

Meeting Report

Regarding: EDF Hinkley Point C: Transport Forum	Date: Thursday 10 th July 2025 – 6pm
	Meeting held at: Bridgwater and Taunton College, Cannington Campus.
Participating:	
Doug Bamsey, <i>Chair</i> John Addison (JA), <i>Cannington Parish Council</i> Mark Phillips (MP), <i>Wembdon Parish Council</i> Andy Coupé (ACé), <i>Somerset Council</i> Roy Pumfrey (RP), <i>Stop Hinkley</i> Sebastian Koa (SK), <i>University of Exeter</i> Valdo Andrade (VA), <i>Avon & Somerset Police</i> Nicola Hale (NH), <i>Somerset Council</i> John Roberts (JR), <i>Nether Stowey Parish Council</i> Chris Morgan (CM), <i>Stogursey Parish Council</i> Sue Goss (SG), <i>Stogursey Parish Council</i> Hugh Davies (HD), <i>Somerset Council</i>	EDF Team: Richard Clews (RCL), <i>EDF</i> Mounia Miguil (MM), <i>EDF</i> Andy Wagstaff (AW), <i>EDF</i> Rachel Lister (RL), <i>EDF</i> Jamie Jamieson (JJ), <i>EDF</i> Matthew Williams (MW), <i>SEC Newgate</i> Apologies Received: Rosemary Woods (RW), <i>Somerset Council</i>

In addition to the forum meeting notes and agendas, all presentations and reports are available at www.edfenergy.com/hpcccommunity

Item		Action
1	Welcome and Introductions	
1.1	'The Chair' welcomed everyone to the meeting. He asked everyone to introduce themselves and ran through the venue arrangements and forum protocols.	
2	Meeting Note and Matters Arising	
2.1	The Chair referred to the meeting note of 13 th March 2025 and invited any further comment on the draft and the afternotes provided.	
2.2	<p>3.4.6 - Driving and inappropriate overtaking In response to a point raised by Richard Cuttell about early morning volumes of traffic, Andrew Cockcroft agreed this was an issue along with things such as inappropriate overtaking.</p> <p>Andrew Cockcroft said he would reinforce this point to B&A station. Andy Wagstaff said he would take the action to do this as he already attends a Quarterly Road Safety Tri-Site Meeting, and will raise it more formally in that forum. AFTERNOTE: Driver behaviours from HPA and B raised at the cross-site Road Safety forum.</p> <p>In response, AW added that he attends every quarter, there is a perception that it's always HPC, but there are issues with drivers at HPA and HPB too.</p> <p>2.2.1 Sue Goss (SG) responded by saying that the Parish Council are approached (especially in Shurton), and it comes largely from HPA and B whereas HPC workers are taken in by authorised bus as they feel it's totally wrong for HPC to be blamed for everything – there are Speed Indicator Device (SID) posts in place to deter speeding (even if one of these has been run over by a vehicle).</p> <p>Chris Morgan (CM) agreed with the point SG made. He made the point about losing the SID due to a speeding car, and no-one knows what happened to the car, but that strangely further along that junction a post was put for a SID but has been dug up, and asked who was going to replace it.</p> <p>2.2.2 Roy Pumfrey (RP) asked for confirmation that over 200 cars and a similar number of white vans were going to site each day. AW replied that with 300 parking spaces this is likely to be higher.</p> <p>2.2.3 John Roberts (JR) added that Stogursey Lane, stating that at shift changeover times it is like a racetrack; he expressed fears for school children.</p> <p>Mark Phillips (MP) added the fact that Wembdon is a rat run and that SIDs have picked up speeds in the region of 60-70mph.</p> <p>2.2.4 RP then asked MP what proportion of vehicles are adhering to the speed limit. MP replied it's about 87%, but that it also picks up runners and bicycles.</p> <p>The Chair invited Valdo Andrade (VA) to comment; he mentioned how Esther and Ewan have been to Stogursey early in the morning because of concerns about speeding.</p> <p>2.2.5 CM then raised the issue of electric bikes and scooters, that he adheres to 30mph and he has been overtaken by a bicycle along these roads! VA replied that the law still applies for bicycles, and that last week someone was brought in for being on the wrong side of the road. SG then asked if A&S police deal with electric scooter riders? VA replied that they do because it's illegal to ride the scooter on a public road.</p>	

