

Meeting Report

Regarding:

EDF Hinkley Point C: Community Forum.

Participating:

Doug Bamsey, *Chair*

John Burton (JB), *Somerset Council*

Allan Jeffery (AJ), *Green Party*

Justin Sargent (JS), *Somerset Community Foundation*

Amelia Thompson (AT), *Somerset Community Foundation*

Peter Payne (PP), *Williton Parish Council*

Chris Morgan (CM), *Stogursey Parish Council*

Mike Haycraft (MH), *Otterhampton Parish Council*

Joanna Whitehead (JW), *Somerset Council*

Nicola Hale (NH), *Somerset Council*

Jon Ayers (JA), *Environment Agency*

Alex Lord (AL), *Environment Agency*

Alun Griffiths (AG), *ONR*

Finlay Duff (FD), *ONR*

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

Sue Goss (SG), *Stogursey Parish Council*

Roy Pumfrey (RP), *Stop Hinkley*

Shaun Ryall (SR), *Cannington Parish Council*

Nic Pehkonen (NP), *Artist*

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

Steve Pettitt (SP), *Cannington Parish Council*

Rosemary Woods (RW), *Somerset Council*

Michael Featherstone (MF), *Cannington Parish Council*

Date: Thursday 16th January 2025 – 6pm

Meeting held at:

Bridgwater & Taunton College, Cannington

EDF Team:

Andrew Cockcroft (AC), *EDF*

Mounia Miguil (MM), *EDF*

Nick Stone (NS), *EDF*

Richard Clews (RC), *EDF*

Stacy Walker (SW), *EDF*

Jane Tomaney (JT), *EDF*

Matthew Williams (MW), *SEC Newgate UK*

Apologies received:

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

Sue Spicer (SS), *Burton Resident*

Hugh Davies (HD), *Somerset Council*

HPC Police

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	Previous Meeting Note and Matters Arising	
2.1	<p>The Chair reviewed the previous Community Forum meeting note from 19th September 2024 including the actions and after-notes and invited any further comment.</p> <p>2.1.1 SH mentioned that there were 8 or 9 buses in convoy and requested that the Transport Forum report back to the Community Forum. AC responded that this issue had been discussed previously and clarified that there is no stipulation in the DCO regarding the number of buses in convoy. While verbal agreements may have been made, there is no formal standing within the DCO.</p> <p>SG noted that EDF had mentioned a gap of 3 minutes between buses leaving the site, understanding the differences if traveling to or from the site. AC suggested having a detailed discussion at the Transport Forum about the impact on communities and will ensure Andy W is aware, proposing to unpack this issue at the Transport Forum in March.</p> <p>2.1.2 SW provided an update on motorcyclists, mentioning that Ewan Love (A&S Police, who leads on road traffic and safety) has done significant work along the C182, focusing on motorcycle users. All riders must complete the Raise my Ride course. Ewan is not aware of groups traveling to HPC, but A&S are aware of groups of riders through Somerset ending in Minehead and are investigating further. EL continues to work with local stakeholders to tackle unsafe riders and has removed parking rights for riders whose behaviour is unacceptable to the project.</p> <p>2.1.2 SH thanked SW and others for the update and noted that the vegetation has been mown to a suitable level.</p>	
2.2	There were no further comments, and the meeting note was agreed.	
3	Project Progress Update – (Andrew Cockcroft, Nick Stone - EDF)	
3.1	<p>A Year of Progress: AC highlighted progress made in 2024, with the RPV installation being the biggest item. He also showed members some other examples of progress from the past 12 months.</p> <p>There are a diverse set of activities planned for 2025 including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lifting of Unit 2's dome • Fit out of remote station shut down room • First concrete poured around spent fuel pond • Welding of the primary nuclear steam circuit • Installation of boric acid tank • Sections of the main turbine installed • Installation of safety injection pumps • Emergency diesel generators installed • Completion of safeguard buildings • Construction of Unit 1's pump house <p>There are four primary goals for the year ahead:</p>	

