

Meeting Report

Regarding:

EDF Hinkley Point C: Transport Forum

Date:

Thursday 11th July 2024 – 6pm

(Meeting held at: Bridgwater and Taunton College,
Cannington)

Participating:

Doug Bamsey, *Chair*

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

Richard Cuttell (RC), *West Hinkley Action Group*

Andy Coupé (ACé), *Somerset Council*

Mark Phillips (MP), *Wembdon Parish Council*

Gary Perrett (GP), *Sustrans*

Hugh Davies (HD), *Somerset Council*

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

Sue Goss (SG), *Stogursey Parish Council*

Chris Morgan (CM), *Stogursey Parish Council*

Roy Pumfrey (RP), *Stop Hinkley*

EDF Team:

Stacy Walker (SW), *EDF*

Andy Wagstaff (AW), *EDF*

Jamie Jamieson (JJ), *EDF*

Drew Aspinwall, *SEC Newgate*

Matthew Williams, *SEC Newgate*

Apologies Received:

Rachel Lister (RL), *EDF*

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

Item	Action
1 Welcome and Introductions	
1.1 'The Chair' welcomed everyone to the meeting. He asked everyone to introduce themselves and ran through the venue arrangements and forum protocols.	
2 Meeting Note and Matters Arising	
2.1 The Chair referred to the meeting note of 14 March 2024 and invited any further comment on the draft and the afternotes provided.	
2.2 There were no comments and the meeting note was approved.	
3 Project Progress Update - (Stacy Walker, EDF)	
3.1 Stacy Walker (SW) provided an update on the project.	
3.2 Latest site tour	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SW showed a video which provided an update from Nuclear Island Area Director Simon Parsons. • SW then talked through an aerial shot of the site taken by a drone, highlighting the gap in construction between Units 1 and 2. 	
3.3 Latest Progress	
Steam Generators	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These began arriving into Combwich in May, and have since made their way safely to site. 	
Inner Structures	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pouring of two slab ledges within Unit 1's containment building marked the completion of all concrete works above the +19.5m level in Unit 1's reactor building, meaning that the major civils work has been completed on the 'inner structures' of the building. 	
3.4 Looking ahead	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SW mentioned some of the specific milestones the project aims to achieve in the second half of the year. These include the heat exchanger installation, pouring the spent fuel building pool slab; and completing the pumphouse walls, and installing the reactor cavity in Unit 2. 	
Reactor Pressure Vessel	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The installation of the Reactor Pressure Vessel (RPV) will be this year's 'dome lift' – the major milestone it is hoped will be achieved later this year. 	
MEH	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The MEH phase will accelerate. • SW highlighted the intricate nature of the MEH phase, up to now the project has had moments of great 'visuals' (eg. Lifting the polar crane, dome lift etc.). The MEH phase will be a lot less ostentatious, with a lot happening behind walls. SW mentioned that there are 7,000 rooms in Unit 1 alone. 	

3.5 DCO Material Change Application

- SW gave an update on the DCO Material Change application; the pre-application consultation has been completed, EDF are assessing that consultation and gathering feedback. The application will be submitted in early 2025. SW stressed that Forum members will be kept up to date as the application passes through the various stages.

3.6 Workforce Uplift

- SW gave background on workforce numbers, from the original assumption in 2013 of 5,600 to an estimate of over 12,000 now.
- The project is reviewing the mitigation measure to ensure that the impact is limited and opportunities maximised for communities.
- SW explained that the change is necessary as the civils phase of the project will last for longer than was originally planned. The MEH phase is beginning before the civils phase has been completed.

Does an increased workforce require planning permission?

- No, there are no requirements or other restrictions within the Development Consent Order. The physical form of the power station will not change, and there are no legal obligations that limit the number of workers.
- SW highlighted that the project team are aware of their potential impact on local communities, as well as looking at the potential mitigation that could be put into place.
- The Project team are reviewing the relevant topics from the DCO Application and Environmental Statement to determine if their strategies should be updated. The advantage is that they now have the ability to consider *actual* impact rather than forecasts.

3.7 Reviewing current impact examples

Transport

SW showed a slide showing the breakdown of numbers of the workforce travelling to site by different transport methods. SW highlighted that in spite of increased numbers, the proportion of workers travelling to site by bus was 90%, which was still within HPC's targets.

Complaints

SW talked through a slide showing the number of complaints over time; mentioned that she had been undertaking community walks etc. SW emphasised that there hasn't been a proportional rise in complaints as the workforce has increased.

Ambulance call outs

From 2021 to 2024, there hasn't been an increase in SWAST Ambulance callouts coming to site as the workforce has increased.

