
Report on Questionnaire Answers

Questionnaire: Local Plan 2020

Question: [32: Appendix 2: Draft policies: Nuclear New Build] Do you think t...

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
A. Ashyon	Continue to explore renewable energy	31 Jan 2021
Alan Jones - Hanham & District Greenbelt Conservation Society	<p>Reality dictates that with the adoption of the wide spread introduction of electric vehicles, and changes to home heating systems necessary to meet the climate change targets, there will be a tripling in demand for electricity generation. If not on existing, albeit disused sites, nuclear sites, where else will these plants be constructed?</p> <p>The timescale for planning, construction and commissioning of these sensitive buildings is incredibly lengthy - 9 years mentioned in the document - and therefore, the sooner this issue receives serious scrutiny, the better.</p> <p>We presume a projection of shortfall in electricity supply, between uptake of electric vehicles/ home heating, etc. and the current power generation capacity has been prepared. When will this be published? An essential element for consideration of this subject.</p> <p>On the bright side, increased employment opportunities in short and longterm could be advantageous.</p>	26 Feb 2021
Andrew Gunn - Somerset County Council	Supportive of this policy .	01 Mar 2021
Andrew Rigler	Nuclear is the only green energy, however it must not be left to commercial development and control.	31 Jan 2021
Andrew Shore	Not sure I fully know what the nuclear new build policy is	01 Mar 2021
Angela Crabtree	<p>Please see the Trapp'd Response.</p> <p>(Thornbury Residents Against Poorly Planned Development)</p>	28 Feb 2021
Anne Thomson - Burbank Neighbourhood Watch	Safety	21 Jan 2021
Annette McLaren	Must follow Solar/Wind energy revolution as cost have dramatically reduced and long term Nuclear needs to be well away from populated areas	28 Feb 2021
Ashfield Land	No comments.	31 Mar 2021
Caroline Phillips	Enhancing new technologies for smaller local reactors or generators as opposed to larger "key" reactors.	12 Mar 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
Catherine Bird	<p>Why would you put any money into nuclear??</p> <p>You should be concentrating on</p> <p>Wind Water Solar</p>	28 Feb 2021
Catherine Graham	far more commitment and detail required for it to be taken seriously.	08 Feb 2021
CEG and the Charfield Landowners Consortium (CEGCLC)	Please see accompanying covering letter.	23 Apr 2021
Chris Rich - Mizmo Communications Ltd	No comment.	11 Mar 2021
Clara Goss - Redrow Homes Ltd	Pegasus make no comment.	26 Apr 2021
Clifton Homes (SW) Ltd	We do not seek to comment on these at this stage.	24 Mar 2021
Colin Gardner - TRAPP'D	<p>The chances of Oldbury NNB coming to fruition are vanishingly small and would certainly not evolve within the timescale of this Plan. The exceptionally long gestation period between any serious sign that the project may be resurrected and the first spade in the ground means that the Local Authority would be able to respond to such an unlikely event in one of its mandated five-year review cycles.</p> <p>Therefore, this Plan should make express presumption that there will be no NNB within the lifetime of this Plan, caveated with a statement that preparatory actions would need to be considered in the unlikely event that such a project at Oldbury is to be resurrected.</p>	15 Mar 2021
David George	Nuclear should be on the table. It will create high quality jobs and provide relatively clean energy to support those that detest any erosion of their Pinterest lifestyle	15 Feb 2021
David Hathaway	No comment	27 Feb 2021
David Heape	Enhancing new technologies for smaller local reactors or generators as opposed to larger "key" reactors.	12 Mar 2021
David Redgewell - South West Transport	<p>But need new important rail freight facilities to be developed on the Thornbury branch line.</p> <p>The line will need upgrading to Tytherington line through to Thornbury as Railhead</p>	28 Feb 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
Network and Railfuture Severnside	<p>for construction.</p> <p>Other access could be river via the Severn Estuary. And a pier.</p> <p>Local skilled jobs are important.</p> <p>The site requires a green transport plan and Park and Ride sites.</p> <p>A passengers service using a light rail vehicle could operate from Yate for the station on the main line Bristol Parkway to Gloucester railway line.</p> <p>With a platform on the Thornbury branch.</p> <p>Housing will need to be proved.</p>	
Donna Simmons - Emersons Green Town Council	No	01 Mar 2021
Ellandi LLP On Behalf of Crestbridge Corporate Trustees Ltd and Crestbridge T...	No comments.	05 May 2021
Emma Jarvis	<p>Yes.</p> <p>The DEPZ inner zone (Detailed Emergency Planning zone) and outer zone needs to be defined and illustrated in the local plan strategy. This is the zone where should there be a radiation emergency, with radiological consequences to members of the public , off site emergency planning is required. This may affect where development is located.</p>	28 Feb 2021
Fiona Milden - Vistry Homes Limited	Vistry Homes has no comments on this policy.	09 Mar 2021
Gerrit Rollema	We have to have more Nuclear power to keep the lights on.	10 Dec 2020
Hannah Saunders - Dodington Parish Council	<p>Pages 200 to 222 – Nuclear issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members note that the plans for new nuclear in the area are sited to the furthest point West of LA – our Parish is nearly at furthest East – so Members felt unable to comment with confidence on this – not being closely involved. • They would like to think that some of the workers for the site could be found locally – so that they aren’t having to travel far – and add to Carbon emissions. • They appreciate that Magnox work closely with the local communities and trust 	25 May 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	that SGC will continue to encourage and facilitate this.	
