

DRAFT Meeting Report

Regarding:

**EDF Hinkley Point C:
Main Site Forum.**

Date & Venue:

**Thursday 4th June 2026 – 6pm
Meeting held at: Victory Hall, Stogursey,
Bridgwater**

Participating:

Doug Bamsey, *Chair*

Michael Brooks (MB), *Stogursey Parish Council*

Chris Ford (CF), *Stogursey Parish Council*

Allan Searle (AS), *Stogursey Parish Council*

James Holbrook (JH), *Somerset Council*

Stuart Lake (SL), *Stogursey Parish Council*

Chris Morgan (CM), *Stogursey Parish Council*

Hugh Davies (HD), *Somerset Council*

Nicola Hale (NH), *Somerset Council*

John Roberts (JR), *Nether Stowey Parish Council*

Valdo Andrade (VA), *Avon and Somerset Police*

Sue Goss (SG), *Stogursey Parish Council*

Sue Spicer (SS), *Burton Resident*

Gareth Glover (GG), *Burton Resident*

Jennifer Burgis (JB), *Burton Resident*

Nicola Hunt (NH), *Burton Resident*

EDF Team:

Andrew Cockcroft (AC), *EDF*

Richard Clews (RCL), *EDF*

Drew Aspinwall (DA), *SEC Newgate UK*

Matthew Williams (MW), *SEC Newgate UK*

Apologies received:

Amanda Stanley (AS), *Shurton Resident*

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

Item		Action
1	Item 1 - Introductions	
1.1	Doug Bamsey ('The Chair') welcomed everyone to the meeting, ran through the venue arrangements and forum protocols, and invited all attendees to introduce themselves.	
2	Item 2 - Meeting Note and Matters Arising (from Thursday 16th October 2025)	
2.1	Matters arising: Item 2.7 (Reversing beacons) ACTION: Andrew Cockcroft (AC) confirmed that there was an ongoing discussion with Richard Cuttall about this. Reports of inappropriate reversing beacons are investigated and quickly rectified.	
2.2	<u>Item 4.3.1 (Lighting on the stockpile)</u> AFTERNOTE: The HPC team have checked with the team responsible for the stockpile. The lighting has not been increased in that area and an entire compound has been removed to the north of the area, such that there is currently less lighting at the height of the stockpile. However, the stockpile is reducing as the project is now able to blend material for backfill. This is reducing the height of the main stockpile. Our expectation is that this may be allowing more light from the main site to propagate south, which was previously shielded by the stockpile.	
2.3	<u>Item 6.2 (Informal bus stopping)</u> ACTION: Andrew Cockcroft updated forum members that this issue has been raised with Rebecca Jeffreys in the HPC Transport Team.	
2.4	<u>Item 6.2.1 (Landscaping items and footgate on emergency road / spring clean)</u> ACTION: AC mentioned how the spring on the gate was broken, and that this has been fixed - but encouraged members to report any issues such as this via Hinkley enquiries.	

	SL said that it hadn't been fixed. SS added that it does close – Michael Brooks said that being spring loaded people can't get through with a horse. CM sought clarification of which gate – and if it was RV4.. he said there wasn't a bridleway or a footpath through that land, and didn't understand where the issue was. The Chair suggested clarifying the status of the area outside of the meeting. –	
2.5	Item 6.2.2 (Litter in bushes along public footpaths near Shurton) ACTION: AC confirmed the environment team had carried out a check and found there not to be any litter – Jennifer Burgis (JB) mentioned that a community litter pick had in fact taken place. AC said that HPC wants to have a regular litter pick e.g. having one in mid-summer - JB said that litter continues to be problem, especially when the hedges had been cut back.	
2.6	There were no further comments, and the meeting note was then agreed by members.	
3	Item 3 – Project Progress Update (Andrew Cockcroft (AC) - EDF)	
3.1	The Chair invited AC to give his project progress update to Forum members. AC gave a presentation to members on project progress – (slides 5 to 14 in the presentation pack). This included the latest construction site video update from delivery director Simon Parsons, a summary of the recently published socio-economic and environmental impact report, an update on workforce uplift, and an update on the acoustic fish deterrent (AFD). AC told members he would be providing a further update on the AFD at the next Main Site Forum in October.	
3.1.1	Chris Morgan (CM) asked how much would be going to the Somerset Community Foundation (SCF) – AC said that they are proposing to maintain the funding, right through to the end of construction, including	

Commented [DB1]: follow up required and to be updated on please.

