



Members of the Cabinet  
(Councillors A H Trollope-Bellew (Leader), M J Chilcott (Deputy  
Leader), M O A Dewdney, A Hadley, C Morgan, S J Pugsley,  
K H Turner and D J Westcott)

Our Ref DS/KK  
Your Ref

Contact Krystyna Kowalewska kkowalewska@westsomerset.gov.uk  
Extension 01984 635307  
Date 24 October 2017

**THE PRESS AND PUBLIC ARE WELCOME TO ATTEND THE MEETING  
THIS DOCUMENT CAN BE MADE AVAILABLE IN LARGE PRINT, BRAILLE, TAPE FORMAT  
OR IN OTHER LANGUAGES ON REQUEST**

Dear Councillor

I hereby give you notice to attend the following meeting:

**CABINET**

**Date: Wednesday 1 November 2017**  
**Time: 4.30 pm**  
**Venue: Council Chamber, Council Offices, Williton**

Please note that this meeting may be recorded. At the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being recorded.

You should be aware that the Council is a Data Controller under the Data Protection Act. Data collected during the recording will be retained in accordance with the Council's policy.

Therefore unless you advise otherwise, by entering the Council Chamber and speaking during Public Participation you are consenting to being recorded and to the possible use of the sound recording for access via the website or for training purposes. If you have any queries regarding this please contact Committee Services on 01984 635307.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "B. Lang", written over a light blue horizontal line.

**BRUCE LANG**  
Proper Officer



## CABINET

**Meeting to be held on Wednesday 1 November 2017 at 4.30 pm**

**Council Chamber, Williton**

### AGENDA

1. **Apologies for Absence**

2. **Minutes**

Minutes of the Meeting of Cabinet held on 6 September 2017 to be approved and signed as a correct record – **SEE ATTACHED.**

3. **Declarations of Interest**

To receive and record declarations of interest in respect of any matters included on the agenda for consideration at this meeting.

4. **Public Participation**

The Leader to advise the Cabinet of any items on which members of the public have requested to speak and advise those members of the public present of the details of the Council's public participation scheme.

For those members of the public wishing to speak at this meeting there are a few points you might like to note.

A three-minute time limit applies to each speaker and you will be asked to speak before Councillors debate the issue. There will be no further opportunity for comment at a later stage. Your comments should be addressed to the Chairman and any ruling made by the Chair is not open to discussion. If a response is needed it will be given either orally at the meeting or a written reply made within five working days of the meeting.

5. **Forward Plan**

To approve the latest Forward Plan for the month of January 2018 – **SEE ATTACHED.**

6. **HPC Planning Obligations Board – Allocation of CIM Funding**

To consider Report No. WSC 113/17, to be presented by Councillor M Chilcott, Lead Member for Resources and Central Support – **SEE ATTACHED.**

The purpose of this report is to present the recommendations of the Hinkley Point C Planning Obligations Board, for the allocation of monies from the Community Impact Mitigation (CIM) Fund secured through the Section 106 legal agreement for the Site Preparation Works at Hinkley Point.

7. **Hinkley Point C Planning Obligations – Allocation of Ecology Contribution**

To consider Report No. WSC 111/17, to be presented by Councillor C Morgan, Lead Member for Energy Infrastructure – **SEE ATTACHED**.

The purpose of the report is to request that Cabinet recommends to Full Council that £250,000 is allocated to the East Quantoxhead Estate for the purpose of providing landscaping and other works to enhance the foraging habitat for bats as a result of the loss of habitat on the main Hinkley Point C site.

8. **Hinkley Point C – Non-Material Change Response**

To consider Report No. WSC 112/17, to be presented by Councillor C Morgan, Lead Member for Energy Infrastructure – **SEE ATTACHED**.

The purpose of the report is to bring to Members attention EDF Energy's proposed changes to the DCO 'plot plan' (essentially the details plans of the buildings on site during operation) and to formulate West Somerset Councils response to those changes.

9. **Planning Obligations Allocation**

To consider Report No. WSC 117/17, to be presented by Councillor M Chilcott, Lead Member for Resources and Central Support – **TO FOLLOW**.

The purpose of the report is to make proposals for the allocation of monies secured through planning obligations to individual schemes.

**COUNCILLORS ARE REMINDED TO CHECK THEIR POST TRAYS**

**CABINET****MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 6 SEPTEMBER 2017****AT 4.30 PM****IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, WILLITON****Present:**

Councillor M Chilcott ..... Deputy Leader (In the Chair)

Councillor M Dewdney  
Councillor C Morgan  
Councillor K TurnerCouncillor A Hadley  
Councillor S Pugsley  
Councillor D J Westcott**Members in Attendance:**Councillor G S Dowding  
Councillor B Maitland-Walker  
Councillor P Murphy  
Councillor R WoodsCouncillor S Y Goss  
Councillor K Mills  
Councillor J Parbrook**Officers in Attendance:**Assistant Chief Executive (B Lang)  
Assistant Director - Place and Energy Infrastructure (A Goodchild)  
Assistant Director – Asset Development Projects (T Gillham)  
Principal Revenues & Debt Recovery Officer (D Emery)  
Economic Regeneration Manager (C Matthews)  
Finance Manager (J Nacey)  
Project Accountant (P McClean)  
Senior Revenues Officer (J Collins)  
Meeting Administrator (K Kowalewska)**Also in Attendance:**

Jan Downie, West Somerset Opportunity Area Manager, Department of Education

**CAB21     Apologies for Absence**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor A Trollope-Bellew.

**CAB22     Minutes**

(Minutes of the Meeting of Cabinet held on 21 July 2017 - circulated with the Agenda.)

**RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the Meeting of Cabinet held on 21 July 2017 be confirmed as a correct record.

Administrator's Note: In relation to Minute No. CAB17, a request for an update on the Leader's letter to the Secretary of State was made and it was agreed to make arrangements for an email to be sent to all Members.

### **CAB23     Declarations of Interest**

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

<b>Name</b>	<b>Minute No.</b>	<b>Member of</b>	<b>Action Taken</b>
Cllr M Chilcott	All	SCC	Spoke and voted
Cllr C Morgan	All	Stogursey	Spoke and voted
Cllr K Turner	All	Brompton Ralph	Spoke and voted
Cllr D Westcott	All	Watchet	Spoke and voted
Cllr S Goss	All	Stogursey	Spoke
Cllr B Maitland-Walker	All	Carhampton	Spoke
Cllr P Murphy	All	Watchet	Spoke
Cllr J Parbrook	All	Minehead	Spoke

### **CAB24     Public Participation**

No members of the public spoke at the meeting on any items on the agenda.

### **CAB25     Forward Plan**

(Copy of the Forward Plan for the month of November 2017 – circulated with the Agenda.)

The purpose of this item was to approve the Forward Plan.

**RESOLVED** that the Forward Plan for the month of November 2017 be approved.

### **CAB26     West Somerset Council Representation on Minehead Business Improvement District Steering Group**

(Briefing report – circulated with the Agenda.)

The purpose of the report was to agree the appointment of the Regeneration and Economic Growth Lead Member as the Council's representative on the Steering Group for Minehead Business Improvement District.

It was noted that this was a Cabinet appointment on a new outside body and would subsequently be agreed annually.

The Lead Member for Regeneration and Economic Growth proposed the recommendation of the report which was duly seconded by Councillor S Pugsley.

**RESOLVED** that the Regeneration and Economic Growth Lead Member be appointed as the Council's representative on the Steering Group for Minehead Business Improvement District.

**CAB27**     **Proposed Business Rates Revaluation Relief Scheme**

(Report No. WSC 94/17 – circulated with the Agenda.)

The purpose of the report was to consider amending the Discretionary Rate Relief Policy to include the new relief for revaluation from 1 April 2017.

The Lead Member for Resources and Central Support introduced the item and the Principal Revenues and Debt Recovery Officer provided detailed information on the delivery of Revaluation Relief. It was estimated that 201 businesses, who had received hardship due to revaluation, would benefit from the relief and the target audience would be those in the retail and leisure industries within the West Somerset area. Attention was drawn to WSC's allocation of the relief funding (£148,000 in the first year) and it was explained that there would be no roll forward of the money to the following year, and any unspent monies would be reclaimed by Government. However, it was proposed to convert any unspent funding into cash which could be rolled forward to help organisations in years 2, 3 and 4. An update was also provided on the Small Business Help Relief and future legislative changes to Rural Rate Relief.

In response to a question, it was advised that the Council had been gifted £12,000 by Government as part of the New Burden's Allowance to help with the delivery of the relief scheme, however this would only be enough to cover costs associated with software changes.

The Lead Member proposed the recommendation of the report which was seconded by Councillor M Dewdney.

The scheme was applauded and the Revenues Team were thanked for their hard work on the policy.

It was requested that Scrutiny Committee comments be incorporated into the report being presented to full Council.

**RESOLVED** that the use of Council's local discount powers from 1 April 2017 to award Revaluation Relief to those organisations that face significant increases in their business rates bills following revaluation be supported.

**CAB28**     **HPC Planning Obligations Board – Allocation of CIM Funding**

(Report No. WSC 92/17 – circulated with the Agenda.)

The purpose of the report was to present the recommendations of the Hinkley Point C Planning Obligations Board for the allocation of monies from the Community Impact Mitigation (CIM) Fund secured through the Section 106 legal agreement for the Site Preparation Works at Hinkley Point.

The Lead Member for Resources and Central Support presented the item and provided information on the application submitted for CIM Funding. She went on to propose the recommendation which was seconded by Councillor A Hadley.

An error was noted in Appendix A to the report in that the funding allocated to this project would be released from the 1<sup>st</sup> Annual Payment and not the West Somerset fund as indicated.

It was acknowledged that small businesses in West Somerset would be impacted by Hinkley Point just as those in Bridgwater.

The process of how Key Performance Indicators were measured and monitored was explained.

