

Otterhampton Community Plan (Revised 1st March 2012)

1. Otterhampton Parish (population 873)

- 1.1. The Steering Group which produced this Community Plan consists of volunteers from the Otterhampton Parish Recreation Association, Village Hall Committee, Social Club, Parish Council, and other organisations and concerned individuals. The responsibility for the Community Plan is the Steering Group which meets bi-monthly and holds an Annual General Meeting in the spring of each year when officers and Steering Group members are elected, and any need for plan revision examined. The plan was adopted by the Otterhampton Parish Council in March 2011. This Community Plan supports Policy S3 and S4 of Sedgemoor District Council's Core Strategy and the aims of P5 (Other Sustainable Settlements).
- 1.2. This Community Plan is an evolving plan for Otterhampton Parish in the Sedgemoor District of Somerset between Bridgwater and the Steart Peninsula and was developed with the valuable assistance of the Community Council for Somerset and Sedgemoor District Council. The parish consists of three villages: Otterhampton (from which the parish takes its name); Steart, which is a small community of 15 homes at the end of the Steart Peninsula; and Combwich, which is the largest of the three villages. All are rural and peaceful communities; the homes of people who chose to live here for these qualities and because of convenience of transport connections for employment purposes in and beyond Bridgwater and to Hinkley Point.
- 1.3. The Parish is now facing three major infrastructure development proposals: EDF's proposal for development at Combwich Wharf to facilitate the nuclear new build at Hinkley Point C, and two new wetland schemes proposed by the Environment agency and the Port of Bristol Company, together involving more than half the total landmass of the Parish. Any one of these proposals has the capacity to change the very nature, landscape and futures of our communities. A key purpose of this plan is to set out community priorities in relation to these proposals and to seek to ensure that their overall impact is likely to be as positive as possible for the residents of Otterhampton Parish.

2. The Vision for our Parish

- 2.1. As this document demonstrates, most residents are very happy with where they live; many chose to do so because of the existing nature of the area and its surrounding environment. Whilst it is recognised that change is inevitable, residents are now determined to influence future changes in favour of, and in harmony with, the existing environment, the peaceful nature of the area and their way of life.
- 2.2. All the evidence from surveys, public meetings and a drop in day (and not least representations to parish councillors) has made clear what the communities' priorities are. Details of the consultations are provided in appendix A to E.
- 2.3. In summary, a majority of Otterhampton Parish residents would like their communities to remain rural in nature, and for impacts of the current development proposals to be carefully mitigated. There is also an identified need for certain community infrastructure such as a new or redeveloped village hall, cycle paths and affordable housing. Priorities are set out in detail in the section 8.

3. Our Communities

- 3.1. There is a good community spirit with many activities organised or supported by the Otterhampton Parish Recreation Association (OPRA) and other organisations all working together with the Parish Council and the Community Plan Steering Group in the interests of the residents. Real efforts are being made for an inclusive approach to community life.
- 3.2. Though accepting the need for change, our communities are anxious to preserve the rural nature of the area and are very much opposed to any large scale industrial development. They value the nationally recognised environmental designations and diversity of wildlife.
- 3.3. The evidence to support this contention comes in part from a Drop-in Day held on the 12th February 2011 as part of the development of this community plan. It was attended by 112 local residents and listed the maintenance of “our peaceful and rural location” as the number one priority among opinions. (Details of the consultation are in appendix A). Evidence is also drawn from the community’s response to EDF’s Stage 2 proposals from which emerged the slogan “Keep Combwich Rural”. In addition, questionnaires were delivered to every household in the parish in August 2010; over 50% (170 questionnaires) were returned with over 95% rejection of a proposal for large industrial buildings and freight logistics/storage site on the edge of the village (see Appendix B).

