the project proposals when considered at the strategic level and accept that the specific impacts and most appropriate avoidance, cancellation and reduction measures will, by necessity, need to be considered at the detailed project level. Providing that the main Nuclear National Policy Statement document acknowledges that it may need to change to accommodate the results of this detailed level assessment, as set out in section 3.33, and that such an assessment will be required as a matter of law or Government policy, then this approach is acceptable.	87840-132-2225	/			NPS EN-1 confirms that the relevant NPSs provide the primary basis for decisions on NSIPs by the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC). Para 4.1.5 of NPS EN-1 confirms that the energy NPSs have taken account of relevant Planning Policy Statements and older style Planning Policy Guidance notes and that, in the event of a conflict between the NPS and other documents in the Local Development Frameworks, the NPS will prevail for the purposes of IPC decision making given the national significance of the infrastructure.
Countryside Council for Wales	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	CCW notes and welcomes the consideration of the potential effects of nuclear waste and notes the acknowledgement that storage/disposal for waste will need to be assessed/fully considered within individual nominated site assessments (EIA and HRA) at the project level. The precedent for future development at nominated sites may well have been set through this Nuclear NPS and associated AoS and HRA processes. Reassurance is required that in the event that project level (nominated site level) assessments conclude that storage/processing/disposal of nuclear waste might constitute an unacceptable risk to the environment and that mitigation/avoidance measures are not feasible, the project will not proceed despite being given 'approval in principle' under the auspices of the nuclear NPS.	87860-132-2464			/	Response to Consultation The relevant NPSs were emerging as the HPC Project also emerged through consultation. A number of consultees, therefore, made the point both at the Stage 1 and Stage 2 consultations that caution should be exercised in attaching too much weight to the NPSs as they were subject to further revision and were not yet finalised.
Countryside Council for Wales	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	6.3 : We note the primary intention of this AoS is to inform the developing draft Nuclear NPS, particularly the Strategic Siting Assessment, and the potential significant environmental effects and proposed mitigation measures should be interpreted in this context.	87900-132-2309			/	
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	3.5.8 Applications to the IPC must meet with the terms of National Policy Statements (NPS's), drafted by the Government, which cover different areas, such as transport and energy. Six NPS's are being produced for the energy sector, including ones for electricity networks and nuclear power.	88790-132-28067			/	