**RESOLVED** that the following recommendation of the Hinkley Point C Planning Obligations Board be endorsed:

- a) To recommend to Council that a total of £79,289 be released from the 1<sup>st</sup> Annual payment to the Bridgwater Chamber of Commerce for the Supply the Supplier Business Engagement project with the following conditions:
- That 50% of the funding should be released to enable the employment of relevant project staff when a formal Memorandum of Understanding between the Bridgwater Chamber of Commerce and Somerset Chamber of Commerce is agreed, signed and in place before the start of the project.
  - That the remaining 50% of the funding should be released when a range of Key Performance Indicators that measure outputs and outcomes of the project with targets are developed and submitted by Bridgwater Chamber of Commerce and agreed by the Planning Obligations Board within 3 months of the start date of the project staff and a plan for financial sustainability of the project after the initial 2 years is developed by Bridgwater Chamber of Commerce and reported to the Board within 6 months of the start date of the project staff.

**CAB29**     **West Somerset Opportunity Area**

(Report No. WSC 93/17 – circulated with the Agenda.)

The purpose of the report was to inform Members about the implementation and activity to date of the Department for Education's West Somerset Opportunity Area Programme.

The Lead Member for Resources and Central Support introduced the item and provided background information.

Jan Downie from the Department of Education provided further information on the activities and funding being delivered in the West Somerset area. The West Somerset Opportunity Area was part of a wider tranche of initiatives addressing social mobility principally involving children and young people and much of what would be delivered would be related to education and training. The Department of Education would target national programmes and local funding allocated to support bespoke initiatives to recognise the problems in West Somerset in order to make changes in the educational system to achieve better outcomes and sustainable improvement.

The Lead Member proposed the recommendations which were duly seconded by Councillor K Turner.

Jan Downie confirmed that early years education was one of the priorities, and providing help and support in the home learning environment was also an important aspect of the programme as parental support given to children in the early years was fundamental to their learning. Members agreed that the key to improving standards was early intervention. There was some discussion regarding the relative merits of the two and three tier education system.

**RESOLVED** that the contents of the report be noted and that the Scrutiny Committee be asked to consider the contents of the detailed delivery plans when these are available later in the Autumn.

**CAB30**     **Seaward Way, Minehead – Development Proposals for Mixed Uses: Residential and Employment**

(Report No. WSC 72/17 – circulated with the Agenda.)

The purpose of the report was to seek Cabinet's endorsement of the business case and recommendations for proceeding with a viable investment and development of a mixed use scheme creating new affordable homes and essential employment units in Minehead.

The Lead Member for Housing, Health and Wellbeing presented the report and proposed the recommendations, subject to amending recommendation 2.1 (c) by changing 'Directors' to 'Director of Growth and Development' and 'in agreement with' to 'in consultation with'. The recommendations, as amended, were seconded by Councillor A Hadley.

Members were supportive of providing affordable homes and employment in the district, both of which were in great demand and would benefit the community. The proposals made excellent use of the site and Members underlined how important and valuable it was to support businesses who required additional space and people who needed low cost housing.

**CAB31 Exclusion of the Press and Public**

**RESOLVED** that the press and public be excluded during consideration of the appendices set out in Part 2 of Report No. WSC 72/17 on the grounds that, if the press and public were present during this item, there would be likely to be a disclosure to them of exempt information of the class specified in Paragraph 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended as follows:

The appendices contained information that could release confidential information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information). It was therefore agreed that after consideration of all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

**CAB32 Readmittance of the Press and Public**

**RESOLVED** that the press and public be readmitted to the meeting.

**CAB33 Seaward Way, Minehead – Development Proposals for Mixed Uses: Residential and Employment**

There was no further debate following the discussion of the confidential appendices and it was

**RESOLVED** that it be recommended to Council to approve the following proposals:

- (a) The sale of land to local housing provider, identified specifically for a residential scheme, on the eastern half of the site. The land sale will be subject to a conditional contract based on draft terms, as set out in the special purchaser's offer letter (Confidential Part 2 - Appendix D).
- (b) Approve a supplementary estimate of £2.982m to the Capital Programme for this scheme, to be funded by external borrowing, to pay for the costs of planning, development, construction and professional fees. (Confidential Part 2 – appendices H & I).
- (c) Delegate Director of Growth and Development and S151 Officer the authority to proceed with the proposed development, in agreement with Asset Project Group and Lead Members (Portfolio Holder, Deputy Leader & Leader), delivering two new commercial units for rent on retained land, and:
  - (i) Appoint a preferred Design and Build provider (Contractor A) as the most economically advantageous tenderer (Confidential Part 2 - Appendix F).

- (ii) Appoint a professional team of advisors to support the Council with detailed design and planning, quality and cost control, ensuring the commercial units are developed to an agreed specification, on time and within budget (Confidential Part 2 - Appendix K);
- (iii) Conclude Lease Agreement with occupier of large Light Industrial Unit (Draft Terms agreed with major business operator and its parent company as guarantor (Confidential Part 2 - Appendices L);
- (iv) Conclude Lease Agreement with occupier of new smaller unit, based on draft Heads of Terms agreed with local business operator (Confidential Part 2 - Appendix M);
- (v) Submit a planning application, following consultation and develop scheme in accordance with a future planning committee determination, within agreed programme timescales and budget (indicative milestones in Confidential Part 2 Appendix G).

The meeting closed at 6.49 pm.



9  
Cabinet Forward Plan January 2018

Forward Plan Ref / Date proposed decision published in Forward Plan	Date when decision due to be taken and by whom	Details of the proposed decision	Does the decision contain any exempt information requiring a resolution for it to be considered in private and what are the reasons for this?	Contact Officer for any representations to be made ahead of the proposed decision
FP/18/1/01 19/01/2017	3 January 2018  By Leader of Council	Title: <b>Corporate Performance Report 2017-18 Quarters 1 and 2</b>  Purpose: to provide Members with an update on progress in delivering corporate priorities and performance of council services	No exempt / confidential information anticipated	Richard Doyle, Corporate Strategy and Performance Officer 01823 356309
FP/18/1/02 19/01/2017	3 January 2018  By Lead Member Resources & Central Support	Title: <b>Budget Monitoring Report Quarters 1 and 2</b>  Purpose: to provide Members with details of the Council's expected financial outturn position in 2017/18 for both revenue and capital budgets, together with information relating to predicted end of year reserve balances	No exempt / confidential information anticipated	Jo Nacey, Financial Services Manager / Deputy S151 01823 356537
FP/18/1/03 19/01/2017	3 January 2018  By Lead Member Resources & Central Support	Title: <b>Allocation of Section 106 funds held</b>  Purpose: to make proposals for the allocation of monies secured through planning obligations to individual schemes, and to update members with the current funding position	No exempt / confidential information anticipated	Tim Burton, Assistant Director Planning and Environment 01823 358403
FP/18/1/05 19/01/2017	3 January 2018  By Lead Member for Energy Infrastructure	Title: Hinkley Point  Purpose: to consider any key issues that arise relating to Hinkley Point	No exempt / confidential information anticipated	Andrew Goodchild, Assistant Director Energy Infrastructure 01984 635245

Note (1) – Items in bold type are regular cyclical items.

Note (2) – All Consultation Implications are referred to in individual reports.

The Cabinet comprises the following: Councillors A H Trollope-Bellew, M Chilcott, M Dewdney, A Hadley, C Morgan S J Pugsley, K H Turner and D J Westcott.

The Scrutiny Committee comprises: Councillors P H Murphy, N Thwaites, R Clifford, G S Dowding, B Maitland-Walker, J Parbrook, R Woods, I Aldridge and P Pilkington.



Report Number: WSC 113/17

## West Somerset Council

### Cabinet – 1<sup>st</sup> November 2017

#### HPC Planning Obligations Board – Allocation of CIM Funding

This matter is the responsibility of Cllr M Chilcott, Lead Member for Resources and Central Support.

Report Author: Lisa Redston, Community and Housing Impact Lead, Energy Infrastructure

#### 1 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to present the recommendations of the Hinkley Point C Planning Obligations Board, for the allocation of monies from the Community Impact Mitigation (CIM) Fund secured through the Section 106 legal agreement for the Site Preparation Works at Hinkley Point.

#### 2 Recommendations

2.1 **That Cabinet makes a recommendation to West Somerset Full Council to endorse the recommendations of the Hinkley Point C Planning Obligations as follows:**

- 2.1.1 To award Somerset County Council £393,849 from the 1st Annual CIM fund payment for the Somerset Education Business Partnership project.
- 2.1.2 To not award £300,000 of CIM funding to North Petherton Rugby Club for the New Changing Rooms project on the basis that the project did not sufficiently meet the criteria to mitigate community impacts of the HPC development.
- 2.1.3 To award Holford and District Village Hall £125,000 from the CIM Fund ring-fenced for West Somerset for the Holford Village Hall - Fit for Future project with the following conditions:  
That no funding will be released until
- Planning permission has been granted for the proposed project.
  - Match funding has been secured to cover the total project costs as set out in the application.
  - Following the tender process and selection of a preferred contractor the CIM Fund Manager is satisfied that the project remains affordable.
- 2.1.4 To not award £35,000 of CIM funding to Fiddington Village Hall for the Kitchen and Toilet Renovation project and to advise the applicants to return with a revised application.
- 2.1.5 To note that the HPC Planning Obligations Board have deferred a decision on the application from Citizens Advice Sedgemoor for £165,837 towards the Supporting Hinkley Advice Needs project pending the submission of additional information by the applicant to support their application.