<p>3.1.1</p> <p>3.1.2</p> <p>3.1.3</p> <p>3.1.4</p> <p>3.1.5</p>	<p>Spent Fuel Pool</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Unit 1 Spent Fuel Pool is located inside the Fuel Building on the Nuclear Island. • Our goal will be to pour the first level of concrete around the base of the Spent Fuel Pool, allowing civils construction to progress before MEH equipment can be introduced. • The Fuel Building pools form part of the Reactor Cavity & Spent Fuel Pond Cooling & Treatment System (PTR System). This manages the cooling of the spent fuel once it's removed from the reactor. <p>Welding of the Primary Circuit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Primary Circuit is located inside the Reactor Building on the Nuclear Island. • Last year we installed the first component of the Primary Circuit – the Reactor Pressure Vessel. • Over the coming months we'll continue to install more components – such as the Steam Generators and legs which connect the equipment • The first weld will take place on the Reactor Pressure Vessel in the weeks ahead before completion of the circuit later in the year. <p>Unit 2 Dome Lift</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Big Carl will lift and place the 245t steel dome onto the second reactor building this year. • It will again be a big moment for the Project and an opportunity to demonstrate the learnings from Unit 1, as we continue to build the second reactor 20-30% quicker. • Placement of the dome is key to providing the correct environmental conditions inside the Reactor Building for the next stage on the path to RPV introduction. • It also signifies a shift in focus from civils to MEH ramp up on Unit 2 and the start of the installation of the primary circuit. <p>Safeguard Buildings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Safeguard Buildings are located in the Nuclear Island. • Our goal will be to complete the civil structures of the safeguard buildings allowing the rooms to be coated and handed to MEH for fit out. • The safeguard building surrounds the main reactor building and contains important rooms such as the Remote Station Shutdown and Main Control Room as well as being the interface between the Nuclear Island and the Conventional Island. <p>AC then showed members a view of where things will be at HPC by 2026. SG asked to be shown the interim spent fuel store and further questioned the design life. SG mentioned that the GDF might take 100 years, and AC responded that it would be a large, robust building. ACTION</p> <p>AFTERNOTE: The design life of the spent fuel store, once built, is 120 years. Set against the Government's target / position for a Geological Disposal Facility (GDF) ready by 2050 (intermediate waste) and for high level waste by 2075.</p>	<p>ACTION / AFTERNOTE AC</p>
<p>3.2</p>	<p>RPV Placement and Cooling Water Intakes</p> <p>AJ stated that when the RPV is placed into Unit 1, it must be placed through an equipment hatch and then lowered, stating that getting the steam generators in would be a long process. AC agreed and referenced the Outside Lifting System, which would remain in place to lift the steam generators, describing it as a very intricate manoeuvre.</p> <p>AJ enquired about the evidence of cooling water intakes when looking out to sea, questioning if the connection of the water tunnels had been completed. AC confirmed that the connections of the vertical with the horizontal were done. AJ asked about the interim store and concrete in</p>	