4. The Villages of the Otterhampton Parish

4.1. Combwich

- 4.1.1. Combwich is a small rural cul-de-sac village on the Estuary of the River Parrett with well-defined boundaries (see appendix F: Combwich Development Boundary) and approximately 309 households. Its history as a settlement and port dating back to Roman times is well documented. It has a small wharf, extensively refurbished by the nuclear industry around 20 years ago, which is used occasionally to deliver large machinery to Hinkley Point. The wharf area and nearby Pill have been used mainly by the Combwich Boat Club and other leisure users over recent years.
- 4.1.2. There is a public house, shop/post office, village hall, primary school (rated good by Ofsted) and a church in the village. Combwich is identified as an Other Sustainable Settlement in the Sedgemoor Core Strategy and the focus for limited growth to meet local needs.
- 4.1.3. The village hall is in urgent need of refurbishment and a consultation exercise involving a questionnaire to every household to establish the views of residents has been completed by the village hall committee, although the results are not yet available.
- 4.1.4. An extensive refurbishment of the wharf and a new goods handling facility together with a 10 hectare laydown area are planned as part of EDF’s revised proposals for the construction of Hinkley Point C (see below).
- 4.1.5. A 9-acre lake known as the Combwich Ponds was a very popular area for walkers and families alike, until the landowner restricted access in May 2007. This area is very important to local people who have expressed the need to have the paths

designated as a right of way as a matter of priority. An application for designation was made to Somerset County Council in May 2008 but it is still awaiting adjudication.

4.1.6. The village also boasts a common at the side of the river which is a SSSI and the adjacent area is designated a special protection area, a RAMSAR site and is part of the Bridgwater Bay National Nature Reserve.

4.2. **Otterhampton** (28 properties)

4.2.1. The ancient village of Otterhampton (mentioned in the Domesday Book) is a small scattered settlement which includes Hill House, the church and cemetery (which dates from the 14th century), a former rectory, farm and a number of cottages along a narrow country lane leading from the C182 Hinkley Point road to Stockland Bristol and Steart

4.3. **Steart** (15 properties)

4.3.1. Situated at the end of the peninsula, Steart village is an isolated community whose subsequent tranquillity is highly valued by the majority of the 15 households there. It has a small church, St Andrews, which is linked with Stockland church as part of the Cannington Benefice. It has at least three services a year and is also used for occasional community events (exhibitions, residents' meetings etc.). It has the potential for greater community use which is currently being considered.

4.3.2. Steart Peninsula is surrounded by both the large Severn Estuary Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Bridgwater Bay National Nature Reserve (NNR). The NNR is designated as a Special Protection Area (SPA), a Special Area for Conservation (SAC) and an important international wetland site under the RAMSAR Convention.

4.3.3. A car park is provided within Steart village and a coastal path leads to a number of observation hides situated at the mouth of the River Parrett.

5. The Natural Environment

5.1. Steart Peninsula and land bordering the Parrett Estuary is surrounded by the Severn Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), parts of the SSSI include some land within the peninsula and Combwich Common. The surrounding estuaries are included in the Bridgwater Bay National Nature Reserve (NNR), which carries the following international conservation designations, Special Protection Area (SPA), Ramsar Site and Special Area of Conservation (SAC). These national and international conservation designations emphasise its ecological importance. The coastal and estuarine habitats include areas of threatened coastal marsh and the inter-tidal zones support nationally important populations of wintering waders and waterfowl. The hinterland holds many priority and protected species, including great crested newts, grass snakes, water voles, badgers and otters.

6. Current Challenges

6.1. EDF propose to refurbish the wharf and build a new goods handling facility complete with a 10 hectare laydown area for loads delivered to Combwich wharf and by road for the construction of Hinkley Point C, as detailed in EDF's Hinkley Point C Development consent Order Application (IPC Reference EN010001). This site will remain active with Heavy Goods

(HGV) and other vehicle movements for probably 10 years until the construction of the new power station is complete. Two major new wetland habitat schemes are proposed for the area between Combwich and Steart involving rather more than half the total landmass of the parish. These habitat schemes proposed by the Environment Agency and the Port of Bristol Company are cautiously welcomed by most residents although there are concerns about:

6.1.1. The impact of increased visitor numbers and associated traffic using the main access route which will be along narrow rural roads through the village of Otterhampton. It is estimated by the Environment Agency in their planning application to be around 275 a day extra vehicles for both schemes once they are mature. (Developers have involved the community in travel planning by consulting in the first instance with the Otterhampton Parish Council and the Steart Resident's Group).

6.1.2. The long term viability of flood protection for Steart village and the access road.

6.2. It is almost unprecedented that one small parish should be subject to *three* major infrastructure projects running concurrently, any one of which on its own has the capacity to change irrevocably the very nature, landscape and futures of our communities.

