

Meeting Report

Regarding:

EDF Hinkley Point C: Community Forum.

Date: Thursday 19th September 2024 - 6pm

Meeting held at:

Bridgwater & Taunton College, Cannington

Participating:

Doug Bamsey, *Chair*

Allan Jeffery (AJ), *Green Party*

Justin Sargent (JS), *Somerset Community Foundation*

Sue Goss (SG), *Stogursey Parish Council*

Richard Cuttell (RC), *W.H.A.G.*

Stuart Hill (SH), *C.H.A.I.R & Wildfowlers*

Rosemary Woods (RW), *Somerset Council*

Joanna Whitehead (JW), *Somerset Council*

John Burton (JB), *Somerset Council*

Alex Lord (AL), *Environment Agency*

Alun Griffiths (AG), *Office for Nuclear Regulation*

Michael Featherstone (MF), *Cannington Parish Council*

David Woan (DW), *Somerset Council*

Valdo Andrade (VA), *Avon & Somerset Police*

Mike Haycraft (MH), *Otterhampton Parish Council*

Paul Crosland (PC), *Fiddington Parish Council*

Roy Pumfrey (RP), *Stop Hinkley*

Leigh Redman (LR), *Bridgwater Town Council*

Sarah Nason (SN), *Holford Parish Council*

EDF Team:

Andrew Cockcroft (AC), *EDF*

Nick Stone (NS), *EDF*

Stacy Walker (SW), *EDF*

Hayley Critchley (HC), *EDF (Sizewell C)*

Drew Aspinwall (DA), *SEC Newgate UK*

Matthew Williams (MW), *SEC Newgate UK*

Apologies received:

John Roberts (JR), *Nether Stowey Parish Council*

Gill Slocombe (GS), *Somerset Council*

Sue Spicer (SS), *Burton Resident*

In addition to the forum meeting notes and agendas, all presentations and reports are available at www.edfenergy.com/hpccommunity

Item		Action
1	Introductions	
1.1	Doug Bamsey ('The Chair') welcomed everyone to the meeting, ran through the venue arrangements and forum protocols, and invited all attendees to introduce themselves.	
2	Meeting Note and Matters Arising	
2.1	The Chair reviewed the previous Community Forum meeting note from 16th May 2024 including the actions and after-notes and invited any further comment. AFTERNOTE 5.17: AC explained that within the Socio-Economy Advisory Group (SEAG) more localised data will be reported; coming forward from centres of excellence there is more localised information – giving a more detailed set of intelligence. This is relatively new, but something that EDF can do more of in future. SG replied that she's particularly interested in the West Somerset area, given levels of deprivation. AC said that there have been 8,000 people trained in centres of excellence so far. The vast majority of these are from the county of Somerset; 1/3 of these are from most deprived areas.	
2.2	There were no further comments and the meeting note was agreed.	
3	Project Progress Update_– (Andrew Cockcroft, Nick Stone - EDF)	
3.1	Project Update video Members were shown a Project Update video featuring Site Manager Simon Parsons.	
3.2	Turbine hall - Excellent progress is being made to the external cladding of the turbine hall – an essential step before components are installed. - HPC expect the cladding work to be completed by the end of October 2024, at which point the full mechanical and electrical fit out can be begin. - Both the 20 and 40 tonne cranes have been energised, ready for use in the component installation phase.	
3.3	Preparations for RPV installation - At the end of August, the final set of columns for the Hatch Transfer System (HTS) were installed, completing the six columns needed for the system and bridge installation located on the Fuel Building. - Construction has also commenced on the Outside Lifting System (OLS) with the base plates and counterweights already installed and the 40-metre-tall column in progress.	