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	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	7.1 The legislative background to the draft National Policy Statements is set out in Part 2 of the Planning Act 2008. When considering applications for DCOs for proposed NSIPs the IPC is required to decide the application in accordance with any relevant NPS: they will therefore carry considerable weight.	88890-132-31440			/	In July 2011, however, NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-6 were debated and approved by Parliament and designated under the Planning Act 2008. They now represent, therefore the primary policy basis for decision making on the Hinkley Point C Development Consent Order. Concern has been expressed that the NPSs pay insufficient regard to local considerations and, for instance, the NPSs do not deal directly with associated development. To the extent that this is a criticism of the NPS regime, this is a matter for Government to consider and it is relevant, of course, that both NPSs have been the subject of extensive consultation where stakeholders have had the opportunity fully to set out their views for these to be considered by Government. The process of parliamentary scrutiny prior to designation serves to reinforce the accountability and status of the final form of the NPS.
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	12.3 The national policies pay little attention to local impacts, the waste legacy, or mechanisms to secure committee benefit and we would wish members to raise these as serious flaws through the Select Committee process.	88900-132-3330			/	Additionally, the Planning Act 2008 is clear that the IPC will have regard to any other matter which it considers both important and relevant to its decision (section 104(2)). The legislation also obliges the IPC to have regard to any Local Impact Report (LIR) provided by the Local Planning Authorities which Section 60 provides for the Local Planning Authorities to prepare in order to give details of the likely impact of the proposed development on the authority's area, or any part of that area. The process ensures that local considerations will be fully taken into account.
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	b) The draft Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) requires applicants to describe the existing socio-economic conditions in the areas surrounding the proposed development. Furthermore, the Draft NPS indicates that the applicant should explain how the development's socio economic impacts correlate with planning policy. This analysis is lacking in the Stage 1 document, including information of how EDF's approach to "training and employment" will create positive outcomes.	87940-132-3171	/			In any event, the NPSs provide detailed guidance to the IPC on the full range of local and other issues which it expects will need to be taken into account in the consideration of any application for development consent. These issues are set out at length in part 4 and part 5 of NPS EN-1 and in part 2 and part 3 of NPS EN-6. It is apparent from those sections of the NPSs that any significant effect of a NSIP is likely to be a material consideration.
Bridgwater Town Council	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	EDF - Hinkley Point C - Consultation on Initial Proposals and Options November 2009 - Pre-application Stage 1 Bridgwater Town Council response paper 1. General Comments The Town Council are supportive of nuclear new build at Hinkley Point but consider it essential that local issues are resolved in favour of the local communities of which Bridgwater as the 'host' town is the key settlement. This will need assurance of the safety of the type of new nuclear build and will be sought primarily through Government National Policy Statements for Energy (EN-1) and for Nuclear Power Generation (EN-6) and examination through the Infrastructure Planning Commission.	8745-132-0			/	Additionally, Development Consent Order (DCO) applications need to be accompanied by a full suite of documents, including a full Environmental Impact Assessment which will be obliged to set out a comprehensive and objective assessment of the effects of the HPC Project. As some representations point out, the Appraisal of Sustainability and the Habitats Regulations Screening report identified the potential for some adverse impacts arising from the construction of Hinkley Point C, which is certainly true – including the potential for adverse visual impacts on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which may be difficult to mitigate and the possibility that there could be adverse
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	a) The authorities will raise through the NPS consultation the need for Government to enable community benefit to be secured to invest in the long term sustainability of the community affected.	88050-132-0			/	
Sedgemoor District Council &	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee	Stage 1	Reference is made in section 5.3.6 that there is an expectation that the draft Nuclear NPS will provide guidance on the sustainability of a national scale nuclear programme. This is not explicit within the draft NPS and it is	88480-132-2979			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)		recommended that EDF demonstrate the sustainability objectives for the Hinkley Point C proposals in the context of national initiatives for the development of a national supply chain; economic renewal; educational initiatives; environmental stewardship; carbon reduction and security of supply.					<p>impacts on European designated sites. It is a strength of the policy support for the HPC Project, however, that the site was identified as being potentially suitable notwithstanding the recognition of these potential impacts. It is also relevant that the NPSs identify that there are IROPI (imperative reasons of overriding public interest) in providing new nuclear generating capacity in order to provide our future energy security in a way which minimises carbon emissions, thus securing public safety, public health and combating climate change, which is a beneficial consequence of primary importance to the environment (NPS EN-6 Volume 2 para A.3.7).</p> <p>Nevertheless, as the representations pointed out, it would be insufficient for EDF Energy simply to rely on the NPS. Instead, EDF Energy is obliged to undertake a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment and to address the assessment principles and impact criteria set out within the NPSs. This is the exercise which EDF Energy has undertaken and which is reported extensively within the DCO application documentation.</p> <p>Whilst the NPSs do not directly identify the associated development sites required to support individual NSIPs, the NPS policy regime applies just as much to associated development as it does to the main Hinkley Point C site. Associated development sites need to be subject to the same comprehensive assessment and considered against the same assessment and impact criteria. Again, this exercise has been undertaken and is fully reported within the DCO documentation.</p>
Tractivity 807	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	2. Any other ideas or comments? it is a rural area, this is not the place for a power station	9565-132-507		/		
Tractivity 1146	Public	Stage 2	3. Any other ideas or comments? Works should not begin until the IPC have given their consent to the development of the new reactors.	9904-132-1394		/		
Tractivity 62128	Public	Stage 1	(i) the setting up of the IPC to replace full local public enquiries in effect very much diminishes local democratic participation, particularly in that locals can no longer speak directly to the appointed government commissioning body nor cross-examine key 'expert' evidence and witnesses.	9415-132-1910			/	
Tractivity 62352	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	5} In our opinion, there should be a properly conducted public inquiry.	10029-132-3226			/	
Tractivity 62531	Public	Stage 2	1. National Policy EdF refers extensively in the introduction to its Preferred Proposals to government policy on energy and nuclear power ("Preferred Proposals: Explanation and Assessment, July 2010"), and in particular the draft National Policy Statements which were issued in 2009. The new coalition government has since announced that these NPS's will be re-issued in a revised form and a new national consultation will be held. EdF can therefore no longer confidently rely on the statements of government policy it quotes in support of nuclear power and the Hinkley C proposal in particular.	10104-132-1759			/	
Countryside Council for Wales	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	The NPS set out the case for developing new nuclear power generation facilities as part of the UK energy mix. As part of this justification, the NPS carried out an AoS and HRA on the individual proposals to test the 'principle' of development. These identified a number of significant environmental effects (AoS) and likely significant effects (HRA) for the Hinkley C proposals that could only be partially addressed at the level of the NPS and would need further assessment at the Project development stage as part of any formal submission. The ES should address this issue.	89127-132-261			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	There is an important question which this raises, which goes to the heart of the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) and its processes. In this new 'fast track' system, are standards lessened for information requirements, justification and attention to the local policy framework and local needs? As a key point, we would like to highlight how unusual it is to participate in pre-application consultation on the 'preferred proposals' when these are not clear, nor agreed with the local planning authority.	89181-132-4929			/	
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	- Low risks do not require inclusion on a Risk Register.	89182-132-3472			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	18. The draft Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) requires applicants to describe the existing socio-economic conditions in the areas surrounding the proposed development. Furthermore, the Draft NPS indicates that the applicant should explain how the development's socio-economic impacts correlate with local planning policy frameworks. The National Policy Statement is an overarching document to take into consideration, and we need further assessment and justification of how proposals accord with the policy framework in place. This analysis was absent from the information presented in the Stage 1 documentation and the County Council had anticipated that this matter would have been addressed in the Stage 2 documentation. Some of the relevant policies at a National and local level have been quoted but an analysis of their applicability to each element of the proposed development is not contained within the documentation provided.	89190-132-29	/			
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	1.22. The Planning Act 2008 imposes a duty on promoters of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) to consult those who would be directly affected by the proposed development, people living in the vicinity of land proposed for development, the general public, local authorities and a range of other statutory consultees before submitting an application to the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) for a development consent order. The Council has the right to submit a report to the IPC regarding the adequacy of consultation, and the IPC has the right to refuse to accept the application if it believes the promoter has not conducted the pre-application consultation adequately.	89196-132-13073			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	- Whilst the National Policy Statement is an overarching document to take into consideration, there needs to be further assessment and justification on how proposals accord with the policy framework in place. Policies are quoted but their applicability to each element is not contained within the documentation provided. The proposed use of a number of sites where, due to their location outside defined settlement limits, there is a presumption against development without significant justification, needs to be fully addressed.	89199-132-3207			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	<p>EdF refers extensively in the introduction to its Preferred Proposals ("Preferred Proposals: Explanation and Assessment, July 2010") to government policy on energy and nuclear power. Particular reference is made to the draft National Policy Statements which were issued in 2009, one of which specifically covers nuclear issues. A number of statements from these NPS's are quoted to demonstrate both government support for new nuclear build and the suitability of the Hinkley Point site in particular.</p> <p>The coalition government elected in May 2010 has since announced that these NPS's will be re-issued in a revised form and a new national consultation will be held. It is expected that publication of the revised policy statements will happen during October 2010. EdF can therefore no longer confidently rely on the statements of government policy it quotes in support of nuclear power and the Hinkley C proposal.</p>	89447-132-3143			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62128	Public	Stage 1	(g) the detail of exactly how the relationship in planning procedure etc. between the IPC, County Council, District Councils, parish Councils, statutory consultees, other Hinkley SSG members and groups, and other independent consultees (organisations or individuals) is nowhere defined and how it will work in practice (including an agreed timetable for submissions and public hearings etc.);	9415-186-3871		/		Introduction A number of representations have been made to the effect that the proposed new power station at Hinkley Point C (the HPC Project) has not been sufficiently informed by the need to generate a local beneficial legacy – either overall or on the specific sites. Some representations suggest that EDF Energy’s site selection for associated development proposals should have been informed principally by the ability of sites to generate a local lasting legacy. Others suggest that there would be no lasting legacy from the project and that this is unacceptable.
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	d) The developments should take account of the Sustainable Community Strategy for Sedgemoor and wider Somerset, Economic strategies of both Districts, and the Bridgwater Vision, as well as corporate and regeneration objectives, and should set out how the proposals can assist in delivering the strategies, priorities and outcomes.	88040-186-2797			/	Before addressing specific points raised in the representations, it may be helpful to review the fundamental purpose of the HPC Project and the constraints imposed upon the project by planning policy and by legislation.
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	the authorities recommend that the sites taken forward for associated development should meet the following requirements: a) Any development proposed for a site conforms with emerging and approved local policy including policies to focus development around the principal urban settlements of the Districts. The Sedgemoor Local Plan (September 2004) identifies Bridgwater as the County’s third largest town, and offers the best facilities, the most employment and the greatest accessibility by public transport within the District. Development in other settlements (identified as Rural Centres and Villages in the Local Plan) should be such that will sustain and enhance their role and will be commensurate with their size and accessibility (and therefore capacity to accommodate such development), and appropriate to their character and physical identity. If development (whether of a permanent or temporary nature) is proposed within rural centres or villages that does not meet these policy requirements then such development would need strong justification. Part of this justification will be explaining why there are no other acceptable sites for the intended use available on sites within or on the edge of the main urban settlements.	88040-186-695			/	The fundamental purpose of the HPC Project is to provide urgently needed low carbon energy. There is an urgent national need to enhance the country’s energy generating capacity and to diversify the sources of supply. De-carbonising national electricity supply is essential if stretching carbon reduction targets are to be met. Because of the importance of these objectives, the project is defined as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). The Planning Act 2008 established a new, separate planning regime to ensure the efficient and independent scrutiny and determination of applications for nationally significant infrastructure. National policy has been developed and approved for NSIPs in a series of National Policy Statements, including NPS EN-1 and EN-6 which are specific to energy and to nuclear power generation. The Planning Act 2008 (Section 104) provides that applications for NSIPs should be decided in accordance with the relevant NPS unless the adverse impact of the proposed development would outweigh its benefits.
Marine and Fisheries Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	The proposal comprises a number of on-site and off-site developments, of which some them are considered "preliminary works." This proposal is developing an intricate regulatory route as it crosses a number of other areas of regulatory responsibility. Along with MFA (which is to become part of the Marine Management Organisation on 1 April 2010), Department for Transport, Environment Agency, the Local Authority and County Councils, the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) assumes responsibility for projects of national infrastructural significance from March this year. As a result, a potentially significant legal issue may arise in terms of how various regulators proceed with applications for the preliminary and subsequent works, and thereby ensuring compliance with their EIA directive. The legal way forward for this is yet to be ratified	8691-131-1427			/	The Planning Act 2008 is concerned, however, only with NSIPs, which are narrowly defined. By virtue of Section 115 of the Planning Act, development consent can include consent for “associated development”, ie development which is associated with an NSIP. Guidance on associated development produced by the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) (Sept 2009) recognises that development can be treated as associated development, provided it has regard to the following principles:- <i>“associated development should not be an aim in itself but should be subordinate to and necessary for the development and efficient operation to its design capacity of the NSIP that</i>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Marine and Fisheries Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Of these works, the following will be of particular interest to this Agency as they fall within our regulatory remit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -A Sea Wall along the frontage of the site for coast protection -Cooling Water Intake Tunnels and associated infrastructure -Outfall Tunnel -Temporary Aggregates Jetty for bulk aggregate delivery -Refurbishment of Comwich Wharf to accommodate a heavy loads berthing facility 	8691-131-2283			/	<p><i>is the subject of the application.</i></p> <p><i>We would expect associated development in most cases to be of a type normally brought forward for that sort of primary development. For clarification it could include:-</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>measures necessary to mitigate the impacts of the primary development;</i> - <i>innovative development ideas where the resulting development would fulfill the principles outlined in this guidance; and</i> - <i>in relation to transport infrastructure, retail/business</i>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Civil Aviation Authority	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Notwithstanding the apparent lack of any aviation related comment within the documentation provided I believe that the following issues are worthy of note and should be addressed within future consultation process and associated environmental documentation:</p> <p>-Protective Airspace. In accordance with Statutory Instrument 2007 No 1929 (The Air Navigation (Restriction of Flying) (Nuclear Installations) Regulation 2007) nuclear power stations in the UK are afforded an element of protection from aviation activity through the establishment a Restricted Areas (RA) encompassing each individual site. Aviation activity within any RA is limited to that specifically permitted by the Statutory Instrument (SI). Typically, such RAs have a 2nm radius and extend vertically to 2000ft above the surface.</p> <p>The existing Hinkley Point nuclear installation has an associated RA. Through the Department of Transport's amendment of the aforementioned SI, a similar Restricted Area around the proposed facility (or an amendment to the existing RA) would provide a similar level of protection from civil aircraft movements.</p> <p>Clearly a new or amended RA would have a potential impact upon airspace availability to aviation. The scale of any such impact needs to be assessed and detailed within associated environmental documentation, which should also describe the mitigation of any related concerns. As a starting point, related studies will need to consider any aerodrome related operations, aviation activity associated with the power station itself and current usage of airspace (both civil and military, including Ministry of Defence-sponsored activity in Danger Area119 (Bridgewater Bay)).</p> <p>-Aviation Warning Lighting. The documentation provided to date gives no indication of the maximum height of any associated structure(s); there is a mandated requirement for structures of a height of 150m or more to be equipped with aviation warning lighting in accordance with Article 133 of the UK Air Navigation Order. Structures of height of less than 150m might also need aviation obstruction lighting if, by virtue of their location and nature, they are considered a significant navigational hazard. Given the anticipated potential for helicopter operations associated with the proposed power station, even if the maximum height of any associated structure was less than 150m, aviation warning lighting of some scale would be recommended.</p> <p>-Gas Venting and/or Flaring. Any venting or flaring of gas either routinely or as an emergency procedure such that might cause a danger to overlying aircraft would need to be appropriately promulgated throughout the aviation community.</p> <p>-Aviation Promulgation. There is a civil aviation requirement in the UK for all structures over 300 feet high to be charted on aviation maps. Should this development progress and the 300 feet height be breached, to achieve this charting requirement, developers will need to provide details of the development to the Defence Geographic Centre.</p> <p>Whilst nothing above negates the future need for relevant planning authorities to checks any safeguarding maps lodged with the authority and consult, where appropriate, in line with DfT / ODPM Circular 1/2003, I trust this initial overview is useful and meets you current needs.</p>	8699-131-416			/	<p><i>space where this is not disproportionate to the retail/business space normally found in similar types of infrastructure of a comparable capacity.” (Page 5)</i></p> <p>The reason for setting this out at length is that planning legislation and policy guidance makes clear that it is not open to EDF Energy to include within its application for development consent any sites or proposals which are not necessary for the development and effective operation of the proposed nuclear power station to its design capacity. Importantly, this means that it would not be lawful for EDF Energy to include within its application any of the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sites or proposals for uses or buildings which are not necessary for the construction or operation of the nuclear power station; ▪ Alter uses of sites which are not necessary to the operation of the power station. <p>Whilst associated development, therefore, can and should include proposals which are necessary for the construction of the power station, once their construction phase is complete, development consent cannot be granted through the Planning Act process for any future use of the land.</p> <p>This background provides a very important context for the consideration of concerns relating to any legacy strategy for the project.</p> <p>That is not to say, however, that the HPC Project cannot and will not generate an important legacy for the local area but any such long term benefits must arise from the inherent attributes of the project. The addition of unrelated proposals in order to generate local benefit would be inconsistent with the regime established by the Planning Act 2008 and would fail the tests of Government policy set for planning obligations which require any obligations to be necessary, reasonable and directly related to the project.</p> <p>Approach to Site Selection</p> <p>For the reasons set out above, it would not have been appropriate for EDF Energy to determine its approach to the selection of associated development sites by reference to those which offer the greatest potential for local legacy benefits. Indeed, such an approach would have been potentially unlawful.</p> <p>Consistent with the recognised national importance of the project, the selection of associated development sites has</p>

