

**EDF Energy**  
**Sizewell C Community Forum**  
**16 November 2017**

***Attendees:***

*Brian Stewart OBE, Community Forum Chair*

*Ian Bryant, EDF Energy*

*Richard Bull, EDF Energy*

*Rebecca Calder, EDF Energy*

*Jim Crawford, EDF Energy*

*Hugh Hutton, EDF Energy*

*Tom McGarry, EDF Energy*

*Carly Vince, EDF Energy*

*Peter Palmer, Aldeburgh Town Council*

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

*David Secret, Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council*

*David Hepper, Bredfield Parish Council*

*Michael Simons, Darsham Parish Council*

*Geoff Abell, Dunwich Parish Meeting*

*Ian Norman, Farnham with Stratford St Andrew Parish*

*Susan Jackson, Friston Parish Council*

*Argus Gathorne-Hardy, Gt Glemham Parish Council*

*Clare Perkins, Woodbridge Town Council*

*Sharon Smith, Yoxford Parish Council*

*Joan Girling, Together Against Sizewell C (TASC)*

*Malcolm Blakeney, Sizewell Parishes Liaison Group*

*Philip Ridley, Suffolk Coastal District Council*

*Bryn Griffiths, Suffolk County Council*

*Tim Rowan-Robinson, Suffolk Coast DMO*

*Malcolm Robinson, Hacheston Parish Council*

*Edwina Galloway, Kelsale cum Carlton Parish Council*

*John Staff, Knodishall Parish Council*

*Lesley Hill, Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council*

*Peter Chaloner, Little Glemham Parish Council*

*Richard Cooper, Marlesford Parish Council*

*Alan Porter, Melton Parish Council*

*Roy Dowding, Middleton-cum-Fordley Parish Council*

*Sue Brown, Nacton Parish Council*

*Jason Wood, Parham Parish Council*

*Kenneth Parry Brown, Peasenhall Parish Council*

*Keith Bridges, Pettistree Parish Council*

*Mike Stevenson, Rendlesham Parish Council*

*Graham Farrant, Snape Parish Council*

*Ian Bradbury, Southwold Town Council*

*Stephen Brett, Theberton & Eastbridge Parish Council*

*Ray Clune, Wickham Market Parish Council*

*Nick Mayo, Leiston, Saxmundham and District Citizens  
Advice Bureau*

*John Dugmore, Suffolk Chamber of Commerce*

*Simon Amstutz, Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB*

*Rachel Fulcher, Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth*

*Therese Coffey, Suffolk Coastal MP*

*Chris Betson, Suffolk Coast Businesses*

*Simon Barlow, Environment Agency*

*Pat Hogan, Sizewell Residents Association*

*Leigh Jenkins, Suffolk Constabulary*

*Steve Knight-Gregson, National Grid*

*Maureen Jones, Suffolk Coastal District Council*

***Apologies:***

*Russ Rainger, Suffolk County Council*

*Blaxhall Parish Council*

*Tony Cooper, Suffolk Coastal District Council*

*Rendham Parish Council*

*Ian Pratt, Suffolk Coastal District Council*

*Saxmundham Town Council*

*Blythburgh Parish Council*

*Sweffling Parish Council*

*Bruisyard Parish Council*

*Walberswick Parish Council*

*Sibton Parish Council*

*Public Health Suffolk*

*Community Action Suffolk (CAS)*

*Marine Management Organisation (MMO)*

*RSPB Minsmere Nature Reserve*

*Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR)*

*Suffolk Wildlife Trust*

*Campsea Ashe Parish Council*

*Highways Agency*

*Tunstall Parish Council*

*Natural England*

*Westleton Parish Council*

*Suffolk Resilience Forum*

## **I. Chair's Introduction**

Brian Stewart introduced himself and welcomed attendees. He announced that the Riverside Centre venue had been selected to foster better community discussion compared with the previous locations.

The purpose of the meeting was to hear a presentation from EDF Energy on Stage 2 Consultation, led by Jim Crawford and colleagues. He would ensure that attendees had an opportunity to ask questions. He asked that questions be put in an orderly and appropriate fashion.