Continued monitoring and feedback

SW ran through the different groups that are able to engage with and feed back to the Project. These will continue as the workforce grows.

3.8 Mitigation being considered

SW talked through a slide showing the mitigation being considered, broken down into 6 different headings: Community Safety, Health, Transport, Accommodation, Opportunity and Benefits and Community Fund.

3.9 Social and Economic benefit

SW continued by running through slides showing the 'good news' that has emerged from the Project both socially and economically.

3.10 Pre-submitted Question - ONR

"How can EdeF claim that 'significant adaptation of design to meet British regulations' is one of the main reasons for delay and cost overrun at HPC when ONR refuted that claim in January with 'we do not recognise our regulatory requirements as being the principal factor in these increases, as they are broadly similar to the requirements in France?'

- Submitted by Roy Pumfrey, *Stop Hinkley*

Answer: SW said that both AC and others have said there are several reasons for the delay, that this was discussed in depth at the Community Forum in May. One of which is going first has been difficult, another being the impact of Covid. There have been issues with skills related to going first in terms of getting people in place. The regulation was difficult, HPC continues to work with the ONR. They recognise that changes were a factor, as do EDF.

RP said it was interesting that the ONR reacted in this way, it was clear that they were piqued that HPC had blamed this on the British regulatory system. He said he remained unconvinced that British regulation is responsible for the delay and being over budget.

SW said they work closely with the ONR, the design was based on that in France, but there have been learnings and changes over the past 10-15 years. HPC will continue to work with the ONR, but there isn't one primary factor.

RP said that instigating the design changes were at HPC/EDF's behest, not that of the ONR. SW agreed but saying these were primarily for safety reasons, and will continue to work with the ONR on these.

3.11 Pre-submitted question – Workforce Uplift

"Why is it the case that months after you arbitrarily increased the number of workers on site to 12,000, and long after EdeF knew they would be doing this, there have still been no substantive discussions with any of the parties interested in this significant change in practice?"

- Submitted by Roy Pumfrey, *Stop Hinkley*

Answer: SW answered that they are still doing work to understand the final increase in numbers, HPC want to ensure they get this right, so that when they go out to local communities that they have an accurate figure. The Project is working closely with Somerset Council for potential mitigation for those impacts and are hoping to come back to the wider community in the autumn, sometime after the Community Forum in September. There will be the opportunity for feedback.

RP remarked that in the meantime there are still 12,000 workers with no mitigation as how to deal with that number.

The Chair remarked that it was an important Forum that needs to be discussed as soon as possible.

3.12 There were then a number of additional questions from members:

GP asked about the given the length of project and the length of the project at Sizewell, huge amount of equipment is being transported on roads.

GP continued that he didn't understand is why the dome is put on first, or major components of the turbine hall installed with the roof on. He was under the impression that 'Big Carl' was built to put all those major components into the two

Units and then put the dome on – and suggested this could have saved the project time.

SW answered that regarding the installation of the Reactor Pressure Vessel, she asked this very question. SW likened the dome to putting a roof onto a house, making it watertight.

This has made it possible for work to be done inside before the RPV went in. This also allows for the protection of the polar crane; which needed to be installed to help with installation of the RPV.

Taishan installed the RPV with the dome off, Flamanville did it similar to HPC ie. through the equipment hatch.

SW said that further information would be added in an Afternote.

AFTERNOTE

AFTERNOTE - Upon review, it was agreed that there was no additional relevant information to add to SW's response.

RC stated that SW mentioned that workforce is 10,500. With people working on site 24/7, are there 10,500 there all the time or is it split into shifts? How many workers are in this catchment area – ie. Is it 20,000 to get 10,000 onto site?

SW said that workforce numbers are calculated over a 5 day average. eg. SW might go to site once a week, others go 5 days. SW said it is important to capture workforce and not numbers including visitors etc.

SW will look to provide what fluctuation of workforce looks like by way of an Afternote.

AFTERNOTE

AFTERNOTE – There is no further publicly available information or data to insert here.

RP then said that the video shown [see 3.2] talks about 12,000 workers, and this is the figure that gets banded about.

SW replied that the Project is not at 12,000 yet. In the video, Simon Parsons talks about 12,000 but this is the figure that it will eventually reach, so it would be wrong to talk about a number that's less in a video that's public/community facing. At the end of the 6 months (that this update lasts for) it will be closer to this number.

RP then asked about dates; the dome was installed at Christmas and Unit 2 is nominally 12 months behind Unit 1, yet SW said the dome for Unit 2 won't be installed to Q1 or Q2 2025. RP pointed out this is more than 12 months behind.

SW replied that the Project continues to monitor time; on occasions work on Unit 2 has been slowed to focus on Unit 1. The focus for rest of this year is the RPV, which allows dome lift for Unit 2 to be pushed back. It depends on where the workforce is needed.