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Wessex Water	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	This investment may increase the rate of predicted growth in Sedgemoor and West Somerset and some infrastructure schemes may need to be promoted earlier than originally planned under the Local Development Framework - Core Strategy.	8705-131-2113			/	been driven by an understanding of what is necessary to ensure the efficient and sustainable construction of the Hinkley Point C Project. Operational requirements should not be compromised unless the application of those requirements would give rise to significant conflict with the terms of the National Policy Statements.
Nether Stowey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	1.7 At the presentation on 14 December 2009 EDF Energy indicated that the Initial Proposals Document did not include any proposals for associated development in Nether Stowey as they had been guided by the emerging Sedgemoor District Council Local Development Framework (LDF). In its response to the LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options consultation the Parish Council disagreed with the proposed Spatial Strategy and the lack of a review of the development boundary for the village; both of which the Parish Council considered to be too restrictive and against the best interests of the village. The Parish Council considered that the Core Strategy should allow for further development of Nether Stowey, most likely to the north and east of the existing settlement. A copy of the Parish Council's response to the LDF Core Strategy consultation is included as Appendix 2	8717-131-2356			/	EDF Energy has produced a detailed Alternative Sites Assessment (ASA) as part of the application for development consent, which provides a comprehensive explanation of the need for and selection of sites necessary for the construction and operation of the HPC Project. As the ASA makes clear, site selection has been determined by an understanding of the operational requirements of the HPC Project, with potential alternative sites screened against the assessment principles set out in the NPSs and against local planning policies and local amenity considerations – all informed by successive stages of public consultation. There are a number of important considerations which have informed site selection, all of which are more legitimate and relevant than the consideration of the long term legacy potential of individual sites. If legacy potential had been a principal consideration, there would have been a serious risk that operational or other important planning policy requirements would have been compromised.
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	All developments need to be compliant with the governments Planning Policy Statements. In the matters of flood risk management Planning Policy Statement 25 (PPS25) provides the relevant guidance. Section 14 of PPS25 advises that... "A sequential risk based approach to determining the suitability of land for development in flood risk areas is central to the policy (PPS25) statement and should be applied at all levels of the planning process." Section 17 of PPS25 goes on to state that "In areas at risk of river or sea flooding, preference should be given to locating new development in flood zone 1. If there are no reasonably available sites in flood zone 1, the flood vulnerability of the proposed development (see table D2, Annex D) can be taken into account in locating development in flood zone 2 and then flood zone 3. Within each flood zone, new development should be directed to sites at the lowest probability of flooding from all sources (see Annex C) as indicated by the SFRA (see Sedgemoor DC and West Somerset DC level 1 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).	88820-131-497			/	In practice, site selection was informed by a much wider range of considerations which recognise both the importance of the project's operational requirements but also the importance of local planning considerations. Dealing with long term uses With the exception of the proposed bypass around the village of Cannington (the Cannington Bypass) and the refurbishment and extension of Comwich Wharf, all of the HPC associated development proposals are temporary in nature, the use of which would be complete by the end of the construction process. Rather than requiring a legacy use of the sites after the end of construction, it would be open to the development consent process to require the full restoration of the sites to their pre-existing condition.
Environment Agency	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	This will also be in line with Sedgemoors draft preferred options which include sustainable development principles - "minimizing the impact on natural resources by incorporating the principles of sustainable consultation to contribute to energy efficiency, waste reduction and reduce waste use".	88820-131-7083			/	In recognition of this, EDF Energy has developed a Post Operational Use Strategy which would allow the IPC or the planning authority to consider the extent to which individual sites should be restored or whether buildings and infrastructure constructed for the purposes of constructing the proposed new power station could be partially or

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Countryside Council for Wales	Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Table 6.2: We note the overall assessment of significant strategic sustainability effects summarised in this table and the large number of negative evaluations identified. While we feel that a large number of these can be avoided, cancelled or reduced by appropriate mitigation measures there are two key points that must be emphasised;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The need to consider these proposals in the context of other developing plans, programmes and policies, notably the developing Local Plans and Local Development plans, Shoreline Management Plans and Flood Risk Management Strategies, The Environment Agency Review of Consents Process, and Severn Tidal power feasibility studies. - The requirements of meeting the Habitats Directive and particularly Section 85C of the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) (Amendment) Regulations 2007 	87901-131-833			/	<p>completely retained. Planning permissions would then be required to enable the continued use of those retained facilities or any alternative use of the land. By definition, EDF Energy could not be obliged to promote uses unrelated to the HPC Project. By this means, therefore, the operation of the Post Operational Use Strategy should act to ensure that each site is returned to an appropriate use after the construction process – whether that be restoration back to open countryside or retention and re-use of the facilities constructed for the HPC Project.</p> <p>Individual Sites</p> <p>In terms of selecting individual sites, there was no starting preference for greenfield or brownfield sites. Sites were initially screened against their potential to meet the</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>(Editor's note: pdf contains 2 submissions)</p> <p>(Editor's note: first submission. Text from letter received 30/12/2009)</p> <p>CONSULTATION ON INITIAL PROPOSALS AND OPTIONS - HINKLEY POINT C</p> <p>Thank you for providing the Highways Agency with the opportunity to comment on the above document. The Agency acknowledges that it is stage one of a two part consultation process with the second public consultation due to take place in March 2010.</p> <p>The Agency has been involved in pre-application discussions concerning the proposals at Hinkley Point C and the associated development since December 2008. In that time, we have informed EDF Energy of the requirement for a full and robust evidence base in order to develop a comprehensive suite of transportation documents, however, to date, insufficient information has been provided to enable the Agency to assess the potential impact on the strategic road network (SRN). The Agency requires all transport related documents produced to be in accordance with the DfT. 'Guidance on Transport Assessment and the Circular 02/2007 'Planning and the Strategic Road Network' The Travel Plan should be in line with the DfT 'Good Practice Guidelines: Delivering Travel Plans through the Planning Process'.</p> <p>In responding to the consultation document, the Agency will refer to each relevant section in turn:</p> <p>Section 1 - Introduction</p> <p>In reviewing the development objectives identified in paragraph 1.1.8, the Agency supports the objective which seeks to minimise as far as reasonably practicable any negative environmental impacts. However, given the importance of transport and the potential impact on local and strategic networks during the construction period, we would expect an objective dedicated to minimising any detrimental impact on the local and strategic road network.</p> <p>With regards to the summary of development proposals and specifically paragraph 1.1.12, the Agency would like to be updated on the Infrastructure Planning Commission's (IPC) confirmation of whether all 'Associated Development' can form part of the main application to the IPC or whether such development will need to be applied for separately under the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.</p>	88860-131-0	/			<p>operational requirements of the Project. Candidate sites were then scrutinised in more detail against planning policies and other considerations to determine the most appropriate sites. Some sites have particular locational criteria, which has meant that greenfield sites have been selected. Examples include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the proposed Cannington park and ride site which must lie close to the southern side of Cannington, accessible to the A39 in order to meet its operational purpose – no brownfield sites were available; ▪ the lay down area at Combwich had to be adjacent to Combwich Wharf and, again, no brownfield sites were available; and ▪ The land at Junction 23 for the proposed park and ride facility and freight logistics facility is a greenfield site. Again, for any site to perform the desired purpose, a location with easy access to Junction 23 was necessary. No brownfield sites were available and the selected site best met the range of planning and other assessment criteria. <p>Similar considerations apply, of course, to the route of the Cannington Bypass. The ASA explains its selection but it is clear that there was no brownfield alternative.</p> <p>Where operational flexibility exists, however, EDF Energy has demonstrated a preference for brownfield land over greenfield land. Specific examples are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. EDF Energy changed its plans for the proposed park and ride facility and freight logistics facility at Junction 24 from the greenfield site to the brownfield re-use of the Somerfield site, after consultation, when it became known that the Somerfield site would become available; and 2. EDF Energy revised its proposals for a park and ride site at Williton from a greenfield site to the brownfield site at