3.4	Flamanville – start-up process • The first ‘criticality’ (first nuclear reaction) took place on Tuesday 3rd September at 3.54pm French time • This is an important milestone in the start-up operations of the plant. • It is currently at 0.2% of rated power, this will gradually ramp up to 25%. • At that point it will be connected to the national grid for the first time and generate electricity (expected by late autumn). RP pointed out how over budget and behind schedule Flamanville is, AC agreed with this that it’s significantly behind scheduled, and said that it means that HPC can learn some lessons from this. RW said does this mean that having learned this, HPC should be on time? AC replied that HPC’s challenges have been different to Flamanville. RP stated that David Eccles used to say repeatedly that HPC would cost £20billion and be completed by 2025 – AC replied that he has updated members many times on costs and why the project is where it is in its timeline. AFTERNOTE: Flamanville 3 was connected to the grid on 21st December 2024 and is now fully operational.	AFTERNOTE
3.5	Transport and logistics • An expanding requirement for covered storage space for pipework and cabling before installation at HPC. • MEH Alliance considering the use of further off-site warehouse space at Junction 24. • Potential to phase refurbishment work across the site and make use of the excellent location close to existing HPC infrastructure.	
3.6	Transport and logistics – C182 With surveys now complete, work to repair the C182 will be completed over the coming months and split into phases. <u>Preparatory phase from Monday 16 September to Friday 27 September</u> • There will be rolling single lane closures in place each weekday from 0900-1530. This has been specifically agreed in order to avoid the peak travelling times to and from HPC Site. • Overnight phased road closures then follow on weekdays between 1900 and 0500, affecting different sections of the road from the Cannington Roundabout to the HPC Southern Roundabout. • Phase 1 from Monday 23 September to Friday 04 October - There will be overnight weeknight road closures between 1900 and 0500 approaching the Burton/Shurton junction from the South.	

3.6.1 3.6.2	• Phase 2 from Monday 07 October to Friday 11 October - overnight weeknight road closures between 1900 and 0500 on the stretch of road from the Burton / Shurton junction to the HPC Southern Roundabout • Phase 3 / 4 from Monday 14 October to Friday 25 October - overnight weeknight road closures between 1900 and 0500 between the Cannington roundabout and Burton/Shurton junction. RC asked if lorries were being diverted when the road is closed; AC replied that HGVs aren't operating during those hours. RC then said that the road is closing at 7 or 7.30pm but lorries are operating until 9.30? AC mentioned that deliveries are in very low numbers at that period of the day and some won't be able to fit. RC then said that traffic lights and cones have been left on the road even though it wasn't being worked on, which was dangerous for traffic and buses passing. The Chair asked if there was a number to ring and how to best alert authorities to issues like this. JW commented that there would be a number in the communications for people to ring. SH asked if the sign to Combech would be reinstated – SW replied that the roadsign itself requires a lorry crane to lift and is taken down when there are ALL movements. HPC are investigating replacing the sign with an easier version which does not require a crane to lift – she will check when it will be put back up.	
3.7 3.7.1	DCO Material Change Update AC gave a reminder of the process through which the DCO Material Change application needs to pass. AC thanked everyone for their feedback and consultation responses; off the back of these the Project has made some modifications. Changes to three weirs were proposed. All work and surveys of Pawlett Hams area will cease, some of the environmental designations of the area would make a saltmarsh scheme difficult, as is the strength of public feeling. This means that other mitigatory habitats will need to be explored, and the Project are exploring options and locations where this could take place – in a variety of places. Conversations with these communities, individuals, MPs and parish councils have and will continue to take place. This will be continued until a second phase of consultation which will take place in 2025. All of this information will be packaged and the most suitable areas selected – this will then be included in the application. JB asked that if alternative sites haven't been determined, once there is an agreement with the landowners, presumably HPC will have to collate 1 year's of biodiversity information to assess the impact – how will this be done before April 2025? AC replied that it is possible to add data as addenda to the application.	

3.7.2 3.7.3	SH pointed out that Gloucester wildfowlers bought an area and converted into marshland, there could be potential synergy with this Project? AC thanked SH for this. SG asked who was heading up the application now that Andrew Goodchild has left the project? NS replied that John Pingstone is at present, and that a replacement for AG will start work later in the autumn, but they will modify John's role into a DCO Delivery Manager – with the rest of AG's portfolio being taken on by the new colleague. RP asked that the issue with Pawlett was that it is already mitigation for landfill site nearby? AC said that there are a number of different technical elements, one of the biggest complexities has been the SSSI designation, meaning that the project is essentially having to 'mitigate for mitigation.' AC concluded by saying that the Project continues to believe that saltmarsh is a good thing with many benefits. But saltmarsh needs to work with people too, hence why HPC are working with local partners on any future project.	
3.8 3.8.1	Workforce uplift update NS continued the presentation by giving an update on workforce uplift. Since May's forum, HPC have been working with Somerset Council on a detailed plan. The key to the process is the detailed spatial distribution note. LR asked about the timescale; saying it looked like a couple of months from when topic papers land to decision. NS replied that this is the aspiration, it could be that there are suggested amendments etc. LR asked how many topic papers there are – to which NS replied there are 7. LR asked if workforce levels have been breached, and that members have been asking for these papers for a few months now. NS replied that none of these things are sequentially staged, topic papers are written by different subject matter experts. LR asked if the spatial distribution paper would be backdated, given that number has been exceeded for a while now? NS said that the recognition is that the Project is on an upward curve, and that potentially peak workforce has not been reached. The 12,000 referred to the video is anticipated not the actual current figure. The reason for flexibility is the	