3.1.2 3.1.3	contingency for any changes in future timelines. He mentioned that he and Justin Sargent from SCF are exploring how grants can be geared to longer term projects that will outlive the construction phase. Hugh Davies (HD) asked if a second AFD unit had been produced – AC answered that there were many units, all about the size of a lobster pot, with batteries lasting approximately 18 months; these would surround the intake heads. CM asked how much involvement there would be for divers with the new system. AC confirmed that there would be none – and that this was the key reason why HPC had shifted to this proposed system.	
3.2 3.2.1	<u>Pre-submitted question</u> “What action is HPC taking against HPC worker individuals who are not living in the Shurton, Burton, Knighton and Wick location and who are parking their vehicles in non-designated locations; as they are in breach of their Code of Conduct agreement they signed up to as either a contractor or sub-contractor?” - Submitted by Lidia Bosa, local resident AC gave the following response: AC said that flyparking is an ongoing issue and shares members’ frustration. He ran through the ticketing and flyparking ‘strike’ procedure. He mentioned that Valdo and the HPC police team also play a role in tackling this, particularly disruptive fly parking, and Valdo and the team could go down an antisocial behaviour route. AC also mentioned the new GIS reporting system that HPC are working on to make reporting easier for impacted residents.	
3.3 3.3.1	There were then the following questions and comments from members on the subject of parking: JB mentioned that there was a problem in Shurton and Burton, with HPC workers paying residents to park on their driveways, and residents’ frustration	

	with not being able to get the bus. She said there was approximately 200-300 cars there in the morning. AC said that these are unofficial and don't have planning consent; Gareth Glover (GG) mentioned that people can run an unofficial car park without planning permission for 28 days. JB suggested sending an SPS team to stand along the road between 5 and 7 am; AC said that this is something HPC is aware of and is looking to clamp down upon.	
3.3.2	James Holbrook (JH) said that this [un-consented car-parks] was a real issue for him, and there would be a change of personnel in his team. He said he was concerned with a lot of these sites having planning agents and advising people on planning points. He said that people have submitted appeals and hoped that these would be dealt with quickly, and requested that all parties need to look at this issue as Somerset Council can't deal with this in isolation.	
3.3.3	Sue Goss (SG) said that under the enforcement scheme, one of the applications is under appeal, meaning that they can continue their business until the outcome of the appeal. She said how the Parish Council had been proactive on the legal side of this and reported these to the previous planning officer at SC (John Burton). CM added that the ethos always was no extra cars going through the villages and hamlets. He asked whether people should rely on enforcement, or if people in the area should just allow this to go ahead – and suggested that the planning system / Council should do more in enforcement. The Chair underlined how this was a very important issue, but that this should be explored in greater depth at the Transport Forum (on 25th June 2026). JH said that the Council wants to focus on the powers available to it to enforce this. He mentioned how legislation had changed and what could be done – this wasn't in place when construction of HPC began. In terms of personnel within the authority, he has spoken to the new director about this matter and they are supportive. He encouraged members and parishes to continue to report things as this really helps from an enforcement perspective.	

	AC underlined that the key issue was the powers available regarding enforcement.	
3.3.4	John Roberts (JR) asked about what happened where the workers haven't registered their vehicle with the Project. AC replied that this is where HPC works with the police, VA and team and identify the driver through the system, and HPC can cross check with their formal records. JR then asked what was happening with the GIS system. AC updated that it has gone through its final testing and there would be an item on this at the forthcoming Transport Forum in a few weeks' time.	
3.3.5	Nicola Hunt (NH) asked if there was a problem with individuals renting out driveways, fields etc. and if there was a way that bus drivers to ask where people were coming in from. AC said that this has been explored and if bus drivers had to cross reference passes, locations etc then this would create delays; the driver checking each passenger would result in buses being stationery for a period of time. AC added that having this across the entire fleet would become unwieldy and result not only on delays to the bus service but also to other road users.	
3.3.5.1	NH asked if there was another way within the system to find out where workers were parking? AC said that where people register on the project, they have to enter their home address - and this gives them an Park & Ride allocation. The problem he (NH) felt is the minority of people who don't care about this – and AC recognised it doesn't take many fly parkers to create a large impact.	
3.3.6	Chris Ford (CF) pointed out that bus and train companies check people's passes and felt the problem AC mentioned was being exaggerated. CF suggested that HPC should look at whether people had a pass to board at various locations – AC said that the project would have to cross check each	