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 1	<p>11 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</p> <p>11.1. The legislative background to the draft National Policy Statements is set out in Part 2 of the Planning Act 2008. When considering applications for DCO's for proposed NSIP's the IPC is required to decide the application in accordance with any relevant NPS: they will therefore carry considerable weight</p> <p>11.2. The Council is a statutory consultee for all draft NPS's. Although the DECC deadline for responding to the consultation does not expire until 22 February 2010, the period for submitting evidence to the Parliamentary Select Committee that will scrutinise the draft NPS's expires on 15 January 2010. If the Council wishes its concerns and observations about the draft NPS's to be considered not only by DECC but by the relevant select committee they will need to be finalised and submitted by 15 January 2010, rather than by 22 February 2010.</p>	88800-131-1280			/	<p>the former lorry park site, again following consultation.</p> <p>Potentially greater flexibility exists in the selection of sites to meet accommodation requirements. As the Accommodation Strategy and the ASA explain, however, particular advantage was considered to attach to the development of the proposed on-site accommodation campus and associated leisure facilities at Hinkley Point C. Residual accommodation requirements were directed to Bridgwater which was considered to be the second most sustainable location – acting, as it does, as the principal service centre in the area. Within Bridgwater, brownfield sites have been selected at locations known as Bridgwater A and Bridgwater C. In both cases, care has been taken to ensure that the layout of the construction worker accommodation is such that its services and infrastructure at least is capable of long term re-use once the sites' use for construction workers is complete. In both cases, therefore, the layout of development has been directly informed by long term legacy considerations.</p>
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	<p>Re: Pre-Application Consultation Stage 1: Consultation on Initial Proposals and Options, November 2009</p> <p>Further to our Council meeting on 14 January, 2010, I can now confirm the Council's comments on the consultation document.</p> <p>I attach a copy of the Council report for your information and reference.</p> <p>The minutes of the meeting are held in draft but will not be confirmed until the next full Council meeting in March 2010.</p> <p>I must highlight that there were strong views from a number of Council members and community representatives about the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Lack of evidence base, particularly on labour force requirements, accommodation planning, and traffic impact -Lack of planning strategy 	88890-92-0	/			<p>The temporary use of the Bridgwater A site for construction accommodation is likely to be broadly consistent with the projected development date for the land which forms part of a much wider area consented for residential development. At Bridgwater C, EDF Energy expects that the best long term use for the land would involve the retention of the construction accommodation campus and its re-use for student accommodation in association with Bridgwater College. For the reasons set out earlier, however, this outcome cannot be guaranteed through the development consent process but would be determined through the application of the Post Operational Strategy.</p> <p>Overall Legacy</p> <p>Whilst the legacy use of individual sites has not been the primary consideration in their selection, it is expected that the HPC Project would generate a very substantial legacy for West Somerset, Sedgemoor and Somerset as a whole. Important components of that legacy include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 900 long term operational jobs at the power station; ▪ The Cannington Bypass and the enhanced wharf facilities at Combswich; ▪ Enhanced education facilities at Bridgwater College, the Construction Skills Centre at Cannington and at West Somerset College, funded by the HPC Project; ▪ The legacy of a skilled and trained construction
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	<p>EDF Energy is undertaking its pre-application consultation activities in two formal stages to inform a Development Consent Order application to be submitted to the IPC in July 2010. EDF's plans for consultation are set out in their Statement of Community Consultation (SOCC).</p>	88890-131-9216			/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 900 long term operational jobs at the power station; ▪ The Cannington Bypass and the enhanced wharf facilities at Combswich; ▪ Enhanced education facilities at Bridgwater College, the Construction Skills Centre at Cannington and at West Somerset College, funded by the HPC Project; ▪ The legacy of a skilled and trained construction
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	<p>- Any development proposed for off-site associated development conform with emerging and approved local policy including policies to focus development around the principal urban settlements of the Districts;</p>	88890-131-23043			/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enhanced education facilities at Bridgwater College, the Construction Skills Centre at Cannington and at West Somerset College, funded by the HPC Project; ▪ The legacy of a skilled and trained construction

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	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	- Any development proposed to conform with the Bridgwater Vision and wider Economic Masterplan, including the requirement to assess the economic implications of proposals and to develop an Employment and Skills Charter (Local Labour Agreement)	88890-131-23252			/	workforce; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The legacy of inspired school children resulting from the application of the HPC Education Strategy; The long term benefit of at least £40 million per annum being injected into the local economy through the life time of the project, in addition to any rates retention which is settled as part of the Local Government Finance Review;
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	- That there are no overriding policy or environmental constraints to developing the sites; - That work on a Construction Strategy is urgently undertaken by EDF to provide the overarching framework for the proposals for off-site associated development.	88890-131-23623	/			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The legacy of local businesses who have up skilled and enhanced their offer in response to the opportunities available at Hinkley Point C; The decontamination of land at Bridgwater A and the potential for re-use of infrastructure, services and buildings at other associated development sites such as Junction 23 and Bridgwater C;
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	5.1 The Sustainable Communities Strategy highlights the importance of economic well being and the energy sector, and makes reference to the need for the Local Development Framework to address issues arising from new infrastructure developments such as new nuclear energy facilities, as well as the need to prioritise skills and workforce development, and secure community benefit.	88890-131-28506	/			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant investment in local leisure facilities as a result of financial commitments made through the site preparation and DCO Section 106 obligations;
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	5.2 The Corporate Plan highlights national energy projects as one of Sedgemoor District council's key priorities to meet its objectives, and the need to secure investment in local infrastructure and through mitigation and wider community benefit. The Regeneration service plan also highlights that we need to tackle the physical constraints in the area and states our aim by 2014 to provide economic leadership across the District and to manage and shape investment and to restructure the economy and develop the workforce for the longer term through projects such as Hinkley.	88890-131-28890			/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The legacy from £20 million spent by and on behalf of the local communities on projects to enhance low quality of life. Enhancements to the road network in Bridgwater and elsewhere as a result of improvements carried out for the construction traffic peak; Enhancements to the public right of way network in the area, public realm heritage improvements in Cannington and Bridgwater and a range of landscape and other initiatives within the Quantock Hills Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB);
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	5.3 The councils Economic Masterplan includes an assessment of the potential of nuclear new build and a performance management framework which does need to be considered in shaping development proposals.	88890-131-29470			/	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant net long term ecological enhancement of the Hinkley Point C site itself as well as off site landscaping

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	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	<p>9. Risk Management Implications</p> <p>The following risks have been taken from the Regeneration Service Plan</p> <p>Risk: RE1</p> <p>Consequence to the customer: Failure to shape the future of our place and communities</p> <p>Probability: High</p> <p>Impact: High</p> <p>Action to mitigate: Evaluating development proposals against corporate and Policy objectives e.g. Hinkley</p> <p>Will the report recommendations mitigate the risk YES/NO: Yes</p>	88900-131-0			/	<p>improvements to the Fairfield Estate and within the AONB.</p> <p>Significantly, as the planning authorities recognise, the HPC Project provides a potential catalyst for the restructuring of the local economy. Without the development of Hinkley Point C it is possible to be pessimistic about the prospects for the long term local economy but the investment in the construction and operation of Hinkley Point C provides an opportunity to change the face of the local economy towards a more highly skilled, low carbon economy. Significant initiatives to take advantage of this potential are the subject of collaboration between EDF Energy and the local authorities and form the basis for the economic strategy set out in the Sedgemoor and emerging West Somerset Core Strategies.</p> <p>The inherent attributes of the HPC Pproject, therefore, would generate very substantial legacy benefits.</p>
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	The Conservative administration of Somerset County Council has stated that they support nuclear power, and the expansion of new nuclear development at Hinkley Point. This support is, however, only forthcoming on the basis that the operation at the site is demonstrated to be safe and the associated benefits of the development will outweigh environmental impacts.	87910-131-1858			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	An explanation is needed of how the process for progressing the development of these sites through the planning process. The choice of sites, the need for the actual development, the impacts and the after use all need to be fully justified.	87920-131-4531			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - Local Authority, Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	The development of these sites, which are almost all outside existing settlement boundaries, may not be straightforward given planning policy considerations. 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.	87920-131-4771		/		