	<p>ponds, noting that spent fuel would be in those ponds for up to 10 years before being dried. AC mentioned that it could be removed quicker, but the capacity to store it for years is available, and removing it sooner would be beneficial. AJ stated that spent fuel stays in cooling water at A and B stations for 90 days before removal, corrected by SH to 100 days. AC added an afternote about the flow of the system rather than the need. SH asked if the tunnels were wet, and AC confirmed that they are connected but no water is flowing through them.</p>	
3.3	<p>Project Progress and Schedule</p> <p>RP recalled that exactly a year ago at the CF, AC offered an upbeat assessment of progress, followed by announcements of cost increases and delays five days later. RP asked if a similar update could be expected this year. AC remembered the moment well and clarified that he wasn't privy to that information when he gave the update. He restated that there is a clear and reasonable schedule extending to the end of the decade, with a worst-case scenario schedule to 2031. The intent and ability of the project to deliver Unit 1 by the end of the decade remains achievable, with positive steps and efficiency gains speeding up Unit 2, providing confidence. However, unknown issues that the project may face in the coming years cannot be discounted. AC categorically stated that there won't be a similar announcement this year.</p>	
3.4	<p>Education Outreach Programme</p> <p>In 2024, the Project engaged with 66 education establishments, 30% of which came from within 10 miles of the HPC site. The most frequent visitors included Bridgwater and Taunton College, and Bridgwater College Academy.</p> <p>More than 2,750 people have been engaged with face-to-face. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 74 Sealed Tours • 70 visitor centre trips • 137 presentations • 9 school workshops • 7 visits to schools 	
3.5	<p>DCO Material Change Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HPC continues to move through the process for a material change to Hinkley Point C's Development Consent Order. • Proposed changes include a change to "dry" spent fuel storage and environmental mitigation for the removal of the acoustic fish deterrent. • Although creating saltmarsh, among other measures, is the only option currently likely to be accepted as mitigation, it remains HPC's preference to find voluntary ways to meet the Project's obligations. • In order to give time to carefully evaluate the best approach, the planned public consultation will now be carried out later in 2025. 	
3.5	<p>Workforce Location and Mitigation</p> <p>NS introduced Richard Clews as the new planning manager, who joined in December.</p> <p>NS updated members that since the last CF in September, feedback about timescales from members has been taken on board. The project could base mitigation on current numbers or peak numbers, but the most important aspect is getting the right mitigation in place. Conversations have taken place with various stakeholders, including Somerset Council, to establish a realistic timeline.</p>	

The workforce location in relation to their communities was discussed, showing the workforce limit at peak and the mitigation from that point. A spatial meeting note was distributed to Somerset Council, which provided HPC with a response on 20th December, aiming to agree on the note with the Council and move onto the topic papers. Next steps involve a meeting and discussion with the Council to address each point and agree on positions, allowing HPC to approve the SDN.

Meanwhile, the project has been working on other elements, such as accommodation and parking, to ensure the site functions for the maximum number of workers. The project is addressing accommodation requirements in the interim and will receive residual input from Somerset Council.

NS mentioned that RP had asked about diminishing returns, and HPC needed to restructure provisions on site and prepare welfare facilities and offices. Project papers can then be progressed after the meeting, leading to engagement and agreement on these elements through Q1. The S106 agreement is to be agreed during Q2, in response to feedback from stakeholders and forum members.

3.5.1 This update was also the answer to a pre-submitted question:

“Is there an update available on your discussions with Somerset Council regarding potential mitigations for the proposed Workforce increase?”

- Submitted by Sue Goss, Stogursey Parish Council

SG suggested that Somerset Council is far from communities affected by HPC and emphasized the need to ensure local issues are properly addressed. JW explained that in Workforce Uplift 1, the step SG mentioned didn't take place, leading to the inclusion of LCNs.

JW reassured members that the process is simplified for presentation purposes, with other processes within each topic paper. EDF revisits the original agreement under the DCO to determine if mitigation can be provided, and the Council decides whether to agree with EDF's assessment.

The amended strategy affects the s106 obligation, monitored and challenged through SEAG and the TRG, with stakeholders raising concerns.

SH asked to go back one stage, because a lot of work was put in. How and who are holding HPC's feet to the fire over this? Suggested he had heard these sorts of things before. Asked how HPC would be held to the agreement that would take place between them and the Council.

The Chair suggested that this could be asked at a joint Forum.

AC addressed SH's comments about mitigations not being delivered, reiterating that the door is always open for discussions and encouraged direct contact with the team.

JW wished to reassure from Somerset Council side that this process is simplified for the purposes of getting it on a slide, there were other processes within each.

In each of the Topic Papers, there will be a section in them (written by EDF) usually right at the end, EDF has to revisit the original agreement under the DCO and whether they can provide mitigation or not. The Council can then come to a decision as to whether they agree with them or not. This compares what was approved to what is the new reality.