	workforce wants to be grown - particularly in MEH, when some further specialist contractors will be brought in, which will bring the number up further. The model is based on peak and then a dropping away in numbers so that further mitigation is not needed. LR said there needed to be realism about the process and the timeline. Previous conversations have been had about the realism of the spatial distribution – but there are more people now than anticipated and in workforce uplift. NS said that the first element is that this process is not being delayed so that the workforce number will drop. Consultations have produced a realistic range of workforce numbers, the upper figure is being used as the figure for mitigation. NS repeated that the topic papers are already underway, unless something comes up which challenges assumptions or the numbers in the papers.	
3.8.2	JB thanked LR for his questions. He suggested that the timeline is not reasonable, the Council gave EDF a response to the latest iteration of the Spatial Distribution Note (SDN) that was provided to the council in September. EDF's response has not been received and yet the Project are expecting a decision in two months. JB pointed out that this is unlikely, and from a Council perspective that this won't be achieved by the end of the year. He stated Somerset Council's willingness to work with EDF on this.	
3.8.3	The Chair echoed the Forum's concern to get progress on this. SH said that mitigations have been put in place previously, and that some people were disappointed by these because of levels of activity. He also asked where the referencing baselines were in the DCO; and then mentioned a few examples. SH asked when the general public would be asked for their views on this, as some were disappointed in previous mitigation measures? He felt the process seemed rushed and people are fatigued by it. This is a complex process and agreed that the timescale seems unrealistic. AC replied that there is a process using the Local Community Networks (LCNs), invited JW to give a reply too.	
3.8.4	What is known is that collective mitigations and partnerships that now exist are working, even with a higher workforce. Even though the current figure is 10,000, up from 5,600, but in terms of key impacts there are very stable figures, which will be seen later in the presentation. There isn't a correlation between impact and workforce numbers (other than accommodation), some of which (eg. accommodation and transport) are more important than others in terms of impact. JW said that she had sympathy with the views on how long this will take, things are moving faster than in workforce uplift 1. Yet none of this is done quickly. She	

3.8.5 3.8.6 3.8.7 3.8.8 3.8.9	agreed that this timescale is ambitious, and a number of conversations between Somerset Council and EDF have taken place, time is needed to consider the documents and validate the information given. The difference with this process is that it is outside of the normal planning regime and not a planning application (mitigation is on a voluntary basis from EDF). Engagement needs to take place with the most affected communities, hence why the Local Community Networks were mentioned. The Council wants to run a process that gives members and communities the reassurance that things have been conducted properly. SH gave the example of people raising with him that more than 3 buses are travelling in a 5 minute period. He stated that this is what people see on the ground and undermines public trust in the process. AC said that he recognises that this is a long-running thing for SH, but that HPC does not recognise any formal limit on buses in a set period and it is not a DCO requirement. LR said that his fear was that EDF will hand everything to Somerset Council and then blame them for a lack of progress. He repeated fears that the timescale wasn't realistic and asks HPC to be honest with members. NS replied that this plan was developed in collaboration with Somerset Council and not developed independently and acknowledge the timescales were ambitious. The Chair said that a considered and consistent view was needed on this. SG said that at the start of the project assurances were given that buses would be released at 3 minute intervals. She pointed out that unlike coming from Bridgwater, leaving site and coming up C182 buses shouldn't be realised in convoys. SG also asked how many of these in Somerset will be contacted? JW replied that it will be the closest 4 – AFTERNOTE these are: LCN13 - Minehead and Watchet LCN14 - Dowsborough LCN6 - Burnham LCN8 - Bridgwater RC said that DCO clearly said nothing about buses but the promise was previously given (SH interjected a memorandum of understanding?) HPC has total control over the reversing sounders and is fed up with vehicles ignoring this. The Chair suggested that buses and vehicles was a matter for the Transport Forum.	AFTERNOTE ACTION AC/NS
---	--	--

