

Meeting Report

Regarding:

EDF Hinkley Point C:
Main Site Forum.

Date & Venue:

Thursday 13th February 2025 – 6pm
Meeting held at: Victory Hall, Stogursey, Bridgwater

Participating:

Doug Bamsey, *Chair*

Chris Ford (CF), *Stogursey Parish Council*

Allan Searle (AS), *Stogursey Parish Council*

Chris Morgan (CM), *Stogursey Parish Council*

Sue Goss (SG), *Stogursey Parish Council*

Hugh Davies (HD), *Somerset Council*

John Burton (JB), *Somerset Council*

Mike Laver (ML), *Burton Resident*

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

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

Lidia Bosa (LB), *Shurton Resident*

Simon Moss (SM), *Shurton Resident*

Suzie Hendon (SH), *Shurton Resident*

Max Hendon (MH), *Shurton Resident*

Sue Spicer (SS), *Burton Resident*

Nicola Hunter (NiH), *Burton Resident*

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

Amanda Stanley (AS), *Shurton Resident*

EDF Team:

Andrew Cockcroft (AC), *EDF*

Mounia Miguil (MM), *EDF*

Richard Clews (RCL), *EDF*

Drew Aspinwall (DA), *SEC Newgate UK*

Matthew Williams (MW), *SEC Newgate UK*

Apologies received:

Nicola Hale (NH), *Somerset Council*

Rosemary Woods (RW), *Somerset Council*

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

Item		Action
1	Item 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	Item 2 - Meeting Note and Matters Arising (from Thursday 17th October 2025)	
2.1	<p>Item 4.22: Stacy Walker (SW) was looking into the images from the ecology cameras in the Southern area and was going to share images with members.</p> <p>Item 3.7: Sue Goss (SG) mentioned the ringfenced money for Stogursey Parish [the Rural Parking Fund], and confirmed that Stogursey will be taking this up, but there is a long wait for funding agreement from a third party. SG has told the Transport Forum that it will come forward.</p> <p>Item 3.8 Soil Stock Pile: AFTERNOTE: A regular programme of testing is ongoing, a further update will be provided once analysis is complete</p> <p>Item 4.1.2 Community Safety AFTERNOTE: Ewan has been invited to attend a future Transport Forum meeting to talk the wider police work related to traffic.</p>	AFTERNOTE
2.2	There were no further comments and the meeting note was then agreed.	
3	Item 3 – Project Progress Update (Andrew Cockcroft (AC) - EDF)	
3.1	<p>Review of 2024 A run through of 2024 was given showing the progress that has been seen. This included the Unit 1 containment building concrete pour and the delivery of RPV components in February, installation of first heat exchanger in April, delivery of steam generators in May, pre-stressing of Unit 1's containment building in July, final liner ring lifted onto Unit 2 in October, and Unit 1's pressure vessel installed in December.</p>	
3.2	<p>Projects planned for 2025</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 	
3.3	<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. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	
3.4	<p>Welding of 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. 	
3.5	<p>Unit 2 dome lift</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teams on site are busy preparing for the lifting of Unit 2's dome later in the summer. • The milestone will require a number of activities to take place before it can be achieved, notably the completion of the containment building walls and the installation of the polar crane which is currently being pre-fabricated on site. • 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. 	
3.6	<p>Unit 1 safeguarding 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. 	
3.7	<p>DCO material change update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We continue to move through the process for a material change to Hinkley Point C's DCO. • 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 our preference to find voluntary ways to meet our obligations. • In order to give time to carefully evaluate the best approach, the public consultation planned for later this month will now be carried out later in 2025. 	
3.7.1	<p>SG asked about the interim fuel store (IFS), when Andrew Goodchild was planning manager, at the consultation event in 2024 he said that EDF would look to move the IFS further back from sea wall.</p> <p>AC replied that he was going to come to this and said that EDF is looking to reconsult (e.g. on environmental mitigation measures), but won't be re-running the full consultation.</p>	

