

# DRAFT Meeting Report

<b>Regarding:</b> EDF Hinkley Point C: Transport Forum	<b>Date:</b> Thursday 13 <sup>th</sup> March 2025 – 6pm
	<b>Meeting held at:</b> Bridgwater and Taunton College, Cannington Campus.
<b>Participating:</b>	
Doug Bamsey, <i>Chair</i> John Roberts (JR), <i>Nether Stowey Parish Council</i> Richard Cuttell (RC), <i>West Hinkley Action Group</i> Allan Jeffery (AJ), <i>Green Party</i> Sue Aubrey (SA), <i>Stop Hinkley</i> Andy Coupé (ACé), <i>Somerset Council</i> Mark Phillips (MP), <i>Wembdon Parish Council</i> Hugh Davies (HD), <i>Somerset Council</i> Sue Goss (SG), <i>Stogursey Parish Council</i> Robin Kinahan (RK), <i>Fiddington Parish Council</i> David Dodge (DD), <i>Otterhampton Parish Council</i> John Addison (JA), <i>Cannington Parish Council</i> Chris Morgan (CM), <i>Stogursey Parish Council</i> Valdo Andrade (VA), <i>Avon &amp; Somerset Police</i> Liam Frampton (LF), <i>Avon &amp; Somerset Police</i> Sebastian Koa (SK), <i>University of Exeter</i>	<b>EDF Team:</b> Andrew Cockcroft, (AC), <i>EDF</i> Stacy Walker (SW), <i>EDF</i> Andy Wagstaff (AW), <i>EDF</i> Rachel Lister (RL), <i>EDF</i> Jamie Jamieson (JJ), <i>EDF</i> Richard Clews (RCI), <i>EDF</i> Drew Aspinwall (DA), <i>SEC Newgate</i>  <b>Apologies Received:</b> Roy Pumfrey (RP), <i>Stop Hinkley</i>

In addition to the forum meeting notes and agendas, all presentations and reports are available at [www.edfenergy.com/hpccommunity](http://www.edfenergy.com/hpccommunity)

Item		Action
1	<b>Welcome and Introductions</b>	
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	<b>Meeting Note and Matters Arising</b>	
2.1	The Chair referred to the meeting note of 14 <sup>th</sup> November 2024 and invited any further comment on the draft and the afternotes provided.	
2.2	<p>4.9 – John Addison, Cannington Parish Council - A said that someone turned up at the Bowling Green at Cannington Court but nothing was said to this driver by staff – this should be reinforced? AC said this was good feedback, there's a grey area there as Cannington Court isn't technically an HPC office.</p> <p>ACTION - AC will speak to their staff to ensure consistency. AC confirmed that this had happened.</p>	