RP says that 20-30% faster is irrelevant because Unit 2 won't be active until at least 12 months after Unit 1.

HD then asked about the lifespan of the tunnels. SW answered that they are designed to be there for the lifetime of the power station.

4 Update from Transport Review Group – (Andy Wagstaff & Jamie Jamieson, EDF)

4.1 Andy Wagstaff (AW) and Jamie Jamieson (JJ) provided a summary of the Transport Review Group Quarterly Report for January to March 2024 (Q1), which was presented to the Transport Review Group on April 29th.

4.2 Construction Workforce Travel Plan (CWTP)

JJ then ran through the CWTP, which SW had used earlier in her Project Update presentation.

Final journey to HPC site (last Quarter)

- Walk **5.2%**
- Cycle **0.5%**
- Motorcycle **0.4%**
- Car (Driver) **1.6%**
- Car Share (Driver) **0.3%**
- Car Passenger via HPC Car Park **0.3%**
- Car Passenger via Drop Off Location **1.7%**
- HPC Bus Service **90%**

4.3 HPC Bus Passenger Boarding Locations (last Quarter)

- North of Bridgwater **16%** (including **9%** at Brean Campus)
- Local Area **10%**
- West Somerset (including Washford Cross P&R and Minehead) **2%**
- Taunton & J25 P&R **11%**
- J24 P&R **7%**
- J23 P&R **15%**
- Bridgwater (including Campus) **38%**
-

4.4 Bus Movements

Bus movements a day (DCO) – 1,232.

Bus movements a day (Last Quarter) – 1,091.

Note: Current bus movements a day include “empty running” buses which are not included in the DCO number.

4.5 HPC Helpline Complaints for 2023 Q3 and Q4

In 2024 Q1, there were 348 complaints, of which:

- HPC Worker not fly parking 53
- HPC Worker fly parking 48
- Not a HPC Worker / Not Registered 247

The HPC Fly Parking team undertake their own checks and investigated 1,026 potential observations.

In the last Quarter, 255 bus passengers were found to by fly parking, representing 2% of the total workforce and based on a full working week.

4.6 Construction Workforce Travel Plan (CWTP) – HPC Car Share

23% of those arriving by car to a Park and Rider were car sharers. (3,015 bus passengers arriving via car: of these, 694 via car sharing – 338 car share drivers and 356 car passengers.)

- 4.7
- 20 breaches (0.22% of total HGV movements) during Quarter Q1:
 - 1 HGV outside of permitted delivery hours
 - 0 HGV over permitted time limit
 - 19 HGVs deviated from the approved HGV route
 - All HGV drivers who were involved in these breaches have received a Driver Strike.

4.8 **2024 Q1 (average):**
Daily HGV Movements – 133
Daily HGV Deliveries – 67
(below 500 DCO average limit)

Forecast Next Quarter

Daily HGV Movements – 190
Daily HGV Deliveries – 95

5 **Update on C182 – Andy Coupe (Somerset Council)**

- 5.1 Andy Coupé (ACé) reminded members that HGV routes to HPC site are subject to a survey every 2 years (paid for by EDF). There are 3 methods of assessment - a deflectograph, a scanner and looking at the surface condition of road in terms of its ability to withhold skidding. The deflectograph is most important, it measures the residual life of the road, and gives an idea of how much structural integrity is left in the road

Previous surveys showed no significant causes for concern. However, there are now lengths of the C182 where residual life expectancy has dropped away considerably; and this requires intervention. They are currently overlaying the traffic movements that EDF are predicting for the rest of the project, and predict what the rate of deterioration would be to model effectively where the carriageway will deteriorate and where work needs to be done.

This piece of modelling work will ensure the carriageway is fit for purpose well into the operational life of the power station. It also shows how to manage risk without the need to undertake further works further down the line of the process.

ACé showed a diagram of the areas of planned intervention. Areas 1-7 are localised treatments, areas 8 – 17 shown need significant intervention. This will involve some planing out, some areas of resurfacing, undertaking clearance of the grips along the length of the C182.

Somerset Council are proposing to undertake some surface dressing next year and add some additional life into carriageway. These works are still in the design and planning phase, and they are looking to start sometime after the summer holiday period – there will be further communication eg. with parish councils. The traffic management associated with the works is still in preparation. This will be a significant period of works needed over period of time.

ACé then took questions from members:

SG asked how does this impact between Iddeson Lane and the Shurton Junction and if this is included.

ACé replied that Section 8 is the Stolford junction just after Stogursey up to the HPC site. The sections south of that are more localised with areas needing particular attention.