6.3. Consequently there is a huge strength of feeling that our communities must have a strong voice in how our parish develops, and are not just dictated to by powerful organisations with their own separate agendas. A holistic approach taking account of any cumulative impacts should inform any development plans.

7. Addressing the Challenges: EDF, Port of Bristol Company and the Environment Agency Proposals

7.1. EDF Proposals at Combwich Wharf

7.1.1. The 'residential amenity' of areas affected by development is a prime concern. We wish to protect Combwich residents as far as possible from the impact of any extensive use of the wharf and the laydown area - noise and light pollution and extended working hours being of particular concern. We support the approach set out in the Hinkley Point C Supplementary Planning Document 9.7 Box 32, and will insist that working hours are strictly regulated, effective soundproofing is introduced and that those residents nearest to the wharf and the laydown area are adequately mitigated/compensated for the disruption caused by light and noise pollution, increased flood risk and reduction in property values.

7.1.2. Consideration is being given to the development of a community orchard between the laydown area and the residents, partly as noise and light mitigation and as a mitigation that could have a legacy benefit to the local community.

7.2. Steart Proposals

7.2.1. The developments of a massive area of wetland habitat to be created by the Environment Agency and the Port of Bristol Company are generally welcomed by the residents of all three villages (see Appendix C and D); but the following issues must be considered and addressed:

- Footpaths, including the Parrett Trail, will have to be rerouted and there have been consultations with the parish council and other bodies about how this should be done.
- In Steart the main concerns are to reduce the impact of visitor numbers from the proposed schemes, and to maintain flood protection and permanent access to and from the village. Wherever possible, development plans that affect the village should be designed to promote the viability of the community, especially through improvement of strategic flood defences, assistance with flood defence of individual properties and assurance that 24 hour access for commercial, private and emergency vehicles is maintained.
- Contingency plans must be developed and regularly revised for flooding events and for major incidents at Hinkley Point nuclear power stations. Contingency plans are also needed to ensure access for emergency services, including provisions for helicopter and hovercraft access in times when the road is impassable, and to ensure the supply of main utilities - water, electricity and telephone. Discussions with the Environment Agency are on-going.
- Long term maintenance of all the major aspects (including new defences) of these habitat creation schemes is seen as essential components for any development brought forward. Whilst modelling may predict how any developments may change our peninsula, contingency and remediation plans for any unpredicted occurrences must be an integral part of any project.
- Whilst the main sign posted route is through Otterhampton village, it is likely that many visitors will access the new wetland habitat areas through Comwich, leaving their cars in the village as they walk the few hundred yards to the south easterly edge of the development. Lack of car parking facilities for such visitors has the potential to create problems and needs to be considered carefully. On a positive note however, opportunities for local business will arise as visitors seek refreshment, for example.
- There is close liaison with both projects and agreement (in principle) for community representation on any management organisation affecting these projects and access to the village.

7.3. Transport

7.3.1. Transport is a major issue for the parish and in particular during the construction of Hinkley Point C. The Comwich and Otterhampton junctions with the busy C182 are a particular cause for concern because of the greatly increased traffic the construction of HPC will create. During the peak construction period EDF estimate that there will be 1250 daily one way vehicle movements. This excludes travel to Park and Ride sites and locally generated recreational trips by the construction workforce.

7.3.2. The amount of traffic on the C182 from Comwich to HPC may be far greater than above as the traffic limit suggested in the DCO does not apply between the proposed Cannington by-pass junction with the C182 and Hinkley Point. (See

Appendix E and HPC DCO ENV Statement 4.19, Annex 7, Transport Assessment, Chapter 18 (Controls and Monitoring) Section 18.2.3).

7.3.3. In addition the two wetland habitat creation schemes will generate 275 additional vehicle movements a day along narrow roads through Otterhampton to the already dangerous junction with the C182 once the scheme is mature (figures from Environment Agency Planning Application). In addition it is expected that some visitors will access the schemes through Combwich (despite signage indicating the route through Otterhampton) creating a parking problem.

7.3.4. Modifications to the C182 junctions at Combwich and Otterhampton are required for the safety of all road users

7.3.5. Cycle routes to link the parish villages with Cannington and on to Bridgwater and a cycle path between the school and Brookside Road to reduce motor vehicular impact on the village. (SCC Rights of Way Improvement Plan Section 6). Also bus links need to be improved for everyone in order particularly to provide affordable access to and from the villages (adequate to allow transport to and from work and other transport connections) and to reduce the need for more households to run (and have to park) more cars.