2.3	There were no further comments, and the meeting note was approved.	
3	<b>Project Progress Update - (Andrew Cockcroft, EDF)</b>	
3.1	Andrew Cockcroft (AC) provided an update on the project.	
3.2	<p><b>AC gave an update, running through 2025s 4 primary goals</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Spent Fuel Pool: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Unit 1 Spent Fuel Pool is located inside the Fuel Building on the Nuclear Island.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• The Fuel Building pools form part of the Reactor Cavity &amp; Spent Fuel Pond Cooling &amp; Treatment System (PTR System). This manages the cooling of the spent fuel once it's removed from the reactor.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>AC highlighted that the 'rebar' (short for reinforcement bar or reinforcing bar used in reinforced concrete) is being manufactured in Avonmouth and brought in by barge to the temporary jetty, in order to reduce the amount of freight traffic on the roads.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2) Welding of Primary Circuit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Primary Circuit is located inside the Reactor Building on the Nuclear Island.</li> <li>• Last year we installed the first component of the Primary Circuit – the Reactor Pressure Vessel.</li> <li>• Over the coming months we'll continue to install more components – such as the Steam Generators and legs which connect the equipment.</li> <li>• The first weld will take place on the Reactor Pressure Vessel in the weeks ahead before completion of the circuit later in the year.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3) Dome Lift Unit 2 Reactor Building: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Big Carl will lift and place the 245t steel dome onto the second reactor building this year.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>4) Final goal of the year is the Unit 1 Safeguarding Buildings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Safeguard Buildings are located in the Nuclear Island.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>AC showed a plan of the site and highlighted where major components are located in relation to Unit 1 and Unit 2. Looking ahead, work on site will become more complex and at a smaller scale for the Mechanical, Electrical, Heating, ventilation and air conditioning (MEH) phase.</p> <p>For more information about the MEH Alliance visit: <a href="http://www.mehalliance.co.uk">www.mehalliance.co.uk</a></p>	
<p><b>3.3</b></p>	<p><b>DCO Material Change Update</b></p> <p>AC gave an update on the DCO Material Change and said that the project continues to move through the process for a material change to Hinkley Point C’s DCO. The proposed changes include a change to “dry” spent fuel storage and environmental mitigation for the removal of the acoustic fish deterrent (AFD).</p> <p>There has been widespread coverage in the news regarding our work to remove the AFD and our mitigation proposal for creation of new saltmarsh, which AC know has been followed closely by forum members.</p> <p>Key update was that an innovative technology, not available when the consent was originally granted, is now available and means it's possible to deploy an AFD without the need to endanger the lives of divers.</p> <p>Then technology was pioneered in the South-West and used in fishing fleets around the world, it uses electronic transducers to target specific fish species with high-frequency sound. The efficiency of the system means it can be precisely tuned and installed, retrieved / serviced from the surface.</p> <p>Additional benefits potentially include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses less power</li> <li>• Avoids the need for high voltage underwater cabling and underwater substation</li> <li>• Uses transducers not loudspeakers, which can be tuned to different frequencies, including those that may help eels</li> </ul> <p>The project is pausing work on proposals for new areas of saltmarsh while we work to establish the suitability of this new acoustic fish deterrent technology. AC said the project is going to now undertake some research to look at the ‘Hinkley specific environments’.</p> <p>Depending on how it all moves forward, there is the possibility the ASD Removal will not need to be included in the DCO Material Change application, as will simply discharge the original requirements.</p>	
<p><b>3.3.1</b></p>	<p>Whether with or without the AFD featured, the timescale is still to submit the application in the early part of 2026. Richard Clews (RCI) and team are looking into if any sort of re-consultation may be required or not.</p>	

