

EDF Energy
Sizewell C Community Forum
26 July 2018

Attendees:

Brian Stewart OBE, Community Forum Chair

Jim Crawford, EDF Energy (from Item IV)

Richard Bull, EDF Energy

Tom McGarry, EDF Energy

Sizewell C Community Forum Secretariat

Suzie Osben, Aldeburgh Town Council

Eric Atkinson, Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council

David Secret, Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council

Michael Simons, Darsham Parish Council

Geoff Abell, Dunwich Parish Meeting

Susan Jackson, Friston Parish Council

Edwina Galloway, Kelsale cum Carlton Parish Council

Terry Hodgson, Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council

Chris Betson, Leiston Business Association

Nick Mayo, Leiston, Saxmundham and District Citizens Advice Bureau

Peter Chaloner, Little Glemham Parish Council

Carol Gradwell, Melton Parish Council

Roy Dowding, Middleton-cum-Fordley Parish Council

Sue Brown, Nacton Parish Council

Kenneth Parry Brown, Peasenhall Parish Council

Mike Stevenson, Rendlesham Parish Council

Adam Rowlands, RSPB Minsmere Nature Reserve

Malcolm Blakeney, Sizewell Parishes Liaison Group

Pat Hogan, Sizewell Residents Association

Russ Rainger, Snape Parish Council

Tony Cooper, Suffolk Coastal District Council

Geoff Holdcroft, Suffolk Coastal District Council

Maureen Jones, Suffolk Coastal District Council

Rachel Fulcher, Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth

Bev McClean, Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB

Richard Smith MVO, Suffolk County Council

Leigh Jenkins, Suffolk Constabulary

Alan Miller, Suffolk Wildlife Trust

Joan Girling, Together Against Sizewell C

Andrew Lewis, Walberswick Parish Council

Dick Jenkinson, Wickham Market Parish Council

John Walford, Yoxford Parish Council

Apologies:

Campsea Ashe Parish Council

Community Action Suffolk (CAS)

Dunwich Parish Meeting

Blaxhall Parish Council

Office for Nuclear Regulation

Parham Parish Council

Public Health Suffolk

Rendham Parish Council

<i>Blythburgh Parish Council</i>	<i>Saxmundham Town Council</i>
<i>Bredfield Parish Council</i>	<i>Sibton Parish Council</i>
<i>Bruisyard Parish Council</i>	<i>Southwold Town Council</i>
<i>Environment Agency</i>	<i>Therese Coffey, Suffolk Coastal MP</i>
<i>Farnham with Stratford St Andrew Parish Council</i>	<i>Ian Pratt, Suffolk Coastal District Council</i>
<i>Gt Glemham Parish Council</i>	<i>Suffolk Chamber of Commerce</i>
<i>Hacheston Parish Council</i>	<i>Suffolk Resilience Forum</i>
<i>Highways Agency</i>	<i>Sweffling Parish Council</i>
<i>Knodishall Parish Council</i>	<i>The Suffolk Coast DMO</i>
<i>Marine Management Organisation</i>	<i>Theberton & Eastbridge Council</i>
<i>Marlesford Parish Council</i>	<i>Tunstall Parish Council</i>
<i>Natural England</i>	<i>Westleton Parish Council</i>
<i>National Grid</i>	<i>Woodbridge Town Council</i>

I. Chair's Introduction

The Chair introduced himself and welcomed the attendees. The purpose of the Community Forum was to bring to together local stakeholders who would be most affected by the Sizewell C Project. Although the meeting was held in public, it was not a public meeting. In the interest of full transparency, the Chair informed the meeting that Therese Coffey, in her capacity as a DEFRA Minister, had appointed him to be the chair of the Anglian Central Regional Flood and Coastal Committee (RFCC), covering the Great Ouse catchment

II. Minutes of the Last Forum Meeting

The minutes were available on the website and the Chair proposed they be approved as a correct record of the meeting. Kenneth Parry Brown seconded the Chair's proposal. The Minutes were therefore approved as a correct record of the previous meeting.

III. Project Directors Report

Tom McGarry provided the meeting with a brief update on current activities, assessments and surveys being undertaken to inform the forthcoming Stage 3 Consultation. Many of the emerging proposals were at a draft stage and continually evolving. They would be more fully shared with the attendees and the wider public at Stage 3.

It was anticipated that the third stage of public consultation would commence in the New Year. There would be ample time provided for the Forum's members to provide feedback regarding the latest plans and proposals. The EDF Energy team would also conduct a number of consultation events across the area. Following the conclusion of Stage 3, EDF Energy would take time to

consider the feedback before preparing its application for Development Consent to the Planning Inspectorate. Following a process led by the Planning Inspectorate, a decision would be made by Government on whether consent had been attained, which could take up to 18 months.