## **II. Minutes of the Last Forum**

The Chair stated that the minutes of the last meeting published on the website were overly long; the new transcript would be in a more summary format. Feedback would be welcome on the new minutes.

### **III. EDF Energy Presentation on Stage 2 Consultation**

#### **1. Project Overview**

Jim Crawford explained that Stage 2 had been his first involvement in the project's consultation phase. He thanked those who had provided informal and formal feedback, expressing his eagerness to hear people's questions.

The project is now between Stages 2 and 3. Stage 1 had been completed in February 2013. The next stage of consultation had been delayed until a final investment decision had been made on Hinkley Point C (HPC). HPC contracts had been signed in September 2016; Stage 2 had followed in November; and the consultation had been open from November 2016 until February 2017. The feedback received had been varied, which helped inform the approach to arrive at updated proposals.

A firm timetable on Stage 3 public consultation could not be given, so as not to pre-empt the outcomes of the further work required. Furthermore, constraining to a timescale would be disrespectful to the process and impact the quality. The current work would provide viable and accurate proposals in response to feedback. Sufficient notice would be given in advance of Stage 3 Consultation, as per the company's commitments in its Statement of Community Consultation (this is published on the Sizewell C website). Subsequent to the consultation, feedback would again be considered, and an application for a development consent order submitted to the Planning Inspectorate and recommended to the Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy Secretary of State. This process would take approximately 18 months. EDF Energy would then make a Final Investment Decision (FID) before a construction period of approximately 10 years, dependent on a positive decision from the Secretary of State. Hitherto, the EDF Energy team had been focused on several priorities. One priority was completing Stage 2 and reviewing the feedback. One of his principal tasks was to update the business case for Sizewell C to be the next affordable new nuclear project in the UK. The HPC strike price had been agreed with the Government in October 2013 when the price of renewables and the wholesale price for electricity had been significantly higher. Falling prices showed that electricity market reforms were working.

EDF Energy had a large and growing renewables portfolio. Matching supply and demand in UK electricity had become more challenging, resulting in additional costs. There remained a strong case for back-up capacity to ensure security of supply, and therefore for nuclear electricity.

The EPR would be in operation during the building of Sizewell C with stations to begin operating in France, Finland and China over the next few years. At Hinkley Point C there are approximately 2,500 employees on site, and construction milestones are being met. 1,000 apprenticeships would be created during the build programme. Nearly £9 billion on contracts have been signed, with 64% of that construction value going to UK companies. The project brought firms and expertise from across the world together. 2017 on-site priorities had already been achieved.

He stressed that there had been various engagement activities in communities around Sizewell and throughout Suffolk outside of formal consultation periods.

#### **2. Summary on Stage 2 Proposals and Activity**

##### *a. Activity*

Tom McGarry explained that he had managed the public consultation. He encouraged attendees to contact the Sizewell C information office, which was open every weekday. He introduced John McNamara who was taking over as Community Relations Manager, and who now managed the information office function.

He spoke about the consultation activity, including the 70 public exhibitions, meetings and presentations and 1,059 responses received. The utmost had been done to ensure there were activities and events in areas close to proposals for developments sites. The good response rate to the consultation presented a huge task. The process was qualitative; substantive issues of concern were focused on.

*b. Proposals*

He then went on to present the proposals included at Stage 2, including:

- the main development site and temporary construction area;
- the three sea delivery options;
- the four options for crossing the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI);
- the three borrow pit options for managing material on site;
- the three accommodation campus options;
- the park and ride sites;
- the rail options;
- the proposals for the A12, B1122 and the junction at Yoxford.

## **IV. Feedback on Stage 2 Consultation**

### **1. Overview**

Carly Vince thanked the community for engaging with the consultation. All feedback had been analysed. The slides from the forum would be shared on the website. The consultation had been aimed at updating the community on proposals and strategies. There had been diverse views from stakeholders, who would continue to be engaged with at pertinent times. Main themes in terms of support included the recognition of Sizewell C's ability to help meet the nation's low-carbon energy needs, employment opportunities and the principle of new nuclear.