Hannick Homes	N/A.	25 Mar 2021
Hazel Jones - Hawkesbury Parish Council	Hawkesbury Parish Council are not qualified to comment on this section of the policy	01 Mar 2021
Helen Johnstone - Stroud District Council	SDC support the overall policy approach and would welcome the opportunity to work closely with South Gloucestershire Council on development of this policy area; in particular, with regard to the provision of housing for construction workers, health and safety issues having regard to the location of Stroud District within the identified nuclear waste risk area, transport and biodiversity impacts; to satisfactorily address these issues.	26 Feb 2021
Ian Leslie	This is the one development which will assist climate change. I support NNB.	28 Feb 2021
Ifer Gwyn - Horizon Nuclear Power	<p>Horizon is a UK energy company that was created by the German utility companies E.ON and RWE to develop a new generation of nuclear power stations. It was established in 2009, following the UK Government's announcement that new nuclear energy would be a core element of the future electricity mix, and was subsequently acquired by Hitachi, Ltd. in late 2012. In 2020 Hitachi, Ltd. announced it was withdrawing from its UK nuclear projects. It stated it would consider approaches from third parties interested in taking forward developments on Horizon's land at Oldbury-upon-Severn and Wylfa on Anglesey, two of the eight sites designated in the UK for new build in the National Policy Statement for nuclear power generation.</p> <p>South Gloucestershire Council's Local Plan 2020 will eventually replace the adopted planning policies in the Core Strategy 2006 – 2027 (adopted in 2013), Policies, Sites and Places Plan (adopted in 2017) and, where appropriate, policies from the Joint Waste Core Strategy (adopted in 2011). It is noted that the Phase 1 Issues and Approaches consultation is the first step in preparing the Local Plan 2020.</p> <p>We note and support the proposal to include several policies within the new Local Plan 2020 which are of relevance to new nuclear build (and related development) on land owned or controlled by Horizon adjacent to the former Oldbury Nuclear Power Station. In particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategic policy for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) and related development, currently covered by existing policy CS36 (Proposals for major infrastructure projects) • A policy for Oldbury Nuclear New Build (currently covered by existing policy CS37 Nuclear related and PSP46 Oldbury New Nuclear Build (NNB)) <p>Horizon is generally supportive of the working draft policies contained in Appendix 2, and notes that key PSP46 recommendations have been adopted following Examination of the Policies, Sites and Places Plan in 2017.</p>	26 Feb 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	The working draft policy also considers the possibility of other types of development being brought forward at Oldbury, including Small Modular Reactors (SMRs) and nuclear fusion through the Government's Spherical Tokamak for Energy Production (STEP). This aligns with current proposals for a joint Oldbury / Berkeley nomination (supported by a number of councils and other bodies), in response to the UK Atomic Energy Authority's call to find a site for a world first fusion power plant and associated opportunities.	