If EDF Energy were successful in gaining planning consent, it would be in a position to take a final investment decision. If it took the decision to proceed, it would signal the end of the development phase for the project and the beginning of the 10-year construction programme of Sizewell C. The Stage 3 Consultation events would be held in Leiston, Middleton, Wickham Market as well as other towns and villages, focussing on the key areas of interest to those communities.

Tom McGarry indicated it was felt that the case for Sizewell C was increasing. Construction costs and cost of finance could be reduced by 20% compared to Hinkley Point C. 5,600 workers would be required at peak construction, and EDF Energy would work to ensure that younger apprentices and trainees within the Suffolk area were given the opportunity to work on the project. Local companies were required in order to support and supply the project.

Tom McGarry noted that the Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy had launched its consultation on National Policy Statement 6. EDF Energy believed that all of the suitable sites in the nuclear National Policy Statement should remain, while it also believed in having a mix of low carbon energy generation, including nuclear. Sizewell C also had an advantage of having extremely low connection costs.

Tom McGarry noted that there were significant benefits from construction and operation. EDF Energy's new build project team was working hard at developing robust proposals within the East of England for the delivery of new nuclear power stations. Sizewell C would aim to create 1,000 apprenticeships, while the construction of the project could inject as much as £4 billion into the regional economy.

While EDF Energy was not at a formal stage of consultation, it had still been engaging with the wider community. EDF Energy had attended the Suffolk Show, while Jim Crawford had given a major speech at the East of England Energy Group Southern North Sea Conference & Exhibition. The EDF Energy team had also contracted 18 successful applicants in the Sizewell C community fund.

IV. Project Update

Richard Bull stated that he would not be providing an indication of what Stage 3 would contain, but would highlight the work being undertaken to inform the next stage of Consultation. There was currently a developing project at Hinkley Point C (HPC) and as the construction programme progressed it would feed back into the Sizewell C project. The EDF Energy team was working closely with HPC to understand how to best filter information as quickly as possible into the work that would be undertaken.

The traffic models had been further developed.

The Chair noted that in order to avoid any doubt, the presentation slides would be made available to the Forum.

Richard Bull outlined that with regards to traffic modelling, EDF Energy had been asked to look at the impact of seasonality. It had also looked at scenarios when there were outages at Sizewell B. There was due consideration of the increased workforce and how it would impact on traffic during the construction of Sizewell C. The traffic model had been refined in order to inform road safety considerations.

EDF Energy had been working closely with Network Rail in order to develop rail proposals. There was a requirement to introduce additional capacity on the Suffolk Line to ensure that the freight trains could operate alongside the existing passenger service. In order for the freight trains to efficiently travel up and down the Suffolk Line during the day, they would have to operate at 40 mph, which was an increase on the current 20 mph restriction. This would have an impact on level crossings.

As the Sizewell C site sat within the AONB, it was at the forefront of EDF Energy's minds. There had been engagement with the local authorities in order to identify how best to ensure that the station sat within the setting as best it could. Regarding the accommodation strategy, there had been feedback at Stage 2 that there were alternative siting options from the County Council, which would be reviewed and reported on at Stage 3. In the meantime, EDF Energy would engage with the local authorities in relation to their response to the Stage 2 Consultation.

Noise and vibration were key issues for the main development site and the local road network. There had been a wealth of feedback at Stage 2 on the proposed use of the B1122, outlining the implications for the villages situated on this road.

Richard Bull commented on air quality. Regarding the main development site, there was a requirement to mitigate potential dust issues. A construction dust assessment would be conducted. There was also a requirement to fully understand the potential for service water runoff and any changes in the local ground water and surface water levels. This was a key area of assessment. Any increase in flood risks needed to be fully understood, as well as the drainage principles.

With regard to the impact on existing public rights of way, EDF Energy was working closely to understand how they could be safely kept open during the construction period. There would be further clarity at the next stage.

Richard Bull also reported that work was being undertaken on ecology. He acknowledged that there were protected species within the area, including bats, birds, great crested newts, reptiles and water voles. Vole fencing had also been installed at Aldhurst Farm to stop natural colonisation. With regard to birds, EDF Energy was assessing potential noise impacts on Marsh Harriers and any loss of foraging habitats, and additionally whether any marine changes could reduce available fish prey for Little Terns and Red-throated Divers.