There had been concerns principally over landscape issues, and over the need for, and cost of, new nuclear. In relation to the construction phase, concerns were raised on mitigating impacts. Specific mitigation had been sought by respondents. Some concerns were related to landscape, particularly the area of outstanding natural beauty designation, ecology and heritage assets. Community impact, amenity and access to local service concerns had also been raised.

### **2. Main Site**

On Option 1, wide jetty, there had been general support for using water to bring freight on site. Feedback themes concerned minimal impact and maximum use of the marine environment. Principal comments related to bringing a large number of goods on site by water via the jetty, minimising the amount transported by road. There were visual, ecological concerns and practical concerns.

Similar responses to Option 2, narrow jetty, and Option 3, beach landing, were received.

With regards to the crossing SSSI land options, issues had been similar across all four propositions, specifically to minimise environmental and landscape impacts. There had been mixed views on Option 1, from supporting the greater land-take to concerns over the construction time. Similar feedback had been provided on Option 2. Option 3 had been supported by some due to lower

land-take level. Ecological and flood risk worries had been frequently cited on Option 4. Option 1, the preferred proposal, had to be further reviewed in order to adequately respond to concerns.

The benefits of borrow pits had been understood by many. Concerns, however, had been raised on visual and air quality. There was a preference to use fields further from the community. Option 1 had been generally less preferred. Options 2 and 3 had caused concerns over environmental and community impact. Option 3 had been cited as preferable. Further work was being undertaken to understand ground conditions and minimise environmental impacts. The Stage 3 focus was on keeping borrow pits to the east of the East Bridge Road.

There had been fewer responses to the main development site operational phase, though there had been requests to minimise environmental impacts. Station design and associated lighting had been most frequently cited, which the design team were taking heed of.

### **3. Transport**

There had been high-level support for maximising marine and rail options to reduce road freight transport. The park-and-ride and highway improvements had been recognised as beneficial. Stage 2 comments had focused on how to minimise site impact. Wickham Market proposals would be refined based on feedback. Darsham proposals had received support on the accessibility to park and ride through the railway station.

The proposals for delivering freight on the green rail route were generally more preferred to transporting freight by road. The long-term impact of improving the rail network was recognised.

On Option 1, main comments concerned minimising the environmental and community impact, and how the closure of Buckleswood Road would be addressed. Environmental and technical work would be the focus in coming months in order to take forward Option 1 as the preferred option.

With regard to road proposals, concerns had focused on the A12's ability to facilitate greater traffic flows. Bypass options had been preferred to the other propositions. Option 1 had received feedback referring to the need for infrastructure to prevent worsening traffic. Option 2's concerns related to the demolition of the grade 2 listed building, and safety and amenity impacts. The principle of Option 3's new road infrastructure for the village bypass was supported, while recognising environmental and community impacts. Option 4's (two-village bypass) long-term legacy beneficial impacts had been recognised. EDF Energy's approach would be clearly stated in the Stage 3 consultation alongside potential opportunities to work with district councils.

On the A12/B1122, further progress was required. The roundabout proposal was more supported than the signalised junction. Land-take, environmental and community impacts had also been raised.

### **4. Socioeconomics**

There had been general support for the strategy's aspirations, with questions on how and why ambitions would be achieved. There had, however, been recognition of the potential impact on tourism and existing sectors.

### **5. Accommodation**

There had been recognition of benefits, though similar issues had been raised across all three options with little preference given to any. Some had sought more dispersed, smaller campuses. There had been a focus on the siting of the campus in the context of the landscape designations. Option 2.ii had been recognised for a potential off-site sports pitch legacy benefit. The main

development site campus option had been regarded as appropriate, though EDF Energy was aware of other suggestions. The importance of design was understood and would be consulted on.

## **6. Engagement Going Forward**

Carly Vince reported that EDF Energy would work with stakeholders to refine strategies, which would inform proposals. Stage 2 feedback would be reviewed alongside the outcomes from ongoing technical and environmental studies.