	<p>The Chair suggested that this might be something to mention at the next quarterly meeting.</p> <p>ACTION</p> <p>5.8.1 - Bus fleet numbers</p> <p>In response to a question from Richard C, AW said he would follow up with the team to see if the fleet number could be larger.</p> <p>AFTERNOTE: AW did ask the question and it is considered that the existing numbers are large enough, SPS will not be re-configuring the entire fleet with larger numbers.</p>	<p>ACTION AW</p>
2.3	<p>There were no further comments, and the meeting note was approved.</p>	
3	<p>Project Progress Update - (Richard Clews (RCL), EDF)</p>	
3.1	<p>Richard Clews (RCL) provided an update on the project.</p>	
3.2	<p>Ready for Dome Lift</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The construction of Unit 1’s building is almost complete, as the installation of equipment accelerates inside. • Unit 2’s 245-tonne dome is now due to be lifted this summer and allow the containment building to move into its fit-out phase. • Progress has been helped by a transformation in the way the power station is being built with prefabrication in civil construction now approaching 60%. • At dome lift for Unit 2, the second reactor building will be further ahead with more equipment installed than at the same point on Unit 1. • The amount of structural steel inside the building will be almost 300 tonnes versus just 10 for Unit 1. <p>RCL then showed members a slide with two images, one showing the polar crane (which has been pre-constructed on site) being ready for installation before dome lift, and the other showing that Unit 2’s equipment hatch has been fitted. It was delivered to Combwich Wharf and moved up the C182 a few weeks ago.</p>	
3.3	<p>RCL then showed members a video showing the site’s readiness for Unit 2’s dome lift.</p>	
3.4	<p>Pre-submitted question – Dome Lift</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “When Unit 1 dome lift was complete, EdeF said that this was a boon as work could then carry on under cover and not be weather dependent. Following the predictable delay to lifting Unit 2’s dome, the line is now that masses more equipment, including structural steel, has been installed without cover and this is a benefit. These are contradictory stances. Please would EdeF explain? <p>- submitted by Roy Pumfrey, <i>Stop Hinkley</i></p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>There has been a lot of learning on Unit 1, particularly with regard to building inside once the dome has been put on and what could be done prior to the dome being installed. RCL doesn’t feel that they are contradictory, but that a weatherproof roof is good but not essential.</p> <p>RP asked if that means that the salty air is not corroding the 300t of steel inside Unit 2, as it</p>	

	<p>would at Unit 1 if the dome hadn't been put on? He also raised the point that he's unimpressed that EDF are learning on the job, given EDF's experience of building this sort of reactor would mean that there would be less learning compared to other nuclear sites. Quote from Nigel Cann at Sizewell. Also theoretically asked if Unit 1 was a practice and that people wouldn't buy a 'used' Unit 1 from HPC.</p> <p>RCL said that Unit 1 was ensuring that everything was delivered that needed to be; and learnings from process. A lot of this is to do with parallel working as opposed to series working, there's a lot of prebuilding and then lifting into place. RCL said it's about process rather than Unit 1 being poorly built. RP replied he might raise the same point at the CF when the ONR attend.</p> <p>The Chair commented that this was something for the CF in September.</p>	
3.5	<p>DCO Material Change update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We continue to move through the process for a material change to Hinkley Point C's DCO. The proposed changes include a change to "dry" spent fuel storage and environmental mitigation for the removal of the acoustic fish deterrent. • An innovative technology, not available when the consent was granted, means it's possible to deploy an acoustic fish deterrent without the need to endanger the lives of divers. • Pioneered in the South-West and used in fishing fleets around the world, the technology uses electronic transducers to target specific fish species with high-frequency sound. The efficiency of the system means it can be precisely tuned and installed and serviced from the surface. • We have paused work on proposals for new areas of saltmarsh while we work to establish the suitability of the new acoustic fish deterrent technology. • Our current schedules has a submission of the material change application, <i>potentially without</i> the proposal to remove the fish deterrent system, at the end of 2025 or early 2026. 	
3.6	<p>Community Dashboard</p> <p>RCL mentioned that HPC has now developed a simplified community dashboard, which gives a look ahead at key elements that could cause impact, this is live on the website and gives notice of expected elevated noise, light or dust levels; use of the emergency access route for vehicles, whether any roadworks are planned, or if the diversion routes are needed. RCL also requested that members give feedback on the new dashboard.</p>	
3.7	<p>Workforce uplift</p> <p>RCL said he would focus on the topic papers, the Spatial Distribution Note (SDN) and the community engagement aspect of workforce uplift. The SDN is all but agreed with Somerset Council, although they don't have the final version – they are expected to within the next week or so.</p> <p>The purpose of that is to set out how an upper limit of 15,000 workers would look in the area. He ran through the various topic papers, which are progressing well, with transport being the most complicated. The aim is to base the impacts on evidence – in comparison with the original DCO and workforce uplift 1, which were based on informed guesswork.</p>	
3.7.1	<p>In terms of community engagement, RCL mentioned that there are four or five Local Community Networks (LCNs) that the project wants to engage with. HPC is working closely with Somerset Council about how to do this. It is also hoped to consider the SDN and potential topic mitigations at the Community Forum on 18 September.</p>	

