

**Peter Scott**

*Director of Regeneration & Planning Services*  
Bryan Hanson House  
Hanson Square  
Hartlepool  
TS24 7BT

Tel: 01429 523280  
www.hartlepool.gov.uk

Our Ref:

Your Ref:



Contact Officer Richard Waldmeyer

11 May 2009

Office for Nuclear Development Public Comments  
Freepost SEA 12430  
Thornton Heath  
CR7 7XT

Dear Sirs

**Nomination of Hartlepool as a Site for New Nuclear Power Station**

I set out below the response from Hartlepool Borough Council on the Strategic Siting Assessment and Nomination of a new Power Station at Hartlepool.

The Council's Cabinet, meeting on 1 May 2009, agreed that the Nomination of a site for a new Nuclear Power Station at Hartlepool merits further investigation by the Government in its preparation of a draft Nuclear National Planning Policy.

In reaching the decision Cabinet also noted that studies are being undertaken locally to assess the economic and environmental impacts of a new nuclear power station at Hartlepool and the findings of the studies will help inform public debate in the lead-up to, and during, the longer and wider stage of public consultation in Autumn 2009.

In the process of assessing the Nomination, we have identified a small number of factual detail points which we have discussed with the Nominator, EDF. None of these raise any issues of substance that impact on the Cabinet resolution. In the interests of completeness, these points are set out below:

**Question A1**

**1.1 Site Description**

The site is not located within the Civil Parish of Greatham. It is located within Seaton Ward of the Borough of Hartlepool.

The reference to County of Cleveland is out of date. Since the 1996 abolition of Cleveland County Council the Borough of Hartlepool has been a unitary authority and is one of five Boroughs in the Tees Valley.

### **Question D3**

#### **3.3 Proximity to Hazardous Facilities**

The Nomination document did not fully reflect the position in respect of COMAH establishments, but we note that EDF has submitted a Corrigendum on this point.

There is no reference to the Ekofisk pipeline which comes ashore close to the Nominated Area (see Question 3.10 below), but we understand from EDF that the associated hazard has been assessed in relation to the existing station and any risk is within acceptable limits.

### **Question D4**

#### **3.4 Durham Tees Valley Airport Safeguarding Zone**

The text at 3.4 indicates that the “site is not located in or adjacent to a ..Safeguarded Area...” This does not appear correct as the site is within the Durham Tees Valley International Airport Safeguarding Zone wherein the Local Planning Authority will consult with the airport on any applications for buildings and structures over 90 metres in height. EDF has noted this point, which presumably will be factored into the Civil Aviation Authority’s assessment of this criterion.

### **Question D8**

#### **3.8 Area of Historic Landscape (Hartlepool Local Plan Policy HE15 ) Salt Mound Area at Seaton Common.**

In addition to the designations referred to in the Nomination, the locally designated Historic Landscape at Seaton Common lies to the immediate north of the Nominated Area. As well as this designated site the Nominated Area and its immediate locality contain various other non-designated sites of archaeological and historical interest. It is presumed that consideration will be given to the impact of any development on these features within the detailed design work in due course.

### **Question D10**

#### **3.10 Access to suitable sources of cooling**

The Document does not make reference to the Ekofisk pipeline which comes ashore close to that part of the Nominated Area likely to be used for the cooling water outfall; it is acknowledged however that the impact (if any) of proximity to the pipeline can be considered at the design stage.

I trust that these comments assist the Department’s consideration of this nomination.

Yours sincerely



for  
Richard Waldmeyer  
Team Leader  
Planning Policy