	RP pointed out that if 5,600 workers were supposed to complete HPC by 2025 and 12,000 unlikely to by 2031, hasn't the law of diminishing returns gone into overdrive here? NS said that RP made a good point regarding diminishing returns - peak workforce has an impact on efficiency when there are too many people on site at HPC. He said that this comes back to getting and identifying the right work pattern with contractors. NS reiterated that the upper figure is being used so that there isn't a danger of 'under mitigation.' The Chair thanked members for a good debate and questions. LR then encouraged the early circulation of potential joint Forum dates, which was agreed.	
3.9	Pre-submitted question Operation Harold - "The above emergency route through Stogursey Parish has been somewhat neglected by Somerset Highways over the last few years. The white and yellow road markings have been virtually obliterated by normal road traffic use and are now barely visible to road users . The route from the C182 through Shurton and Burton to the A39 is particularly affected- as is the Stringston to Stogursey route - where the road junction markings are no longer visible. As a direct result of this particular failure in maintenance of the latter, several accidents have occurred resulting in vehicles failing to stop at the junction and crashing into to hedgerow across the carriageway. This situation needs rectifying asap particularly as a section of it also provides the Emergency Access Route from HPC in addition to Operation Harold." <i>Submitted by Sue Goss, Stogursey Parish Council</i> Answer: AC said that from an HPC perspective they can help with signage.	
3.9.1	SG then said that the white and yellow lining is virtually obliterated and encouraged HPC to put pressure on Somerset Highways to carry this out as it's a safety issue due to absence of double white lines. AC agreed this would be a good time to do this while the right people are present JW said that previously the portal address was given to a parish council colleague, has this happened with this one?	

	SG replied that it hadn't, but JW recommended that Stogursey Parish Council submit their observations to be picked up by Highways so it is formally recognised by Somerset Council. SG said she feared that it won't be carried out for a while but hoped that it could be expedited given the importance of the route to HPC vehicles.	
3.10	Pre-submitted questions Sewage - "Please confirm at what distance is the sewage outfall point in the Channel from HPC." - "What measures are you proposing to take to ensure that the increase in the volume of effluent to be disposed of in the Bristol Channel from HPC will not have adverse impacts on our coastline, wildlife and the well-used beach at Shurton Bars?" - "Are you able to confirm how frequently water quality in the area close to the disposal point will be monitored and by which agency- and will these outcomes be made available to the public? (I understand that the on-site Sewage works will be monitored by EDF)" <i>Submitted by Sue Goss, Stogursey Parish Council</i> AC gave a broad overview of sewage treatment at HPC with full detail in the below afternote. Afternote: Effluent is currently discharged from HPC site from the end of the jetty (500m offshore), this treated and tested effluent and not raw sewage and a clear distinction should be made to some of wider un-controlled discharges into waterways made by utility companies across the UK in the event of heavy rainfall. HPC has full control over the discharges from the jetty and sewage is treated on site in a specialist facility (The HAJ building). This is a biological treatment plant but also includes an additional UV treatment phase before it is tested and only released if it means the standards set by the Environment Agency. Recently, a permit variation was carried out to parts of sewage effluent that could be discharged. This permit variation was approved in 2024. The reason for this was to allow for the variations that can occur on a construction site – such as fluctuations in workforce numbers on site during the. As mentioned above, the treated effluent has to meet high standards and there is monitoring by both HPC and the EA. There is a monitoring regime within the system. The process also includes an Operator Self-Monitoring Scheme. Within this Wessex Water are mandated to monitor HPC's discharges 12 times a year – this is reported into the EA and the results are publicly available.	AFTERNOTE

3.10.1

Pre-submitted question
Sewage

- “Increasing worker numbers at HPC will inevitably put further pressure on an already inadequate sewage treatment system. The modelling for this was flawed from the outset and it has only been possible to cope with the current level of sewage produced on site by tankering raw sewage from HPC to Avonmouth for two years. What does EdeF intend to do that will make the HPC sewage treatment plant fit for purpose and capable of dealing with thousands more workers?”
Submitted by Roy Pumfrey, Stop Hinkley

Answer:

AC replied that there was a period where sewage was tankered off site, whilst the new HAJ facility was being put in place. With the treatment facility now operational HPC are no longer tankering as part of day-to-day operations. There may be some infrequent use of tankers as part of normal operations to remove “sludge” which is a by-product from sewage treatment. Future proofing the HAJ building is possible as it is modular and can be extended.