<p>3.7.2</p> <p>3.7.3</p> <p>3.7.4</p> <p>3.7.5</p> <p>3.7.6</p>	<p>SG asked that some bus drivers were concerned about workers walking along the C182 to get to work, and asked what action was taken.</p> <p>Andy Wagstaff (AW) said that reflective clothing, flashing lights etc were offered. Discussions had also been undertaken with the Somerset Council Rights of Way Service to understand wider improvements being progressed associated with path diversions at Doggets. SG said that this was going against the DCO for these people who were parking illegally at Wick – the owners have been encouraged to put in planning applications.</p> <p>AW suggests that they probably are not in breach of the DCO. SG feels that this is wrong as it is encouraging people who are inviting people to park in their premises rather than the P&Rs (which are in the DCO). AW says they aren't encouraging people to park by issuing safety equipment.</p> <p>CM said that there are at least 60 cars parked in Wick.</p> <p>RCL said that HPC have been aware of this for a long time. The workforce is signed up to the code of conduct, including parking at a Park and Ride or at a safe place near their residence. As this is private property, HPC can't enter to check badges. The Project has been requesting that the Council take action; he understands that the Council has written (as has the Project Director) to the landowners. The applications have taken a long time to arrive, but it is with the local authority and planning authority to enforce.</p> <p>SG said that SPC has received the planning applications, which will be discussed at their next meeting. SG says she understands the planning officers' slowness as the departments are hugely short staffed - and that John B has been pushing about this and managed to get the process in operation now. SG pointed out that there are two planning applications, which RCL asked to be notified when these applications were validated.</p> <p>RP asked if HPC would write a letter of objection to these applications?</p> <p>RCL said that he hadn't seen the applications or their content and at present wouldn't support them. HPC won't be offering any financial support and the expectation is that they would object.</p> <p>The Chair asked Andy Coupé (ACé) for comment. As a representative on the Transport Review Group, he says that SG has a strong point that there is car parking provision made in the DCO and is disappointed to see that these facilities have come forward – and that the planning process needs to deal with this and that members need to be able to make comments on this.</p> <p>RP referred to June minutes of Cannington Parish Council – and that someone was going to approach EDF about providing further parking in a bid to reduce fly parking in the village. SG said that she thinks that HPC should be supporting this, given that EDF have provided these parking places at great expense and yet seem happy to let these cars drive in and use these spaces.</p> <p>RCL added that he discussed with the Council the taking of enforcement action, but the authority didn't agree and preferred the planning application route as an alternative.. SG said she would forward RCL the planning applications.</p>	
---	--	--

4	Update from Transport Review Group – Rachel Lister	
4.1	Rachel Lister (RL) provided a summary of the Transport Review Group Quarterly Report for January to March 2025 (Q1), which was presented to the Transport Review Group on 28 th April 2025.	
4.2	<p>Construction Workforce Travel Plan (CWTP)</p> <p>RL then ran through the CWTP figures for Q1</p> <p>Final journey to HPC site (last Quarter)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Walk 4.6% - Cycle 0.7% - Motorcycle 0.4% - Car (Driver) 1.3% - Car Share (Driver) 0.4% - Car Passenger via HPC Car Park 0.5% - Car Passenger via Drop Off Location 1.4% - HPC Bus Service 89.1% 	
4.3	<p>CWTP - HPC Bus Passenger Boarding Locations (last Quarter)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - North of Bridgwater 17% (including 8% at Brean Campus) - Local Area 11% - West Somerset (including Washford Cross P&R and Minehead) 4% - Taunton & J25 P&R 11% - J23 & J24 P&R – 15% - Bridgwater (including Sedgemoor Campus) 42% 	
4.4	<p>Bus Movements</p> <p>Bus movements a day (DCO) – 1,232. Bus movements a day (Last Quarter) – 1,187.</p> <p>Note: Current bus movements a day include “empty running” buses* which are not included in the DCO number. (* buses with no passengers, such as when buses are travelling to journey start point or returning to depot for maintenance).</p>	
4.5	<p>Construction Workforce Travel Plan (CWTP) – HPC Car Share</p> <p>The project continues to have a real focus on the promotion of car sharing.</p> <p>18% Car Passenger (only) at J23 P&R and 11% at J24 P&Rs (with targets set for peak construction at J23 P&R 38% and J24 P&R 36%, the car share targets in the DCO relate to the proportion of car passengers as a total of mode share to the park and rides including those walking and cycling).</p> <p>32% (372 workers) Car Sharers (Car Passenger and Car Driver with Passengers) at J23 P&R and 23% (120 workers) at J24 P&R – based on all users.</p> <p>Overall, 27% of those arriving via car to all Park and Ride were car sharers (2,839 bus passengers arriving via car and of these 765 via Car Sharing– 345 car share drivers and 420 car passengers).</p>	