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	b) The draft Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) requires applicants to describe the existing socio-economic conditions in the areas surrounding the proposed development. Furthermore, the Draft NPS indicates that the applicant should explain how the development's socio economic impacts correlate with planning policy. This analysis is lacking in the Stage 1 document, including information of how EDF's approach to "training and employment" will create positive outcomes.	87940-131-3171			/	
Bridgwater Town Council	Dual - Statutory Consultee and Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	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. This section should be read with section 2 above.	8745-131-4843			/	
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	n addition, the authorities require further information on the planning strategy for these applications, including the consultation activities programmed for all elements; the relationship of technical information and the mechanisms to evaluate cumulative effects of the development in its entirety.	88070-131-1347			/	
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 recognised that there are three distinct elements to the proposals, and that the Hinkley Point C and Associated Development elements will be ultimately addressed within an application to the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC); whilst aspects of the Preliminary Works are to be addressed within Town and Country Planning Act Applications and a Harbour Empowerment Order (for the proposed aggregates jetty). Further information on the management of these applications is contained within this Stage 1 evaluation.	88090-131-2704			/	
Sedgemoor District Council & West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - Local Authority and Consultee with an Interest in Land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 1	A common theme that emerges from the review is the absence of detail on the role of the Development Consent Order process, the Town and Country Planning Application Process and the Harbour Empowerment Order as it relates to each element of the works. It would be helpful to set out the purpose of the Consultation document in the context of the approach to planning applications and the Development Consent Order processes that will be required for each element.	88270-131-205			/	

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>EDF Energy Planning Application Strategy</p> <p>It is understood that planning permissions for associated development (on and off site) will be pursued through two consent routes: firstly, Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA) applications; and secondly, via a Development Consent Order (DCO) granted by the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC). What is not clear from the Stage 1 Consultation document is how the planning permission will be secured for the residential campus developments proposed. Communities and Local Government (CLG) Guidance on Associated Development states that the Planning Act 2008 "...defines associated development as development which is associated with a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project as defined in Part 3 of the Act. The construction or extension of one or more dwellings is specially excluded from the definition of associated development" (Paragraph 4). The EDF Energy Stage 1 Consultation sets out that TCPA applications will be submitted for on-site preliminary works, a new sea wall and jetty, but does not explain how consents will be achieved for residential development.</p> <p>The Councils would welcome the opportunity to meet EDF Energy to discuss a planning application strategy for residential development, once further clarification from EDF and the IPC is forthcoming.</p>	88270-131-720			/	
Stop Hinkley	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>We note that West Somerset District Council has a long existing but standing policy to allow any new build at Hinkley not to exceed the current generation output ie of Hinkley A plus Hinkley B. The projected output from two EPRs would greatly exceed that figure.</p>	88960-131-28319			/	
Somerset Chamber of Commerce & Industry	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	<p>Regulatory Issues</p> <p>The Somerset Chamber regards it to be inappropriate to comment in detail on the regulatory issues associated with this development suffice to say the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We would urge the Independent Planning Commission (or any successor) to deliberate and determine the application in a timely manner so that the project, when agreed, can start and complete to plan - We would urge the local authorities in Somerset affected by the application to provide a full pre-application service to EDF Energy so that associated planning applications can be determined in a timely manner so that the project, when agreed, can start and complete to plan. - We would encourage EDF Energy to continue to satisfy local interest in the project by remaining engaged with the local community - including businesses, throughout the process. 	8756-131-1338	/			

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Hallam Land Management	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 1	<p>In this regard Hallam Land Management considers that the priority in terms of accommodating non-local workers is to focus accommodation at Bridgwater. Rightly the consultation document recognises the importance of regional and local planning policies ("including areas identified for development") as a key factor in determining a strategic approach to the location of accommodation campuses.</p> <p>Existing and emerging regional and local planning policy direct an increasing proportion of development within the area to its principal town: Bridgwater. Bridgwater is identified regionally as a Strategically Significant City and Town. SSCTs are so identified not least because of their existing roles sub-regionally "for housing, employment cultural, education, retail, health and other services and facilities and as strategic hub for public transport' (Development Policy A, South West Regional Spatial Strategy- Proposed Changes). The Somerset Structure Plan likewise seeks to focus development in Bridgwater.</p> <p>Development directed to such locations is intended to take advantage of the range of services and facilities that are available and will in turn help to further enhance the facilities and services on offer. Sedgemoor District Council has recognised the mutually reinforcing benefit of concentrating new development at Bridgwater by setting out a comprehensive vision for the town of Bridgwater - the Bridgwater Vision.</p>	8760-131-3195			/	
Somerset Wildlife Trust	Non-Statutory Consultee	Stage 1	All applications associated with this development, which precede the application for a DCO to the IPC, will need to go through the town and country planning system. Therefore applications will need to follow relevant planning policy statements and guidance, and comply with provisions within the Local Plan.	8769-131-14208			/	
Tractivity 812	Public	Stage 2	<p>1. Any other ideas or comments?</p> <p>the decision for where hinkley point c is to be placed was decided in the major public enquiry back in the 1980's and i believe that people in somerset should let the work start or lose out</p>	9570-131-127			/	
Tractivity 1017	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>I support what Stogursey Parish Council has said in it?s response.</p>	9775-131-6508			/	
Tractivity 1065	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and 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>The lack of cohesion in the planning of improvements to the local infrastructure- the flood relief scheme, the long term development of the A38 andA39 road and EDF?s proposals means "local pain" for" national gain". EDF, local and national government together with the Europead Union should conduct a fundamental review of these linked issues. The review would produce a "win win" result for most involved including the host communities to Hinkley Point.</p>	9823-131-6821			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 1078	Public	Stage 2	4. Any other ideas or comments? I endorse the views of Stogursey Parish Council.	9836-131-1564			/	
Tractivity 1296	Public	Stage 2 Update	NO WORK should be commenced on this site until Planning Permission has been agreed by the IPC/Government.	89562-131-2406			/	
Tractivity 1357	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2 Update	Would not be in favour of Housing development in Shurton. We were informed by planning when we moved here that no further development would be allowed in Shurton.	89623-131-434	/			
Tractivity 281	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? There doesnt appear to be any clear linkage with the draft Environment Agency Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) in the options document. SMP indicates herd defences at Hinkley restrict sediment supply to the East at Stolford Steart. This will worsen with new defences for 'C' site. Could EDF work with the Agency to either maintain existing defences to East of Hinkley B or compensate households if properties are lost?	9344-131-6345	/			
Tractivity 377	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Without planning permission being granted yet, why is it necessary to destroy the environment. As a home owner i would not be allowed to start any sort of programme until i was granted permission to build so why can you do this?	9064-131-4896			/	
Tractivity 386	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? No work whatsoever should not begin before formal planning permission is granted.	9071-131-4270			/	
Tractivity 402	Public	Stage 1	All green field sites taken with this plan will become brown field sites and then building sites the local infrastructure will not support support such enlargement.	9085-131-4192			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 441	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? You need to balance earlier production against the risk of losing your investment. However, don't short-circuit due process (planning, environment assessment).	9120-131-6012			/	
Tractivity 466	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? I think it's vital to get HPC up and running asap so I support making a start at your risk.	9356-131-6815			/	
Tractivity 473	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? EDF must not do any works on land until planning consents have been given by the relevant authorities, and until after all 'consultation' has been completed and agreed.	9149-131-4641			/	
Tractivity 525	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? You should wait for planning approval like the rest of us. WSDC obviously make up the roles as they go, hedges, trees, woodland, wildlife all gone takes years to come back and establish, once ripped up!	9196-131-4831			/	
Tractivity 539	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Since EDF is so confident that the IPC will grant permission for the 2 reactors and since I understand that such works could be undone if not, I am not greatly concerned. Creation of hideous white elephants, if finance runs out and when these installations are superseded concerns me more.	9208-131-6412			/	
Tractivity 544	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 think the 2 x UKEPR's pressurised water reactors are too big a project for the local Somerset community infrastructure. I am not in favour of nuclear power. I see it as potentially dangerous, remembering Chernobyl in 1986 - fallout from Chernobyl fell on sheep pasture in Wales - where sheep are still restricted from selling as meets. It is also dangerous to our health (evidence of increased cancers in Burnham-on-Sea). However, if the IPC does give permission I think one reactor would be more suitable to our local rural community.	9213-131-5874		/		

