

EDF Energy  
Sizewell C Community Forum  
21 November 2013

**Attendees:**

*Brian Stewart OBE, Chairman*

*Cllr Marianne Fellowes, Aldeburgh Town Council*

*Cllr Eric Atkinson, Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council*

*Cllr Nigel Suckling, Blaxhall Parish Council*

*Raymond Catchpole, Campsea Ashe Parish Council*

*Joan Girling, Communities Against Nuclear Expansion*

*Nick Mayo, Community Action Suffolk*

*Stephen Walls, EDF Energy*

*Tom McGarry, EDF Energy*

*Ian Bryant, EDF Energy*

*Hugh Hutton, EDF Energy*

*Roy Collins, EDF Energy*

*Simon Barlow, Environment Agency*

*Cllr Ian Norman, Farnham with Stratford St Andrew Parish Council*

*Cllr Peter Watkiss, Friston Parish Council*

*Cllr John Cross, Great Glemham Parish Council*

*Maureen Carr, Jobcentre Plus*

*Cllr Edwina Galloway, Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council*

*Cllr Terry Hodgson, Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council*

*Paul Rosher, Leiston Business Association*

*Cllr Kate Burt, Little Glemham Parish Council*

*Cllr Margaret Carswell, Marlesford Parish Council*

*Cllr Bryony Abbott, Melton Parish Council*

*Dr Therese Coffey, Member of Parliament for Suffolk Coastal*

*Cllr John Morris, Middleton-cum-Fordley Parish Council*

*Steve Knight-Gregson, National Grid*

*Cllr Chris Norrington, Peasenhall Parish Council*

*Cllr Jeff Hallett, Pettistree Parish Council*

*Mary Orherwere, Public Health Suffolk*

*Cllr Roger Lintott, Rendham Parish Council*

*Cllr Mike Stevenson, Rendlesham Parish Council*

*Ben McFarland, RSPB Minsmere Nature Reserve*

*Cllr Jon Swallow, Sizewell Parishes Liaison Group*

*Pat Hogan, Sizewell Residents Association*

*Miles Vartan, Suffolk Chamber of Commerce*

*Simon Amstutz, Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB*

*Cllr Tony Cooper, Suffolk Coastal District Council*

*Councillor Andrew Nunn, Suffolk Coastal District Council*

*Rachel Fulcher, Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth*

*Sgt Nigel Thompsett, Suffolk Constabulary*

*Michael Wilks, Suffolk County Council*

*Cllr Richard Smith MVO, Suffolk County Council*

*John Pitchford, Suffolk County Council*

*Andy Osman, Suffolk Resilience Forum*

*Alan Miller, Suffolk Wildlife Trust*

*Cllr John Tesh, Sweffling Parish Council*

*Tim Rowan-Robinson, TA Hotel Collection*

*Cllr Clive Brown, Theberton & Eastbridge Parish Council*

### ***Apologies:***

*Saxmundham Parish Council*

*Dunwich Parish Council*

*Knodishall Parish Council*

*Westleton Parish Council*

*Bredfield Parish Council*

*Highways Agency*

*Woodbridge Town Council*

*Walberswick Parish Council*

*Nacton Parish Council*

*Natural England*

19.00 – 21.10

## **I. Welcome from the Chairman**

Brian Stewart introduced himself as independent Chairman of the Sizewell C Community Forum and formally opened its third formal meeting. New members were welcomed, and the Chairman asked everyone to ensure their name plates were clear to him.

## **II. Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting**

The Chairman asked the Forum to approve the minutes of the last meeting held on 25 April 2013. The minutes were approved subject to the point raised by Cllr Jeff Hallett that the date of the previous meeting needed to be added. Once inserted the minutes were cleared for publication on the consultation website <http://sizewell.edfenergyconsultation.info>.