	<p>Promotion of HPC Car Share continues following the promotional week in September 2024. RL shared images of some of the promotional material, articles and signage used in the campaign.</p> <p>278 new members joined (92 new members joined in Q4 2024).</p>	
<p>4.6</p> <p>4.6.1</p> <p>4.6.2</p>	<p>Fly Parking</p> <p>During the last quarter, the HPC Fly Parking Team also undertook their own checks and investigated 827 potential observations.</p> <p>33 of the reports (9%) were confirmed as HPC workers fly parking; 50 of the reports (13%) were HPC workers not fly parking and 303 of the reports (78%) were found to be not a HPC worker or not registered.</p> <p>161 bus passengers were found to be fly parking. This represents 1.5% of the total workforce and based on a full working week (Monday to Sunday) during the quarter equates to 4 HPC workers fly parking a day (based on Monday to Friday excluding Bank Holidays).</p> <p>All of the 161 are subject to the Fly Parking Policy – a 3 Stage Approach which is applied to all HPC fly parkers.</p> <p>Pre-submitted question: Fly parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Regarding HPC worker fly parking, the data presented to the Forum has been manipulated to minimise the problems experienced by many members of local communities. One of the ways this is done, as local residents know, is by taking the position that a worker fly parking for a working week has only transgressed once. How can EdeF remedy this situation?” <p style="text-align: center;">- submitted by Roy Pumfrey, <i>Stop Hinkley</i></p> <p>Answer:</p> <p>The data presented to the Forum on HPC Worker Fly parking covers two areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> HPC Enquiries Helpline – fly parking related complaints received HPC Fly parking team observations – monitoring undertaken by team <p>The data is provided from both the HPC Enquiries Team managed externally and by Somerset Passenger Solutions. These teams work together to investigate each potential fly parking enquiry or observation. All of which are recorded.</p> <p>The question refers to ‘taking the position that a worker fly parking for a working week has only transgressed once.’</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> HPC Enquiries Helpline – Even if a vehicle is reported multiple times in a week, only one complaint is typically logged due to the time required to process and investigate each report. The complaint would then be passed onto the Fly Parking team to investigate and if found to be fly parking, reported to their employer as part of the Fly Parking Process. HPC Fly parking team observations – these include each occurrence. These observations (each occurrence) are used to escalate the issue through the Fly Parking Process, potentially leading to disciplinary action such as removal of the HPC Site Pass. <p>RP then said that if an HPC worker wanted to fly park, they could park for a week and not be spotted (except by a member of the public) – and that the system relies on someone reporting them. A worker could then move on and fly park somewhere else where they may not be a member of the public reporting vehicles – and mean that someone could evade attempts to report transgressions by ‘hopping around.’</p>	