8. Addressing the Challenges: Parish Priorities

The following priorities have emerged from a consideration of the issues facing the Parish in consultation with Parish residents as set out in detail in the Appendices:

- 8.1. Keep our communities rural. Combwich should maintain a clear, controlled and well defined village development boundary, as set out in the Sedgemoor Core Strategy. This should include a green “buffer zone” wedge in between Combwich and Cannington. Otterhampton and Steart are classed as Countryside in the Core Strategy, where development is limited to that which is necessary for specific countryside uses or for rural employment. We support this approach.
- 8.2. Short and long term flood protection to all residential areas, houses and all access roads to them within the whole parish. This must include protection to community land designated for growing food, orchards and for ball games and to land designated for future housing. All flood protection measures must be designed based upon climate change prediction and in accordance with Sedgemoor Core Strategy Policies S4 and D1 which set out planning policy as regards flood risk and new development. Flood protection schemes for existing development and areas may be funded through the emerging Community Infrastructure Levy or through Section 106 Agreements from new developments (including that associated with nuclear build).
- 8.3. Similarly all new development within the Parish should use SUDS (Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems) wherever possible. Core Strategy Policy D1 expects all new developments to be run-off neutral as a minimum. Policies S3, S4 and D1 encourage the use of SUDS.

- 8.4. Where appropriate development must first have undergone an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to include ecological, landscape, visual and noise impact assessment. EIA is required by law on certain types of development. Core Strategy Policy D14 requires Landscape, Visual and Ecological Assessments where adverse impacts are possible.
- 8.5. All land used for temporary development should be returned to green field standard; and consideration be given for ownership or a 100 year leasehold passed to the parish's Community Trust where possible.
- 8.6. Developers should identify mitigation/compensation issues and implement where appropriate as set out in Core Strategy Policies S2, MIP2 and MIP3.
- 8.7. A clear need for a limited number of affordable homes to meet the needs of local people for young and old. A housing needs survey conducted recently produced 6 responses and a further 2 requests for affordable homes in the parish has been identified by SDC. The parish council is currently considering the situation. The need for affordable homes is to be regularly monitored and reviewed.
- 8.8. Cycle routes to link Combwich with Cannington and on to Bridgwater and a cycle path between the school and Brookside Road to reduce motor vehicular impact on the village. (see SCC Rights of Way Improvement Plan Section 6). Also bus links improved for everyone in order particularly to improve affordable access to and from the villages (adequate to allow transport to and from work and other transport connections) and to reduce the need for more households to run (and have to park) more cars.
- 8.9. The provision of a community orchard and allotments.
- 8.10. Community Market. A monthly Community Market has now been established using exclusively local producers. There is currently a stall holder's waiting list.
- 8.11. We believe that there are a number of current and future needs and opportunities in the parish which may best be served by the development of a new community building. This does not necessarily preclude the retention of use of the current village hall, which needs major refurbishment including a new and efficient heating system and a new kitchen together with sound insulation between the various rooms to allow them to be used simultaneously. A consultation on this issue is being conducted by the Village Hall Committee following which a business plan will be produced.
- 8.12. Improved recreation facilities particularly for young people but also for people of all ages, including the erection of a multi-purpose shelter and all weather play surface.
- 8.13. Re-establish access to Combwich Ponds.
- 8.14. Any use of Combwich wharf must take account of its situation at the heart of the community with restrictions imposed due to it being surrounded on three sides by dwellings, with the fourth adjacent to a special protection area on the river. This is in line with Core Strategy Policy D16 and with HPC Supplementary Planning Document.
- 8.15. Industrial or storage type development should be avoided on areas with a high flood risk, or of a green field nature. Core Strategy Policy SD1 requires a sequential approach to development in flood risk areas as set out in national planning policy. Development in

high flood risk areas and green field areas is strictly controlled by the Core Strategy, although it is recognised that development that forms part of the DCO application will be decided by the IPC rather than the District Council.