SG asked for confirmation that no solids are discharged into the Channel, is water monitored by WW?

AC confirmed this and said that the self-monitoring scheme is conducted by Wessex Water. The testing process also includes an Operator Self-Monitoring Scheme. Within this Wessex Water are mandated to monitor HPC’s discharges 12 times a year – this is reported into the EA and the results are publicly available.

SG said that the application to the EA was misleading because HPC said it would be monitoring things themselves.

AC said that HPC do monitor this, and refer themselves to the EA if it goes above any limits.

3.10.2

RP asked how many more modular units were put in from 5,600 to 8,600 workers, and how many more will be put in for 12,000?

AC said that he was unaware of the figure, but that when the workforce was at 5,600 the facility was very different.

At present, the new HAJ facility is fit for purpose. There is scope for additional modular infrastructure within the HAJ platform so more units could be added if they were to be needed for further increases in workforce numbers in the future.

AL (EA) gave input from the EA side. The decision document is available on the permit variation containing the reasons given for approval. In terms of water quality, there is independent monitoring, HPC must flag non-compliance and provide monitoring. There are two other directives – the water framework directive which looks at water bodies as a whole and provides monitoring; other is

AFTERNOTE

3.10.3	bathing water directives – AL is unaware of any designated areas but will check and find out. AFTERNOTE: AL will provide further information at January 2025's Community Forum. SG pointed out that a lot of people use the area by the jetty but would be interested to know the figures as it is popular. AJ said that when the permit was changed, it related to Acoustic Fish Deterrent as well. Millions more dead fish will be sent out over the 60 years, the change to the permit about the effect of extra dead fish would have on living habitat environment. It seems that this has been 'washed away' because of the tidal nature of the estuary. AL clarified that there were two changes, one to the construction water discharge permit, the other to the operational water discharge (which includes the AFD). This regulates discharge, the intake is regulated through the DCO. SG said that her understanding was the jetty would be out of life in 2025, where will sewage outfall from HPC be located? AFTERNOTE The jetty remains an important element of the process and remains well within its design life. The project is considering the timelines for transitioning to the operational sewage disposal process.	AFTERNOTE
4	Item 4: Office for Nuclear Regulation Report	
4.1	AG updated members on the ONR's activities in the first three quarters of 2024: In this period, routine inspections (including unannounced inspections) of the Hinkley Point C site covered: - plant construction and/or commissioning; - radiography - quality assurance and records; - organisational capability, including the function of the Internal Regulator; - conventional (non-nuclear) health and safety, including life fire safety; - security ONR continues its engagement with the project via regular site inspections, visits and meetings at NNB GenCo (HPC) Ltd's offices and supplier locations across the following themes: • design and safety case; • organisational capability (including supply chain and quality); • pre-operations; • conventional health and safety and fire safety; and • security.	

	These inspections, along with routine contact with other international regulatory bodies provide ONR with valuable intelligence on the progress NNB GenCo (HPC) Ltd is making developing its competence and capability to manage the design, procurement, and construction of HPC and will inform future permissioning decisions.	
4.2	Permissioning - The RPV installation will be a major permissioning point, using primary powers. - In advance of major permissioning points the ONR will continue to apply flexible permissioning to allow the start of a number of other activities. - ONR concluded flexible permissioning in relation to the commencement of early commissioning activities on Low Voltage switchboards.	
4.3	Non-routine matters - The investigations into the tragic fatality that occurred on site in November 2022 and the separate event at site that resulted in a worker sustaining injuries as a result of a rebar mesh wall falling continue. - At this time, we are unable to provide further details about the ongoing investigations as these remain live inquiries. - Dutyholders have complied with enforcement notices served under the fire safety reform order. These notices were served in relation to conventional health and safety matters and not nuclear related safety matters.	
4.4	Pre-submitted question Design changes - "The simmering dispute between ONR and EdeF regarding 7,000 HPC design changes that EdeF alleges ONR has forced them to make erupted again recently when ONR published another rapid refuting following repetition of these claims in The Times. As the local ONR Inspector, how does the design for HPC appear to you compared to what was submitted in the 2012 DCO Application?" <i>Submitted by Roy Pumfrey, Stop Hinkley</i> Answer: AG gave some clarification that he wouldn't describe it as a 'simmering dispute' but ONR was giving context to the situation in relation what the regulator saw as inaccurate. For AG it's about the ONR being seen as an independent regulator. If members hadn't seen, on the ONR website there is some detailed analysis undertaken. 7,500. Many of those changes come from a variety of factors, some UK regulatory, some Fukushima enhancements, other international enhancements and standards, international good practice, some enforced by EDF themselves, this isn't about the ONR 'over regulating.'	