<p>4.6.3</p>	<p>Regarding the data, he noted the increase of 50% in non-HPC registered fly parking reports. He pointed out that the real number of HPC-related fly parking incidents had increased, they had dropped as an overall percentage, and also said that members of the public don't just phone in on the off chance that a fly parker is an HPC worker – and that this indicates to him that HPC workers increasingly aren't registering their vehicle with the Project. He also referenced a recent BBC report on fly parking about this matter and suggested that the problem was larger than the data presents.</p> <p>John Addison (JA) asked how workers using the buses were checked in and suggested the system could be better if workers had a ticket or similar and had to board at a specific park and ride.</p> <p>RL replied that the previous 'swipe on' system had stopped. She mentioned that when a worker joins the project they are allocated a park and ride or if they walk etc, and they register their vehicle with the project. RL mentioned how the SPS team are good at spotting HPC workers by looking for stickers or high-viz. The team are aware of the fly parking hotspots and the key times of day to catch fly parkers – and have caught people getting off the bus and then walking to their vehicle.</p> <p>RL mentioned how the fly parking team wasn't mandated in the DCO, and how the team are focusing on trying to reduce the effects of fly parking on local communities rather than using their efforts to increase car sharing.</p> <p>AW added that HPC workers aren't permitted to travel on external buses in PPE. He responded to JA by saying that TfL don't allow passengers to only board in specific locations – and that the technology required and everyday circumstances make that difficult to enforce.</p> <p>AW mentioned how the buses only go to HPC site, and a pass system works until someone forgets theirs, or are a visitor. He underlined what he saw as the difficulty in enforcing this and instead having swiping in on site; and mentioned how over the course of a week the SPS team cover nearly all the known fly parking hotspots. In response to RP, he added that the statistics are what has been reported, and these are what the Project has to work with.</p>	
<p>4.7</p>	<p>HGV Movements against HGV Average / Maximum Daily / Quarterly Limit for HGV Routes</p> <p>2025 Q1 (average): Daily HGV Movements – 185 Maximum Movements on any day (Mon-Fri) – 310 Maximum Movements on any day (Sat) – 51 All marked as green, as below the DCP average limit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 40 breaches (0.29% of total HGV movements) during Quarter Q1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 3 HGV outside of permitted delivery hours - 0 HGV over permitted time limit - 37 HGVs deviated from the approved HGV route • All HGV drivers who were involved in these breaches have received a Driver Strike. <p>RL said that the team continue to undertake regular HGV Route Compliance activity which includes: Driver Briefings random observations; Senior Leadership Engagement Tours; HGV Signage review.</p>	
<p>4.8</p>	<p>CWTP Last Quarter: Daily HGV Movements was 185 (91 deliveries). Next Quarter forecast: Daily HGV Movements: 250 (125 deliveries).</p>	

5	Passenger Transport Update - (Andy Wagstaff, EDF)	
5.1	<p>AW gave a brief update, saying that:</p> <p>Planning permission for the additional parking at Bridgwater Albion RFC was approved on Monday 7th July. There will be some infrastructure changes at the rugby club too. He invited questions from members.</p>	
5.2	<p>RP asked how those parking at the rugby club would get to site. AW replied that they would walk to Sedgemoor campus.</p> <p>RP referred to the fact it was sold the community that only people living at Sedgemoor campus could get the bus from there.</p> <p>AW replied that he wasn't aware of that being the case.</p>	
6	Marine Deliveries, AILs and Rebar Update - (Jamie Jamieson, EDF)	
6.1	<p>JJ start by saying that a major component is the larger rebar is being constructed off site and being transported by marine – a first of its kind in Europe. This is innovation in the forefront regarding construction.</p> <p>Avonmouth Rebar Facility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operated and managed by Expanded on behalf of ByLor • Game changer in terms of installation efficiency • 1st of a kind in Europe • Cages built in vertical stations to heights of 12m • Bespoke semi-automated production line • 3,596 individual designs sign-offs required • Over 3,300 tonnes of rebar transported so far. • Removed a total of 275 HGV journeys. 	
6.2	<p>JJ then showed members a slide showing a high-level scope of the operation. He ran through the process to members.</p> <p>He showed members some photos of rebar weighing nearly 30 tonnes. The facility at Avonmouth is a bespoke facility.</p> <p>From that they're put into the hold, arriving at the HPC jetty, the bottom left image is the cage in the vehicle station. JJ showed members an L9 cage, a critical part of where the rebar goes in. He explained how the cage is lifted onto the SPMT.</p>	
6.3	<p>Peak Anfield</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General cargo ship with double hull • Built in 2000 • Length 82.48m • Beam 12.4m • Deadweight 3171 tonnes • Vessel chartered by Osprey until Dec 24 • Pre-charter Jan 24 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class Inspection completed Apr 25 <p>Prior to Avonmouth, it would take 6 weeks to install from the point of building to pouring concrete. From the image to the cage being installed, the time has come down to 6 hours.</p> <p>RP –asked if there was no-one at Taishan who could have told them this? He mentioned how the Chinese have extensive experience with concrete and rebar.</p>	
6.4	<p>Lifting Operations HPC Jetty Crane</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Liebherr 300t crawler crane • Owned and operated by Ainscough • Extremely challenging lifting conditions from a vessel hold during tidal conditions • 640 Individual lifts completed so far 	
6.4.1	<p>SG then asked what percentage of deliveries at the jetty compared to the wharf for rebar.</p> <p>JJ replied that rebar isn't brought into the wharf as there are more tides on the jetty (over 700). Only 14% of the 600 tides at Comwich can be used per year, which are needed for the ALLs.</p>	
6.4.2	<p>SG then asked how much more would be expected at the jetty. JJ replied there are plans to extend the period that rebar can be brought in (currently this can be done until the end of 2025.)</p>	
6.4.3	<p>RP then said that given the increase in speed, would this be passed onto Paris, and could an announcement be expected of a revised completion date?</p> <p>JJ replied that rebar and concrete is only a part of the operation and there is far more to be done.</p> <p>JJ then moved on to show members a slide of the site trans shipment area.</p>	
6.5	<p>JJ then showed members a slide of statistics of rebar deliveries to HPC – the headline figure being a combined success rate of 82.26% of voyages. JJ said that he 82% success rate was very good given the challenging nature of the Bristol Channel., where weather and tides are against them.</p>	
6.5.1	<p>SG said that Bristol Port Authority are looking at putting wind turbines in the Celtic Sea, and asked if rebar shipping would be affected. JJ said that HPC have an excellent relationship with the BPA. JJ said that they are confident that facilities in T berths have been upgraded.</p>	
6.5.2	<p>RP mentioned how the Romans found the port at Comwich a challenging place to operate a wharf from.</p> <p>JJ mentioned a previous harbour master, and when a barge comes up there are environmental spotters counting shelduck, other birds etc. They are also looking at silt and weight coming off the barge. The former port of Bridgwater harbourmaster says he can't go faster than 5 knots in the pilot boat – replied the Romans have been coming up the river for hundreds of years and nobody told them to slow down.</p>	
6.5.3	<p>ACé reflected that as Chair of the TRG it's about holding EDF to account and offered compliment to EDF about the depth of the quarterly report (70+ pages) that is produced providing information about compliance with the targets and commitments in the transport management plans, and includes information about the use of the jetty. The jetty was</p>	