## **III. Presentation from EDF Energy**

The EDF Energy team provided an update on the Sizewell C Project, including background to the official announcement on 21 October 2013 about Hinkley Point C. This was described as a ‘major milestone’ and a ‘positive message’ for Sizewell C, demonstrating that EDF Energy was committed to investment in nuclear new build in the UK. The company hoped that following the Hinkley Point announcement the plans for Sizewell could progress in a more streamlined way, but was still unable to commit to a firm time frame. The Community Forum was also given an update on activity since Stage 1 consultation and associated development sites. EDF Energy stressed that nothing was yet fixed and that all aspects of the project were still open to consultation.

The PowerPoint slides, which accompanied the presentation, have been provided to the Community Forum as part of these minutes.

### **III. Q&A Session with Members**

The first question came from Cllr Marianne Fellowes, who wanted to know if there was going to be a formal Stage 2 Consultation before any application went to the Planning Inspectorate and what resources were going to be made available to local councils to help them engage with residents. Tom McGarry replied that detailed proposals would be subject to public consultation toward the end of 2014 and that EDF Energy would be looking to engage with communities near the lead associated development sites at the beginning of next year. In terms of resources, with regard to Stage 2, Tom McGarry referred Cllr Marianne Fellowes to the Statement of Community Consultation that EDF Energy had taken to local authorities prior to the formal launch of Stage 1. He said they had on-going engagement with the local authorities on resources, and held update meetings every quarter. As things progressed, they would be getting feedback from District and County Councils as to the resources they felt were required both on the approach to and during Stage 2 consultation.

Next, Pat Hogan asked for an update on the visitor centre. Stephen Walls said they were still working on it and that there were a few issues they needed to get their heads around because not all of the sites would be available during construction. The site at Goose Hill, which had been well received, would only be available during the operational phase. A decision had to be made if there were going to be two separate centres during the two phases (construction and operation) or if there were any other sites which might be fit for use for both phases. Stephen Walls estimated it would be early next year before there was more clarity on that and that they would consult again regarding the site they selected as a lead site.

Mike Stevenson applauded EDF Energy's interaction with the outage workforce over socio-economic issues. However he questioned the validity of the data because it was gathered from a temporary outage workforce rather than the permanent workforce. He also wanted to make EDF Energy aware that near the proposed park and ride site at Woodbridge there was a planning application for 200 houses on the corner opposite the development. Stephen Walls accepted the point about the outage workforce, but said it was still useful information and that other evidence would also be considered in the round. He confirmed he was aware of the housing issue and said that if the Wickham Market park and ride site fell away for archaeological or other reasons then they would look at it more closely.

Addressing the issue of accommodation, Richard Smith MVO said he was dismayed that EDF Energy seemed to prefer a single campus for 3,000 people at Eastbridge. He said a single campus for this number of people anywhere was a bad idea, and asked the company to think again about multiple sites. Richard Smith then asked what EDF Energy meant by 'resolving' the issues of the exposed archaeology at the Wickham Market park and ride site. On the accommodation point, Stephen Walls said he had outlined why they felt a single campus was the best option and stressed that the 3,000 number still had to be verified. With Wickham Market, he said the fact there was archaeology on the site raised the project risk level, and what he meant by 'resolve' was lowering that risk to an acceptable level.

Raymond Catchpole reminded the Panel that he had been promised an update on the rail freight loop – near what he now called Campsea Ashe Railway Station. He said that EDF Energy had been working from out of date Ordnance Survey sheets which showed no houses there. In addition to the 19 houses he had pointed out at the last meeting, he explained that work had begun on a further 22 properties in the same area. Raymond Catchpole said no one from EDF Energy had

come back to him to confirm that they were aware of this or what the position was with Network Rail. Roy Collins said they were aware of these issues and were in discussions with Network Rail. He said they had had no definitive responses from Network Rail at this point and so could not provide any answers.

Therese Coffey MP pointed out that during the consultation EDF had said people would be able to put forward other options which were not part of the original plans. She made particular reference to concerns about the A12 in Yoxford and the use of the B1122. She mentioned an alternative suggestion, D2, and wanted to know if any analysis had been done on that. She also asked about legacy issues. Stephen Walls responded that they had looked at all options and considered them in the round. He explained that the three sites they had selected at Stage 1 had been chosen after a lot of other options had been discarded. Roy Collins said they were aware of people putting forward alternative suggestions. He referred to the D2 option and said the final decision would depend on what their traffic analysis showed them. He explained that there was more work to do on that in terms of capacity and environmental impact. Ian Bryant addressed the legacy point, saying that they were only able to apply for things directly connected with the power station. He stressed they were unable to apply for things not connected with the power station. Therese Coffey said she was referring to the Darsham park and ride. Ian Bryant responded that there were mechanisms relating to the DCO which could give them an avenue to open up potential legacy, and that was something they would be working on.