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 562	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? HP is as good a place as any. Follow HPC public enquiries. See inspector's conclusions and recommendations by (personal details removed)	9231-131-4278			/	
Tractivity 581	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Any other comments? Why risk damaging the local environment before full planning permission is granted	9250-131-6280			/	
Tractivity 594	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? This will be damaging to the environment and habitats for years to come if planning is not approved.	9260-131-5506			/	
Tractivity 595	Public	Stage 1	11. Any other comments? Until full planning consent has been guaranteed this work should not commence.	9261-131-4418			/	
Tractivity 610	Public	Stage 1	4. Any other ideas or comments? You have produced plans which encompass people's property without even discussing it with them, me included	9274-131-885			/	
Tractivity 62324	Public	Stage 2	- Not being a conventional planning permission request, it is not possible to apply for a retrospective Development Consent Order. It is an offence under part 8 of the Planning Act 2008 to "Carry out, or cause to be carried out, development for which development consent is required, when a Development Consent Order has not been granted.	10008-131-205			/	
Tractivity 62352	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	5) In our opinion, there should be a properly conducted public inquiry.	10029-131-3226			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62473	Dual - Consultee with an Interest in Land and Public	Stage 2	The unnecessary use of a Greenfield site should not be contemplated especially when there are so many brown field options closer to the workforce.	10091-131-11907	/			
Tractivity 62560	Public	Stage 2	Environment Always a problem where industrial development, especially roads are concerned. HM GOVERNMENT does not like new road projects; EDF has been quick to hide behind this and potential loss of habitat statements. Surely people have the right to be considered as well. If this project is given the go-ahead, it will be "steam-rolled" through and all chance of mitigation will be lost, resulting in total misery.	10117-131-10758			/	
Tractivity 62574	Public	Stage 2	The PRINCIPLE is that, in his concluding report of the 1988/89 Hinkley 'C' Enquiry (personal details removed) stated that, in the event of a future Power Station being built. Canning ton and Stogursey should be exempt from any impact through it's construction, as they had already made their contribution at the time of construction of both Hinkley 'A' and 'B' Stations. That statement still stands!	10125-131-769		/		
Tractivity 62576	Public	Stage 2	Most people know that the planning proposal is a farce and that the new power station will go ahead regardless of local feeling or the feelings of the local authorities because it has long been a 'done deal' between the 'powers that be' and EDF.	10127-131-204			/	
Fiddington Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	You use the planning permission granted in 1990 - page 26 - 4.2.6 to 4.2.8, and quote the (personal details removed) on a number of issues ranging from the original justification for additional reactors, to the need for living accommodation. You conveniently omitted to also state that (personal details removed) approved the need for a link road, constructed over the River Parrett, connecting the M5 to the Hinkley site The need for this link (NBB) is now much greater, due to the gridlock traffic conditions experienced at peak rush hour, and in holiday times on the NDR and A38/A39	10223-131-9187		/		
Nether Stowey Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	5.3 The Parish Council has noted the specific proposals included in the "Proposed Planning Requirements and Obligations" document It is also noted that this document variously refers to "the communities closest to the power station* (e.g. para 4.4); "in the vicinity of the Project" (e.g. para 13.11) and "in the vicinity of Hinkley Point C" (e.g. para 30.2) without defining any of these descriptions or indicating whether or not they are meant to be the same.	10226-131-13274			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62486	Public	Stage 2	Given that the Government must rely on the nuclear industry in order to obtain the technical information necessary to compile a 'Cumulative Impact Assessment', the failure of EdF to provide an adequate Cumulative Assessment in this instance means that were the Government to facilitate the implementation of this project it would be vulnerable to legal action under the Strategic Environmental Assessment legislation.	89473-131-4972	/			
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Final Decision We will comment to the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) on the development proposals put forward by NNB Genco. The final decision on whether or not a development consent order is issued will be made by them. For other planning applications we will comment to the local planning authority and the appropriate planning committee will make the final	89068-131-1904			/	
Environment Agency	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Issue: At this time the requirements of PPS 9 (Bio-diversity and Geological Conservation) have not been sufficiently demonstrated. Comment: All development needs to comply with the principles of PPS9. This policy document ensures that the potential impacts of the planning decisions on biodiversity and geological conservation are fully considered. The approach of PPS9 is through a number of stages - firstly the focus is on the avoidance of impacts on Biodiversity, If impacts cannot be avoided they should then be mitigated/compensated against and or provide new benefits. Planning policy statement requires that planning decisions should prevent harm to nature conservation interests. Action: NNB GenCo should clearly demonstrate within design justification how Bio-diversity considerations factored into designs.	89087-131-4136			/	
Natural England	Dual - statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	The Planning Obligations document is deficient in its consideration of obligations and requirements for the Natural Environment. That there is no chapter for the consideration of impacts on biodiversity within the obligations paper is a serious omission. The document is not statutory so there are still opportunities to work with them on these requirements, which will also be picked up during the application, EIA and AA, and not wanting to prejudge the outcome of the Appropriate Assessment we may decide to limit our requirements to "consideration of the obligations and requirements for European Habitats will be dependent upon the outcome of the Habitats Regulations process".	89116-131-8859			/	
Highways Agency	Statutory Consultee	Stage 2	3.2 The Agency would expect any planning policy context sections to be revised in light of the Coalition's decision to revoke the RSS and RPG10. With this in mind, the Agency is currently seeking clarification from both Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council with regards to the future timetable of the LDF suite and their intentions to review and revise employment and housing targets.	89168-131-2217			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	In the spirit of the PPA, we are keen to understand how EDF have threaded the PPA vision and objectives through their development teams to ensure proposals align with the shared vision agreed at the outset.	89181-131-3004			/	
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	Moving forward we hope that in preparing the revised proposals the EDF team will work collaboratively with the Councils to address the advice of the local planning authorities and put some data, strategy and evidence behind revised proposals that better fit with the local policies.	89181-131-8244			/	
West Somerset Council	Local Authority	Stage 2	<p>4.23 As set out above, there are significant concerns with the material presented at Stage 2. However, it is important to note that this is potentially the final opportunity for this Council to set out its position prior to the submission of an application to the IPC. Given the weight of national need set out in the draft National Policy Statement for Nuclear Power Generation it is considered important to promote an alternative strategy, set out within Chapter 18 of the attached response, which assists in achieving the Council's Corporate Priorities, delivers the objectives set out in the vision statements for legacy, agreed between the Councils and EDF, while at the same time delivering the necessary infrastructure to deliver EDF's power station proposals on site.</p> <p>4.24 The alternative strategy presented seeks to deliver specifically in relation to Corporate Objectives 2, 3 and 7 that are set out below -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Objective 2: To ensure adequate mitigation for any negative impact on the local housing market from accommodating workers involved in the construction of Hinkley Point. - Objective 3: To maximise the legacy benefit to local people of any new housing built or existing housing utilised during the Hinkley construction. - Objective 7: To maximise the sustainable job and skills training opportunities together with the prospects for economic development that will be created as a result of the construction and operation of Hinkley Point. <p>4.25 These objectives are aligned with the vision statements for legacy agreed between the Councils which are as follows:</p>	89184-131-38			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>There is an important question which this raises, which goes to the heart of the Infrastructure Planning Commission (IPC) and its processes. In this new 'fast track' system, are standards lessened for information requirements, justification and attention to the local policy framework and local needs?</p> <p>As a key point, we would like to highlight how unusual it is to participate in pre-application consultation on the 'preferred proposals' when these are not clear, nor agreed with the local planning authority.</p>	89185-131-3151			/	

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	19. The information presented as part of the Stage 2 consultation does not take full account of the local policy framework or interpret how the proposals could contribute towards the aspirations and objectives of relevant policy documents. Relevant local policy documents, which result from significant stakeholder consultation and technical work, provide a detailed context from which a coherent approach could be developed that shows how the EDF proposals will integrate into the community.	89190-131-992			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	Furthermore, it was not clear how EDF had taken account of existing/emerging local policy.	89196-131-1355			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>The Infrastructure Planning Commission's Scoping Opinion response in April 2010 also raised a number of issues which EDF needed to inform this consultation on preferred proposals, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the requirement under the Regulations to provide a Non Technical Summary; - the need to describe the impact assessment methodology, use of legislation and guidelines or best practice, and to explain how the significance of any impacts will be described or assessed; - the need to clearly identify and describe the proposal and any associated development; - the need to consider the cumulative effects with other development in the area; - the need to consider the assessment as a whole and not as a series of unconnected specialist reports; - the potential impacts of the proposals on adjacent internationally and nationally designated sites; - the need to ensure the baseline information is complete and up to date; - the need to identify the physical scope of the assessment and that this is sufficient to enable consideration of the potential impacts; - the potential traffic impacts and transport other than road; - the potential visual impacts; - the potential social impacts, especially during the construction phase; - the need to consider decommissioning of the proposed development; - the cumulative impacts associated with the decommissioning of the existing stations. 	89201-131-1010			/	
Somerset County Council	Dual - local authority, statutory consultee and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2	<p>Mitigation is required to address identified socio-economic impacts and harm resulting from the development and should be in accordance with national planning policy as set out by both the draft Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (para; 4,1,5) and by Circular 05/05. This is recognised by Stage 2 and most of the aspirations set out by this report can be considered as mitigation and will therefore be required as Development Consent Obligations under the Section 106 Agreement.</p>	89206-131-2977			/	