<p>3.5.2</p> <p>3.5.3</p> <p>3.5.4</p>	<p>CM expressed a lack of faith in LCNs, noting that Stogursey is part of Downsborough CN and has borne the brunt of the project. JW will follow up with CM on this. The Chair acknowledged the good debate and raised the bar for workforce uplift presentations.</p> <p>Pre-submitted question</p> <p><i>“As there have been 12,000 or more workers on site for over a year, it seems a tad behind schedule to only have a projected date for Section 106 Agreements being in place by Q2 2025, and what is the situation regarding other measures necessary to deal with over 12,000 workers, such as the capacity of the sewage treatment plant at HPC?”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Submitted by Roy Pumfrey, Stop Hinkley <p>Answer: NS replied that at in October 2024, the 12,000 workers (on site over a 24 hour period) figure was approached. Through most of 2025, it is expected that figures will remain steady, but that in 2025/26 there will be a longer, flatter peak. Funds are being managed successfully to manage the impacts – as AC showed at a previous Community Forum. Bristol offices are being expanded to offer further afield options for workers. The current sewage treatment plant has been expanded already, it can cope with an increased number of workers, but HPC have the ability to enhance it further, this is not necessary at present.</p> <p>Sewage Disposal Plant</p> <p>SG then asked about the sewage disposal plant, noting that the jetty won't be operational when the station is operational and questioning why the disposal point can't be in operation now. AC explained that eventually, sewage would be discharged 1.5km offshore when water flows through intakes and outfalls, transitioning to a further point as soon as possible.</p> <p>Pre-submitted question</p> <p><i>“Regarding DCO Material Changes, why does EdeF continue to insist that creating a saltmarsh as indirect mitigation for removal of the Acoustic Fish Deterrent in the face of organised opposition is a ‘requirement’ when the Environment Agency states that they are merely a consultee and have no powers to require EdeF to do any such thing?”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Submitted by Roy Pumfrey, Stop Hinkley <p>Answer: AC replied that RP is correct, the EA (as with the ONR), work on the basis that it is on HPC to suggest potential mitigation; but the EA are robust in their application of things such as the Habitats Regulation etc. This means that in order to have mitigation that is fit for purpose it needs to be achievable and scientifically robust.</p> <p>AC mentioned that saltmarsh is the only viable option that would complete the ‘mosaic’ of mitigation measures (with others including upgrading weirs, sea kelp etc).</p> <p>However, that the Project has always stated is that HPC wants to explore whether there are alternatives out there, and this is why consultation has been postponed.</p> <p>RP mentioned saltmarsh as the only viable option for completing the mosaic of mitigation measures. RP recalled SH's comments about WWT saltmarsh by Slimbridge, where £21m was given by Aviva, and landowners sold up. AC agreed with RP's assessment.</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p>Item 4: Office for Nuclear Regulation Report</p>	
<p>4.1</p>	<p>AG updated members on the ONR’s activities in the fourth quarter of 2024.</p> <p>In this period, routine inspections (including unannounced inspections) of the Hinkley Point C site covered the following:</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • plant construction and/or commissioning; • quality assurance and records; • organisational capability; • conventional (non-nuclear) health and safety, including life fire safety and emergency arrangements; and • security. 	
4.2	<p>Site Pass and Inspections: AG has a full site pass, with unannounced inspections occurring with 20 minutes' notice, the most recent of which was before Christmas.</p> <p>ONR was joined by the Dutch nuclear regulator (ANVS) on a visit to Hinkley Point C, which focused on sharing learning, expertise and best practices. www.onr.org.uk/news/all-news/2024/12/onr-shares-learning-with-dutch-regulator-at-hinkley-point-c/</p> <p>ONR has received an application from EDF Energy Nuclear Generation Ltd to decommission Hinkley Point B power station. The application includes an environmental statement that outlines the measures intended to avoid, prevent, reduce, and, if possible, offset any significant adverse environmental effect. ONR is inviting comments and feedback from all stakeholders on the environmental statement to help inform its decision on the application. The consultation is temporarily paused but when necessary further information is received it will be relaunched for a further 90 days. www.onr.org.uk/working-with-others/public-participation/consultations/open-consultations/hinkley-point-b/</p>	
4.3	<p>Permissioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ONR gave consent, using primary powers, to install the reactor pressure vessel (RPV) into unit 1 reactor building. Based on detailed assessments, ONR was satisfied that sufficient evidence had been provided in relation to: • The structural integrity of the RPV to allow the safe operation of the power station for its design lifetime; • The readiness of the HPC site and relevant personnel to safely undertake the process of installing the RPV; and • The robustness of the licensee's processes for determining its own readiness. <p>See ONR news article for further information: www.onr.org.uk/news/all-news/2024/12/major-permissioning-milestone-reached-at-hinkley-point-c/</p> <p>In advance of major permissioning points, ONR will continue to apply flexible permissioning to allow the start of a number of other activities:</p> <p>ONR concluded, with no objection, flexible permissioning for the management of change in relation to the establishment by NNB GenCo (HPC) Ltd of a Safety and Schedule Assurance Function.</p>	
4.4	<p>Non-routine matters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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, ONR is unable to provide further details about the ongoing investigations as these remain live inquiries. 	