Jon Swallow said that putting 3,000 workers in temporary accommodation on the edge of Eastbridge would destroy the community. He realised it was much easier in planning terms to situate all the workers in one place, but asserted that for social reasons it would not work. He agreed with Richard Smith's earlier point that EDF should be looking at multiple sites. He understood it would mean more work for EDF Energy but that seeing as they were talking about a period of 10 years it would be worth it for the community. Jon Swallow also made the point that to put in the infrastructure for 10 years and then dig it all out again after the construction period was over was not the right approach and was unsustainable. He also wanted some more definite timelines. Stephen Walls said they would continue to consult with local residents on the emerging plans. He repeated that the 3,000 figure was an upper limit which had been presented at Stage 1, and that it was still subject to verification. He said that through good design and community input he believed they could optimise design to seek to alleviate any concerns.

Joan Girling wanted to know about the access road. She said it was never actually seen on any plan, and that it would be helpful to find out where it was. She also wanted clarity on whether the Eastbridge hostel, the rail link and access road all came together in the same area. She said she saw a pattern emerging, and wanted confirmation of whether this was the case. Turning to the jetty, she wanted to know if this was to be permanent or temporary, what size it was going to be and what the sea defences were going to look like. She was concerned that they were going to be very high. Hugh Hutton spoke first about the access road, saying it was shown reasonably well in the Stage 1 documentation, and advised that Joan Girling should refer back to that for the details. He said she was correct in her analysis that the access road, the hostel and blue rail route option were very close at the site entrance. He said that was one of the areas they were working on, and that as they started doing the master planning for that area they would be able to demonstrate where all the different elements fitted in. Regarding the jetty, Hugh Hutton confirmed that the intention was for a temporary jetty during construction. The permanent facility which would be built for the operational stage would look very different to the temporary jetty as it would only be needed to deliver abnormal loads. They had yet to present their thinking on how that could be achieved. He said the jetty length would need to be sufficient to bring aggregate vessels in without additional dredging. In terms of the sea defences, he confirmed EDF Energy were looking at a design similar to the Sizewell B defences, which was a landscaped feature rather than anything with visible rocks

on it. The height of the Sizewell B defences was around 10 metres and the Sizewell C defences would probably start life at a similar elevation but would be adaptable to accommodate climate change over the life of the power station. Hugh Hutton could not be sure of the exact height at this stage.

Cllr Bryony Abbott said that while she applauded the Forum and was grateful for her inclusion in it, she felt very uncertain for her area because of what she called the ‘triple whammy’ of a proposed new housing development, the park and ride and the lorry park. She echoed Therese Coffey’s concern about legacy, and said that from her point of view the legacy was going to be that individual villages were going to be subsumed into one larger built up area – Greater Ipswich. Stephen Walls noted her comments and said he would keep the Forum abreast of all developments.