<p>3.7.2</p> <p>3.7.3</p> <p>3.7.4</p> <p>3.7.5</p>	<p>All of the feedback already received is logged will be considered. As HPC move through the submission process, eg. when looking at design - that is when things like this will be fed in. Realistically it will be in 2027 before there are decisions on this.</p> <p>But AC reiterated that this hadn't been forgotten, and those consultation comments are still there and valid.</p> <p>Mike Laver (ML) pointed out that dates for consultation 12 months later than originally proposed and asked how this would affect the application and programme given there won't be an approved fuel system.</p> <p>AC replied that it is a tight programme. As it stands at the moment, water needs to come into the power station for testing by mid-2028, so the programme needs to move pretty quickly to get an approval by 2028 and to allow that to happen. In terms of the interim fuel store, HPC has the ability to store fuel from the reactor for up to ten years, before it needs to move to the interim store, so there is time in the programme to allow things to happen and decisions to be made.</p> <p>ML said that they have a design programme, but they don't have a 10-year plan for the station; and stated that HPC were presenting the planning authority with a fait accompli.</p> <p>AC said that looking at the commissioning date as it stands now, the interim spent fuel store would need to be built by 2040, which gives HPC enough time.</p> <p>Richard Cuttell (RC) said that what is being proposed is to extend the build programme for another 10 years – and this means that they haven't complied with the DCO and local residents would be affected by construction. AC clarified that this meant that if the DCO material changes were not approved, the power station would be able to operate.</p> <p>Lidia Bosa (LB) asked if that meant that spent fuel would remain on site.</p> <p>AC said that it would, and that it would be removed once the deep geological disposal facilities were operational.</p> <p>SG pointed out that the problem with this is that a GVA might not be built for 100 years. AC replied that this is a matter for central government and that they estimated 80 years, and that it's important that this deep geological storage was brought forward.</p> <p>AC said it would check the Finnish facility and how long was taken to construct it.</p> <p>SG pointed out the length of time needed to construct one and AC suggested it might be about a decade.</p> <p>Chris Morgan (CM) said he had been part of a consultation on geological disposal facility since 2014, and governments are still looking for areas that could accommodate this. He asked how waste from HPC stood vis à vis waste from Sellafield, which should take first priority, and asked how long waste would be stored on site at HPC.</p> <p>AC replied that this was a good point but could not give an exact date, but that HPC has the ability to store all of its spent fuel for about 60 years on site.</p> <p>CM pointed out the amount of nuclear waste in the UK that needed to be prioritised to be taken in a facility before HPC – and that public should be aware of this.</p> <p>Amanda Stanley (AS) asked for diesel generators and where details on this would be.</p> <p>AC pointed them out around the reactor building and they are part of the design and not in the material change.</p>	<p>AFTERNOTE</p>
---	--	-------------------------

3.7.6	<p>Sue Spicer (SS) asked about the gap between Units 1 and 2.</p> <p>AC clarified that since Covid, the gap between them is now 18 months. The 12-month gap is optimum and HPC wants to maintain this. An unofficial goal for this year is to bring Unit 2 back to the 12-month gap. AC repeated that Unit 2 is about 20 – 30% quicker in construction thanks to learnings from Unit 1.</p>	
3.8	<p>Education outreach and engagement in 2024</p> <p>AC said that it is National Apprenticeship Week, and outlined that more than 2,750 people have been engaged with face-to-face through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 74 Sealed Tours • 70 Visitor Centre trips • 137 presentations • 9 school workshops • 7 visits to schools <p>They had:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 350 visitors on free school meals • School yrs 3–13 (most yr 12-13) • Ages 7 - 18 (typically 17 yrs old) • +10% more visitors than 2023 • 21,820 people reached • 30% came from within 10 miles of HPC site • Most frequent visitors included: Bridgwater and Taunton College & Bridgwater College Academy <p>3.8.1 AS asked if HPC supported the mock interviews that took place at the beginning of March at Brymore Academy in Cannington. AC said he wasn't sure if HPC had been asked.</p>	
3.9	<p>HPC Community Fund</p> <p>3.9.1 <u>Bridgwater Railway Station</u> The Hinkley Point C Community Fund contributed £10,000 towards the refurbishment of a room in the Bridgwater Railway Station that has been sitting empty and unused for over 10 years.</p> <p>The fully accessible room – which includes access to a kitchen and toilet – is free to book and use, and can accommodate up to 14 people. It also includes internet access and a large screen for presentations. The room is already being used by community groups, including Bridgwater Civic Society and Go-Op Bus.</p> <p>3.9.2 <u>Stacked Wonky: £10,000</u> 14 young people from the Porlock-based dance theatre company, Stacked Wonky, were able to step out on London's famous Sadler's Wells main stage in front of a packed auditorium earlier this year.</p> <p>Thanks to grant funding from the Hinkley Point C Community Fund, the group, aged 11 to 18, performed You Don't Know Either, an original work by first time director, 18-year-old Benjamin Johnson from Stacked Wonky.</p>	