### 3 Risk Assessment

Risk Description	Current Score	Existing and planned control measures	Target Score after control
Lack of quality approvable bids to the CIM Fund due to communities not having the means (skills/resources) to make quality bids and deliver projects resulting in a lack of effective impact mitigation projects	Medium (12)	Community development officers in post in WSC/TDBC and Sedgemoor District councils and Engage WS contracted to support communities in WS in making bids and project delivery. Risk remains feasible as capacity of community development officers is limited.	Medium (9)
Risk of future community impacts not being mitigated due to early demand for funding exceeding available budget resulting in an inability to respond to future or unknown impacts.	Medium (12)	Annual contribution payments (2015 and 2016) will ensure a budget is available to respond to future demand. Planning Obligations Board to continue to develop funding strategy that includes mechanisms for review and reprioritisation and trigger points for release of funding to reflect changes in circumstances and impacts.	Low (8)
Failure of the Planning Obligations Board to allocate CIM fund by April 2019 resulting in continued requirement for staff resource to manage application/decision making process, finances and to support community.	Medium (9)	Planning Obligations Board to continue to develop funding strategy to provide direction for release of funding.	Low (4)
Failure of the Planning Obligations Board to monitor the actual and potential impacts of the development due to the lack of a defined impact monitoring procedure resulting in the inability of the Planning Obligations Board to apply funding to achieve maximum mitigation of impacts.	Medium (16)	Planning Obligations Board to develop process and procedures for monitoring the impact and potential impact of the development and reflect this in the funding strategy.	Low (8)

- 3.1 The scoring of the risks identified in the above table has been based on the WSC and TDBC council's risk assessment scoring matrix. Only those risks that score medium or high are detailed in this report. The full risk assessment is available on request from the CIM Fund Manager.

### 4 Background

- 4.1 Applications to the CIM Fund are considered by the Planning Obligations Board against nine criteria outlined in the Section 106 legal agreement for the Site Preparation Works at Hinkley Point. A recommendation is subsequently made to West Somerset Council's Cabinet. Any proposals above £25,000 also require approval by West Somerset's Full Council.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation Criterion</b>
<b>Priority Impact Zones</b>	<p>Priority shall be given to those areas that are anticipated in the Environmental Statement to experience or which actually experience the greatest adverse impact from the project in accordance with the following hierarchy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Directly adjacent to the site</li> <li>2) Directly adjacent to the main transport routes to and from the site within West Somerset, Sedgemoor and Somerset</li> <li>3) Within West Somerset and/or Sedgemoor and directly affected by adverse impacts of the project</li> <li>4) In Somerset but beyond West Somerset and Sedgemoor and experiencing the next greatest degree of adverse impact, with projects which benefit West Somerset and Sedgemoor as well as its immediate area</li> <li>5) In Somerset and experiencing indirect adverse impacts or in relation to a measure which benefits West Somerset and/or Sedgemoor.</li> </ol>
<b>Quality of Life</b>	The principal purpose of the contribution shall be to enhance the quality of life of communities affected/potentially affected by the Project.
<b>Sustainability</b>	To what extent will the project contribute to achieving sustainable communities, contribute to regeneration objectives and raising environmental sustainability?
<b>Extent of benefit</b>	To what extent has the applicant demonstrated that the project will ensure a positive benefit and/or legacy to an adequate proportion of people within that community?
<b>Community Need</b>	To what extent has the applicant demonstrated a need for the project
<b>Community Support</b>	To what extent is there demonstrable local community and and/or business support for the project?
<b>Partner Support</b>	To what extent is there demonstrable local partner support for the project?
<b>Governance</b>	Demonstrate that good governance arrangements are in place, including financial and project management to ensure deliverability?
<b>Value for Money</b>	Can the applicant demonstrate value for money and that reasonable effort has been made to maximise the impact of any investment? Has match funding been secured where appropriate?

## 5 CIM Applications considered by the HPC Planning Obligations Board

- 5.1 The HPC Planning Obligations Board considered 5 applications to the CIM Fund on 5<sup>th</sup> October 2017. The Board considered the application against each of the nine funding criteria.
- 5.2 Where an application is seeking funding to mitigate impacts or to benefit from opportunities in relation to education, skills, training or employment the Planning Obligations Board seeks the view of the Hinkley Point C Education, Employment and Skills Operations Group (EESOG). EESOG includes representatives from the District and County Council, EDFE, Department of Work and Pensions, and a range of Education and Training providers. The views of EESOG in relation to applications are included in the application summary where appropriate.
- 5.3 Where an application is seeking funding to mitigate impacts or to benefit from opportunities in relation to the promotion of tourism the Planning Obligations Board seeks the view of the Hinkley Point C Tourism Action Partnership (HTAP). The view of HTAP in relation to the application is included in the application summary where appropriate.
- 5.4 All applications have been subject to financial viability checks, any concerns in relation to the viability of an organisation or project are highlighted within the summary.
- 5.5 Cabinet is asked to consider the following applications for allocation of CIM Funding.
- 5.6

Project Name:	Somerset Education Business Partnership(EBP)
Expression of Interest Ref No:	232
Organisation Applying:	Somerset County Council
Summary of Project:	Funding is sought to create an EBP in Somerset. The EBP will deliver a face to face contact with employers and educators, online resource, and events regarding local employment and work related learning opportunities (e.g. industry days, work experience, traineeships and apprenticeships), careers advice provision and guides for employers on how to engage with and recruit young people. The focus of the EBP will be to forge links between business and young people via education in Sedgemoor and West Somerset. The EBP will also take a strategic role and analyse gaps and help to standardise quality of provision across Somerset. The EBP will be open to all, not just those in education. The EBP will be impartial and will not act as an agent of any particular organisation. Funding is sought for the first 3 years of the project.
Impacts mitigated as stated in application:	There is evidence that Somerset employers and particularly those in West Somerset and Sedgemoor feel they cannot compete with HPC in retaining or attracting new staff to backfill vacancies due to displacement of staff to HPC, this includes young people. There are opportunities for young people as a result of HPC to seek careers within Somerset, however at present there is not consistency across the County in terms of careers advice, understanding how to access employment or work related learning to enable them to take advantage of the opportunities that HPC and back filling posts can provide. This project will ensure young people can take advantage of working and engaging with employers.
Start Date: Jan 2018	Total Project Costs: £443849

Completion Date: Dec 2020	<b>Amount applied for: £393849</b>
Documents received:	Business Plan; 11 letters of support; 2015/106 and 2016/2017 statement of accounts; SCC Strategic Framework; Project financial forecast summary; SCC constitution, Financial Regs and Procurement regs; SCC member code of conduct and decision making protocols.
<b>EESOG Expert Commentary:</b>	
<p>EESOG was broadly supportive of the original proposal, feeling that such a service is essential for Somerset where there is currently a very patchy provision of Careers Education Information Advice and Guidance (CEIAG).</p> <p>The view of EESOG is that the lack of good CEIAG provision is seriously undermining the talent pool at a time when opportunities and demand are at their highest. This means that young people are missing out on some great and rewarding placement and jobs.</p> <p>EESOG did recognise some of the weaknesses of the previous application, and are pleased to see that this proposal is much stronger and viable.</p> <p>In making comments members of EESOG have commented:</p> <p>The application demonstrates much improved value for money  The Governance arrangements are far more transparent, and much needed capacity for the Somerset Chamber is now being delivered via SCC and their agreement to host the posts.  The financial contributions from the Somerset Local Authorities is welcomed, and helps to embed additional value, and avoids duplication of activity.  There is far more confidence that the EBP will align to the activity of EESOG and ensure that Somerset provides a sustainable talent pool to drive economic productivity for the area.</p>	
<b>CIM Fund Manager Comments:</b>	
<p>This was a very well thought out application which proposed an effective way to deliver the service in the local context in terms of impact mitigation; maximising opportunities available as a result of the HPC project and drawing on the strength of existing partnerships.</p> <p>The bid contained a great deal of detail to give the necessary assurances that the concerns of the Board in relation to the previous bid for an EBP in Somerset had been addressed.</p> <p>SCC are well placed to ensure the project is delivered effectively and to draw upon existing partnerships within the skills, education and employment sector and to draw upon the expertise and business engagement provided by the Somerset Chamber of Commerce.</p> <p>Community need has been established in the context of mitigating the impacts of displacement of employees to the HPC project, maximising the opportunities for young people to take gain from generationally significant employment opportunities and the current challenges of a mixed and confusing array of career advice, work related learning opportunities and opportunities to engage with employers in Somerset. The project will provide significant benefits for education providers, individuals (especially young people) and employers in Somerset.</p> <p>The application included a list of outputs and deliverables providing clarity on the expected activity of the EBP. Performance will be reported on KPIs directly attributed to the EBP (take up of service by schools and employers) and those indirectly attributed to the EBP (e.g reduction in NEETs, increased levels of employment and social mobility). If the project</p>	

is awarded funding the applicants should be advised to develop ways to measure outcomes of careers advice, WRL and employment opportunities for individuals.

The plans to ensure that information is open to all businesses, education providers and individuals is key to ensuring a wide reach, and the plans to target those areas most impacted by the HPC development shows a keen understanding of local context and community need.

The application describes very strong partnership working arrangements to ensure a range of key stakeholders (statutory and business) have input into the day to day operation of the EBP, and overall governance, strategic steer, risk management and performance monitoring. Collaborative working between key statutory stakeholder organisations, the Chamber, EDF skills and employment projects, supply chain, education providers and employers provides assurance that the project will be delivered effectively in Somerset.

The assessment of whether the project offers value for money has taken into account the potential for significant social value to be gained from the project and that the project is likely to maximise opportunities and benefits for young people in Somerset.

**POB comments:**

The Board felt the bid was very comprehensive and addressed all questions they had in relation to the effective delivery of an EBP in Somerset.

The Board took into account that the project would provide benefits for a three years and that an exit strategy, that considered continuation and funding options for the project past year 3, has been considered.

The Board agreed that the focus on measuring the take up of the service by businesses and education providers needed to be enhanced by measuring the actual benefits and the impact on the lives of young people and they would wish to see with within any monitoring reports submitted by the applicants to the CIM Fund Manager.

The Board suggested that the applicants were advised to utilise social media to engage with young people.

The Board unanimously agreed to recommend allocation of CIM funding to support the project.

**POB recommendation:**

To allocate £393849 from the 1st Annual CIM fund payment to Somerset County Council for the Somerset EBP project.