James Carpenter - Falfield Parish Council	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Emergency planning.</p> <p>The DEPZ inner zone (Detailed Emergency Planning zone) and outer zone needs to be defined and illustrated in the Local Plan strategy. This is the zone where should there be a radiation emergency, with radiological consequences to members of the public, off site emergency planning is required. This may affect where development is located, can people evacuate safely, or will they be queued up for a MetroBus?</p>	14 Apr 2021
John Acton	I don't know.	26 Mar 2021
John Brimacombe	Potential nuclear options and their impact on the local environment.	28 Feb 2021
John Mills - Cotswolds Conservation Board	No comment.	16 Mar 2021
Jonathan Edwardes - Pilning and Severn Beach Parish Council	<p>Additional comments sent by email on Monday 1st March 2021 -</p> <p>We should not be supporting any nuclear new build. This area was contaminated by Chernobyl the vacated site at Oldbury would make an excellent location for research into non harmful power generation from the river.</p>	26 Feb 2021
Kate Kelliher	There should be more, distributed very small nuclear energy producing sites throughout Southglos. A reactor the size of a dustbin in several places within Southglos would make the energy supply more varied and reliable.	31 Jan 2021
Katherine Buff	<p>The chances of Oldbury NNB coming to fruition are vanishingly small and would certainly not evolve within the timescale of this plan. The exceptionally long gestation period between any serious sign that the project may be resurrected and the first spade in the ground means that the Local Authority would be able to respond to such an unlikely event in one of its mandated five-year review cycles. Therefore, this plan should make express presumption that there will be no NNB within the lifetime of this plan, caveated with a statement that preparatory actions would need to be considered in the unlikely event that such a project at Oldbury is to be resurrected.</p>	26 Feb 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
Kevin Masters	I have read Trapp'd's response and wish to add my name to it.	25 Feb 2021
Lauren Cook - Stride Treglown	No comment on this matter	01 Mar 2021
Lee Taylor	Not seen the policy. Consider SMRs. Also whether nuclear really is the right choice considering the risk and waste considerations.	23 Jan 2021
Lizzie Staley	It will take far longer for the new build to start happening, and the infrastructure for the housing developments, than it would for the houses to be built. They would be filled up with commuters rather than Power Plant workers.	28 Feb 2021
Louise Powell - Thornbury Town Council	The Town Council supports the current bid to carry out fusion research in the area	08 Apr 2021
Mactaggart & Mickel - Frampton Cotterell	N/A.	07 Apr 2021
Mactaggart & Mickel - Pilning	N/A.	25 Mar 2021
Mark Rosher - Charfield Parish Council	I am not convinced of the need for highly expensive highly toxic nuclear power. I believe instead we should be investing in tidal lagoon solutions.	08 Dec 2020
Martyn Hall	We should not be building nuclear since someone has to get rid of the waste and so you are leaving this problem to future generations! Haven't you learnt a thing	26 Feb 2021
Matthew McCollom	The principles are sound. The manner of implementation is the key.	28 Feb 2021
Maurice Wayne	Traditional building techniques have remained mainly unaltered and in the UK housing development is constrained to standard models across the country. Good design to Parker Morris standards coupled with system building could be a way forward.	08 Feb 2021
Mr. Blake - Oldland Parish Council	Don't want to see windmills on every hilltop and green space or more solar panels 'blotting the landscape'. There is no other alternative than Nuclear energy	17 Feb 2021
Neil Oviatt	I feel decommissioning is absolutely correct, this is a significant eyesore to the community but I would like to see Hydro electric on what is one of the planets most significant tides rather than more nuclear / NNB	30 Nov 2020
Nick Woodward	No knowledge of this area/topic.	28 Feb 2021
Nicola O'Connell	No comment	27 Feb 2021
Patricia Trull - South Glos	We really should be looking at other forms of energy. Solar, wind etc.	08 Dec 2020

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
Council		
Patrick Williams	<p>The emphasis on large stations as planned such as Oldbury should be reconsidered if they create a strategic dependency on China or comparable nations. Clusters of smaller modular reactor builds as proposed by Rolls Royce should be given increased priority as a cost effective solution on the Oldbury site, if this project goes in to any reassessment phase. Hence a balance of small nuclear power solutions that can be used with Renewables would be used. Nuclear Fusion is still a long way off, probably beyond this strategy period.</p> <p>Also see answer to Question 23.</p>	09 Mar 2021
Paula Evans - Rangeworthy Parish Council	Safety and the environment.	26 Feb 2021