	<p>SH mentioned the Port of Bristol authority extension to Avonmouth dock mitigation, looking other side of Hinkley B off River Parrett; will this be taken into consideration?</p> <p>AG said he would take this away.</p> <p>AJ clarified that near Steart Marshes, this was mitigation for the deep sea port. Essentially an extension of Steart Marshes.</p> <p>SG said that Stogursey Parish Council are meeting with the Steart group in the next few months.</p>	
5	Item 5: Environment Agency Update - (Alex Lord, Jon Ayers, Environment Agency)	
5.1	<p>AL provided an update on the EA's role in relation to the project, split between the Wessex Area (construction and conventional aspects) and the Nuclear Regulation Group (of which AL is part). AL outlined the EA's role and highlighted their 'Meet the Regulator' meetings, the most recent of which was on 20 November 2024. The next one is planned for spring 2025.</p> <p>Slide 29 covered operational regulation, and Slide 30 provided an update on construction regulation. JA continued, mentioning chromium and cadmium seeping into supplies and regulations about leak testing for F-Gas. Slide 31 discussed water quality, with RW asking if bathing water has anything to do with HPC. AL explained that this is about giving an overall picture of water quality in the area, noting that nuclear sites generally aren't large-scale contributors to water quality, although they are included in monitoring.</p> <p>The Chair explained why this was included in the presentation.</p>	
5.2	<p>Operational and Radioactive substances update</p> <p>AL and JA then gave members an update on the following:</p> <p>Permitting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes (since 2023 WDA variation). • WDA and CA applications expected 2025. <p>Inspections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gaseous radioactive waste management, • Ventilation, • Liquid radioactive waste management, • Solid waste (ILW) store design <p>Workstreams – Regular Level 4 meetings with operator (and ONR):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operational permit compliance, • Site overview, • Radwaste and decommissioning, • Chemistry 	
5.3	<p>Construction & Conventional update</p> <p>Permitting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sewage Treatment Works (HAJ) variation July 2024 • Construction WDA variation July 2024 • Further applications expected 2025. 	

	<p>Activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permit compliance checks • Incident investigations • Pollution prevention advice • Waste audits <p>Compliance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recent minor non-compliances relating to HAJ and CWDA. • Additional info requested in relation to F-Gas incidents. <p>JA mentioned chromium and cadmium seeping into supplies and regulations about leak testing for F-Gas.</p>	
<p>5.4</p> <p>5.4.1</p> <p>5.4.2</p>	<p>Water Quality</p> <p>AL and JA continued by discussion water quality, including the following points:</p> <p>Permits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limits and conditions • Operator sampling and monitoring, witnessed / check monitoring • Operator and Independent environmental monitoring programme <p>Hinkley Point C Site Sewage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction sewage treatment plant (HAJ) • Operational water discharge permit <p>Bathing waters – designated site classifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • West: Dunster (poor) and Minehead (sufficient) • East: Berrow and Brean (good/sufficient) <p>Water Framework Directive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bridgwater Bay listed as moderate ecological classification <p>RW asked if bathing water has anything to do with HPC. AL explained that this is about giving an overall picture of water quality in the area, noting that nuclear sites generally aren't large-scale contributors to water quality, although they are included in monitoring.</p> <p>The Chair explained why this was included in the presentation.</p> <p>SG asked if the discharge at HPC, 500m off Shurton Bars beach, was far enough away from land and if the beach would be safe. JA explained that the sewage had been treated, and during the permit determination process, modelling assessed whether this would be appropriate to discharge there. 500m offshore is better than other sewage treatment works and has been assessed. SG asked if this was regularly checked, and JA confirmed that HPC must submit 12 samples before being discharged through the header tank.</p> <p>AJ mentioned that monitoring of water quality takes place several times a year, and if levels exceed accepted limits, sewage would have to be moved from the site to other places in Somerset.</p> <p>JA confirmed that HPC legally has to meet those limits and 'tankering' (ie. Using tankers) off-site is an option.</p> <p>SH asked for clarification on how far offshore 500m is, whether from low water or high water. JA wasn't sure where the modelling was carried out but will update members. ACTION</p>	<p>AFTERNOTE JA/AL</p>