5.7

Project Name:	Additional Changing Rooms
Expression of Interest Ref No:	216
Organisation Applying:	North Petherton Rugby Football Club

Summary of Project:	Funding is requested to contribute towards new changing rooms at North Petherton rugby club which will enhance facilities.
Impacts mitigated as stated in application:	Communities in North Petherton are impacted by Hinkley Point C and related significant housing developments in the area. 2 caravan parks in North Petherton are solely providing accommodation to HPC workers (150 caravans are expected to accommodate workers). The club provides community hub providing sport and other community facilities for those in North Petherton and the surrounding areas. The club has seen an increase in membership across all age groups due to promotion of health and wellbeing activities and this is expected to increase with HPC families migrating into the area. The influx of new visitors and residents due to HPC has driven the need to update facilities. The club hosts training and matches for a HPC rugby team.
Start Date: 1/5/2018	Total Project Costs: £420,000
Completion Date: 1/9/2018	<b>Amount applied for: £300,000</b>
Documents received:	Club development plan; Letters of support; Public liability insurance; various policies (health and safety, codes of conduct, safeguarding, code of conduct, first aid, membership etc.); Accounts 2014/2016, Plans for new changing rooms and gym.
Documents outstanding:	No detailed business plan or cost projections provided.

#### CIM Fund Manager Comments:

Although it is clear that the club is committed to improving its community and sporting facilities the application was missing essential detail to provide assurance that an investment of this size to develop new changing rooms would be appropriate and would mitigate impacts of the HPC project for a significant number of the local community.

There is a good level of community support for the project, evidenced through a range of letters from user groups, local organisation and partners. The club is well used for rugby by a good number of the local community, groups and visitors, although the changing room use is limited to and will benefit only those involved in the sport and some community groups at this time.

Although the organisation is planning to develop a community gym at the facility at this stage funding is not guaranteed and a delivery plan for the gym was not included to give the necessary assurances that the wider community would benefit from the changing rooms.

Local authorities are aware that HPC workers are staying in accommodation provided by the 2 caravan parks adjacent to the club, although these are not solely providing accommodation for HPC workers. We are also aware that there are a significant number of HPC workers renting accommodation within the areas of Stockmoor and Willstock.

There is definite need for enhanced community and sporting facilities to meet increase in demand, however benefit will be limited to those using the changing rooms for rugby until the gym and enhanced community space have been developed. If funding was sought for the gym and enhanced facilities this would provide better impact mitigation. It is expected

that an investment of £300k should provide transformational benefits for a community impacted by HPC with benefits for a wide range of people. The development of changing rooms alone is unlikely to provide this.

There is significant detail missing from the application in terms of risk assessment and contingency, clear measures of success, income generation and how this will be used to offset future development and maintenance plans and plans for securing the funding needed for the gym and enhanced social space, promotional activity and an explanation of decision making in terms of the preferred supplier.

With £300k sought for this project this information is vital to help give necessary assurance that the project is deliverable and will achieve impact mitigation for the wider community of North Petherton.

**POB Comments:**

The Board agreed that there was a clear need for enhanced community and sporting facilities in North Petherton as a result of the growth in population in the area and impacts of the park and ride and works at junction 24 linked to the HPC project.

The Board agreed that this was potentially the right location and organisation to deliver a project that benefited the wider community, but that the new changing rooms alone didn't offer the opportunities that the wider community needed.

The Board had concerns about the scale of the project, and suggested that a project that aimed to enable access to facilities to a wider range of people through other recreational activities at the club would provide better mitigation of impacts.

The Board requested that the CIM Fund Manager and Sedgemoor District Council work with the applicants to consider alternative projects that would deliver better impact mitigation.

**POB recommendation:**

To not award CIM funding to North Petherton Rugby Club for the New Changing Room project.

5.8

Project Name:	Holford and District Village Hall - Fit for Future (Second application)
Expression of Interest Ref No:	179
Organisation Applying:	Holford and District Village Hall Committee
Summary of Project:	To refurbish and extend the Village Hill and change the adjoining land to create an overflow car park for users of the hall and adjacent Cricket Club. The project will enable educational, recreational, sport and social activities for all age groups in the surrounding areas and improve quality of life for residents of communities nearest the HPC site, new HPC workers and families moving into the area. The extension to the venue will enable activities to take place that can't be offered due to the current layout of the building. Work includes an improved entrance with porch, a new meeting room and a new community area with flexible storage and improved toilet and baby

	changing facilities, improved lighting and insulation to reduce running costs.
Impacts mitigated as stated in application:	The HPC development is increasing the number of workers and families moving into and visiting the area. The project aims to foster good relations between new residents and the local community. The project aims to provide activities for HPC workers and the local community affected by the works at the HPC site and wider infrastructure development. The project aims to involve new residents and families in community clubs and promote volunteering. The venue is on a convenient location on the A39 close to target impacted groups. The applicants will take the lead in early action to promote a cohesive community and provide services, activities, and courses to reduce the need for local residents to travel, helping to reduce congestion as a result of the HPC project.
Start Date: April 2018	Total Project Costs: £517,570
Completion Date: September 2018	<b>Amount applied for: £125,000</b>
Documents received:	Capital Project Delivery Plan; Business Plan; Analysis of community survey results; 53 letters of support; Project plan; Project budget; Travel plan for proposed hall; safeguarding and equality policies; access statement; copy of hire agreement; hall risk assessment; health and safety and fire safety policy; insurance policy; complaints policy; conflict of interest policy; data protection policy; charity registration; balance sheet Aug 2017.
<b>CIM Fund Manager Comments:</b>	
<p>This is a very well presented, detailed and thought out project and application to the CIM fund. Successfully meeting all 9 criteria.</p> <p>Community need in relation to the HPC project has been well established and has taken into account detailed research into the local community and the wider District picture. Need has been established for local activities that reduce the need to travel for those living in communities closest to the HPC site, especially for vulnerable and low income members of the community that are less likely to wish to travel outside of the villages. Need has also been established in relation to the integration of HPC workers who are living in Holford and the surrounding villages and who will be attracted to the area as a result of the park and ride in Williton.</p> <p>The applicants have carried out extensive and robust consultation with the wider community. This included users, potential new users and hirers, young people, families and older people to ensure the project is needed by the community. The consultation has helped to shape the layout of the improved facilities and the offer of services and activities to ensure they meet the needs of the community and mitigate the impacts of HPC on communities closest to the HPC site. Over 50 letters of email and support have been provided with the application from a range of users, residents, families, local businesses and agencies and councillors.</p> <p>The applicants have an impressive range of partners involved in the design and delivery of provision within the hall. The application demonstrates a keen understanding of the importance of sharing expertise, resources and provision across partners to enable community needs to be met effectively. A joint Awards for All grant has enabled the applicants to establish partner working relationships with other village halls in the area, together they have held taster sessions, governance and facilities management training</p>	

and now ensure that halls offer different provision to widen the catchment area and signpost to each other effectively.

Governance arrangements are robust, with clear structures for financial and project decision making in relation to the project. A detailed risk register and management plan was included in the application. A range of targets and performance measures have been developed and are included in the business plan. The applicants have gathered baseline information to measure the success of the project in relation to increase in provision and take up of activities, along with outcome measures taking into account improved wellbeing and reduced impacts of HPC on the community.

Letter of support provided with the application evidence that the applicants have consultation with potential users and groups for social, leisure, educational and business use to support the cost projections for increase revenue from hire set out in the business plan.

The investment from the CIM fund along with significant match funding will help to ensure a significant number of the local impacted community will benefit from the facilities and provision of local events, activities, courses and opportunities for private and business hire throughout the life of the HPC project.

#### POB Comments:

The Board fully supported the application and commented that the bid provided a great deal of detail; was greatly improved from the first application; was requesting a more appropriate level of funding and aimed to draw a significant amount of match funding into the area.

The Board recommended that the applicants should be advised there is a resource available as part of the Hinkley Help scheme to provide professional construction management support to the project.

#### POB recommendation:

To award Holford and District Village Hall £125,000 from the CIM Fund ring-fenced for West Somerset for the Holford Village Hall - Fit for Future project with the following conditions:  
That no funding will be released until

- Planning permission has been granted for the proposed project.
- Match funding has been secured to cover the total project costs as set out in the application.
- Following the tender process and selection of a preferred contractor the CIM Fund Manager is satisfied that the project remains affordable.

#### 5.9

Project Name:	Kitchen and Toilet renovation
Expression of Interest Ref No:	207
Organisation Applying:	Fiddington Village Hall
Summary of Project:	Funding is sought to renovate the kitchen and toilets within the hall to encourage greater use by the community and income generation which will be redirected into hall maintenance and new community events.

Impacts mitigated as stated in application:	The main impact of on the community in Fiddington is the traffic associated with the HPC project. Annual average daily traffic flows show an increase in traffic through the village of 7.6% since 2012 (approx. 420 vehicles). If operation Harold is implemented traffic in the village will be affected and made worse by the road layout with few passing places. Mill Farm campsite has received planning approval to accommodate 53 HPC workers and HPC workers are also accommodated in B&Bs in Fiddington. Workers are likely to use private cars during leisure time further increasing traffic in the village and on the A39. Integration of HPC workers into the village is important.
Start Date: Jan 2018	Total Project Costs: £40259.82
Completion Date: Feb 2018	<b>Total applied for: £35000.00</b>
Documents received:	Location plans; Letters of support (Parish Council, Caterers, Art group leader, Art group member/Community events x5, Resident x4, WI member, Village Hall committee member x2); Project budget, Project timeline; Business Plan 2018 to 2020; 3 quotes for each element; Balance statements 2014 to 2016; insurance policy.
CIM Fund Manager Comments:	

The village hall currently provides annual or monthly activities that are well received by the community based on the letters of support showing that the village hall is valued by the local community, especially those of the older generation and those that attend regular groups. Groups and events are mostly aimed at the older generation. The range of current events held at the hall do however help to bring the community together, provide social and leisure opportunities and helping to improve cohesion and reduce isolation, therefore strengthening the community.

It is clear that the hall requires improvement to ensure current and future users impacted by the HPC development and increase of workers in the village are attracted to and able to use the hall safely. However the application does not focus on what services or activities residents now require in the hall, the activities that will be provided, who will access them and how they will mitigate the impacts of HPC on the community.