There was an abundance of work being undertaken with regard to Coastal Geomorphology and marine water and sediment quality. High resolution topographic surveys of the shore had been undertaken along with detailed analysis to assess shingle tracking during storm events. In addition, there were ongoing considerations of the potential effects of climate change and relative sea level rise.

EDF Energy was supporting the establishment of the Eastern Institute of Technology, with the aim for it to become a hub to deliver the curriculum for the National College of Nuclear, helping EDF Energy source skilled workers for the project.

EDF Energy was working closely with schools to develop science, technology, engineering and mathematics. EDF Energy was also looking at the potential impact on tourism, with the aim of focussing on some of the concerns raised at Stage 2. There was the potential for economic development for local businesses. There was also engagement with local community needs, such as emergency services, social care, education capacity, public services and the potential for sports facilities.

V. Questions & Answers

Cllr Richard Smith stated that he was delighted by what he had been told. It was hoped that the consultation period would last for 12 weeks. He queried the potential length of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, as it was hoped that it would not be 41,000 pages long, as he believed the HPC application had been.

Jim Crawford explained that it was EDF Energy's ambition to follow a 12-week consultation process. This could be constrained by some local council changes. The volume of a DCO application was driven by a requirement to provide as much information in order to justify the proposals which were being put forward. There had been some learning since the HPC DCO application, and there was an attempt to strike a balance. It was suggested that all Forum members took the time to read the relevant points of interest in the document. A summary document would also be produced.

Carol Gradwell noted that while the project update touched on noise and vibration, it did not mention noise pertaining to the railway lines. With the trains increasing their speed through a number of villages, there would be an increase in noise and vibration. This was something that required further information.

In addition, the increased trains would run diesel fuel, and there had been no mention of how such a move would affect air quality. The level crossing in Melton was close to the station, holding traffic while trains passed. From an air quality point of view, there would be a number of cars and HGVs that would be held. Such information had not been included in the survey. Carol Gradwell asked if these issues were being considered.

Richard Bull responded that EDF Energy would focus on these issues.

Roy Dowding queried the impact of ScottishPower Renewables (SPR)'s two proposed windfarms, as the associated additional transport would use the same routes proposed for Sizewell C. He asked if it had been considered that the route of the suggested D2 road would be beneficial to both programmes. Richard Bull explained that EDF Energy had engaged in dialogue with SPR, with there being a particular focus on transport. The aim had been to ensure that EDF Energy and SPR's transport consultants worked together to review the projected traffic flows for each project, the potential timescales and the mitigations that would be put in place.

Jim Crawford noted that local authorities had taken action on the matter. There were a couple of forums, including the Suffolk Energy Coast Delivery Board, which had been actively discussing the cumulative impact of the proposals that they were aware of which may be coming to the area. Whilst a lot of EDF Energy's work was based upon their project and the potential impact, the information was being shared.

Mike Stevenson observed that comments from the National Infrastructure Commission (NIC) stated that the Government should not agree support for more than one nuclear power station beyond HPC before 2025. He asked if there were any comments regarding the suggested recommendation. Jim Crawford responded that EDF Energy acknowledged the recommendations made in the NIC report. The EDF Energy team had read and taken note of the report. Some of the assumptions that the report concluded appeared quite optimistic and were not in line with what EDF Energy understood. EDF Energy believed that roughly 20 to 25% of nuclear baseload would be the optimum, although they would wait and see what Government policy stated.

John Walford stated that Yoxford had not earlier been mentioned as a location for the consultation events within the local villages even though it appeared it would be hugely affected by the transport increase. In advance of the meeting, it had been monitored that over 32 large vehicles had gone

through Yoxford in one day, traveling at between 45 and 60 mph. Small tractors were also travelling through the village at 19 mph, creating large tailbacks. With regards to potential problems pertaining to traffic, it was felt that Yoxford's concerns were not being taken seriously. Tom McGarry clarified that there would be a consultation event held in Yoxford and concerns were being taken seriously. He was sorry that John Walford had formed such an opinion and suggested that both parties found a solution to ensure that any such concerns be addressed.

Paul Collins stated that the feedback on the various Stage 2 proposals had been presented at the previous forum, such as SSSI crossings, though they could not be compared to what had been shown at the current Forum, as they were different categories. He suggested that EDF Energy presented its options in a consistent manner. Jim Crawford replied that the EDF Energy team would move forward with Stage 3 and present the key proposals in a manner, which would justify the chosen options.