<p>3.32</p> <p>3.33</p> <p>3.34</p>	<p>Sue Goss (SG) asked what happened to the 2025 deadline for submission; was the delay caused by the ASD? AC said that the project needs to look at the research to confirm this new solution will deliver the expected result in the location.</p> <p>Chris Morgan (CM) said that as a former diver he was pleased to hear that this solution would negate the potential danger divers may have been exposed to. CM was interested on the impact on elvers in the estuary and would wait the outcome of the research with interest.</p> <p>Hugh Davies (HD) asked if there was any potential impact on humans from these frequencies used by this technology. AC said that they work at the higher frequency bands, much like a dog whistle, beyond human hearing range. HD asked if there will be warning signs to say that these are in the water? AC said that it was a question he will return to this topic towards the end of 2025, as to how it will work in situ as the project knows more.</p>	
<p>3.4</p> <p>3.4.1</p> <p>3.4.2</p> <p>3.4.3</p> <p>3.4.4</p> <p>3.4.5</p>	<p><b>Workforce Uplift 2 Overview – Transport</b></p> <p>AC talked about the transport element of the workforce uplift implications. Confirming that the 15,000 is the upper limit and the project is using that number a precautionary principal. Using this number, the HPC planning team are working on updating the Spatial Distribution Note (SDN) which is almost ready. This then feeds in to the transport model and updated views on parking provision which then folds in to the topic paper which covers mitigation, such as additional P+R locations, increases to existing parking, shift phasing and the car share scheme.</p> <p>Fly parking continues to be a challenge, so have to think through any impacts or unintended consequences of these changes.</p> <p>CM reported that the Stogursey Parish Council is getting increased reports of speeding drivers and careless driving in the parish, including tailgating. He recognised that these are not on the whole employees of HPC, as he said he knew that majority of workers from HPC are using the buses provided. CM urged AC to put some pressure on HPB and HPA to deal with the situation.</p> <p>AC said that unlike A &amp; B stations, HPC has funded specific support from the Police. Since the last MSF, the Police team have taken an action to increase their presence in the area. Valdo Andrade (VA) and Liam Frampton (LF) in attendance from Avon &amp; Somerset Police confirmed that this was the case.</p> <p>CM added that when he was on the speed watch campaign working with the police, the two people that were stopped were actually from the village, which he described a ‘bit of a kick in the teeth’.</p> <p>AC said that at HPB there is an employee who have been directly tasked to look at this situation.</p> <p>AC also said that the project is talking to the police about potential changes to the speed limits and also utilises the variable messaging signs regarding road safety messages and also the buses all have cameras.</p> <p>Andy Wagstaff (AW) added that the large majority of buses have cameras, 9 video cameras with 30-day latency and have worked with the police to provide CCTV (subject to time, date and GPS tagging) to help with inquires related to A, B or C. HPC has also uses the footage to provide site / employment related penalties to both car and motorbike users.</p>	

<p>3.4.6</p> <p>3.4.7</p> <p>3.4.8</p> <p>3.4.9</p> <p>3.4.10</p> <p>3.4.11</p> <p>3.4.12</p>	<p>SG welcomed that the footage from the bus routes is being used and recognised that it plays a part in the solution to this problem.</p> <p>Richard Cuttell (RC) said he had been approached by a Shurton / Burton residents who said that it is not the speed that is the problem, it was the volume of traffic was a problem, he reported that he saw 156 vehicles between 06:00 - 07:00 that morning. It is the attitude towards other road users and also a issues of cyclist and walker with no high viz on.</p> <p>AC agreed that this was an issue along with behaviours like inappropriate overtaking – and hope the project was able to catch people and show to them, other workers and the wider community that are consequences to these kinds of behaviours.</p> <p>AC said he would reinforce this point to B&amp;A station. AW said he would take the action to do this as he already attends a Quarterly Road Safety Tri-Site Meeting, and will raise it more formally in that forum.</p> <p><b>AFTERNOTE:</b> Driver behaviours from HPA and B were raised at the cross-site Road Safety forum.</p> <p>Jamie Jameson (JJ) said that as part of safety week initiative, the project has issues Hi-Viz items for cyclist and will be look at this again, especially later in the year when the days become shorter.</p> <p>David Dodge (DD), raised that the left turn out of Steart junction had very poor visibility, the dip in the road adds to the problem. Otterhampton Parish Council has raised this previous, with no apparent result, so wanted this to be raised also.