	<p>AFTER NOTE: AL provided the follow afternote: <i>“There was a question raised at the last community forum around whether the EA took tidal movements into account during our determination of the application to vary the ammonia limit in the HPC sewage discharge (HAJ) permit. I contacted our permitting team who confirmed the Operator’s modelling evidence was assessed against 5 different tidal states.</i></p> <p><i>Further information regarding the assessment carried out and the modelling used is outlined in our decision document which is available on request.”</i></p> <p>5.4.3 AC encouraged people to read the afternote in the last meeting note, explaining that sewage tankers leaving the site are not removing excess but disposing of sludge within the system. AL provided a written explanation about water quality in this meeting note.</p> <p>5.4.4 RP mentioned reassessing the level of ammonia from the sewage treatment place, and AL confirmed this, comparing the level to what would be expected in a town or city. The limit was raised from 20mg/litre to 80mg, with some operating without an ammonia limit at all.</p> <p>AJ asked for a rough date when HPC could flood and start using the cooling water system, transitioning into a nuclear site. AC couldn't provide an exact month-by-month update but will provide AJ with an update. ACTION</p> <p>AFTERNOTE: Update is the end of 2028.</p>	ACTION / AFTERNOTE AC
6	Item 6: Community Fund Update - (Amelia Thompson, Somerset Community Foundation)	
<p>6.1</p> <p>6.2</p> <p>6.3</p>	<p>AT introduced herself and her role at the SCF, emphasizing the purpose of making funding as accessible as possible to communities impacted by HPC. She encouraged open communication with SCF to discuss projects.</p> <p>AT gave an update on funding and spending, highlighting the small grants program, which will have reached £1m given out to organizations with less than £250k in income by the next CF. She provided recent examples, such as Stogursey Community Network receiving a grant of £2,500 to support hosting a lunch club over the next year, covering transport, insurance, and venue hire costs.</p> <p>A further example was £80,000 to update toilets and changing rooms at a Bridgwater and Albion rugby club, supporting access to women-led sports and growing numbers, as well as serving as a community venue for blood donation and functions.</p> <p>The Chair thanked AT for her presentation and invited questions from members.</p>	
7	Item 7: Main Site Forum 20 October 2024	
<p>7.1</p> <p>7.2</p>	<p>The Chair provided an update the items discussed at October's Main Site Forum and invited questions from members.</p> <p>There were no questions posed.</p>	
8	Item 8: Transport Forum 11 November 2024 - (Chair)	
<p>8.1</p> <p>8.1.1</p>	<p>The Chair gave an update on November's Transport Forum and the items discussed. The next meeting is on the 13th of March, where buses will be on the agenda.</p> <p>CM asked why many vehicles were leaving the site with beacons flashing. AC acknowledged the point and said this shouldn't happen.</p>	

8.1.2	SG mentioned that this issue has been raised a lot by RC and yet hasn't been addressed. AC explained that this is a behavioural issue rather than a legal one but understands the concerns.	
9	Item 9: Any Other Business	
9.1	SH mentioned the area around HPC and that he had taken many people around there. He mentioned that to his knowledge, there haven't been any complaints but encouraged people to get in touch if there were any.	
10	Item 10: Date of next Community Forum	
10.1	The next Community Forum will be held on Thursday 15th May 2025 at 6pm.	
10.2	The meeting ended.	