	<p>conceived originally for receipt of aggregate for use in concrete production, said that JJ was highlighting additional use above and beyond original purpose, which should be celebrated as it's removing HGVs from the road.</p> <p>SG said she agreed with ACé but as long as EDF realise at the end of the project the jetty has got to go. JJ agreed and said the correct title was HPC temporary jetty.</p>	
6.6	<p>JJ then showed members further images of marine deliveries in Q2 of 2025.</p> <p>He showed transport cages and SPMTs in transport frames heading back into site as a closing image.</p> <p>The Chair thanked JJ for his usual enthusiasm and informative presentation.</p>	
7	Any Other Business - (Chair)	
7.1	<p>CM congratulated Somerset Council on its work to resurface and surface dress the C182, which was fantastic and asked what would be done about the signs.</p> <p>ACé said that these will be collected.</p>	
7.2	<p>SG asked about the RV4 emergency access route at Shurton, there is a gate separating it from the route. A piece of signage with RV4 on it has been removed. She asked if this could be replaced.</p> <p>At the same spot there were bollards separating the verge from the road so people could safely walk along there – overgrowing grass has meant this is now difficult to do and could contractors sort this?</p> <p>SG expressed concern about the state of visibility splays – for example at the access to Shurton off the C182 where grass was growing so high that visibility was difficult – made worse by the bend in the road. Stogursey Parish Council have had to pay the lengthsman to keep people safe in this respect.</p> <p>Previously the Parish Council has suggested that a layby was being used by HPC bound HGVs, meaning that drivers couldn't see what was coming up the lane. Signage was produced and several times this has been damaged, has contacted AC to get this replaced. The splays are overgrown and signs have been removed and thrown in the ditch behind– she asked if this was something for HPC to action.</p> <p>The Chair indicated the answer might be yes on this front – ACTION.</p>	ACTION AW / RCL
7.3	<p>JJ said it is his final Transport Forum as has accepted a two-year secondment in France as they prepare to start a new plant just north of Dieppe. He said he has loved the debate and conversation.</p> <p>The Chair thanked JJ for his informative presentations over the years and wished him well for the future, which was echoed by the meeting attendees.</p>	
8	Date of next meeting: Thursday 13 November 2025 at 6pm	
8.1	The date of the next Transport Forum is on Thursday 13 th November at 6pm, again at Bridgwater and Taunton College, Cannington Campus.	
9	The meeting ended	