</p> <p>AW said he understands the issue it but it is not an something HPC can resolve, its sits with the Highways Authority to resolve if they deem necessary.</p> <p>DD also talked about the speed limit on the stretch coming down to Combwich being an issue.</p> <p>DD said he wanted to raise that perhaps the Steart junction could be widened to improve the view; but recognised that landowners would be impacted and not necessarily in support of such a scheme.</p> <p>Andy Coupé (ACé), said that the Steart junction has been a regular topic of conversation at this (Transport) forum, with several long presentations given. A number of interventions had been made including the reducing the speed limit from 60 to 50 mph as a result of these concerns; together with the introduction of the vehicle activated sign at the junction, funded by HPC and installed by (Somerset County) Council. The potential to improve visibility at the junction was looked at but, as DD inferred, the landowner was not in favour and therefore the other changes were implemented. HPC buses are instructed to slow down to 40mph in that area, despite the 50mph speed limit., which also helps to slow the overall traffic.</p> <p>Allan Jeffrey (AJ) asked if the additional workforce numbers would result in the need to buy more coaches. AW said he would return to this issue under Item 5.</p> <p>John Roberts (JR) said it was driver’s attitude that was the issues, driver have a ‘get out of my way’ attitude as they come across the hills and into the Nether Stowey. There’s then a circa 50% split between traffic going to HPB and the other circa 50% going to the park and ride. He said speed limits are fine as long they are enforced.</p> <p>AC agreed about the attitude as previously mentioned (by RC Item: 3.4.5)</p>	<p>AFTERNOTE (AW)</p>
<p>3.5</p>	<p>AC reminded the forum to sign up to the monthly updates if you are not already subscribed to receive them – (there is QR code in the presentation pack – which takes you to a webpage to insert your contact details).</p>	

4	<b>Update from Transport Review Group – Rachel Lister</b>	
4.1	<p>Rachel Lister (RL) provided a summary of the Transport Review Group Quarterly Report for October to December 2024 (Q4), which was presented to the Transport Review Group on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2025.</p> <p>RL added that in the meeting so far there had been a really good discussion reflecting one of the key purposes of the transport forum, which is:</p> <p>“Transport Forum is responsible for collating views from the public and forms the key link between the TRG and the wider community and provides an indication of the HPC transport issues that are impacting the general public.”</p>	
4.2	<p><b>Construction Workforce Travel Plan (CWTP)</b></p> <p>RL then ran through the CWTP figures for Q4</p> <p><b>Final journey to HPC site (last Quarter)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Walk <b>4.4%</b></li> <li>- Cycle <b>0.0%</b></li> <li>- Motorcycle <b>0.3%</b></li> <li>- Car (Driver) <b>1.4%</b></li> <li>- Car Share (Driver) <b>0.4%</b></li> <li>- Car Passenger via HPC Car Park <b>0.5%</b></li> <li>- Car Passenger via Drop Off Location <b>1.4%</b></li> <li>- HPC Bus Service <b>90.5%</b></li> </ul>	
4.3	<p><b>CWTP - HPC Bus Passenger Boarding Locations (last Quarter)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- North of Bridgwater <b>16%</b> (including <b>8%</b> at Brean Campus)</li> <li>- Local Area <b>12%</b></li> <li>- West Somerset (including Washford Cross P&amp;R and Minehead) <b>3%</b></li> <li>- Taunton &amp; J25 P&amp;R <b>9%</b></li> <li>- J24 P&amp;R <b>7%</b></li> <li>- J23 P&amp;R <b>13%</b></li> <li>- Bridgwater (including Sedgemoor Campus) <b>40%</b></li> </ul>	
4.4	<p><b>Bus Movements</b></p> <p>Bus movements a day (DCO) – 1,232. Bus movements a day (Last Quarter) – 1,104.</p> <p>Note: Current bus movements a day include “empty running” buses* which are not included in the DCO number. (* buses with no passengers, such as when buses are travelling to journey start point or returning to depot for maintenance).</p>	
4.5	<p><b>Construction Workforce Travel Plan (CWTP) – HPC Car Share</b></p> <p>The project continues to have a real focus on the promotion of car sharing.</p> <p>13% Car Passenger (only) at J23 P&amp;R and 12.09% at J24 P&amp;Rs (with targets set for peak construction at J23 P&amp;R 38% and J24 P&amp;R 36%, the car share targets in the DCO relate to the proportion of car passengers as a total of mode share to the park and rides including those walking and cycling).</p> <p>24.3% (364 workers) Car Sharers (Car Passenger and Car Driver with Passengers) at J23 P&amp;R and 23.8% (137 workers) at J24 P&amp;R – based on all users.</p>	