The Business Plan shows a modest, although realistic, increase in revenue by 2020 which may limit the additional community events/activities that could be provided, especially if there are maintenance costs to be taken into account. No detail has been provided regarding how this will be reinvested into a community programme of events and activities. It is unclear how the project will improve quality of life for a good proportion of the local community, including families, young people, older people and to integrate new residents. Therefore it is unclear how the project will mitigate impacts of HPC on the community.

The applicants have not provided evidence to give assurance that they have liaised with other community halls in the area (Stogursey, Holford, Cannington) to co-ordinate a range of impact mitigation activities.

The application does not provide detail of how it will measure its success in terms of an increase in users and the number of impact mitigating services and activities (for example that reduce the need to travel or integrate new residents) that will be provided.

Taking into account the amount requested the Board may wish to consider proportionate expectations of the applicant, and may wish to attach conditions to any funding award

where there is a shortfall of detail or planned actions to improve the potential for the project to mitigate impacts.

**POB Comments:**

The Board recognised that there was an impact on the community of Fiddington due to a significant increase in population linked to the HPC project and that the village hall was the only community facility in the village but that the application did not address how it would mitigate these impact.

The Board agreed that SDC needed to undertake work with the applicants to address how they can ensure that the village hall mitigates impact in terms of the additional activity they are going to provide for the community and workers moving into the area.

The Board recommended that a firm offer of support should be offered by SDC to the applicants with the aim to submit a revised application.

**POB recommendation:**

To not award CIM funding to Fiddington Village Hall for the Kitchen and Toilet Renovation project and to advise the applicants to return with a revised application.

## 5.10

Project Name:	Supporting Hinkley Advice Needs
Expression of Interest Ref No:	140
Organisation Applying:	Citizens Advice Sedgemoor
Summary of Project:	The project aims to deliver advice services needed across Sedgemoor as a result of the HPC development. Funding is requested for a 3 year revenue project that aims to increase organisational capacity to meet changing advice needs; deliver joint services to an increasing population; enhance the skills of current residents and incoming population; promote social cohesion and integration. The project will also enable the organisation to become a strategic partner in the HPC development, implement service improvements to ensure best value is achieved in all areas of service delivery and open opportunities for volunteering, employment and training. Funding is required to cover costs of one member of staff to oversee delivery, volunteer recruitment and training and marketing.
Impacts mitigated as stated in application:	The LIR identified likely impacts as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Economic – opportunities for local people and the skills required to take up opportunities</li> <li>• Housing Market and Services – availability and affordability</li> <li>• Integration – impacts on community cohesion resulting from the influx of workers and their families</li> <li>• Health and quality of life - of local communities including vulnerable communities, children and young people causing possible mental health issues</li> <li>• Considerable added pressure on key services</li> </ul>

	<p>The objective of the project is to mitigate and alleviate these impacts through</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• retaining the provision of advice to established local communities</li> <li>• increasing the availability of advice to new populations and</li> <li>• ensuring a consistent quality standard across the area</li> </ul>
Start Date: 1/12/17	Total Project Costs: £165,837
Completion Date: 31/12/20	<b>Amount applied for: £165,837</b>
Documents received:	Business plan, financial management plan, project plan and timeline, outreach location map, risk register, officer job description, worker job description, letters of support District Cllrs Lerry, Smedley, Hinckes, Pearce, Corke, Cresswell; MP for Wells; Axbridge TC, Puriton PC, Bridgwater TC, Wedmore PC, Cheddar PC, Cannington PC, Chedzoy PC and Otterhampton PC. Insurance policy documents. Safeguarding policy, Health and Safety policy, Articles of Association, Annual report and accounts 15/16 and 16/17, Financial statements 15/16 and 16/17.
Documents outstanding:	Letters of support from partners.
CIM Fund Manager Comments:	

Although it is recognised that there is likely to be an increased need in demand for advice services for the resident community and new non home based workers and families in Sedgemoor due to the HPC development, the application did not provide sufficient detail or evidence in relation to several of the criteria.

It is likely there will be an increased need for particular advice services (housing/tenancy, removing barriers to employment, accessing local service especially health related, specialist advice, opportunities to integrate into the community) as a result of impacts of the HPC project on local people and an increase in non-home based workers and families moving to the area. It is likely that demand will increase in key impacted areas in Sedgemoor such as areas along the main transport routes and areas accommodating HPC workers. The application proposes increased advice provision generally, and in its current outreach areas therefore the project is likely to provide some benefit to communities not impacted by HPC.

It is likely that the applicants are positioned well to increase volunteer advice provision in Sedgemoor, and plans to increase that provision by up to 100 hours per week is likely to meet any significant demand generated as a result of the HPC project. However it is unclear how the estimated increase in demand was calculated. It is also unclear from the application whether the applicants will be targeting increased provision proportionally in line with impacts of the HPC project in specific areas of Sedgemoor. As the output/outcome monitoring measures do not appear to monitor demand generated by HPC it is difficult to see how data will be used to target support and advice.

The application lacks detail on how the project will integrate with other projects that aim to support those impacted by the HPC development or those offering support services in impacted areas to ensure duplication is avoided, although the application states that referral arrangements and partnership working has been arranged with SARI and Diversity Voice the application did not contain any further detail or letters of support from partner organisations.

The application demonstrates that advice services can have a significant benefits and improve quality of life for those accessing advice.

There are plans to promote the project but it is unclear how the project will be promoted to service users impacted by HPC and to recruit new volunteers.

In return for 100% funding it is unclear whether the number of hours of advice offered (especially in the first 2 years), benefits to volunteers and length of time the project will provide a benefit offers value for money. No match funding has been sought for this project. The project could offer improved value if the increased provision and new outreach was targeted in those areas most impacted by HPC rather than across Sedgemoor as a whole.

**POB Comments:**

The Board felt that this was the right organisation, in the right location but the application needed to be refined to ensure that the Board were confident in the CAB's ability to deliver the necessary impact mitigation in the most effective way.

The Board agreed that the support provided should be targeted to communities most impacted by the HPC development and the advice on offer should be targeted at impacts on housing, employment and for those new to the area to access local services, specialist advice and opportunities to integrate into the community rather than more general advice.

The Board agreed that there was a significant amount of detail missing from the bid and that work should be undertaken with the applicants to support them in submitting further information to support their application.

**POB recommendation:**

To defer a decision on the application from Citizens Advice Sedgemoor for the Supporting Hinkley Advice Needs project pending additional information to be supplied by the applicant to support their application.

## 6 Links to Corporate Aims / Priorities

- 6.1 The allocation of these funds will enable the Council to deliver against the Corporate Priorities of '*Our Communities - Helping our communities remain sustainable and vibrant is vital in keeping West Somerset a great place in which to live and work*' and '*Our Place and Infrastructure - West Somerset is a beautiful place to visit and in which to live and work. We want to keep West Somerset a place to be proud of and one which is well maintained and welcoming to residents, visitors and businesses alike.*

## 7 Finance / Resource Implications

- 7.1 On 6<sup>th</sup> May 2016, EDF made the payment for the second anniversary of phase two under the Site Preparation Work agreement. Under this, the CIM fund has received £1,937,220 inclusive of inflation uplift. Bringing the total CIM Fund received to £7,424,395.

- 7.2 Financial information regarding allocated funding from the Community Impact Mitigation Fund can be found in Appendix A.
- 7.3 These proposals will not have an impact on the Council's own resources.
- 7.4 All organisations applying for funding are subject to financial viability checks to reduce risk associated with the award of grant funding.

## **8 Legal Implications**

- 8.1 These funds have been paid by a developer (NNB Genco) due to the signing of a Section 106 legal agreement for planning permission to carry out the site preparation works at Hinkley Point C (West Somerset Council Planning Application No: 3/32/10/037). As part of this legal agreement West Somerset Council shall take into account the recommendations of the Planning Obligations Board when deciding how to apply those elements of the Community Impact Mitigation Contributions (Schedule 1 – General, Para. 5.3 of the S106).

## **9 Environmental Impact Implications**

- 9.1 There are not considered to be direct implications of approving the release of these monies associated with the Community Impact Mitigation Fund. However, there are obviously environmental impacts associated with the wider proposed development of Hinkley Point C. These have been assessed within the Environmental Statement submitted by NNB Genco with the application to carry out Site Preparation Works at Hinkley Point C (West Somerset Council Planning Application No: 3/32/10/037) and mitigation measures have been secured.
- 9.2 Applicants are encouraged to consider any environmental implications of their project and are asked to describe how their projects will promote environmental sustainability

## **10 Safeguarding and/or Community Safety Implications**

- 10.1 Applicants are encouraged to consider the promotion of community safety and community cohesion as part of their project.
- 10.2 Applications for projects that provide facilities or services to children, young people or vulnerable adults are required to include copies of the applicants safeguarding policy and procedures.
- 10.3 The requirement for organisations to adhere to Safeguarding legislation and to ensure necessary checks are carried out to ensure the suitability of staff or volunteers involved in the project are included in the CIM Fund grant terms and conditions.

## **11 Equality and Diversity Implications**

- 11.1 Members must demonstrate that they have consciously thought about the three aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty as part of the decision making process.

The three aims the authority **must** have due regard for:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

- 11.2 Organisations applying to the CIM and Stogursey Contributions Funds are required to describe how their project will promote equal opportunities and will be accessible to all people in the

community regardless of background, ability or personal circumstances.

- 11.3 Projects that restrict membership or access to services without being able to 'objectively justify' their reasons for doing so will not be eligible to be considered for funding. Projects that wish to limit access must be able to show that the less favourable treatment contributes to a 'legitimate' aim and that it is 'proportionate.'
- 11.4 Organisations are required to provide a copy of their Equal Opportunity Policy with their application to demonstrate awareness of their responsibility to deliver accessible services that advance equality.
- 11.5 Wider community benefit and the ability of the project to promote cohesive communities are both taken into account when scoring applications and making recommendations.