The Chair clarified that this means interaction with Parish Councils to explain the detail of this? Which ACé confirmed. AW added that this would be in addition to things going out from HPC comms team.

SG asked if it would be 24-hour repair work?

ACé answered that traffic management means this is challenging, and suggested there would be nighttime working. AW suggested that it would be mostly overnight work.

RC asked what mitigation there would be for the disruption to residents living nearby or disturbed by nighttime working?

ACé replied that there are minimal residents nearby, however they would work with those affected people. Where they are working adjacent to residents, they are going to try to get nighttime works done before the 'night' time.

RP asked if this slide could be incorporated into presentation pack, which was agreed.

MP asked when works would be completed?

ACé said that it would be by the end of this calendar year.

HD asked if EDF would be contributed financially to the works?

ACé replied that these are works being done using s106 contributions made by EDF.

The Chair thanked ACé for his presentation about the C182.

6 Fly Parking Update (Andy Wagstaff, EDF)

6.1 AW started by giving an update on the Sedgemoor Campus. Planning permission has been achieved in May for an extra 340 spaces in land around the existing Sedgemoor campus, with work commencing imminently.

This will allow the provision of parking places for approximately 160 additional residents alongside 100 workers residing locally, as well as 60 for host campus staff. This will allow to relieve some of the fly parking pressures in this area, as well as greater parking provision as part of the workforce uplift plans.

These plans will deliver a substantial increase to capacity within the current footprint at minimal disruption to the local community.

6.2 Site Construction Director Rob Jordan's June video log was then shown, where he highlighted the zero-tolerance approach to fly parking.

AW mentioned that this video has been shown at the start of each morning and is repeated at various locations across site, including subtitles. AW added that 2 people have been dismissed this year for fly parking, which 1 other under investigation.

DD mentioned that Otterhampton PC want to pass on their thanks for efforts to tackle fly parking on Brooke Road, Comwich. AW was grateful for this.

RC asked what the policy was on people parking at residents' houses with their blessing and then walking to work?

AW said they can try to dissuade people from doing this but there is little by way of enforcement if it's done with the permission of landowner.

RP said that he hoped that AW would say that Rob's Vlog was on in the canteen 24 hours a day.

SG asked what was happening on the issue of fly bike parking?

AW replied that there is little that HPC can do because HPC don't own the real estate, people aren't breaking the regulations or 'fly parking' by doing that.

SW added that Nicola Hale and her team were doing work to explore the potential of sites such as Wembdon Village Hall – could some permanent bike racks (available to workers and community) be installed here? SW has had conversations with charity On Your Bike, This is something that she’s aware of and these where they can they are looking to improve accessibility to bike racks for workers and the wider community.

GP mentioned that Cycle UK are putting stands in a number of locations eg. in Combswich. But said that the issue is that one needs to have full ownership of the land to put those stands in place – which can be tough.

AW commented that it has worked well at Combswich.

7 Update on Proposals for a Combswich-HPC link (Andy Wagstaff, EDF)

- 7.1 AW explained how there were plans were for multi-use cycle path between back of Combswich and HPC. A number of public information evenings and consultations were held; there was an approximately 50/50 feedback for and against.

What became evident was that it was always Somerset Council’s intention to make it a bridleway to enable equestrian use, rather than a footpath to allow cycling. HPC’s involvement was hindering progress. People were concerned about the surfacing and how that would affect the landscape, particularly at Steart Marshes.

Following a meeting with RJ, the decision was made to ‘delatch’ from right of way officers’ intention to become a bridleway. Somerset Council is therefore going ‘solo’ in this application.

SG asked how many cyclists will use that route to go to work etc, and also if AW knew how many survey respondents come from the East of the HPC area and how many from West side from Stogursey or Williton. SG pointed out that only those from the east would actually use that route.

AW said he wasn’t sure how many cyclists would benefit. GP added that a 2010 survey at ABC on the map, there were hundreds that would use those routes, most of those from the eastern side, there should be a safe route from the west but a significant proportion (5% of workforce) that would use the path.

AW added that there could also be recreational use by the local community too, and Somerset Council envisaged this too.

ACé clarified that this was a rights of way mitigation as it’s part of national coastal route which means that equestrian users could not legally use this footpath. The bridleway creation order was published on that basis. A bridleway allows cycling on it, with no plans to change the surface.

AW highlighted 3 areas where they might put in cattle grids with gates alongside wide enough for a horse to pass through.

At the Chair’s request, ACé clarified how far the bridleway order process had gone. There will be another update following the review as to whether another order is needed.

8 Any Other Business - (Chair)

- 8.1 No items were mentioned.

9 Date of next meeting: Thursday 14th November at 6pm



9.1 The meeting ended.