- 8.16. Maintain public access and use of the Pill for recreational boat users.
- 8.17. Maintain the common.
- 8.18. Provision of high speed broadband to better facilitate home working and small businesses.
- 8.19. All public rights of way within the Parish must be protected or previous rights of way restored back to public access. A thorough assessment must be made of all the footpaths and bridleway links between Bridgwater, Cannington, Otterhampton, Stogursey and Nether Stowey Parishes and to the Hinkley site. A main 'artery' public footpath/cycle-way/bridleway such as a Multi-User Path (MUP) which links all these places must be implemented and then protected under planning legislation such as a Protected Transport Corridor in perpetuity. This main artery must also link at points to any major road such as an 'A' road and preferably through to an existing railway station. All future development must not be allowed to sever this route at any point along its length to the extent of blocking, either permanently or for long periods, any users (including designated modes of transport) from using this route.
- 8.20. A car park at Combwich to provide for the increased numbers of visitors as a result of the creation of wetland habitat.
- 8.21. Visitors to the wetland habitat areas should be assisted to enjoy the experience without excessive intrusion on local residents.
- 8.22. Modifications made to St Andrew's church, Steart to enable its use as a community centre as well as a place of worship.

9. Progress so far

- 9.1. In the 12 months since the Community Plan was developed and adopted by Otterhampton Parish Council much has been achieved. For example a community market has been established for local food producers and craft workers. The Village Hall Committee has been revitalised and is actively exploring refurbishing or replacing the hall. A survey of all residents in the parish has recently been conducted by the Village Hall Committee and the results are awaited. A cycle path sub-group has been established and is represented on the Transport Forum. A housing need survey also has been undertaken which has demonstrated a limited need for affordable homes in the parish. A working group has been convened to examine the issues relating to Combwich Ponds and an allotment group is to be established. The views of local children have been surveyed and the community is looking to join 'Childsafe'.
- 9.2. The interest created in the plan has revitalised the community in some unexpected ways, for example a community choir and an art group has been successfully set up and a weekly coffee morning in the village is well supported.

9.3. This Community Plan will continue to evolve as the working groups set up to examine and action the various proposals report their progress. Residents will continue to be kept informed and involved in the process by meetings, newsletters and the new parish website (currently under construction).

Appendix A

COMMUNITY LED PLAN – OPEN DAY 12th February 2011

SUMMARY

An Open Day was held in Combwich Village Hall to gather the thoughts and views of the residents of Otterhampton Parish, as input to preparing a community led plan for the Parish.

112 people attended the day, contributing around **370** comments. This report presents the raw information gathered on the day.

The **10 most popular issues** overall (based on the number of comments received) were as follows...

- Maintaining our peaceful and rural location is important to us [18]
- We want to cater for wide range of housing needs e.g. affordable housing, housing for the elderly, new developments being built in sympathy with current houses [16]
- We do not want our parish industrialised [16]
- We want to provide a footpath or cycle path with parking on Brookside or by the existing bus stop as an alternative way for children to get to the school [15]
- We want to restore access to Combwich Ponds including removing the car park and road by the ponds [14]
- We want a more frequent bus service [13]
- We want to improve the path for cyclists following the main Hinkley Point road from Bridgwater [13]
- We do not want wind turbines [13]
- We want to provide allotments [12]
- We want to provide a monthly market on the village common [10]

The most popular issues by category were as follows...

Transport

- We want to provide a footpath or cycle path with parking on Brookside or by the existing bus stop as an alternative way for children to get to the school
- We want a more frequent bus service
- We want to improve the path for cyclists following the main Hinkley Point road from Bridgwater

Sustainability

- We do not want wind turbines
- We want to generate renewable energy (wind/solar/water) for the village, including village hall and school

Recreation and leisure

- We want to provide allotments
- We want to provide better recreation facilities for teenagers in village e.g. a skate park

Housing

- We want to cater for wide range of housing needs e.g. affordable housing, housing for the elderly, new developments being built in sympathy with current houses
- We do not want any more housing in Steart due to the flood risk

Environment

- Maintaining our peaceful and rural location is important to us
- We do not want our parish industrialised

Education and training

- We see our village school as an important part of our community
- We would like to provide education beyond the school e.g. evening classes and adult IT classes

Business

- Continuing to support our village shop is important to us
- We want to provide barn-style units for light industrial use or office space

Facilities

- We want to provide a monthly market on the village common
- We want to modernise and refurbish our Village Hall e.g. a new kitchen and upgrading the drains, perhaps using volunteers

Other

- We believe we have a strong sense of community

The remainder of this report presents the individual comments not included but available..