## **12 Social Value Implications**

- 12.1 Applications to the CIM Fund must demonstrate how they provide economic, social and or environmental benefits for the local area. Applicants are also encouraged to provide opportunities for volunteering and community involvement wherever possible.

## **13 Partnership Implications**

- 13.1 The Planning Obligations Board has representative members from Sedgemoor District Council, Somerset County Council, EDF Energy and West Somerset Council.

## **14 Health and Wellbeing Implications**

- 14.1 The Community Impact Contribution and Stogursey Contribution have been paid to West Somerset Council for the purpose of mitigating the impacts of the Hinkley C development on local communities through projects that promote or improve the economic, social or environmental wellbeing of local communities.
- 14.2 The application and scoring process has been developed to prioritise funding of projects that aim to improve the health and wellbeing of people, families and communities affected by the development.
- 14.3 Applications are required to evidence and demonstrate that
- The communities is taking responsibility for their own health and wellbeing;
  - Projects provide benefits which empower communities to be thriving and resilient
  - Projects provide benefits which support people to live independently.

## **15 Asset Management Implications**

- 15.1 There are no asset management implications as a result of these recommendations.

## **16 Consultation Implications**

- 16.1 Applications to the CIM Fund are considered Planning Obligations Board. The Board consists of representatives from EDF, Sedgemoor District Council, West Somerset District Council and Somerset County Council.
- 16.2 All applicants are required to demonstrate that they have consulted with their local and wider

communities on project proposals with the aim of informing their need appraisal and to shape delivery of their project.

## 17 Cabinet Comments / Recommendation(s)

17.1 This report contains recommendations to Cabinet.

### Democratic Path:

- **Scrutiny / Corporate Governance or Audit Committees – No**
- **Cabinet/Executive – Yes**
- **Full Council – Yes**

**Reporting Frequency: Every 2 months.**

### List of Appendices

Appendix A	<b>Hinkley Community Impact Mitigation Fund Approval Balances</b>
------------	---

### Contact Officers

Name	Lisa Redston, Community and Housing Lead – HPC	Name	Andrew Goodchild, Assistant Director Place and Energy
Tel	01984 635218	Tel	01984 635245
Email	lredston@westsomerset.gov.uk	Email	Agoodchild@westsomerset.gov.uk



## Appendix D: HPC Community Impact Mitigation Fund Approval Balances

29

	TOTAL	West Somerset	Sedgemoor	Cannington	1st Annual payment	2nd Annual Payment	Stogursey
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
CIM Fund Received(including Inflation Uplift)	6,700,000	2,000,000	1,000,000	500,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	500,000
Inflation Uplift	724,395	134,529	67,265	33,632	151,749	337,220	33,632
<b>TOTAL Received</b>	<b>7,424,395</b>	<b>2,134,529</b>	<b>1,067,265</b>	<b>533,632</b>	<b>1,751,749</b>	<b>1,937,220</b>	<b>533,632</b>
<u>Less previously approved allocation</u>							
Stogursey Parish Council - Burgage Road Play Area	(90,373)	(90,373)					Stogursey Earplug Scheme (2,087)
Wembdon Village Hall - New VH & Play Area	(250,000)		(250,000)				Victory Hall (200,000)
Somerset Youth & Community Sailing Association	(9,600)		(9,600)				
Tropiquaria - Relocation of primates	(40,000)	(40,000)					
Tropiquaria - Relocation of play area	(37,350)	(37,350)					
Porlock Shellfish Project	(800)	(800)					
Westfield Street Café	(110,000)		(110,000)				
Williton Bowling Club	(13,000)	(13,000)					
Kilve Cricket Club	(22,000)	(22,000)					
Onion Collective	(243,119)	(243,119)					
Williton Parish Council	(250,000)	(250,000)					
Stogursey Football Club	(750)	(750)					
North Petherton Playing Fields	(46,000)		(46,000)				
SDC - Sydenham Together	(60,000)		(60,000)				
Tropiquaria - Marketing	(1,000)	(1,000)					
Bridgwater Education Trust	(18,295)		(18,295)				
Sydenham and Bower FHWG	(200,000)		(200,000)				

Cannington Village Hall	(186,186)		30	(186,186)			
Victoria Park Community Centre	(14,524)		(14,524)				
Watchet War Memorial Pavilion	(7,500)	(7,500)					
Otterhampton Parish Play Area	(37,820)				(37,820)		
Bridgwater Doctors Cricket Club	(1,000)			(1,000)			
Stogursey and District Victory Hall	(400,000)	(400,000)					
Greenways and Cycle Routes Ltd	(65,000)				(65,000)		
West Somerset Council - Employments Hub	(57,036)	(57,036)					
Bridgwater Town Centre Support Scheme	(116,070)		(116,070)				
Southern Bridgwater and North Petherton Mitigation Scheme	(344,850)		(242,776)		(102,074)		
Watchet Arts Group	(1,000)	(1,000)					
YMCA SC Beach Hotel	(12,500)	(12,500)					
Steam Coast Trail (Phase 2)	(287,950)	(287,950)					
Enterprising Minehead	(501,688)	(501,688)					
Salavation Army Youth Space	(19,745)				(19,745)		
Bridgwater Chamber of Commerce	(79,289)				(79,289)		
<b>Current Committed Balance</b>	<b>(3,524,445)</b>	<b>(1,966,066)</b>	<b>(1,067,265)</b>	<b>(187,186)</b>	<b>(303,928)</b>	-	<b>(202,087)</b>
<b>Current Uncommitted Balance</b>	<b>3,899,950</b>	<b>168,463</b>	-	<b>346,446</b>	<b>1,447,821</b>	<b>1,937,220</b>	<b>331,545</b>
<u>Less Requested approvals</u>							
Somerset County Council (EBP)	(393,849)				(393,849)		
Holford and District Village Hall	(125,000)	(125,000)					
Uncommitted Balance if all requests were approved	<b>3,381,101</b>	<b>43,463</b>	-	<b>346,446</b>	<b>1,053,972</b>	<b>1,937,220</b>	<b>331,545</b>

Report Number: WSC 111/17

## West Somerset Council

### Cabinet – 1<sup>st</sup> November 2017

#### Hinkley Point C Planning Obligations – Allocation of Ecology Contribution

This matter is the responsibility of Cabinet Member Cllr Chris Morgan, Lead Member for Energy Infrastructure

Report Author : Andrew Goodchild, Assistant Director for Place and Energy Infrastructure

#### 1 Executive Summary / Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 This report requests that Cabinet recommend to Full Council that £250,000 is allocated to the East Quantoxhead Estate for the purpose of providing landscaping and other works to enhance the foraging habitat for bats as a result of the loss of habitat on the main Hinkley Point C site.

#### 2 Recommendations

- 2.1 That Cabinet recommend to Full Council that £250,000 is allocated to the East Quantoxhead Estate for the purpose of providing landscaping and other works

#### 3 Risk Assessment (if appropriate)

##### Risk Matrix

Description	Likelihood	Impact	Overall
That the mitigation required in relation to the ecological impacts of HPC is not put in place	2	2	4
<i>The mitigations for this is the proposed allocation as set out in the report</i>	1	2	2

##### Risk Scoring Matrix

<b>Likelihood</b>	5	Almost Certain	Low (5)	Medium (10)	High (15)	Very High (20)	Very High (25)
	4	Likely	Low (4)	Medium (8)	Medium (12)	High (16)	Very High (20)
	3	Possible	Low (3)	Low (6)	Medium (9)	Medium (12)	High (15)
	2	Unlikely	Low (2)	Low (4)	Low (6)	Medium (8)	Medium (10)
	1	Rare	Low (1)	Low (2)	Low (3)	Low (4)	Low (5)
			1	2	3	4	5
			Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
<b>Impact</b>							

<b>Likelihood of risk occurring</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Description (chance of occurrence)</b>
1. Very Unlikely	May occur in exceptional circumstances	< 10%
2. Slight	Is unlikely to, but could occur at some time	10 – 25%
3. Feasible	Fairly likely to occur at same time	25 – 50%
4. Likely	Likely to occur within the next 1-2 years, or occurs occasionally	50 – 75%
5. Very Likely	Regular occurrence (daily / weekly / monthly)	> 75%

#### **4 Background and Full details of the Report**

- 4.1 As part of the Site Preparation Works Planning Permission at Hinkley Point C an obligation was placed on EDF Energy to undertake radio tracking of bats (specifically barbastelle bats which are a UK Biodiversity Action Plan species) to determine where bats were foraging and therefore, where were appropriate locations to provide landscaping to replace the habitat lost on the Main HPC Site.
- 4.2 The results of the radio tracking reveal that the bats are foraging in locations to the east of the HPC site – East Wood, Hodder’s Coombe, Holford Combe, to the east of Kilton, Waltham’s Copse and Honibere Lane. The average roost to foraging distance was around 5km. This led to the conclusion that the priority area was between East Wood and Kilton.
- 4.3 Importantly, the areas to be enhanced need to be maintained over a period of 15 years which will allow time for the final landscape restoration scheme to have been planted after construction is complete on the Main HPC Site.
- 4.4 Following discussion with possible landowners and with the assistance of Cllr Stuart Dowding, the East Quantoxhead Estate emerged as the only real option as they were willing to take on the planting in association with tenant farmers and provide assurances regarding the long term maintenance.
- 4.5 The Estate have provided a specification and plans for enhancement alongside other

necessary works. The specification uses prices from the environmental stewardship scheme and have been double checked by the AONB service. The scheme represents value for money and is located where the radio tracking suggests the bats forage. The Estate have agreed to enter into an agreement with the Council to deliver the enhancement scheme and to maintain it over the next 15 years.

### **Links to Corporate Aims / Priorities**

- 4.6 Key Theme 3 (Our Place and Infrastructure) of the Corporate Strategy 2016/20 includes Key Issue e. to “mitigate negative impacts on the community from the construction phase of Hinkley Point C”.
- 4.7 In 2017/18 the Corporate Plan highlights that “In 2017/18 we will support affected communities to develop plans for mitigating the impacts of the Hinkley Point C development and fund appropriate initiatives and projects from the Section 106 agreement contributions which we have secured.”