	<p>Overall, 25% of those arriving via car to all Park and Ride were car sharers (3,380 bus passengers arriving via car and of these 845 via Car Sharing– 392 car share drivers and 453 car passengers) – increased from 691 car sharers in Q3.</p> <p>Promotion of HPC Car Share continues following the promotional week in September 2024. RL shared images of some of the promotional material, articles and signage used in the campaign.</p> <p>92 new members joined (434 members joined, increased from 342).</p>	
<p><b>4.6</b></p>	<p><b>Fly Parking</b></p> <p>During the last quarter, the HPC Fly Parking Team also undertook their own checks and investigated 607 potential observations.</p> <p>27 of the reports (10%) were confirmed as HPC workers fly parking; 33 of the reports (13%) were HPC workers not fly parking and 202 of the reports (77%) were found to be not a HPC worker or not registered.</p> <p>162 bus passengers were found to be fly parking. This represents 2% of the total workforce and based on a full working week (Monday to Sunday) during the quarter equates to 4 HPC workers fly parking a day (based on Monday to Friday excluding Bank Holidays).</p> <p>All of the 162 are subject to the Fly Parking Policy – 3 Stage Approach which is applied to all HPC fly parkers.</p>	
<p><b>4.7</b></p>	<p><b>HGV Movements against HGV Average / Maximum Daily / Quarterly Limit for HGV Routes</b></p> <p><b>2024 Q4 (average):</b>  Daily HGV Movements – 164  Maximum Movements on any day (Mon-Fri) – 308  Maximum Movements on any day (Sat) – 24  All marked as green, as below the DCP average limit</p> <p><b>Forecast Next Quarter</b>  Daily HGV Movements – 190  Daily HGV Deliveries – 95</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 40 breaches (0.32% of total HGV movements) during Quarter Q1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1 HGV outside of permitted delivery hours</li> <li>- 0 HGV over permitted time limit</li> <li>- 39 HGVs deviated from the approved HGV route</li> </ul> </li> <li>• All HGV drivers who were involved in these breaches have received a Driver Strike.</li> </ul> <p>RL said that the team continue to undertake regular HGV Route Compliance activity which includes: Driver Briefings random observations; Senior Leadership Engagement Tours; HGV Signage review.</p>	
<p><b>4.8</b></p>	<p><b>CWTP</b></p> <p>Last Quarter: Daily HGV Movements was 164 (82 deliveries).  Next Quarter forecast: Daily HGV Movements: 240 (120 deliveries).</p>	
<p><b>4.9</b></p>	<p>RC asked if the briefings include senior managers and those who may have a parking space on site, suggesting that these may be the same people driving inconsiderately in the lanes near site?</p>	

	RL said that all messaging to workers go to all staff; many of the senior managers are the ones who are passing those messages on.	
4.10	<p>SG said a lot of the buses used the Operation HAROLD route during the recent diversions and asked if there was an update on the maintenance of the route, as previously raised. As the route is the forever emergency route, will HPC be contributing to the maintenance of the HAROLD route?</p> <p>AW said he would respond to the question as part of his presentation.</p>	
5	<b>Passenger Transport Update - (Andy Wagstaff, EDF)</b>	
5.1	<p>AW said that he wanted to cover some of the key topics that the project are asked quite frequently regarding passenger transport, these themes are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Buses travelling in convoy</li> <li>2) Why so many empty buses?</li> <li>3) Local community roadworks notifications</li> <li>4) Local area route deterioration – HAROLD, A39</li> <li>5) DCO Vehicle limit</li> <li>6) Buses waiting in dangerous areas and ad-hoc passenger drop off arrangements</li> <li>7) 4 buses attempting to fit into one stop</li> </ol>	
5.2	<p>Buses travelling in convoy. AW wanted to clarify that information given by Andrew Cockcroft’s predecessor was not correct; there are no conditions in planning agreements (DCO) or operationally that does not stop buses travelling in convoy. AW said that there are 14 bus stands at site and if there was pause in allowing each on to leave, this would result in considerable delays; also as traffic leaves the route, stop at junctions, roundabouts, traffic lights etc, it is inevitable that bus will end up travelling together even if they started off spaced out.</p> <p>AW showed some screenshots of the vehicle and driver allocation scheduling software. There are 199 vehicles currently in the fleet, the bus types are mixed up to use them as efficiency as the project can. The system flags the capacity and uses the correct vehicles to match the demand. This also helps with costs such as fuel.</p> <p>AW shared a rough statistic from the figures on the system, which is that if you put each bus passenger into an average sized vehicle instead, the queue of traffic would be approximately 32 miles long (site to just past Wells).</p>	