Appendix B

Otterhampton Parish Council Questionnaire on EDF's Hinkley Point C Preferred Proposals for Combwich

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

No. Dwellings in Parish = 364 No. Questionnaires Returned = 170

Percent Returned = 50.14%

1. Road Freight

Combwich has been selected as EDF's preferred proposal for a road freight logistics and storage site. As yet EDF has not informed us as to the number of vehicle movements per day this would involve.

Do you agree or disagree with EDF's proposal to use Combwich as a site for a road freight logistics and storage facility?

Agree 5.9% Disagree 91.8% No opinion 2.3%

2. Fabrication (industrial) Buildings

EDF's preferred proposal is for three large industrial buildings 12m (39ft) high x 40m (131ft) wide and up to 120m (394ft) long on the Combwich freight logistics site, two of which will be for fabrication purposes. The buildings would be used for fabricating rebar cages, formwork, pipe spooling and other fabrication activities as required during the construction of HPC.

Do you agree or disagree with Combwich becoming a site for a fabrication works?

Agree 3.6% Disagree 95.2% No opinion 1.2%

3. Fabrication (location)

A lot of industrial land or brownfield land already exists in the area

Do you agree or disagree that – fabrication works should be sited either at the Main Hinkley C site or other existing industrial location such as Hinkley A or B site?

Agree 87.7% Disagree 8.8% No opinion 3.5%

4. Park & Ride Buses

EDF's preferred proposal is to park its park and ride buses (number as yet undisclosed) overnight at the Combwich site. Buses would start up at approximately 4.30am and return around midnight.

Do you agree or disagree with the proposal to park buses at Combwich overnight?

Agree 7.1% **Disagree 89.9%** **No opinion 3.0%**

5. Combwich Wharf

In addition to using Combwich Wharf for the large AIL's (abnormal indivisible loads) EDF now wishes to use it for 15 deliveries a month for other cargoes. That is 30 ship movements (arrivals and departures).

Do you agree or disagree with this level of use ?

Agree 10.0% **Disagree 81.8%** **No opinion 8.2%**

6. Combwich Wharf Shared Use

Thirty ship movements a month on the available high tides would dominate the use of Combwich Pill by EDF to the almost complete disadvantage of other users.

Do you agree or disagree that -- for safety and amenity issues an agreement for a fair sharing of tides and access to the Pill should be negotiated?

Agree 87.0% **Disagree 1.8%** **No opinion 1.2%**

7. Noise and disturbance during unsocial hours

To safeguard local residents from noise and disturbance during unsocial hours, use is restricted solely between 08.00hrs to 1930hrs on Mondays to Saturdays and at no other times without the prior written permission of the local planning authority. EDF is seeking to change the times in some areas to 24 hour usage.

Do you agree or disagree that – hours of use should continue to be restricted to safeguard local residents?

Agree 97.1% **Disagree 2.9%** **No opinion 0%**

8. Freight logistics site to be returned to a Green field site

EDF propose to return the freight logistics area to a greenfield site after the construction of Hinkley C rather than leaving the site for continued industrial use.

Do you agree or disagree with the area being reinstated as a Greenfield site after use.

Agree 95.9% **Disagree 1.8%** **No opinion 2.3%**

9. EDF's Consultation Process

EDF's consultation process is in two parts. In **Stage 1** there was no mention of Combwich as a site for a road freight depot, fabrication buildings and overnight bus parking, or the 24 hour use of some facilities. There was therefore no opportunity to comment on those issues at that time.

While other communities were aware of the main proposals affecting them at Stage1, we only discovered them after Stage 2 was launched, effectively denying Combwich residents the level of consultation provided for other communities.

Do you agree or disagree that - EDF's consultation in relation to the Combwich proposals has been adequate?

Agree 22.2% **Disagree 74.9%** **No opinion 2.9%**

Independent Observer: David Hatherley (Cannington Parish Clerk),
44 Tor View Ave.
Glastonbury.

Appendix C

Stear Coast Management Project

Analysis of public consultations undertaken by the Environment Agency

Public drop-in sessions One to Four were consultations on the design process

Drop-In One – April 2009

The event was attended by 122 people

Drop-In Two – October 2009

The event was attended by approx 90 people, all of whom were given questionnaires. 37 questionnaires were completed and returned to us.