4.4.1 4.4.2	They do consider them to be proportionate improvements and in line with international standards. As regulator, it's the ONR's job for the protection of the community and workforce that it upholds the highest standards of safety. RP thanked AG for his comprehensive answer. RP felt that a nerve was touched with the ONR; he had never seen the ONR respond in less than a week to what must have been a stinging criticism. AG says this is fair, but as an independent body it wanted to correct what it saw as misleading statements in the press. SH said it might be useful for the forum if the ONR produced a briefing note but information is hidden. AG much of the learning is the responsibility of the duty holder. The ONR sits in a monthly meeting, going through each and every lower tier report. AJ asked for clarification on the cap on the RPV at HPC was forged in Japan, not France. At Flamanville, they are still attempting to go ahead with cap of RPV carbon content irregularities. French authorities were saying they would have to take the top off the reactor in France as they are unsure as to the strength and safety. AG said that issues with carbon content occurred before AG began work with HPC and can't comment on that. He assured AJ that the RPV at HPC has been and is going through a rigorous assessment process by the ONR; they have been to Japan to see the data etc. AJ said it will be interesting to see where Flamanville is in a few years.	
5	Item 5: Community Fund Update	
5.1	JS updated members that the SCF is inching towards £10m in grants awarded, this milestone may be achieved by the time of the next forum. JS provided an update of projects that had recently received funds: - ST. Margaret's hospice applied for funds towards a community nurse for the TA5 postcode area. They help on average 69 people a year in that postcode alone. £132,000 over 3 years. - The Hub @ Bridgwater, based in Angel Place in Bridgwater, they have lost that facility. Some funds given to hopefully set up a new, bigger centre on the edge of the town. They were hosting 10 community groups to 25. Funding places and space where community 'stuff' can happen, and JS said that this is a great example of that. SCF prefers to speak to applicants before they put an application in.	
6	Item 6: Main Site Forum 20 June 2024 - (Chair)	

6.1	The Chair apologised that the most recent Meeting Note was not yet available (now available here).	
7	Item 7: Transport Forum 11 July 2024 - (Chair)	
7.1	The Chair apologised that the most recent Meeting Note was not yet available (now available here).	
8	Item 8: Any Other Business	
8.1	SH mentioned that high speed motorcyclists have reappeared, somewhere between 6 and 10 of them at a time. He wondered if something could be done about this. AC said that they can get the policing team on that.	ACTION AC.
8.1.2	MF raised the issue of maintenance and grasscutting of the Cannington bypass – he requested assistance with this as it seems excessively steep and needs specialist equipment and yet the PC is charged with doing this. AC replied that this is a new element to previous discussion. There are different areas that come under different bodies – HPC has a cutting regime.	
8.1.3	SH said that turning into Combswich is dangerous because of areas that are overgrown. SH is trying to find out who is responsible for this – JW suggested that SH reports this using the portal. AFTERNOTE: The portal address is: www.somerset.gov.uk/roads-travel-and-parking/report-a-problem-on-the-road/	AFTERNOTE
8.1.4	SW said that a communication that during the w/c 30 th September there will be 4 AILs from Combswich to site over 4 separate days, two of which will be during the week. HPC is usually keen to avoid using midweek slots, the spate of bad weather recently forced cancellation of these moves – the weather meant the barge couldn't come into Combswich Wharf, meaning that these now need to be delivered in a shorter period of time. The duration of these is up to 2 ½ / 3 hours, setting off from Combswich just after 10am to avoid busy periods. On Saturdays and Sundays the usual routine will be followed, leaving early morning to travel up to site. The usual email with all the dates and times will go out tomorrow. SG asked about an AIL this Sunday. SH asked if members could be informed what the deliveries were.	
8.1.5	AL said that it had been a while since the EA attended Forums regularly and offered an update on regulatory activities, which was welcomed by members.	
8.1.6	AJ said he disagreed with using term 'zero carbon' electricity, whereas there is low carbon electricity. He said that DESNZ etc agree.	



9	Item 9: Date of next Community Forum	
9.1	The next Community Forum will be held on Thursday 16 th January 2025 at 6pm.	
9.2	The meeting ended.	