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	12. The relevant economic development Section 106 agreement Heads of Terms should be negotiated prior to the DCO application and should then be a part of the DCO submission.	89211-131-5063			/	
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.	89432-131-3127			/	
Landowner - Bridgwater Gateway Limited (Miller Turner Investment Management Ltd)	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	- Whilst a willingness to negotiate has emerged over a period of time this has been overshadowed by the suggestion that failure to agree terms will lead to compulsory acquisition. To-date no information has been provided to Bridgwater Gateway to explain the process of compulsory acquisition.	89434-131-2752			/	
Tractivity 63240	Consultee with an Interest in Land	Stage 2	15.3 It appears that no consideration has been given to the use of negatively worded planning requirements to secure the delivery of essential infrastructure in advance of the construction of the proposed development or its operation. Consideration should be given to using such requirements to ensure that the impacts of the development are mitigated in so far as possible.	89446-131-1230			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Addressing lessons learnt from Stage 1: We do not believe that the concerns of the local authorities on the Stage 1 process have been satisfactorily addressed as part of the Stage 2 process. In particular there is an overarching concern that EDF Energy have not developed or communicated their vision and objectives for the integration of the Hinkley Point C development (including associated development) into the physical, social and economic fabric of the area, responding to the Planning Performance Agreement, and the policies and strategies of the local authorities. This is despite this issue being raised on numerous occasions as part of the Stage 1 response and in the period between stage 1 and the commencement of Stage 2.	89295-131-3096			/	

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 authorities note that it is widely recognised in the UK and internationally that the development of nuclear facilities and radioactive waste storage facilities can result in significant impacts and concerns about real as well as perceived risks. These concerns can include the actual and perceived impacts on public health and the long term environmental liabilities, as well as on local infrastructure and the economy (as described above). The proposal for the management and storage of high level radioactive waste, which could remain on site for up to 160 years, and the associated strategic flood risk from coastal inundation, is a very significant concern for the local authorities and the communities that will have to live with the real and perceived risks of the storage facility for several generations. The authorities consider that the waste storage facility in combination with the power plants puts at risk the confidence of the community in its long term future and has a chilling effect on economic and social vitality.</p> <p>The authorities consider that the requirements and obligations offer, including a contribution of £1 million into a Community Fund, falls far short in mitigating and compensating for the adverse impacts, risks and overall harm of the project.</p>	89300-131-6257	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>Important points of clarification and progress in terms of plan and strategy production, which will need to be reflected by EDF Energy proposals at a later stage are:</p> <p>There is limited reference to the West Somerset Local Plan (adopted April 2006), which will continue to play an important role with certain policies saved for development control purposes;</p>	89304-131-433			/	
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 commentary provided by EDF Energy on the West Somerset Core Strategy Options Paper (January 2010) , did not include reference to the three spatial development options for the District:</p>	89304-131-795			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>There is no reference to the West Somerset Council Planning Obligations SPD (December 2009), which includes policy on affordable housing, safe and sustainable travel, community infrastructure and the local environment, education and flooding;</p>	89304-131-2128			/	

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 limited reference to Sedgemoor Local Plan (adopted September 2004), which will continue to play an important role as part of the LDF, with certain policies saved for development control purposes;	89304-131-2374			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The Sedgemoor Core Strategy Submission document is due for publication in September 2010. This will include updated policies of relevance to the Hinkley Point C proposals. In particular, the document includes a chapter dedicated to Major Infrastructure Projects, which sets out three policies: MIP1 'Major Infrastructure Proposals'; MIP2 'Hinkley Point C Associated and Ancillary Development and Employment'; and MIP3 'Hinkley Point C Compensation and Mitigation';	89304-131-2582			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	West Somerset Sustainable Council Community Strategy (SCS) 2007-2010 has a vision to make life better for all with priority given to creating a prosperous, welcoming, strong, balanced and self sufficient West Somerset. Priorities include creating a knowledge based low-carbon economy where the level of commuting is reduced and young people are able to choose to stay in the area after leaving school. There is also an ambition for people to live in energy efficient housing with access to a well managed environment. Whilst the West Somerset SCS has been acknowledged in the documentation provided by EDF Energy, there continues to be more scope to respond directly to the vision of the local communities and ensure that a more compatible development is achieved.	89304-131-3452	/			
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The Sedgemoor Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) (3rd edition draft, October 2009), which has recently been refreshed by the Local Strategic Partnership, sets out a Vision for the place Sedgemoor will be by 2026. This is backed up by a series of six aims, with stated actions and indicators for measuring achievement.	89304-131-4220			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Sedgemoor District Council is in the process of finalising an Infrastructure Delivery Strategy, a copy of which will be provided to EDF Energy on completion.	89304-131-5774			/	

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	Sedgemoor District Council is in the process of finalising a Green Infrastructure Strategy, a copy of which will be provided to EDF Energy on completion. The strategy sets out a series of environmental projects and initiatives, with which EDF Energy's landscaping proposals and mitigation and compensation measures could align. Examples include woodland creation in Otterhampton and south of Bridgwater, Green Lane initiatives, and objectives to increase the number of street trees and green roofs and walls in the district.	89304-131-5935			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	West Somerset Council has an adopted Climate Change Strategy and Asset Management Plan that sets out how the authority will tackle central Government's CO2 reduction targets in the district. Sedgemoor District Council is in the process of preparing a similar strategy for its administrative area. The authorities are interested in the extent to which EDF Energy's proposals will have a bearing on the ability of the districts to achieve these targets and will welcome the inclusion of a Hinkley Point C climate change strategy within the documentation submitted to the IPC that considers this matter.	89304-131-6466			/	
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 noted that the relevant EDF Energy Environmental Appraisal (EnvApp) documents consider topic-specific policy and strategy documents, such as the Somerset Economic Strategy, West Somerset Economic Development and Access Strategy, Sedgemoor Economic Development Strategy and Bridgwater, Taunton and Wellington Future Transport Strategy. Sedgemoor District Council will wish to see strong reference to the Bridgwater Vision and design / transformational objectives, and a specific response from EDF Energy in terms of how proposals will be shaped to contribute to delivering the policies and priorities, but also in terms of creating facilities that will encourage and retain a workforce for the longer term. The Councils corporate plans are also highly relevant.	89304-131-7070	/			
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 since December 2009: Any development proposed should conform with emerging and approved local policy including policies to focus development around the principal urban settlements. Development in other settlements should be such that will sustain and enhance their role and will be commensurate with their size and accessibility. If development is proposed within rural centres or villages and does not meet these policy requirements then such development would need strong justification.	89325-131-1015			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The Stage 2 proposal does seek to focus development in Bridgwater, however the authorities have concerns about the over-reliance on the NE Bridgwater site, the absence of the cattle market site, and regarding the lack of dispersal of accommodation across the settlement to distribute impacts, illustrating a lack of recognition of the vision and objectives of Bridgwater Vision.	89325-131-1560	/			

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 December 2009:</p> <p>The developments should take account of the Sustainable Community Strategy for Sedgemoor and wider Somerset, Economic strategies of both Districts, and the Bridgwater Vision, as well as corporate and regeneration objectives, and should set out how the proposals can assist in delivering the strategies, priorities and outcomes.</p> <p>Update September 2010:</p> <p>There is limited reference or evidence that this recommendation has been taken on board by EDF Energy in the current proposals. Proposals that do not address the local policy context cannot be supported.</p>	89325-131-2640			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>Authorities position December 2009:</p> <p>It is recommended that both UK and overseas examples of community benefits packages that have been provided for other nuclear projects are evaluated including those currently being proposed for geological nuclear waste disposal facilities</p> <p>Update September 2010:</p> <p>This recommendation has not been set out in any detail.</p>	89325-131-7129		/		
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 authorities are concerned that EDF have not recognised the role of the local authorities in the preparation of an agreement to a development consent obligation. The IPC Guidance Note 2 on Preparation of Application Documents makes it clear that "The local planning authority remains the party who will enforce such obligations and would potentially be the beneficiary of financial contributions lawfully offered and related to the development".</p>	89418-131-16977			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>In relation to the DCO application(s), given that once an NSIP consent application has been submitted it is not possible to make material changes to the proposed scheme, the discussions with the authorities should also focus on which matters are better dealt with by consent "requirements" or as part of a S174 Agreement. These can be taken forward through a statement of common ground with the authorities. Otherwise, where the authorities cannot agree requirements or Section 174 provisions, the authorities will make representations to the Commissioner(s) that such matters should be included in the development consent order or be an ancillary matter. The authorities are mindful that once a DCO is issued, the enforcement of any requirements which equate to planning conditions will fall to the local planning authorities. The authorities are therefore clearly interested in considering the enforceability of the requirements and Section 174 obligation provisions to satisfy themselves that they will be practicable to enforce.</p>	89418-131-19560			/	