### **5 Finance / Resource Implications**

- 5.1 The Site Preparation Works Section 106 agreement (schedule 5 – Ecology para 2.1) obligates the Council to use the Ecology Contribution (£250,000) to provide “planting, aftercare and management designed to promote the conservation of barbastelle bats and ecology within the relevant area which shall be determined by the results of the Bat Radio Tracking and Monitoring Study and existing bat surveys”
- 5.2 The scheme which has been agreed with the East Quantoxhead Estate has been assessed as providing value for money and does not result in the use of any other funds than the Ecology Contribution.

### **6 Legal Implications (if any)**

- 6.1 Schedule 5 – Ecology of the Site Preparation Works Section 106 sets out the process for payment and the purpose to which the contribution can be spent.

### **7 Environmental Impact Implications (if any)**

- 7.1 The Environmental Statement and Habitat Regulation Assessment which formed part of the planning approval which WSC’s Planning Committee granted for Site Preparation Works at the HPC site both identified the need for additional off site enhancement works to address the impact on protected species, in this case Barbastelle Bats. The delivery of this mitigation will provide necessary mitigation for the development until the final landscape restoration scheme is provided at the end of the construction period.

### **8 Safeguarding and/or Community Safety Implications (if any)**

- 8.1 None

### **9 Equality and Diversity Implications (if any)**

- 9.1 None

### **10 Social Value Implications (if any)**

- 10.1 None

**11 Partnership Implications** (if any)

11.1 None

**12 Health and Wellbeing Implications** (if any)

12.1 None

**13 Asset Management Implications** (if any)

13.1 None

**14 Consultation Implications** (if any)

14.1 None

**15 Scrutiny Comments / Recommendation(s)** (if any)

15.1 None

**Democratic Path:**

- **Scrutiny / Corporate Governance or Audit Committees – No**
- **Cabinet– Yes**
- **Full Council – Yes**

**Reporting Frequency :**  **Once only**    **Ad-hoc**    **Quarterly**  
 **Twice-yearly**    **Annually**

**Contact Officers**

Name	Andrew Goodchild
Direct Dial	01984 635245
Email	agoodchild@westsomerset.gov.uk

Report Number: WSC 112/17

## West Somerset Council

### Cabinet – 1<sup>st</sup> November 2017

#### Hinkley Point C – Non-Material Change Response

This matter is the responsibility of Cabinet Member Cllr Chris Morgan, Lead Member for Energy Infrastructure

Report Author: Andrew Goodchild, Assistant Director for Place and Energy Infrastructure

#### 1 Executive Summary / Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to bring to Members attention EDF Energy's proposed changes to the DCO 'plot plan' (essentially the details plans of the buildings on site during operation) and to formulate West Somerset Councils response to those changes.

#### 2 Recommendations

- 2.1 That Cabinet authorise the Assistant Director for Place and Energy Infrastructure to raise objections with the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of West Somerset Council as to the
- View that this change is being considered as a non-material change;
  - Lack of information regarding the environmental impacts of the change in Spent Fuel storage method; and
  - Visual impacts of the increased size and prominence of the waste store close to the West Somerset Coastal Path and within the wider landscape in the long term.

#### 3 Risk Assessment (if appropriate)

##### Risk Matrix

Description	Likelihood	Impact	Overall
That the proposed changes to the DCO plans are not properly assessed and have materially different effects and that the impact on communities is increased	2	4	8
<i>That the proposed changes are considered properly and any concerns are brought to the attention of the Planning Inspectorate prior to their decision</i>	1	4	4

##### Risk Scoring Matrix

<b>Likelihood</b>	5	Almost Certain	Low (5)	Medium (10)	High (15)	Very High (20)	Very High (25)
	4	Likely	Low (4)	Medium (8)	Medium (12)	High (16)	Very High (20)
	3	Possible	Low (3)	Low (6)	Medium (9)	Medium (12)	High (15)
	2	Unlikely	Low (2)	Low (4)	Low (6)	Medium (8)	Medium (10)
	1	Rare	Low (1)	Low (2)	Low (3)	Low (4)	Low (5)
			1	2	3	4	5
			Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
			<b>Impact</b>				

<b>Likelihood of risk occurring</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Description (chance of occurrence)</b>
1. Very Unlikely	May occur in exceptional circumstances	< 10%
2. Slight	Is unlikely to, but could occur at some time	10 – 25%
3. Feasible	Fairly likely to occur at same time	25 – 50%
4. Likely	Likely to occur within the next 1-2 years, or occurs occasionally	50 – 75%
5. Very Likely	Regular occurrence (daily / weekly / monthly)	> 75%

## 4 Background and Full details of the Report

- 4.1 Members will be very familiar with the Hinkley Point C project and will recall that the operational power station will include not only the 2 main reactor buildings and turbine halls but also a wide of ancillary buildings which will support the operation of the power station as well as a spent fuel store which will house waste until it is capable of being sent to a Geological ‘Disposal’ Facility. Details of these buildings were included on the ‘plot plan’ and various associated drawings that were approved as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO) granted by the Secretary of State in March 2013.
- 4.2 Members may also recall that in 2015 EDF Energy applied to the Secretary of State for a ‘non-material amendment’ to the approved DCO. Briefly this non-material change involved:
- 9 new or relocated elements to the plant which required new buildings or structures;
  - 9 buildings that were redesigned and were increased in size compared to that originally approved;
  - 15 buildings which moved from their original location on the approved plans; and
  - 6 buildings which were proposed to be removed because they were no longer required

- 4.3 West Somerset Council at its meeting of the 18th February 2015 raised no objection to the non-material amendment. The Secretary of State approved the non-material amendment on the 11th September 2015 and published the Hinkley Point C (Nuclear Generating Station)(Amendment) Order 2015.
- 4.4 On the 30th January 2017 EDF Energy applied for a 2nd non-material amendment which proposed changes to the campus accommodation in Bridgwater. Members may recall that originally 2 campuses were proposed, one at the former Innovia site (850 bed spaces) and one at Bridgwater Albion Rugby Club (150 bed spaces). The non-material amendment sought approval to build additional accommodation at the former Innovia site (a total of 986 bed spaces) instead of the rugby club. This 2nd non-material amendment was approved by the Secretary of State on 17th August 2017.
- 4.5 On the 28th September 2017, EDF Energy submitted a 3rd non-material amendment which, as the 1st non-material amendment, relates to changes on the Main HPC Site. EDF Energy's Application Statement sets out that the principal factors driving the proposed changes can be summarised as follows:
- Compliance with UK Regulations – The ONR and the Environment Agency have undertaken and completed a coordinated review of the proposed UK EPR design via the Generic Design Assessment process. For the nuclear plant proposed at Hinkley Point, EDF Energy is obliged to comply with the outcome of the assessment and any findings as the design is developed. In addition, application of UK regulations (notably Fire Regulations) have also played a part in influencing the changes proposed as part of this application.
  - Flamanville and Taishan Feedback – EDF Energy has continued to study the best practice and learning that can be taken from the construction of the reference plants in both France and China;
  - Design and Optimisation Studies – In the normal way, design and optimisation studies have been carried out by the EDF Energy construction and contracting teams to take account of all of the above and to benefit from the more detailed assessments undertaken in preparation for the start of construction.
- 4.6 Of the 71 buildings and structures on site as part of the operational power station, 4 are new, 12 are larger, 4 are moved and 1 building has been removed within this application for a 3rd non-material amendment. In addition the proposal includes the erection of additional pipework along the underside of the temporary jetty to discharge pumped groundwater arising from dewatering activities undertaken to support excavation and the construction of power station, as well as discharges of water produced by the tunnelling works required to construct the heat sink and treated sewage effluent generated from the welfare facilities on-site.
- 4.7 The most significant and noticeable changes are to the interim spent fuel store, the sea wall and the temporary jetty (as described above)..

### **The Interim Spent Fuel Store**

- 4.8 Two important changes are proposed as part of the application. Firstly, EDF Energy are proposing to change the way in which spent fuel is stored at HPC in the interim. This is determined to be interim storage on the basis that the future plan for the spent fuel (as higher activity waste) for permanent storage is predicated on the UK Government's

Geological 'Disposal' Facility (GDF) in accordance with the 2014 Implementing Geological Disposal White Paper. Within the Development Consent Order and supporting technical material therein, EDF Energy's original proposal was to store spent fuel waste in a 'wet store' in pools. The proposal is now, after an initial period of storage and cooling in a pool close to the reactor building, to store the spent fuel securely in concrete and steel canisters. This is known as dry storage. This change results in a significantly larger interim spent fuel store to accommodate the concrete and steel canisters and the change away from a spent fuel pond – it is proposed to be 229m in length by 73m in width by 30m in height (as opposed to 150m by 65m by 25m).