5.3	<p>Why so many empty buses? There are plenty of full buses running at peak times (04:30-06:30 / 16:30- 17:30), at these times it would be very rare to see an empty bus. We co-ordinate the services so that buses can be re-fuelled or going for maintenance at of peak times.</p>	
5.4	<p>Local community roadworks notifications AW highlighted that the ride along C182 is much better since the recent works, that resulted in the diversions. For these works there was a notification issued but AW pledged to see if the notification for the next round of works (in June) could be issued a bit earlier. These work is a week’s of work for further patching and resurfacing.</p>	
5.5	<p>Local area route deterioration – HAROLD, A39 Hinkley Alternative Route Other Lines of Diversion (HAROLD) this is used when the C182 is completely blocked – only passenger buses use this route, as there are some other suitable for cars. It is used infrequently so we are not necessarily the cause of the deterioration of the road surface on the route.</p>	

<p>5.6</p> <p>5.61</p> <p>5.62</p> <p>5.63</p>	<p>Andy Coupé (ACé), advised that the Council’s Highway Inspection Manual defines inspection and intervention standards for highway maintenance. The Operation Harold Route doesn’t get special treatment, but the C182 gets treatment as if an A Road given the strategic importance to the Hinkley sites. This represents a proportionate response based on the frequency of deployment of Operation Harold and limited resources.</p> <p>SG said she could not understand why it is not a strategically important route due to it being the emergency access route for the power station. SG did understand that highways engineers are due to inspect the route soon and hopefully will reconsider the current classification.</p> <p>SG asked if it was correct that there is an embargo on having a full closure on the route because of its emergency role? ACé said he expected there would be a range of considerations applied in determining the need for a road closure. He did confirm that it is not on the winter gritting route.</p> <p>SG did question the rationale employed regarding what is or isn’t considered strategic and suggested further discussion was required.</p> <p>SG requested that some funding could be made available for maintenance in the long term from the project, given the road’s role in emergencies.</p>	
<p>5.7</p>	<p>DCO Vehicle limit.</p> <p>AW returned to the DCO limit and AJ’s question regarding if the additional workforce numbers would result in the need to buy more coaches (as raised under Item 3).</p> <p>AW said that there was no limit to the number of buses – currently there are 199 buses in the fleet which takes the passengers / workers numbers of circa 14,300 – 14,500 – so there may be need to make some adjustments going forward. This week there has been some changes in the work patterns and a new timetable has come in, and the project will see how that settles in and review if any additional vehicle are needed.</p> <p>The DCO (At Peak) is 1,232 bus movements – AW said we won’t be breaking that even if we reach the 15,000 workforce peak and made reference again to the software that is in place to manage capacity and demand.</p>	
<p>5.8</p> <p>5.8.1</p> <p>5.8.2</p>	<p>Buses waiting in dangerous areas and ad-hoc passenger drop off arrangements.</p> <p>AW showed a slide of the position of the fleet numbers on the rear of the buses, which are easier to see than number plates for reporting vehicles. Every vehicle has GPS tracking on the buses which tells us the location, direction of travel, speed, dwelling time, excessive loitering time.</p> <p>It can all be checked, if reporting please have the fleet number and the time / date.</p> <p>RC asked why if the fleet number could be larger? AW said no one had ever asked that before, so will follow up with team to see if the fleet number could be larger. <b>AFTERNOTE:</b> AW did ask the question and it is considered that the existing numbers are large enough, SPS will not be re-configuring the entire fleet with larger numbers.</p> <p>RC said that he reported a bus this week, that has shown to be dangerous driving, so the system clearly works but said he had an email saying that he could also report complaints to SPS directly, and asked if he did this would the report be counted.</p>	<p><b>AFTERNOTE (AW)</b></p>

5.8.3	<p>SW said please keep reporting them to the project direct. Under circumstances if they are report to SPS directly they do still get counted in the figures but please keep all reports submitted to HPC.</p> <p>AJ asked if any buses and coaches are electric. AW said that are all diesels. That is because the infrastructure / power supply available in the area is not sufficient or mature enough to have a charging system that would give the fleet the same flexibility. AW noted that SPS are a private company are not able to tap into the funding for transition to electric that organisations like councils are.</p>	