## **V. Question & Answer**

### **1. Main Site**

Therese Coffey MP, asked for elaboration on the acceptability of borrow pit height. Hugh Hutton explained that the borrow pits would not have significant height, though the height would be raised slightly on completion. A temporary spoil storage area, rather than a higher borrow pit, was proposed. The proposals showed the maximum height.

Therese Coffey MP, asked for a timeline on the borrow pits and storage area. Hugh Hutton said that the period would be a few years, though the peak usage period would likely be less than a year. Jim Crawford encouraged people to visit the CGI tool in the Leiston office.

Stephen Brett stated that EastBridge is lower lying than the proposed field, meaning that the borrow pits would appear more like 50 to 60 metres tall. He asked how spoil would be prevented from being windblown. Hugh Hutton replied that all practical means would be used to avoid windblown material. There would be a requirement to monitor air quality and comply with conditions – and techniques were available to mitigate this.

Simon Amstutz questioned whether the Stage 3 consultation would be informed by the Stage 2 consultation in seeking to measure the damage to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty using the document produced by the EDF Energy and AONB partnership. Ian Bryant said that that document had been useful. That document would be published during Stage 3, referencing the design and landscape of the development.

Bryn Griffiths stated that the generic design of Sizewell C was fixed, meaning that the minimal design standards of Sizewell B could not be achieved. Hugh Hutton said that the safety case had specific requirements, some of which were limiting. The Sizewell C reactor buildings would be set back from the coast and less dominant. The turbine halls nearest the coast would be more prominent. Ian Bryant added that the Sizewell B dome was the most visible element. The turbine halls would be dominant structures, for which there was design flexibility. Sizewell B should remain the visual focal point.

Joan Girling questioned whether that coastal squeeze of Sizewell A, B and C had been considered and whether the site as designed would remain the same size. Ian Bryant responded that the proposed sea defences would come out further into the coast.

### **2. Transport**

Roy Dowding questioned whether EDF Energy would make traffic modelling data available for public analysis. He also asked whether consideration had been given to the A1120/A12 junction. Richard Bull replied that microsimulation modelling had been conducted. That information would be shared in advance of Stage 3.

Kenneth Parry Brown noted that EDF Energy had only referred to their own Stage 2 Consultation options. He questioned whether others' responses had been considered. Richard Bull responded

that they were consulting upon their own options and the received feedback. EDF Energy would continue to work with Suffolk County Council on their proposed four-village bypass. Mitigation for EDF Energy's scheme was the focus. Carly Vince commented that other suggestions on campus and B1122 proposals were being considered.

Pat Hogan questioned whether EDF Energy could provide reassurance about using a separate access road to Lover's Lane. Furthermore, the proposed caravan site would exacerbate Lover's Lane traffic. Richard Bull replied that the green rail route would mean a period of using Lover's Lane to access the site. If the second rail option was selected, there would be more long-term movements on Lover's Lane. Rebecca Calder added that Stage 2 had proposed caravan use on land of the east of Eastlands Industrial Estate. More detail would be provided at Stage 3 on its impact. EDF Energy would also discuss with the district council changes to licensing arrangements.

Therese Coffey MP asked what process EDF Energy would take to demonstrate that feedback on other road schemes, particularly D2 and D4, had been addressed. Additionally, she asked for further clarity on later transport works in Saxmundham and Wickham Market. Richard Bull responded that traffic flows and impacts had to be reviewed with the mitigation built consequently. Further assessments would determine whether Stage 2 proposals could be progressed. D2 could not be assessed separately because mitigation needed to be appropriate for the development. Jim Crawford added that the transport access to B1122 was one of the most challenging items. Alternative access roads would be considered alongside proposals. On the transport question, Richard Bull said that Network Rail had been helpful through the process. Network Rail had to integrate into the current service. The single-track element had to be split. Feedback on the passing loop at Campsea Ashe had been negative. There was an issue with the capacity of the signal box at Saxmundham. Network Rail proposals did not form part of the current DCO.