Pauline and Richard Wilson	In the security zone around the nuclear stations, solar farms and other forms of renewable energy should be encouraged.	25 Feb 2021
Persimmon Homes Severn Valley	No Comment.	11 May 2021
Peter Box	I think that here South Gloucestershire is rather 'jumping the gun'. In order to achieved and sustain, national goals on Climate Change there may well be a need for building more nuclear power stations and the sites of existing power stations may be seen as the best option. However, any further development of Oldbury power station is in the hazy future and certainly outside the current five year plan and the next.	23 Feb 2021
Peter Rawlinson - Gleeson Strategic Land	No comments.	10 Mar 2021
Philip Matthews - Nuleaf (Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum)	<p>Nuleaf (the Nuclear Legacy Advisory Forum) is the Local Government Association (LGA) representative body on nuclear legacy wastes and decommissioning. We are directly supported by over 100 local authorities and national park authorities across England and Wales and speak for the wider LGA.</p> <p>Our remit encompasses all aspects of the management of the UK's nuclear waste legacy. Our primary objectives are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to provide a mechanism to identify, where possible, a common local government viewpoint on nuclear legacy management issues; • to represent that viewpoint, or the range of views of its member authorities, in discussion with national bodies, including the UK and Welsh Government, the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) and regulators; • to seek to influence policy and strategy for nuclear legacy management in the interests of affected communities; and • to develop the capacity of our member authorities to engage with nuclear legacy management at a local level. <p>Our Radioactive Waste Planning Group (RWPG) is an expert forum for senior land-use and waste planning officers, supporting the development of effective</p>	20 Jan 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>Local Plans and Minerals and Waste Plans. The RWPG has guided the development of Nuleaf’s position on the planning aspects of nuclear decommissioning and waste management. More information on our approach is set out in Briefing Paper 11: Approaches to Radioactive Waste Management in Local Plans, published in 2020 .</p> <p>South Gloucestershire Council is an active member of Nuleaf, with Cllr. Matthew Riddle serving as our current Chair and with officer participation in our RWPG. However, this response has been prepared independently by Nuleaf, without consultation with our members in South Gloucestershire.</p> <p>Response to consultation Nuleaf advocates that all Local Plans and Minerals and Waste Plans, particularly those covering areas which include parts of the UK’s nuclear infrastructure, should have policies on decommissioning and radioactive waste management. Their absence leaves local authorities and communities less able to influence proposals for the disposal, storage, management or transportation of radioactive materials within their area.</p> <p>We therefore welcome the inclusion in this Phase 1 document of comprehensive policies on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nuclear New Build • Oldbury A Station- Decommissioning • Radioactive Waste <p>We also note the references to nuclear elsewhere in the Plan, for example in relation to the policy on Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs).</p> <p>Together these policies address the current situation and potential new developments in the nuclear field that may impact on South Gloucestershire. They are clear, comprehensive, integrated and effective, placing all nuclear operations within a planning framework designed to deliver positive economic, social and environmental outcomes. We do not therefore propose any substantive amendments but offer the following comments on the policies and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Nuclear New Build The policy explains effectively the characteristics of the site under consideration and identifies the wider issues in terms of the economic, social, environmental and community impacts of any such development. The requirements for community benefits and mitigation measures are set out, as is the need to consider the impacts of construction and potential for infrastructure for spent fuel and radioactive waste stores. The changing dynamics within national nuclear policy and the potential for alternatives to a large scale Nuclear New Build (NNB) such as Small Modular Reactors (SMRs) and nuclear fusion are also noted. The policy is linked to other relevant policies contained within the Plan.</p> <p>We support the commitment of the local authority to engage with the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) and for integrated working between Oldbury A</p>	

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	and any NNB. As a minor point we would note that the Policy erroneously refers to the Nuclear Decommissioning Agency rather than Authority and this should be corrected.	