<p>3.9.3</p> <p>3.9.4</p> <p>3.10</p> <p>3.11</p> <p>3.12</p>	<p><u>Supporting Somerset's veterans: £100,000</u> Acts of Random Kindness (ARK) is a Somerset-based non-profit offering vital support to individuals with learning disabilities, autism, mental health challenges, and more. Through a 3-year grant of nearly £100,000 from the Hinkley Point C Community Fund, ARK has employed a full-time Armed Forces Link Worker to assist veterans and their families across the county. This funding helps connect those who have served in the military with essential services and support, addressing issues such as social isolation and mental health concerns.</p> <p>AC issued a plea that if anyone was aware of any local groups who might be looking for funding in future, to remind them of this funding pot.</p> <p>AC then asked MM to update members on keeping updated – Plugged In. There is also a monthly newsletter that members can subscribe to.</p> <p>AC asked if members received updates. LB mentioned the emergency access. AS said that it was more public affairs and not items that might affect the local community.</p> <p>HD asked a question about the Dutch visit; the ministry of energy climate visited recently. AS said that she received a phone call from a farmer in the town where the plant was planned for. AC replied that it might be a while before they reach a decision.</p>	
<p>4</p>	<p>Item 4: Workforce Uplift (Richard Clews, EDF)</p>	
<p>4.1</p> <p>4.1.1</p> <p>4.1.2</p>	<p>Richard Clews (RCL) introduced himself, explaining that he joined HPC in December last year. RCL then provided an overview of the Workforce Uplift process.</p> <p>Topic papers – these will be consulted on and there will be local involvement in this; some of these will become strategies.</p> <p>Payments will be made into accommodation fund to offset any remaining impact. This will be fed into the s106 agreements and a new binding agreement and strategies (e.g. bus strategy and workforce development strategy) will be agreed.</p> <p>Working on the basis of 15,000 5-day workers, a 'worst case scenario' in terms of impact was discussed. It would be managed through changes in shift patterns, e.g. utilising the late and night shifts to flatten the peak. The capacity issue of how many people can be on site at any one time remains, hence the need to amend the shift patterns.</p> <p>CM pointed out the amount of increasing traffic, including lorries and buses. He pointed out what he described as the "abysmal condition of the roads in the local area." He suggested that this was becoming unfair and hoped that this would be considered as workforce numbers increase. He requested that this was taken to the Highways department.</p> <p>AC replied that it was a good point. He mentioned that lorries related to HPC shouldn't be using lanes, and said that if anyone saw anything regular this should be picked up by GPS, AC encouraged people to report this, stating the particular contractor or type of vehicle coming up regularly. In terms of the other elements, this is part of the consideration of uplift.</p> <p>SG understand that there is a limit to the number of bus journeys as per DCO; and that therefore HPC might struggle to get the extra workers to site.</p> <p>RCL said that part of the workforce could work elsewhere in a satellite site (approximately 30% are able to do this). Tier 1 contractors will be encouraged to do the same.</p>	