Drop-In Three – March 2010

The event was attended by approx 90 people.

Drop-In Four – July 2010

The event was attended by approx 90 - 100 people

Drop-In Five – October 2011

The event was attended by 67 members of the public. Feedback forms were handed out to all who attended;

31 completed forms have been received so far, out of these:

14 'strongly support' the scheme,

15 'support' and

2 'don't know'.

The Otterhampton Parish Council and the Steart Residents Group have also been involved in meetings with the Environment Agency on a regular basis throughout the whole period and are still on going.

Port of Bristol Company have also supplied an 88 page document detailing their public consultations and discussions with local residents and groups including the parish council which is available if required.

Appendix D

STEART RESIDENTS' GROUP

Responses to a questionnaire regarding the proposed Environment Agency Steart Coastal Management Scheme and the proposed Bristol Port Company Managed Realignment Scheme.

This report summarises the responses to a questionnaire aimed quantifying the current opinions of Steart residents on the developments within the local area proposed by the Environment Agency (EA) and The Bristol Port Company (TBPC).

The questionnaire requested respondents to score their opinions on each of the schemes on a scale of one to five, where one represented “totally against” and five “totally in favour”. Respondents were also asked to give their views on the benefits and costs of each scheme and to indicate areas where they required further information.

Completed questionnaires were received from 13 of the 14 properties within the hamlet, comprising of individual or joint responses from 23 of the 26 adult residents.

Environment Agency scheme

A total of 81% respondents were either “in favour” (38%) or “totally in favour” (43%) of the scheme, 13 % had no opinion either way and 6 % were totally against.

Score	1 (against)	2	3	4	5 (for)
Total Responses	1	0	2	6	7
Percentage	6%	0	13 %	38%	43%

All but two respondents gave a score of their opinions on each scheme; however, one of these respondents indicated a favourable opinion for the EA scheme.

Summary of benefits from the EA Scheme

- An improvement to the flood defences of the village, road and parts of the farmland, plus management of tidal flooding as and when it occurs.
- Complements the flood defences created by the TBPC scheme.
- Enhancement of attractiveness and increased public interest in the area could help to prolong the viability of the community and protect property values.
- Increased visitor numbers might bring greater income to catering and accommodation businesses in the area.
- Increase the wildlife interest in the area and safeguard its biodiversity through the creation of coastal marsh, freshwater and brackish habitats.

- Provision of education and recreation activities that could lead to opportunities for employment and volunteering.
- Satisfies national legal obligations to create coastal marsh and provide land to mitigate losses associated with flood defences in other parts of the Severn Estuary.

Summary of costs from the EA scheme

- The likely increase in visitors would threaten the tranquillity and sense of isolation of the peninsula. Greater visitor numbers would increase disturbance to residents and wildlife, especially of uncontrolled dogs, and possibly lead to an increase in crime.
- Concern regarding potential traffic problems on the narrow roads on, and leading to, the peninsula. The effect of increased traffic through Otterhampton is a safety issue, especially at the Otterhampton/Hinkley road (C182) junction and at the start of the Steart Drove.
- Disruption during construction.
- Loss of the local riverside section of the Parrett Trail.
- Loss of agricultural land and landscape, together with loss of existing habitats, especially grassland, hedges and freshwater rhynes.
- Potential effects on local agricultural enterprises.
- Restricted views from properties adjacent to the new banks.

The Bristol Port Company scheme

A total of 75% respondents were either “in favour” (19%) or “totally in favour” (56%) of the scheme, 25% had no opinion either way and none was totally against.

Score	1 (against)	2	3	4	5 (for)
Total Responses	0	0	4	3	9
Percentage	0	0	25%	19%	56%

All but two respondents gave a score of their opinions on each scheme; however, these two respondents indicated a favourable opinion for the TBPC scheme.

Summary of benefits from the TBPC Scheme

- Realignment of flood defences will reduce the flood risk from the deteriorating sea defences at Country Wall.
- Complements the flood defences created by the EA scheme.
- Enhancement of attractiveness and increased public interest in the area could help to prolong the viability of the community and protect property values.
- Increased visitor numbers might bring greater income to catering and accommodation businesses in the area.
- Increase the wildlife interest in the area and safeguard local biodiversity.