Edwina Galloway questioned whether EDF Energy accepted that their car-sharing ambitions were low. Richard Bull responded that the home-based assumption was expected to be low. The non-home-based worker assumption was 1.6. He believed the figures were realistic. Edwina Galloway advised re-evaluating the figures. Richard Bull said that the figures fed into traffic modelling. Figures could be higher but the assumption had to be realistic. Carly Vince added that measures trialled at Hinkley would be reviewed.

Alan Porter commented that traffic time could be increased due to the impact of level crossings. He was amazed that had not been considered. Richard Bull said that that would be considered.

Argus Gathorne-Hardy stated that traffic modelling seemed geared towards the construction period and questioned what impact the decommissioning of A and B would have on routes such as B1122. Richard Bull responded that the traffic modelling and mitigation done to date informed Stage 2. Operational modelling would be conducted, though not to the extent of decommissioning. Jim Crawford added that the B station could operate for approximately another 40 years. Sizewell A's decommissioning was already planned. Carly Vince explained that Sizewell C decommissioning was subject to the Government's requirement for new build developers to provide a funded decommissioning plan upfront with their application for development consent.

Ray Clune queried whether the road traffic monitoring cameras erected in the village were EDF Energy's and whether the data was shared with parish councils. There was concern about traffic pinch-points. Richard Bull confirmed that the cameras were EDF Energy's, erected to understand the problem with traffic flows. The Wickham Market exhibition had indicated the concerns on traffic flow on the B1078. The current position and additional impact had to be understood.

### 3. Socioeconomic

John Dugmore said that he had visited Hinkley, where he had been advised that £500 million of supply chain activity had gone to local and regional businesses. He asked for assurances that similar figures would be at least equalled for Sizewell C. Rebecca Calder replied that there was approximately an annual £200 million provided to the Hinkley local economy, a third of which was supply chain. The companies currently registered on the Sizewell C supply chain database could be mapped against local Hinkley contracts and people and companies from Suffolk could therefore have the opportunity to win contracts at Hinkley, as well as HPC companies sharing knowledge with Suffolk businesses.

### 4. Accommodation

Stephen Brett questioned whether EDF Energy would work with the district council to explore the potential of the changing laws on legacy housing relating to major infrastructure projects and investigate alternative sites for the campus, including split sites. Rebecca Calder confirmed that EDF Energy would do so, but appropriate project accommodation had to be delivered for workers. EDF Energy would look at all Stage 2 feedback, and take account of current tourism accommodation, the private rented sector and new builds. A balance of accommodation would be sought whilst trying to avoid the impact on tourism and the property market.

Therese Coffey MP asked what proportion was expected to be housed in temporary residences. Rebecca Calder responded that there were 3,200 workers expected to move to the area. 370 were predicted in the tourism population and the private rental sector. Longer-term workers might buy.

### 5. General

Malcolm Robinson stated that he felt unable to express to councillors and residents what the public in general had fed back to EDF Energy and, in turn, was unable to judge whether EDF Energy had taken notice of the feedback. He added that the Suffolk Coastal District Council had an option to create thousands more houses on the A12 corridor up to Saxmundham. He questioned how that was being taken account of. Carly Vince responded that today she had reported on a flavour of the issues raised; as part of the Stage 3 Consultation, further detail would be provided. Malcolm Robinson suggested showing a weight of where public opinion currently lay. Jim Crawford said that that was difficult to do but he wanted to demonstrate what had been said and how EDF Energy had responded at the end of the process. EDF Energy had to think about how subjective data could be best presented. Tom McGarry said that a consultation report would be submitted with the development consent application. Adequacy of consultation would be a key test that would need to be satisfied and EDF Energy was meeting the spirit and letter of its Statement on Community Consultation.

## VI. Next Meeting

Brian Stewart thanked everybody for attending. There was no date set for the next meeting but it was agreed that EDF Energy would present an update on its activities to the Forum during summer 2018.

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