Jeff Hallett stated that he was dissatisfied with the fact that there was not a scheme in place to stop rat running traffic coming through Peasenhall as it avoided congestion in Wickham Market. He also questioned who was responsible for the security on the sites during the building phase. Richard Bull responded that there would be security during the construction process as well as when the site had been created. Jeff Hallett clarified that his worry related to potential terrorist threats. Richard Bull gave assurances that the site would be secured.

Pat Hogan outlined that the Sizewell residents had worries, especially in relation to traffic. She asked for consideration to be given to residents within Sizewell, as they would be met with a vast majority of difficulties. She suggested that EDF Energy had to first make progress with the access road and rail in order to ensure that all of the traffic did not pass through Sizewell. Richard Bull responded that there would be impacts throughout the entire road network. The model being constructed by EDF Energy would highlight those impacts.

Richard Bull stated that rat running was something that EDF Energy would have to look at in more detail, though it was difficult to address how drivers behaved and made use of the roads. Jeff Hallett responded that he had highlighted the issue at previous meetings. He expected EDF Energy to review the problem and consider traffic leaving Sizewell, such as HGV vehicles, as despite them being prohibited from entering Sizewell they would still exit the village. Richard Bull noted that the HGV vehicles would be assigned to designated routes in and out of Sizewell. None of EDF Energy's contractors' HGVs over 3.5 tonnes would be allowed to use a minor road.

Dick Jenkinson stated that a lot of traffic would flow through Wickham Market. It had been mentioned that all HGV vehicles above 3.5 tonnes would travel via the A14 and A12, meaning that HGV vehicles below 3.5 tonnes would take the shortcut through the B1078, which went through Wickham Market. Richard Bull replied that the issue relating to the B1078 traffic flowing through Wickham Market resonated with comments made during the Wickham Market Exhibition Stage 2 event. EDF Energy was looking to identify if there was an issue and if anything could be done to remedy the matter. With regards to the LGVs, there would be a freight consolidation centre* at Wickham Market. Some LGVs would go directly to site, while some would go to the freight consolidation centre. Currently, there was no proposal to restrict LGVs.

Joan Girling stated that although it was now known that the Stage 3 Consultation would take place next year, there was no clarification as to when the DCO would be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

*since recording these minutes it should be noted that the speaker made a mistake at this point – no freight consolidation facility is proposed at this site.

Jim Crawford responded that the timing of the DCO submission depended on the feedback EDF Energy received for Stage 3. It was reasonable to assume that the application would be submitted 12 to 18 months after Stage 3, depending on the amount of work required to respond to the feedback generated at Stage 3.

Much of the work highlighted by Richard Bull during the forums had been discussed in great detail by the statutory stakeholders. As a result, such stakeholder discussions could result in further work being required.

Terry Hodgson stated that traffic flows prior to the new link road had not been addressed during previous forums and asked if the topic would be addressed in the Stage 3 Consultation. Richard Bull responded that an assessment was currently ongoing and would be reported on in Stage 3. It was a key piece of work which required considerable thought. To date, the assessment had been at a peak period, at which point all of the mitigation would be in place. It was likely that there would be more disruption during the early period while everything was being constructed.

Bev McClean noted that Hinkley was not a designated landscape and asked if things should look and function differently at Sizewell, in terms of the AONB. Richard Bull responded that how the larger building sat within the site was important and this would feed through to the design considerations. Michael Simons highlighted the proposed 1,000-space car park at Darsham. It was queried if there was any precedent for a car park of such size, as it was likely that there would be noise and air pollution, as well as congestion on the A12. Richard Bull responded that noise and light assessments would be undertaken by EDF Energy. The Company was also looking at the current location of the car park entrance, with regards to its proximity to the level crossing. Specific detailed traffic modelling had also been undertaken, linking the Yoxford and Darsham level crossings with the aim of helping traffic congestion. A micro simulation model had been produced in order to ensure that EDF Energy was confident that the solutions being proposed would work. It was expected that the proposals would evolve at Stage 3.

Rachel Fulcher asked if EDF Energy was planning to compensate for the loss of Fen Meadow. Richard Bull stated that that was a work in progress. There was a potential issue that required consideration and possible mitigation. If so, they would have to look at alternative sites that would be appropriate to provide the mitigation.

VI. Next Meeting

The Chair thanked everybody for attending. It was intended that the next meeting of the Forum would take place at an appropriately early point in the consultation for Stage 3.

This Standard Summary was produced by Ubiquis UK ☎ +44 (0) 20 7269 0370
<http://www.ubiquis.co.uk/> / infouk@ubiquis.com