- 4.9 Within the NMA application, EDF Energy state that further detailed assessment and analysis has been undertaken with regards to the best way to interim store spent fuel at HPC. The application goes on to describe that "EDF Energy has previously described that both wet and dry storage technologies are judged to be capable of meeting the high safety and environmental standards which are required to permit their use in the UK. Subsequently EDF Energy decided that, subject to implementation of the Licensee's formal modification process (including the provision of an adequate safety justification and both Licensee and Regulatory governance), it would change its technology choice for Interim Spent Fuel Storage (ISFS). The final disposal of spent fuel to the Geological Disposal Facility remains unaffected by the choice of technology. The change to dry storage will result in a different way to store the spent fuel assemblies, very similar in concept to that which has now been constructed, commissioned and operated at the Sizewell B power station in Suffolk, where the spent fuel is securely stored dry in concrete and steel canisters as opposed to wet storage in a pool". It should be noted that the Environmental Statement accompanying the DCO set out, under Chapter 6 'Alternatives' a 'multi attribute decision analysis' of the following options for interim spent fuel storage: namely, pool storage (wet), metal cask storage (dry), vault storage (dry) and canister storage (dry). As such, the Environmental Statement accompanying the DCO provides information relating to the proposals for Interim Spent Fuel storage as proposed at the point of DCO submission (wet storage) and that proposed now (dry storage). Key issues for consideration have been: protecting long term flexibility with respect to possible development in fuel technology, ease of inspection of spent fuel thus enabling review of fuel condition against GDF waste acceptance criteria, reducing financial risks and maximising the benefits from retaining consistency in design with other EDF EPRs.
- 4.10 The regulatory regime for the storage of spent fuel is understandably rigorous and is not something which the Council or any local Authority has any responsibility or technical input. However, it is important that the Council highlight to EDF Energy, the Planning Inspectorate and ultimately the Secretary of State that the Council in its role of Community Leadership that the Council on behalf of the community will wish to be assured that the consideration of GDF waste acceptance criteria has adequately informed the proposal for interim dry storage. Furthermore, the Council will want to be assured that from a regulatory perspective, the selection of dry storage is consistent with the wider regulatory aims of the Office for Nuclear Regulation to ensure delivery of a safe and secure solution for interim waste storage.
- 4.11 As described above, the size of the building required to accommodate the spent fuel is significantly larger than the previously approved building under the DCO, it is proposed to be 79m longer, 8m wider and 5m taller. The operational power station as proposed includes the reactor buildings and turbine halls both of which are larger and taller than the proposed ISFS (64m and 46m tall respectively), however the footprint and height of the proposed ISFS makes it one of the most significant buildings within the power station

site. The application for the non-material amendment includes an assessment of landscape and visual impact but it is noted that this is in the context of the operational power station however, the ISFS will be in situ long after the operational power station has come to the end of its life and potentially decommissioned. It will only be removed when all the spent fuel has been moved to a Geological 'Disposal' Facility.

- 4.12 A location for a GDF has not been found (and a potential location is arguably less clear than during the consideration of the original HPC DCO application) and it is noted that all existing fuel within the UK from legacy sites would be moved to the GDF prior to any new material from HPC being transferred. Therefore, the ISFS could therefore be in situ for a significant period of time – well into the next Century and potentially beyond. In this context a larger store which will be more prominent in the landscape could cause additional adverse impacts which have not been assessed. More particularly, the ISFS is the closest building within the HPC site to the West Somerset Coastal Path (at its closest point the ISFS is only 21m from the Coastal Path) and the increased height of 5m will be significant and, as above, present over a significant period of time. The Application Statement does not make any assessment of this very long term scenario which is an important omission.

### **Sea Wall**

- 4.13 The application states that the a 100m section of the sea wall is proposed to be set back by 7m to avoid interaction with a graving dock on the foreshore which was part of the construction of Hinkley Point A, the graving dock was for the construction of the HPA outfall structure.
- 4.14 The application highlights that following ground investigations to assess the condition of the graving dock require either the use of piled foundations next to the sensitive foreshore environment or to remove the graving dock which would involve the excavation of potentially contaminated material. On balance EDF Energy have concluded that the seawall can be realigned to avoid interaction with the graving dock. The impacts on the foreshore are controlled by Requirement PW17 (Cross-shore rock platform erosion and sediment transport monitoring plan) which will be approved by the Marine Management Organisation after consultation with the Environment Agency, Countryside Council for Wales (now Natural Resources Wales) and Natural England.
- 4.15 Overall the realigned seawall does not result in any additional significant environmental effects.

### **Temporary Aggregate Jetty**

- 4.16 The application highlights that Discharges of pumped groundwater arise from dewatering activities undertaken to support excavation and the construction of the power station. In addition, discharges of water are produced by the tunnelling works that are required to construct the heat sink and treated sewage effluent is also generated from the treatment of effluent from the welfare facilities on site. At present, groundwater is discharged across the foreshore where, due to naturally occurring metals, there is a low potential for impact on two sensitive species on the beach (Corallina and Sabellaria) which has required the imposition of water quality limits in the Environment Agency Water Discharge environmental permit.
- 4.17 These limits mean that water treatment may be needed prior to discharge which is not considered sustainable in the long term. In order to provide a more sustainable solution

and reduce the already low risk of ecological impact it is proposed that groundwater will, subject to permitting and planning, be discharged sub-tidally via a pipe on the temporary Jetty below the lowest astronomical tide. Similarly, discharges of tunnelling water and treated sewage effluent may also be discharged from this location, thereby avoiding the need to discharge water over the sensitive species on the foreshore.

- 4.18 It is intended that these pipes will be placed along the temporary jetty as this avoids the need for any additional construction work on the foreshore which could itself cause impact.
- 4.19 As the pipework will be placed on the jetty the impact of this change is likely to be positive as it will remove pipework and other structures from the foreshore as well as removing the potential impacts on the sensitive species on the beach. Clearly the water to be discharged via the jetty will be subject to a permit from the Environment Agency who will ensure that no unacceptable environmental impact will result.

### **Other Changes**

- 4.20 The other changes to buildings are all within the operational power station, whilst the total number of changes is high, in reality they are unlikely to cause any additional impact. The buildings affected are all located to the north of Green Lane well away from any residential properties. None of the changes would result in any changes to the processes and vehicle movements associated with the construction of the power station.

### **View on whether the change is a non-material change**

- 4.21 EDF Energy's covering letter to the Planning Inspectorate highlights that Schedule 6 of the 2008 Act makes provision for the Secretary of State to grant both material and non-material changes to a DCO. There is no statutory definition of 'materiality' for the purposes of either the 2008 Act or the 2011 Regulations. The 'Guidance on Changes to Development Consent Orders' (DCLG Guidance, December 2015) makes clear that such decisions will inevitably depend on the circumstances of a specific case. However, the guidance sets out four examples of characteristics which are likely to indicate that a change is material.
- 4.22 EDF Energy's covering letter sets out the view that the proposed changes do not trigger any of the four characteristics which would lead to the view that the changes are material. Para 4.9 above sets out the view regarding the 1<sup>st</sup> characteristic which relates to whether or not there is new or materially different environmental effects from the change. After consideration of EDF Energy's explanation within the Application Statement it is agreed that the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> characteristics regarding Habitats and Protected Species and Compulsory Acquisition are not affected by these changes.
- 4.23 The fourth characteristic is the Impact on Businesses and Residents. EDF Energy's own application highlights an important question, which is whether or not "there is no realistic prospect that the proposed changes would generate materially different issues or representations to those which were addressed during the examination of the application in 2013". It is considered that there is a realistic proposition that materially different representations might have been made during Examination in respect of the method of Spent Fuel Storage, Chapter 21 of the Councils Local Impact Report for example was focussed on the storage of nuclear waste.

- 4.24 Officers have sought information from EDF Energy on this issue and have suggested that a detailed analysis of the representations made during the Examination needs to be presented alongside this application to justify the view within the application statement that there is “no realistic prospect that the changes would generate materially different representations”. Thus far no such information has been provided and therefore, it is proposed to raise an objection to the Planning Inspectorate on this basis.

## **5 Links to Corporate Aims / Priorities**

- 5.1 Representing the community in responding to the various impacts of the Hinkley Point C project is part of the Councils stated Roles and Purpose within the Corporate Strategy 2016/20 including ‘Championing / Lobbying’ ‘Public Safety’ ‘Supporting’ ‘Challenging’ and ‘Taking a Strategic View’
- 5.2 Key Theme 2 issue e. of the Corporate Strategy 2016/20 states that the Council will seek to maximise the local economic benefits from Hinkley Point C. Key Theme 3 issue e. states that the Council will seek to mitigate the negative impacts on the community from the construction phase of Hinkley Point C
- 5.3 The Corporate Plan 2017/18 includes a commitment that “In 2017/18 we will continue to work with the most affected communities to understand the issues arising from the development and coordinate activity across the Council and amongst partners to ensure that measures are put in place to minimise the impacts of the Hinkley Point C project.”

## **6 Finance / Resource Implications**

- 6.1 There are no financial or resource implications. All work on considering the proposal has been carried out by the Assistant Director with some limited assistance from technical advisors who are funded through the Hinkley Point C Section 106 agreement

## **7 Legal Implications (if any)**

- 7.1 None in particular, although if approved, the changes will result in a further amendment to the Hinkley Point C (Nuclear Generating Order).

## **8 Environmental Impact Implications (if any)**

- 8.1 The environmental impacts of the proposal are considered above as part of the background and full details of the report.

## **9 Safeguarding and/or Community Safety Implications (if any)**

- 9.1 None.

## **10 Equality and Diversity Implications (if any)**

- 10.1 None.

## **11 Social Value Implications (if any)**

- 11.1 None.

## **12 Partnership Implications (if any)**

- 12.1 A draft of this report has been shared with Sedgemoor District Council and Somerset

County Council.

**13 Health and Wellbeing Implications** (if any)

13.1 None.

**14 Asset Management Implications** (if any)

14.1 None.

**15 Consultation Implications** (if any)

15.1 Initially, EDF Energy only advertised the amendment in the Bridgwater Mercury however, they have agreed to place additional adverts in the West Somerset Free Press.

15.2 In addition to the additional adverts EDF Energy have been encouraged to engage directly with local people. A Main Site Forum meeting took place on the 18<sup>th</sup> October which was an opportunity to explain the proposals to those within the hamlets closest to the site and representatives from Stogursey Parish Council who also attend that meeting. At that meeting EDF Energy agreed to attend the Parish Council on the 14<sup>th</sup> November to explain the proposals. Clearly before finalising this Councils response, there will be an opportunity to listen to views expressed during that meeting and reflect shared views in the Councils response.

**16 Scrutiny Comments / Recommendation(s)** (if any)

16.1 None.

**Democratic Path:**

- **Scrutiny / Corporate Governance or Audit Committees – No**
- **Cabinet/Executive – Yes**
- **Full Council – Yes**

**Reporting Frequency :**  **Once only**  **Ad-hoc**  **Quarterly**

**Twice-yearly**  **Annually**

**Contact Officers**

Name	Andrew Goodchild
Direct Dial	01984 635245
Email	agoodchild@westsomerset.gov.uk