	individuals address and right to board before boarding rather than a quick “ticket check”; CF felt this sounded like an excuse. The Chair said controlling the whole issue of parking should be discussed at Transport Forum – and that HPC and Somerset Council could speak jointly about this issue – and that this could help inform the next Main Site Forum too. JH highlighted that he would be on leave for the Transport Forum, but that he would liaise with Andy Coupé who will be in attendance.	
3.4	<u>Pre-submitted question</u> “What does HPC need to do to change the current buses coming through Shurton to a minibus? Especially during low peak times.” - Submitted by Lidia Bosa, local resident Answer: AC replied that the issue was capacity and felt that minibuses couldn't be a long-term solution. GG asked why if it could be done for roadworks why not the whole time – AC said that this would require more of them.	
3.5	<u>Pre-submitted question</u> “What is HPC doing to address the increasing traffic problems around the area, including the growing number of empty buses using local roads, fly parking in non-designated areas, and the emergence of unofficial “pop-up” parking locations? This week, I spent approximately 20 minutes stationary behind two empty HPC buses while waiting for a tractor and trailer to reverse down the road so the buses could pass. Incidents like this are becoming increasingly common and are now a regular occurrence rather than an isolated event.” - Submitted by Gareth Glover, Burton resident Answer: AC said that buses had to run empty for relocation purposes, but did accept that there are challenges on the roads where they meet buses.	
3.5.1		

	GG said it has made running simple errands a difficult task. AC said that HPC is at peak workforce and bus journeys had been at similar levels for the past couple of years – but would take away the issue of people not boarding buses if they’re full – ACTION AC. AC said the reversing issue has come up a lot, and confirmed that HPC buses are allowed to reverse if the conditions are safe. He also invited GG to attend the Transport Forum on 25th June.	ACTION AC
3.5.2	CM agreed with GG and said that buses coming through here were a third full – and there should be a record of how many people were being picked up where. He said that the problem was full sized buses going down narrow lanes, combined with an elderly population that has difficulty reversing out of the way. He suggested that a better alternative would be larger minibuses or small coaches. AC said that routes are reviewed regularly to ensure correct capacity – and that he would ask Becky Jeffreys to address this in her item at the Transport Forum. The Chair said that previously Andy Wagstaff has updated the Transport Forum on the regular review of the routes – with this question in mind – i.e. that of rural areas. AC said that HPC tries not to bring the largest buses through this area – and the majority would be the smaller buses.	
3.6	<u>Pre-submitted question:</u> “The parish council have again been contacted by residents re the use of the Public footpath at Shurton, adjacent to Bayleys Brook, by cyclists employed by HPC, using this as a short cut to your site. The use of this footpath, with ‘ No cycling ‘ signage, which is being ignored by many of these cyclists, is putting our residents at risk - particularly when electric bicycles are involved . It would seem that the majority of these cyclists appear to come from your site at Mill Farm - as there is quite easy access through the lanes from this site to Stogursey village and from there to Shurton.	

3.6.1	This is particularly worrying due to the fact that HPC / EDF have applied for planning permission to increase the size of Mill Farm to permit accommodation for a further 100 workers. This could result in even more cyclists using this footpath inappropriately. We look forward to a solution to this issue - which has cropped up frequently over the last few years - and could possibly be solved by banning your employees at Mill Farm from cycling to work and using the bus transport provided at cost by HPC / EDF.” - submitted by Sue Goss, Stogursey Parish Council Answer: AC said that the challenge with this is that HPC could only nudge people in the right direction rather than oblige them. Regarding e-bikes and e-scooters, there was an internal campaign about the use of these, including VA seizing bikes and scooters. VA said that the times for these instances were between 5 and 6 am; NH said that previously between 4 and 6pm had worked well. VA said that Tom Hall had done some visibility on this. ACTION VA to ask Esther regarding availability. SG suggested it was mainly cyclists who come from Mill Farm as there is a direct route from there. VA asked if this happened frequently and whether this was for going to or from work – and this was why he mentioned 5 and 6am slot. The Chair said all of these points had made for a useful discussion.	ACTION VA
4	Item 4: Planning Update – (Richard Clews, EDF)	
4.1	Richard Clews (RCL) gave members an update on HPC planning matters (slides 16 to 31 in the presentation pack). This included a recap of the presentation he gave at the Forum in February, and an update on the Mill Farm application (slides 17-19)	
4.1.1	RCL then took questions from members about the Mill Farm application. CM asked what plans there are for the Mill Farm site for after HPC construction has been completed - and if there was any mitigation as a result of this.	