Cllr Marianne Fellowes followed up on the theme of the area around Sizewell being a peaceful, rural area which was in danger of being overwhelmed by this construction project. She returned the discussion to the accommodation campus, saying it was an issue which people felt very strongly about. She challenged EDF Energy’s assertion that a single campus would reduce transport movements and negative social impacts, saying that would only be the case if there was a lockdown, with staff confined to the campus and bussed in to work. She said it would be easier to manage staff and cost effective for EDF Energy to build just one campus, but that the workers would be driving to and from the campus to work, to the shops and social activities, so the rural infrastructure would find it hard to cope. Marianne Fellowes was disappointed that some ideas which had been put in for smaller campuses did not appear to have been considered. She said these could offer better legacy options in terms of hotels or holiday accommodation, and that if EDF Energy was determined to build just one campus, it should be in Ipswich or Lowestoft which had the infrastructure to cope with 3,000 people. She also wanted to know more about the lorry park and what EDF Energy would do to deal with drivers going on unapproved routes. Stephen Walls said he had already addressed the single campus issues and turned to Cllr Marianne Fellowes’ transport concerns. He agreed that there would be extra traffic at the beginning and end of the week as workers came to site, but that during the week they would not need to get in the car to go to work. If there was more than one site then there would be more travel mid-week. He said their socio economic assessment and traffic assessment would look at all the factors that would impact on the situation, including tourism. Regarding the lorry park he said that drivers going on unapproved routes would be policed and that the location of any lorry park would not necessarily have an effect on drivers doing this. He said that all HGVs would be clearly labelled and a code of conduct would be put in place.

John Tesh asked for an update on how EDF Energy would manage the impact on existing medical services, which he said were already operating at their limits. Stephen Walls said it was not something they were currently looking at but that they would need to assess the impact their workforce would have on these services. He said they would need to ensure there was adequate additional provision to cope with the increase in population and referred the Forum to what they had done at Hinkley Point, where additional funds had been put into the local health trust.

Cllr Jeff Hallett expressed his worries about traffic on small country lanes. He acknowledged that EDF Energy had given assurances about big lorries, but said that smaller roads could become rat runs for cars and the general public trying to avoid the busy main roads. Roy Collins replied that he understood the concerns and that their traffic modelling work would be looking at this. He explained they were using sophisticated software which looked at existing and future conditions.

Mary Orherwere echoed John Tesh’s point about the impact on health. She said she would be happy to be involved in this area and provide assurances to the general population that these

concerns were being addressed. Rebecca Calder said EDF Energy would be starting work on a Health Impact Assessment early next year.

Cllr Ian Norman returned to the issue of traffic impact and in particular ambulance response time. He said the response time at present was abysmal, that people were suffering and dying because of it, and that this must be taken into account in the development of Sizewell C. He also raised air quality as another concern and asked how this would affect EDF's thinking on road development. Roy Collins said that their traffic modelling would take into account journey times and delays, and that they would be looking at the specific areas where air quality fell below accepted levels.

Ben McFarland wanted to know why changes had been made with regards to the location of the bridge. Hugh Hutton explained that the location of the bridge was integral to the main site and they felt that moving it further east meant they could bridge at a narrower part of the existing SSSI and gave them the opportunity to broaden the corridor of that section of the SSSI which joined the Sizewell belt to the Minsmere Marshes. They felt it made sense to bridge at a narrower point. He said they had always proposed to put the temporary bridge at the eastern end and that it made more sense to put the permanent bridge there too, to minimise the impact on the SSSI.

John Morris returned to transport and said his understanding was that in trying to minimise the impact on roads EDF Energy would try to maximise the sea and rail options. Stephen Walls agreed that this was the main thrust of their transport policy. Roy Collins also agreed with this and stressed that they had focused on the construction period because that would generate the largest amount of traffic, but that they would also be looking at traffic flow during the permanent operational phase of the plant. He said they would examine potential emergency scenarios, how likely they would be to occur and what could be done to manage them. He said that there was more work to do in this area. In terms of specific road improvements, Roy Collins said they would act on the evidence of their research and in line with planning guidance. He said there were no absolute answers and that it was a judgement as to what was the most appropriate and cost effective action to take.

Cllr Terry Hodgson asked if there had been any progress on proposed bus routes. Roy Collins said there was nothing new to say on this and that it was something they would cover at a future stage of the consultation.