	<p>SH reinforced what CM said, and mentioned how 3 cars had gone off the road into a ditch, one of which had to be towed out. CM pointed out that it is made worse after rain because the ditch is harder to see. AS mentioned how there is no signage to indicate a drop.</p> <p>CM pointed out the problem of police presence and a lack of enforcement. AC said that as part of the workforce uplift, VA would be joined by other members of his team – and would look at more localised patrols.</p> <p>Simon Moss (SM) said that as a new resident, he was shocked at how few people were on the buses.</p> <p>AS asked that more effective use of the current bus system be explored, stated that many buses have come through the emergency road and were nowhere near capacity or empty, and that this is an environmental as well as a community impact.</p> <p>AC said that this topic had been brought up a lot, and agreed that efficiency is very important. He added that HPC needs to move buses from one location to another; and that there were some good topics on transport to discuss.</p>	
4.1.3	<p>LB asked about jobs portal and mentioned the people living in local communities who would like to work at the Project. If they did, this would also reduce the problem of accommodation etc. LB asked if the Project could do more to encourage local people to match their skills to roles at HPC.</p> <p>AC said that if there are people locally struggling to find roles, to let him and MM know, but that there should be more targeted approach, for example including details in the Stogursey newsletter.</p>	
4.1.4	<p>AS suggested having jobs forums in Stogursey village hall. AC agreed with this.</p>	
4.1.5	<p>ML – suggested that there are buses that are waiting in dangerous areas. AC thanked ML for raising this, and that bus drivers shouldn't enter into informal arrangements and asked for more information where he was seeing this.</p>	
4.1.6	<p>JB commented that 'agree s106 contributions' are actions as well as financial; JB asked if HPC could update the Forum as to when they expected the peak of construction to now be, and how long the peak is expected to last. RCL preferred to call it obligation, but that his understanding that the strategies and s106 will clarify what is required, but that the majority of these would be financial obligations.</p>	
4.1.7	<p>AC said peak is expected in about 18 months' time (i.e. mid 2026). It would be a peak for approximately 18 months depending on the MEH phase and how quickly the main civils demobilise. What is known is that demobilisation is more rapid than the upward trajectory.</p>	
4.1.8	<p>RC mentioned the serious road issues in the locality, and asked if it would take as long to repair the local lanes as it would to repair the C182. AC said that it depended, and that HPC's use of the country lanes is fairly low, e.g. for a diversion route; but that it isn't a regular usage.</p>	
4.1.9	<p>JR said that the A39 is used extensively, and that it is breaking up. A part at Sandford corner into Bridgwater is breaking up again and has lasted less than 6 months. He mentioned an example of 4 buses trying to fit into 1 bus stop. He also highlighted that it still wasn't on the gritting route.</p>	

4.1.10	<p>SG said that funding was available for the Operation Harold route. SG then said she thought that this matter would be discussed at the TRG.</p> <p>AC said that there are a lot of Transport Forum linkages, and recalls an action point from the last Transport Forum.</p>	
4.2	<p>Pre-Submitted Question - Soil Stockpiles</p> <p><i>“Can you provide the current height of the Soil Stock Piles bordering the Southern boundary and whether they have now reached the approved heights?”</i></p> <p>- Submitted by Susan Goss, Stogursey Parish Council</p> <p>ANSWER: 35m height of stockpiles that they have now reached. There is equipment on top, but understands (RCL), but that soon there will be a drone checking the height of this (this is carried out regularly), set to be in early March. There will then be an accurate record of this.</p> <p>4.2.1 SG then asked if the peaks were within limits. RCL said that what usually happens is that there is a pile of it and then it plateaued out.</p> <p>SG then asked if Holford Valley would be the first to be filled in by spoil? AC said that the backfilling operation is constant, e.g. by bringing the ground level up. Before HPC starts reprofiling the southern area, the plan for southern area will be brought to this Forum.</p> <p>4.2.2 SG asked if this was in planning permission? AC said he understands that it had to happen, but it didn’t contain any specifics.</p> <p>4.2.3 RC said he felt that things are discussed at length at meetings but that EDF ride roughshod over the little man; right back to the original DCO – and there were too many meetings and not enough doing.</p>	
4.3	<p>Pre-submitted question - Operation Harold Route</p> <p><i>“The Operation Harold route is again soon be brought into use overnight by HPC double decker buses, as a result of further proposed road works on the C182. At the last Community forum I seem to recall that the matter of necessary repairs to both white and yellow road markings, particularly those most crucial, denoting junctions, was to be discussed at the next Transport Review Group.</i></p> <p><i>Sadly, it would appear that this did not happen as the Operation Harold route remains in poor condition and a danger to traffic particularly at night. (As a matter of interest, the white line markings in Stogursey village were re-lined but those posing most danger on the Op Harold route were totally ignored) ”</i></p> <p>- Submitted by Susan Goss, Stogursey Parish Council</p> <p>This question was already answered, and SG was satisfied with the responses.</p>	
4.4	<p>Pre-submitted question – Flooding</p> <p><i>“With the recent heavy rains and floods, flooding in the Shurton and Burton area; it would seem that there is an increasing lot of erosion of the Brook banks and the roads as well. I’m concerned that the Bayleys Brook and Bum brook are not being attended to by the riparian owners including Stogursey Parish Council. In the past a lengthsman used to attend to them and EDF very kindly paid for that.</i></p>	