	RCL said that this was being proposed to be an ongoing legacy for that site in the future – and the Somerset’s Local Plan encourages through policies contained within it. JR said that in the planning application that once it had been finished it would become a recreational pitch site for Mill Farm.	
4.2.2	GG said that HPC were speaking in a way as if this application was going to be approved - and JB asked what mitigation there would be for sewage? RCL said there was a technical suite of documents covering all of these things, and it would be determined by the Council. GG felt that the local area wouldn’t support 534 pitches once HPC construction had been completed. He added that his own planning application [to allow use of pitches by HPC workers] was turned down in part because it was felt that no more accommodation was needed in the area SG said that the two campsites being spoken about are in different areas; and these are in two different neighbourhood plans – and this was the reason the application made by GG was turned down.	
4.1.3	JB said her concern was the environmental impact of this application, plus increased bus and additional cars on top of the 434 existing pitches and the existing pressure on the local road network. RCL said that the application would provide mitigation for these – particularly to do with biodiversity net gain (BNG). RCL said that the hedgerows would be retained and areas would be relandscaped. AC added that Fiddington Parish Council had raised a similar concern, and also the issue of the bus route.	
4.1.4	CM asked about how this might exacerbate the previous issue raised about e-bikes. AC said that HPC will work with the police team regarding seizing illegal e-bikes.	
4.	RCL then focused on requirement MS28 of the original DCO, which relates to landscape restoration. (slides 20 to 30)	

4.2.1 4.2.2 4.2.3	Sue Spicer (SS) asked how by how much the western edge would drop as a result of the restoration – whether the new path would be level with HPC or with the fields. RCL said it would actually be higher than the fields, once reprofiled. [AFTERNOTE RCL to provide diagram] the walking path is next to the bund which is approx. 26m; RCL confirmed that the bund and trees would be removed. SS asked if this would be starting soon – RCL said that the details need to be submitted to the local authority, and once approved, the project would look to be off the land by March 2028. In response to a question from JB habitat, RCL said that this isn't rich habitat, but trees are being grown in greenhouses which will be brought in to plant as part of the landscaping would provide this diversity.	AFTERNOTE RCL
4.3 4.3.1 4.3.2	<u>Pre-submitted question</u> “Why is HPC supporting a number of campsites in the local area when the campsite closest to the HPC site received no support from HPC during its recent planning application? Could HPC explain the criteria used when deciding which local campsites or accommodation providers receive support, and why the nearest campsite was not included?” - submitted by Gareth Glover, Burton resident This topic had already been discussed but GG added he had asked for support from HPC for his application and didn't received it, and asked why certain places e.g. Mill Farm was supported. RCL said that he wasn't aware of GG's application or it being brought to him for support - he said that HPC had been looking for sites at scale to make a meaningful contribution to accommodation needs – and there are certain criteria for this [e.g. local planning policies, access for buses, facilities etc.] He said that any scheme submitted to HPC would be assessed on its merits. GG said that his issue was being told there was enough accommodation in the local area, only to see HPC supporting an application for additional pitches at Mill Farm.	

4.3.3 4.3.4 4.3.5	JB said that she had to turn away lone worker females who had arrived for 24 hours – as under terms of their licence she couldn't welcome HPC workers as they would face sanction. RCL said he didn't understand why these people couldn't book as individuals anyway. CM said that matters of HPC accommodation should be down to EDF to resolve and not individual residents. JB asked about the proposals to build an additional campus – RCL said that it didn't prove to be deliverable in the timescale required, and the workforce is below the expected 15,000. JR mentioned the accommodation review – and said that HPC had no control over where people want to stay. AC said this was correct; and the acknowledged that project would be easier to manage if HPC was able to stipulate exactly where people could stay, and which transport to use.	
5	ITEM 5 – HPC Legacy (Andrew Cockcroft – EDF)	
5.1	The Chair invited Andrew Cockcroft (AC) to present his slide on HPC legacy (slide 34).	
5.2	AC introduced the project's thinking around the legacy for HPC to members; he said that HPC are developing a programme to deal with things like workforce decrease and how this is managed in a way that helps people and businesses – and to consider all the associated developments and physical assets (e.g. accommodation campuses). AC said that developing the plans would take time and encouraged members or parish councils to consider future-use ideas (regardless of area); and that this was something that HPC would want to work with people on. The Chair suggested this would be something that would be returned to repeatedly and encouraged member to play a full and active part in the	

	discussion.	
6	Item 6 – Any Other Business	
6.1	The Chair then invited items of Any Other Business from members.	
6.2	JB shared with members that they get nuclear and ‘large load’ enthusiasts staying at her site and reported that received compliments from campers about the nature reserve at Steart Marshes.	ACTION AC
6.2.1	SS added that the southern area was looking glorious currently. AC said he thought of SS earlier, and the update from the environment team is a programme of seagrass planting and restoration had begun.	
6.2.2	SS requested some interpretation boards for the wildflowers. AC said the team would consider the request. ACTION AC	
6.2.3	SG mentioned that some people had suggested some benches around the southern area. AC said the team would consider the request. – ACTION AC The Chair thanked members for all their contributions	
7	Item 7 – Date of Next Meeting	
7.1	The date of the next Main Site Forum is <u>Thursday 15th October 2026 at 6pm.</u> The Chair presented the Forum dates for 2026 (slide 36 in the presentation pack).	
8	The meeting ended.	