Kate Bird asked if legacy issues had been taken into account in terms of the roads issues. She highlighted that if EDF Energy brought 3,000 people in to work in the area during the construction phase, they would not simply leave when the project was over. She said a lot of them would have developed relationships and created homes and families in the area which would continue to impact on the roads after the building of Sizewell C was finished. She urged EDF Energy to seriously consider alternative routes for the traffic which was going to be generated. Roy Collins sought to reassure Kate Bird, and said their traffic assessment looked at the issues in three stages. The first step looked at the conditions as they were now, the second phase looked forward to the future road network at the time of the construction phase, and the third to the operational phase. In doing that they looked at guidance from the Department of Transport, which included assumptions around traffic and economic growth over time. He said EDF Energy's responsibility was to manage and mitigate the impacts of its own traffic and not wider developments or growth. He said there was a general level of assumed growth based on economic conditions and that they also looked at other developments which could take place during the construction period, and that the impact of those would be included in their plans. He said that they assumed quite strong economic growth because that was what the government assumed, but that in fact historically, traffic growth in this area was actually lower than government forecasts.

Raymond Catchpole said he was encouraged that the traffic analysts were taking future growth into account. He went on to point out, however, that there was an elephant in the room, which was the Bentwaters Parks development. He said this could include 1.25 million square feet of distribution space. He asked how many HGVs would be using this space and questioned the impact this could have on local roads. Roy Collins noted the comment and said they were following the same process as anyone else involved in major developments and considering other developments in the pipeline.

Therese Coffey MP said she hoped EDF Energy realised how people felt about the accommodation issue. She noted that Hinkley Point had more than one campus in Bridgwater and hoped that the same principle could be applied here. Regarding the lorry park and the park and ride scheme, she said EDF Energy would not have allayed the Forum's concerns by what they had said so far. She then addressed the issue of commerce, saying there was £8 million worth of contracts up for grabs and she wanted to know how EDF Energy were encouraging Suffolk companies to bid for work at Hinkley Point so that they could then be ready to work on Sizewell C. Stephen Walls first addressed the lorry park and sought to reassure Therese Coffey that they would reduce the footprint as much as they could. EDF Energy had invested a lot of time and effort around the supply chain for Hinkley Point locally and nationally. He said he shared Therese Coffey's concern and had been looking at how much Hinkley Point business had been won by Suffolk businesses and that the number was quite low. This was a challenging area and they would be looking at how to transfer the skills used at Hinkley point to Sizewell. Stephen Walls asserted that the more they could do to involve local businesses the better.

Miles Vartan intervened to say they were working closely with the Somerset Chamber of Commerce and would continue to do so now that Hinkley Point had been given the go ahead. He said 120 tier-one companies would be involved in the construction of Sizewell and that the role of the Chamber was to facilitate Suffolk companies becoming involved in the process. He said there was a trading portal, [sizewellsupplychain.co.uk](http://sizewellsupplychain.co.uk) which would be developed further.

Cllr Bryony Abbott pointed out that the Panel was made up of men, and wanted to know how they were going to attract more women to work on the project. Stephen Walls pointed out that he had more women than men on his team.

Joan Girling asked that more publicity be given to the meetings so that everyone could get involved. On the access road, she said she understood the area to be developed was 340 hectares, and asked what kind of impact this would have. Hugh Hutton said he had no knowledge of that number, asserting it was more like 150 hectares. He said that figure was based on EDF's experience of how much land it takes to build nuclear power stations. He said they recognised they would be asked to minimise impact and to justify all the land they would be using on both a permanent and a temporary basis and that was what they would do.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

The Chairman confirmed there was no other business. The next meeting was set for March 2014, with the exact date to be confirmed later. He asked that any agenda item suggestions should be submitted to the Secretariat. The Chairman said that in his opinion it seemed the accommodation options were the most vital issue, and asked for EDF Energy to come back with something on that.

Cllr John Cross asked for the more far flung parishes to be given some more definitive statements about transport. The Chairman said he was sure that issue would feature at the next meeting. John Cross said EDF Energy had said the same things at the last three meetings. Tom McGarry said they wanted to give regular updates but that process had to be gone through to arrive at decisions

and that was what they would do. He said that transport would undoubtedly be discussed at the next meeting but that they would still be going through the process at that stage.

The Chairman thanked everyone for coming and closed the meeting.

**This Standard Summary was produced by Ubiqus UK ☎ +44 (0) 20 7269 0370**  
**<http://www.ubiquis.co.uk> / [info@ubiquis.com](mailto:info@ubiquis.com)**