5.9	<p>4 buses attempting to fit into one stop. AW said whilst there reports for 4 buses trying to get in a bus stop, this has never yet been proven, but do keep reporting them if you see this and the team will look into it.</p>	
6	<b>Marine Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) in 2025 - (Jamie Jamieson, EDF)</b>	
6.1	<p>Jamie Jamieson (JJ) gave a definition of AILs which is anything heavier than 150tonnes gross, longer than 50m and over 5m in width. JJ explaining that usually, in Somerset the AIL definition also includes height restrictions, as there are twelve of the lowest bridges of all the UK network between J21 and J22 on the M5 (5 metres) so any load over 4m in height on a standard trailer would strike those bridges – as a consequence the project have to make more use of Comwich Wharf, the closest marine facility to the HPC, that would usually be the case.</p>	
6.2	<p>JJ showed a slide of the Comwich Wharf Barge Plan for 2025 – this detailed the number of tidal windows within which it is possible to make deliveries to the wharf – the project Development Consent Order (DCO) sets out the times of operation and other parameters – nature provides the rest, depth of water blow the vessel along the route, height and length of tides – this leave approximately just 14% of the tides to utilise for deliveries – 403 barges deliveries per year. This is all before weather conditions have an impact (fog particularly), waves above 1m means no launch as does wind over 25knots.</p>	
6.2	<p>Depth of the tide dictates the payload of the barge – so the biggest loads can only come in tidal windows (marked in orange). We can use a crane at Comwich so we use a roll on / roll off method.</p>	
6.3	<p>All the loads have a number and come from France, Italy, Czech republic; Barry port is being used as well as Avonmouth. There is lot of planning all driven by the construction schedule – the loads can't come in to Comwich if they can't go straight to site, as they is limited laydown space.</p>	
6.4	<p>Deliveries so far in 2025 include the Unit 1 Steam Generators which JJ described as the "Crown Jewels" and very proud moment; Unit 1 Low Pressure Outer Casings; U1 Pressurisers; Unit 1 Condenser Modules; U1 CEX Condenser and U9 HXA Tanks, which were made in Cherbourg and the widest load of all at 9.5m – the entire width of the C182.</p>	
6.5	<p>Key takeaways: 23 tidal windows, 40ish individual barge deliveries. This year we aim to have circa 60 deliveries: continual learning. Always trying to reduce the impact on the local community by using the latest technology to speed up delivery where possible – JJ added that the a 572 tonnes steam generator can only be moved very slowly, taking 4 hours to travel from Comwich to site.</p>	
6.6	<p>JJ said we have had some really good feedback on the community notifications and to talk to us so the project can help you -</p>	

	Sign up to notification service for rolling road blocks on the C182 using this link: <a href="https://uk.surveymonkey.com/r/XQY9VDP">https://uk.surveymonkey.com/r/XQY9VDP</a>	
6.7	<p>Question: David Dodge (DD) asked about biosecurity concerns regarding the deliveries from the continent, such as the Asian Hornet, what measure are in place?</p> <p>Answer: JJ said that the bulk of our deliveries come wrapped, we have team that undertake a cargo condition report. We are looking for Asian Hornets or anything else that should not be there; the places the team look at are voids, such as pipework (which include to illegal stowaways and has happened; when it does the item can't be used on the project as it has been compromised).</p>	
7	<b>Future discussion topics – (Chair)</b>	
7.1	The Chair asked the forum members if there were any transport topics they would like to suggest for future meetings – non were suggested – so the Chair suggested to submit any ideas at a later date via the enquires email: <a href="mailto:edfenergy@hpcenquiries.com">edfenergy@hpcenquiries.com</a>	
7.2	The Chair said that an “all forum” site visit (was discussed at the last MSF) was being organised for the afternoon 6 <sup>th</sup> May 2025 and to look out for an email invitation. There will be two pick up / drop off points, for ease of access, at Cannington P&R and the Victory Hall Stogursey – places will be on a first-come-first-served basis.	
8	<b>Any Other Business - (Chair)</b>	
8.1	There were no other items raised.	
9	<b>Date of next meeting: Thursday 10 July 2025 at 6pm</b>	
9.1	The date of the next Transport Forum is on Thursday 10 <sup>th</sup> July at 6pm, again at Bridgwater and Taunton College, Cannington Campus.	
10	<b>The meeting ended</b>	