- Provision of education and recreation activities that could lead to opportunities for employment and volunteering.

Summary of costs from the TBPC Scheme

- The likely increase in visitors would threaten the tranquillity and sense of isolation of the peninsula. Greater visitor numbers would increase disturbance to residents and wildlife, especially of uncontrolled dogs, and possibly lead to an increase in crime.
- Concern regarding potential traffic problems on the narrow roads on, and leading to, the peninsula. The effect of increased traffic through Otterhampton is a safety issue, especially at the Otterhampton/Hinkley road (C182) junction and at the start of the Steart Drove.
- Disruption during construction.
- Loss of the coast path.
- Loss of agricultural land and landscape, together with loss of coastal habitat, grassland, hedges and freshwater rhynes.
- Possible effects of the coastal breach on the eastward movement of sediments and the potential effect on the natural seaward defences of Steart village.

EA and TBPC schemes: General comments and requests for further information

- The effect of both schemes on the movement of freshwater on the peninsula.
- Encouragement for the proposal to create a steering/management group to oversee long term changes to the local area, the group to include representatives of all interested parties.
- More information on the management of visitors to the peninsula, development of visitor facilities and traffic control. Reduction of possible disturbance to the village and its residents.
- Assurance on the provision of management of septic tanks and land drainage.
- Concern regarding the present and future maintenance of the river banks and foreshore.
- "Let nature take its course, as it has in the past"
- Residents should accept changes and encourage visitors.
- Concern regarding the proposed car park at Steart Gate and its effect on nearby properties.
- Requests for regular meetings with developers as detailed plans become available.
- Plan to keep HGV and pedestrians apart.
- Concern regarding the long term maintenance of the newly created flood defences and the workings of a possible "trust fund".
- Long term projection of flood risk to properties in the light of predicted climate change to sea level rises.
- Further details of the protection of the road across Wall Common.

Appendix E

ROAD TRAFFIC ANALYSIS OF HPC DCO

The summary below represents the total one way vehicle movements during the peak years of construction of HPC. The lower figure from the EDF documentation has been taken to avoid the accusation of overstating the volume of traffic that will pass along the C182 past Combwich, Otterhampton and other villages along the route. It will also be a much understated figure for the amount of traffic through Bridgwater as it excludes travel to Park & Ride sites and locally generated non work trips by the workforce.

One very important discrepancy in the documentation relates to the number of HGVs. In Annex 7, page 149, figure 9.3, HGVs on the graph, range from 200 to 250 in the peak years. However, an examination of page 150 table 9.1, figures taken from FMS, show a daily rate between 297 and 375, from 2013 through to 2021!

Summary:

• Daily direct bus journeys to HPC (Annex 7 – Transport Assessment, 8.5.5, page 131)	96
• Park & Ride bus journeys to HPC (Annex 7 – Transport Assessment, Table 8.12, page 130)	254
• Campus bus journeys to HPC (Annex 7 – Transport Assessment, Table 8.15, page 132)	64
• Direct car Journeys to HPC (Annex 7 – Transport Assessment, 8.2.45, page 128)	200
• VIP & business visitors to HPC (Annex 7 – Transport Assessment, Table 8.23, page 137)	135
• Buses to PIC at HPC (Annex 7 – Transport Assessment, Table 8.27, page 140)	26
• Total HGVs to HPC (Annex 7 – Transport Assessment, Fig. 9.3, page 149)	200
• LGVs direct to HPC (Annex 7 – Transport Assessment, Table 9.4, page 152)	75
• Contractors, Combwich to HPC (Volume 7, Chapter 4, operations, page 9)	50
• LGVs, Combwich to HPC (Appendix 3.7, 8.5.5, page 69)	150

Total, daily, one way vehicle movements 1250

NB. The amount of traffic on the C182 from Combwich to HPC may be far greater than above as the traffic limit suggested in the DCO does not apply between the proposed Cannington by-pass junction with the C182. (ENV Statement 4.19, Annex 7, Transport Assessment, Chapter 18 (Controls and Monitoring) Section 18.2.3).

John Marriott, Otterhampton Parish Council

Appendix F Map 11.3 Combwich Development Boundary



Sedgemoor
IN SOMERSET

(c) Crown copyright. All rights reserved.
Sedgemoor District Council, 0100024272 2010

Date: June 2010

Scale: 1:5,000