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 authorities agree with the references to guidance and policy as set out in this section of the document but also consider that regard should also be had to the following guidance and policy on obligations:</p> <p>Paragraph B10 of circular 05/05 states that "Planning obligations might be used, when appropriate, to offset through substitution, replacement or regeneration the loss of, or damage to, a feature or resource present or nearby, for example, a landscape feature of biodiversity value, open space or right of way. It may not be necessary to provide an exact substitute of the item lost, but there should be some relationship between what is lost and what is to be offered. A reasonable obligation will seek to restore facilities, resources and amenities to a quality equivalent to that existing before the development."</p> <p>Paragraphs B25 to B30 on the Plan Led System are also relevant.</p>	89419-131-3734			/	
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 authorities agree with the guidance set out in circular 05/05 as quoted at paragraph 4.1 but believe that it is also important, with respect to the approach to securing benefits for the local community to refer to paragraph B3 of the circular. In particular that part of the circular that states that "planning obligations might be used to prescribe the nature of a development (e.g. by requiring that a given proportion of housing is affordable); or to secure a contribution from a developer to compensate for loss or damage created by a development (e.g. loss of open space); or to mitigate a development's impact (e.g. through increased public transport provision). The outcome of all three of these uses of planning obligations should be that the proposed development concerned is made to accord with published local, regional or national planning policies."</p>	89419-131-6240			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>With respect to the above guidance the authorities do not believe that EDF Energy have correctly interpreted Government policy at paragraph 4.3. The first sentence of this paragraph states that to comply with Government policy EDF Energy "are not therefore proposing as part of the application for Development Consent any community benefits that are not necessary to mitigate the impacts of the Project". The authorities regard this to be a far too narrow, selective and a negative approach which does not respond to policy, guidance and practice on planning obligations.</p>	89419-131-7110		/		
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	<p>To accord with policy the authorities believe that the statement should read</p> <p>"EDF Energy are proposing as part of the application for Development Consent Order contributions to fully compensate for the loss or damage created by the development and mitigation for the development's impact. The compensation and mitigation, alongside any measures to avoid or minimise the harm of the development will accord with local and national policy".</p>	89419-131-7682			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	The authorities wish to see that planning conditions/requirements and section 106 planning obligations for preliminary works applications and DCO applications follow a similar structure (and use a common glossary of terms) to allow consistent and easily navigable coverage of required conditions/requirements and obligations during the relevant phases of the scheme and across the relevant applications.	89419-131-12112			/	
Sedgemoor District Council and West Somerset Council Joint Council Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor)	Stage 2	Obligations - The phasing of the development and use of the associated development sites will need to be agreed and the timing or prioritisation of bringing forward sites for worker accommodation will need to form part of the Obligations.	89419-131-14738			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62898	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>Along with many other residents of Cannington I attended a meeting on Thursday 10th at the college main hall primarily to debate the "Project Supplementary Planning Document" (draft form) all of 88 pages as released 1st March, otherwise referred to as the "SPD".</p> <p>At the open session I highlighted that there were anomalies between the above publication and green & orange EdF booklet handed out at their various presentations which took place 26th Feb at Williton to 5th March at Bridgwater. My concern was that the earlier EdF presentation did not relate to the content of the SPD document.</p> <p>When I look at the EdF version and backed up by the displays at the presentations I am somewhat confused as to the validity thereof. In fact I am questioning the soundness of both publications as there are clear differences. Both are dated Feb 2011 yet give differing viewpoints on various associated developments as well as mitigation offerings.</p> <p>My initial reaction was that the SPD was council driven, and were perhaps suggestions or pointers toward the best approach to any solution or offerings by EdF. However it is clearly stated in the foreword of the SPD page 2; paragraph 1.8 "Part of a Planning Performance Agreement, in collaboration with EDF".</p> <p>So if this is a joint effort then I feel justified to be concerned.</p> <p>May I highlight examples which are particularly relevant for Cannington?</p> <p>-EdF document clearly shows a reduced park & ride for Cannington on page 21, yet the picture on the SPD page 73 is the earlier version.</p> <p>-EdF publication fails to mention the proposal for Cannington Court, however it is on page 45 of the SPD box 24 refers</p> <p>-No mention of the A39 at all in the SPD as the following text from page 19 box 8 "Minimise the volume of road traffic associated with the development of the new power station at all times, but especially during peak hours and during the peak tourism season between the months of June, July and August. The efficient and safe functioning of key routes, including the M5, A38, A361, A370, A371 and A372 must be protected. "This is a very busy road, a Red-Route meaning that investigation into a Northern By-pass should be paramount.</p> <p>There are several other discrepancies between both booklets, but as they are not Cannington related, I don't feel I'm best placed to highlight as such. However each document seems to have their own agenda, which is why I believe that both publications may be uncertain.</p>	89658-131-0			/	
Tractivity 62913	Public	Stage 2 Update	<p>A main sports hub for construction workers, based at the main site or in surrounding settlements, due to the location of the A39 and C182 is planned for Cannington according to the Hinkle Point C Project-Supplementary Planning Document. This isn't mentioned in this pre-application consultation document. How open and transparent is that? When, how and by whom was this decided?</p>	89665-131-3014			/	

Respondent Reference	Respondent Type	Consultation Stage	Comment	Comment ID	Change	No Change	Noted	EDF Energy Response (Begins at first page of Topic)
Tractivity 62915	Public	Stage 2 Update	In conclusion we earnestly oppose EDF commencing any work on the proposed Hinkley Point C station before any Planning Permission has been granted. Planning Permission has already been gained for the removal of asbestos from Hinkley Point using roads directly through the village. EDF are also intending to use the existing infrastructure through Cannington Village before any/if a bypass is built for their construction vehicles. This will cause huge safety issues, noise, pollution, vibration and a vast amount of distress to the residents of this village. It is not acceptable practice.	89666-131-4144		/		
Tractivity 62945	Public	Stage 2 Update	Last one, is difficult, there has be not planning of approval for Hinkley, how can you comply with the planning rigorous process that does not exist in its entirety.	89677-131-51			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	the current project proposals do not integrate into local places and communities in ways that address the policy framework and local issues	89735-131-837	/			
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land	Stage 2 Update	Well thought through urban design approaches to both temporary and permanent buildings and infrastructure must meet Council and CABE requirements, and it is disappointing that the District Councils' as planning authorities, are yet to see or be briefed on associated development siting and design matters.	89735-131-9575			/	
Taunton Deane Borough Council	Local authority	Stage 2 Update	EDF's own Socio-Economic studies have increasingly highlighted the scale and extent of that impact as pre-submission planning has progressed. The extent of that impact raises profound concerns within this Council over the appropriateness of the Planning Performance Agreement (PPA), which has been agreed by EDF Energy and the two District and Somerset County Councils.	89741-131-1004			/	
24	Comments received under the EIR from the IPC	Stage 2	Recently, we noticed in the deeds of our (Editor's note: information redacted) This, put in context to the proposals EDF are making for the area of land a few yards from our back garden is, we feel, somewhat nonsensical.	89813-131-939			/	
Stogursey Parish Council	statutory consultee	Stage 2 Update	2.1.5 [4.1.11] How will planning approval be given for all of the temporary buildings around the construction site, given that they will be provided by the contractors, who have not yet been selected?	89872-131-3123			/	

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	Well thought through urban design approaches to both temporary and permanent buildings and infrastructure must meet Council and CABE requirements, and it is disappointing that the District Councils' as planning authorities, are yet to see or be briefed on design matters.	89876-131-8418			/	
WSC & SDC Joint Response	Dual - local authority and consultee with an interest in land (Sedgemoor only)	Stage 2 Update	<p>The proposed HPC site falls outside the development boundary of any established settlement and as such would be considered contrary to local plan policy. Development in this instance would only be permissible where the development would result in benefit both economic and social activity in the locality.</p> <p>WSC and SDC accept that the principle for the new nuclear power station is driven at the national level as Hinkley Point has been identified as a location which is suitable for the deployment of a new nuclear facility. Any decision for such development is not under the control of the Council and will be decided by the IPC (or successor body).</p>	89897-131-1384			/	
Sedgemoor District Council	Dual - Local authority and consultee with an interest in land	M5 J24 and Bridgwater Highway Improvements	Please also note that Policy RLT1 of the Adopted Local Plan requires lost public open space to either be replaced elsewhere or improvements to the remaining open space, this would be over and above any statutory compensation.	90055-131-1582			/	