	<p><i>The main concern is that the flooding is becoming more and more recurrent and less than less attention is being paid to these overgrown banks and to the Himalayan balsam that grows there in the summertime. Both Brooks could do with some dredging in some places as well.</i></p> <p><i>This concern has been brought up on a regular basis, this request is for EDF or HPC to provide some assistance if possible to ensure that the lengthsman tends to the banks that Stogursey Parish Council is responsible for - and also the roads and the roadside that are crumbling apart. We, the residents of this location would be very grateful.</i></p> <p><i>As a footnote, the recent works done along Bayleys Lane was paid for by a local resident because the parish council failed to attend to it in 2024. I have written to Stogursey Parish Council a couple of times now and have never received a response."</i></p> <p>- Submitted by Lidia Bosa</p> <p>4.4.1 CM said that there was no tangible assistance for things like this. AS added about flooding, stating that the southern landscape is very wet and she regularly clears grids as they are blocked, which exacerbates the flooding. AS said that she had lost the bottom field to flooding 3 times this winter and feels that it isn't being looked after and that cleaning drainage grids would make a huge difference.</p> <p>AC said that LB raised issue of the brook last year – and HPC cleared this. AC said HPC stop where it isn't their land, and that this is why the 'lengthsman' scheme continues to be funded.</p> <p>AC then said that it took him back to 13 years ago and when him and LB were planning out the work; and that it was difficult to balance the workload due to it being seasonal. AC mentioned that HPC don't have the direct control over the lengthsman. AS added that ragwort was an issue, in addition to Himalayan balsam.</p> <p>4.4.2 SG said that Stogursey Parish Council are not the owners, and that owners of the properties there are the riparian owners. This would then mean they would have responsibility for a huge number of streams in the area.</p> <p>SM asked for action. The Chair suggested a conversation about drainage needs to take place. AC mentioned the southern area designed to trap all this water so that it doesn't run off like this. The Chair asked how an overarching conversation could take place.</p> <p>JR asked about riparian ownership vs riparian responsibility.</p> <p>ACTION: AC said he would take this away and discuss how to proceed with other local stakeholders including the Parish Council.</p> <p>RC said this went back to his previous point about delaying matters until the next meeting. The Chair replied that this is an example of where all organisations present at the meeting need to move this forward and take action, rather than talking about this again at the June Forum, and that no-one should sit on their hands. He thanked members for the good debate and content covered.</p>	ACTION AC
5	Item 5: Topics for future meetings	
5.1	AS suggested communication was needed about the relief road being used for buses. AC said that a note was written ahead of this latest road closure. Road use and how people are forewarned.	

	<p>The Chair summarised about two-way communication regarding issues affecting these communities.</p> <p>AC referred to the Parish Council update newsletters; covering AILs / road works and use of relief roads. JR said that warnings are being sent out about AILs and changes to bus routes – and suggested it was just an extension of this.</p> <p>AC/MM want to ensure that everyone is on the relevant distribution lists.</p>	
5.1.1	<p>The Chair mentioned the site visit scheduled for Forum members on 6th May 2025. LB asked if it was just Forum or to residents. AC said how all residents were welcome to join and suggested that capacity was approximately 40, and that it could be a really good opportunity. Members appeared enthusiastic about the prospect of a site visit.</p>	
5.1.2	<p>AC asked if members wanted to continue receiving project progress items during engineering phase. The Chair commented on members' questions being relevant to these communities. CF said that a low point had been hit because MSF are interested in progress on a completion date and it feels like this isn't coming closer, particularly in light of the workforce number now more than doubled what was originally proposed, the C182 and roads are in a poor state, rolling road blocks block these; it's that people are feeling fed up with the Project.</p> <p>AS suggested that Forum dates should be published elsewhere.</p>	
6	Item 6 – Any other business	
6.1	<p>The Chair invited items of any other business. NiH asked about a monitoring box that was situated on a telegraph pole outside her house in Burton. AC said it was either HPA or HPB related and used for random air sampling. The Chair mentioned the site stakeholder group for HPA and B.</p>	
7	Date of next meeting	
	<p>The next meeting of the Main Site Forum will be on: Thursday, 19th June 2025 in Stogursey Victory Hall at 6pm.</p>	
7.1	The meeting ended	