Rebecca Woodward	This is a specialist area	28 Feb 2021
Redcliffe Homes	No comments.	01 Jun 2021
Redrow Homes (SW)	N/A.	29 Apr 2021
Richard Lloyd	<p>Of the sites proposed for large scale New Nuclear Build, it is my view that the proposals for Oldbury were the most problematic not least because of the requirement at this location for extensive cooling infrastructure. New technologies, including Small Modular Reactors and Nuclear Fusion look like being far more appropriate and acceptable.</p> <p>This policy should have more to say about alternative technologies and their pros and cons in relation to Oldbury.</p>	03 Mar 2021
Robert Harris - Olveston Parish Council	<p>No, at this stage of uncertainty over the development there is little that could be added from this perspective.</p> <p>However, SGC should resist any application to build a station of the size originally suggested, e.g., 3000 MW. This is too large for the environmentally sensitive rural setting. Oldbury A consisted of 2 x 217 MW units; any replacement should be of similar size and the possibility of “Modular Reactors” should be encouraged. These are constructed off site thus minimizing disruption during construction. They could potentially come on-stream much faster than stations like Hinkley Point C currently under construction.</p>	26 Feb 2021
Robin Perry	Nuclear power is too expensive and does have some risks associated with contamination. It would be better use of money to build a tidal lagoon than a nuclear power station.	21 Feb 2021
Robin Winfield	Land has been purchased, and with low coal/oil use it is likely that a new generation of power station will be proposed.	19 Feb 2021
Roger Hall	See TRAPP'D response.	25 Feb 2021
Sean and Jacqueline Rinaldi	<p>The chances of Oldbury NNB coming to fruition are small and would certainly not evolve within the timescale of this Plan.</p> <p>Therefore, this Plan should make express presumption that there will be no NNB within the lifetime of this Plan, caveated with a statement that preparatory actions would need to be considered in the unlikely event that such a project at Oldbury is to be resurrected.</p>	26 Mar 2021
Simon Moore	Nuclear power is a necessary evil but the priority should be non carbon renewables which do not create a hazard for future generations in the way that nuclear does.	28 Feb 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
	<p>SG Council should prioritise renewal energy. Tidal is difficult but is the obvious priority for this county.</p> <p>There is much potential for wind energy in our county which is not invested in.</p>	
Simon Steele-Perkins - Waddeton Park Limited	No.	06 May 2021
Sophie Spencer - CPRE Avon and Bristol [South Gloucestershire District]	That the prospects of a major power plant being built at Oldbury are negligible. Although smaller reactors requiring very little infrastructure and creating low levels of employment, are still being evaluated no significant impact on the area is likely in the next 10 years.	02 Mar 2021
South West Strategic Developments (SWSD)	N/A.	31 Mar 2021
St. Modwen Developments and The Tortworth Estate	Any such proposals will need to be considered in the wider discussions regarding Junction 14 of the M5.	05 Mar 2021
Steven Freke	No new build should take place until a long term viable safe cost effective disposal of nuclear waste is established	27 Feb 2021
Steve Seward	Until nuclear waste can be completely and safely disposed of then it should not be considered for expansion. Alternative methods of power generation must be considered such as the severn barrier or tidal generation which would provide less invasive power generation	13 Feb 2021
Sue Green - Home Builders Federation	The HBF have no comment on the Council's draft Nuclear New Build Policy.	05 Mar 2021
Theodore Butt Philip - South Gloucestershire Liberal Democrat Council Group	In the event that new build nuclear does not happen, the area along the Severn should be scoped to provide environmental areas to serve the wildlife such as wading birds and an interesting area of public amenity space.	12 Mar 2021
The Tortworth Estate	Any such proposals will need to be considered in the wider discussions regarding Junction 14 of the M5.	05 Mar 2021
Tom Cotton - Road Haulage Association	No comment	01 Mar 2021
Trystan Mabbitt - Hanson UK - Heidelberg	Hanson generally supports the approach to low-Carbon energy generation, and proposes that additional reference is made to the supply of building materials in achieving the Oldbury policy.	18 Mar 2021

Respondent Name	User Response: Text	Response Created
Cement Group		
Victoria Bailey - Oldbury on Severn Parish Council	The draft Policy is broadly however:- Page, 210 Theme – Emergency Planning. A further issue regarding potential offsite hazards which could create a serious emergency e.g. Storage of Ammonium Nitrate in large amounts at Sharpness Docks. It is essential that the regulations factor this type of emergency into policy as it has an impact on public perceptions regarding public safety and the safe operation of Nuclear Facilities.	24 Mar 2021
Vistry Group	No comment.	06 May 2021
William Howell	No	23 Feb 2021

Report run at 4 Feb 2022 10:52:47. Total records: 86