

**EDF Energy**  
**Sizewell C Community Forum**  
**3 July 2019**

**Attendees:**

*Brian Stewart OBE, Community Forum Chair*

*Jim Crawford, EDF Energy*

*Tom McGarry, EDF Energy*

*Richard Bull, EDF Energy*

*Carly Vince, EDF Energy*

*Beth Winstone, EDF Energy*

*Katy McGuinness, EDF Energy*

*Stephen Roast, EDF Energy*

*Rebecca Calder, EDF Energy*

*Rob Webb, Campsea Ashe Parish Council*

*David Secret, Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council*

*Bill Banks, Melton Parish Council*

*Judi Hallett, Tunstall Parish Council*

*Aidan Semmens, Woodbridge Town Council*

*Michael Simons, Darsham Parish Council*

*Jeremy Smith, Saxmundham Town Council*

*Jocelyn Bond, East Suffolk Council*

*Tony Cooper, East Suffolk Council*

*Philip Ridley, East Suffolk Council*

*Ian Norman, Farnham with Stratford St Andrew Parish*

*Anne Smith, Bruisyard Parish Council*

*John Walford, Yoxford Parish Council*

*Joan Girling, Together Against Sizewell C (TASC)*

*Alan Miller, Suffolk Wildlife Trust*

*Bryn Griffiths, Suffolk County Council*

*Russ Rainger, Suffolk County Council*

*Edwina Galloway, Kelsale cum Carlton Parish Council*

*John Staff, Knodishall Parish Council*

*Roy Dowding, Middleton-cum-Fordley Parish Council*

*Kenneth Parry Brown, Peasenhall Parish Council*

*Mary Ann Woolf, Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council*

*Jeff Hallett, Pettistree Parish Council*

*Mike Stevenson, Rendlesham Parish Council*

*Brian Hunt, Nacton Parish Council*

*Stephen Brett, Theberton & Eastbridge Parish Council*

*Rachel Fulcher, Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth*

*Miles Vartan, Suffolk Chamber of Commerce*

*Andrew Lewis, Walberswick Parish Council*

*Nick Mayo, Leiston, Saxmundham and District Citizens*

*Maureen Philpot, Sweffling Parish Council*

*Maureen Jones, Aldringham-Cum-Thorpe Parish Council*

*Pat Hogan, Sizewell Residents Association*

*Adam Rowlands, RSPB Minsmere Nature Reserve*

*Leigh Jenkins, Suffolk Constabulary*

*Richard Cooper, Marlesford Parish Council*

*Richard Smith MVO, Suffolk County Council*

*Brian Whiteley, Planning Aid*

*Simon Amstulz, Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB*

*Malcom Blakeney, Sizewell Parishes Liaison Group*

*Ian Bradbury, Southwold Town Council*

*Simon Barlow, Environment Agency*

*Peter Palmer, Aldeburgh Town Council*

## **I. Chair's Introduction**

The Chair introduced himself and welcomed the attendees. The minutes of the meeting would be published on the website in due course.

## **II. Minutes of the Last Forum**

The Chair proposed the minutes of the last Forum be approved as a correct record of the meeting. The Chair's proposal was seconded by Ian Norman. The minutes were therefore approved as a correct record of the previous meeting.

## **III. Project Update**

Jim Crawford reported that Hinkley Point C (HPC) remained on schedule. Following the completion of the base for the first reactor (J-Zero) the construction of nuclear buildings above ground could commence. The second reactor would obtain its own J-Zero by June 2020. Almost 4,000 people were working on HPC, with half from the local area. £1.5 billion worth of contracts had been awarded in the South-West of England as a result of the project, and 64% of the project value was being built with UK funds. 430 of the planned 1,000 apprentices had been hired, and 8,500 people had been trained and assessed. Final contracts had been signed for a new, innovative joint venture to install the pipes and cables at the power station.

On Sizewell C technical assessments and environmental surveys continued. The full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) would be submitted with the application for the Development Consent Order (DCO) for Sizewell C in the first quarter of 2020. Arising from the responses to the Stage 3 consultation and other work EDF Energy was now going to be holding a fourth focussed Stage 4 consultation.

## **IV. Sizewell C Stage 3 Consultation**

### *a) Feedback*

#### *Key Facts*

Richard Bull reported that over 7,000 responses had been generated by the RSPB's Love Minsmere campaign. Concerns had been raised in relation to noise pollution, artificial light, fluctuating water levels and coastal erosion and the impacts on wildlife.

#### *Overall Themes*

The majority of responses opposed to the development had included references to nuclear power. Another point had been that transport improvements and infrastructure had to be fully implemented before construction began on the main site. EDF Energy understood the concern from local communities regarding HGVs.

### *Main Development Site*

Concern had been raised over the area of designated land required for the proposals, as well as the potential impacts on the wetland habitat. The perceived visual impact of the height of stockpiles and the addition of four pylons had also been raised. There had been some suggestions that the borrow pits would pollute or disrupt the water table. There was a worry that coastal processes could pose a threat to the safety of the site and that the sea wall fence would be inadequate.

### *People and the Economy*

Respondents were keen to understand further detail on the opportunities. There was some concern regarding how the perceived negative impacts of construction would be managed. Tourism had been regularly mentioned as an economic priority for the area.

### *Accommodation*

Respondents had been concerned about how the campus site would potentially impact on Eastbridge. There was also a general concern that the area would be unable to cope with the influx of construction workers. Some concerns had been raised that the caravan location could damage the landscape and did not leave a legacy for the area.

### *Transport*

The rail-led option had been strongly preferred. Concerns had been expressed over the proposed closure to pedestrian level crossings and the impacts on rights of way. A more detailed justification was required for the discounting of the marine-led option.

### *b) Q&A*

Michael Simons felt that EDF had ignored the major obstacles that would be created by the Northern park and ride. Air pollution was also highlighted. Richard Bull explained that EDF's sophisticated traffic model suggested that there would be free-flowing traffic along the A12 route. Air pollution was not a concern.

Simon Amstulz wanted to hear how EDF responded to the AONB's suggestion that EDF were building in a nationally designated area. He also queried whether there would be less benefit to the local community if EDF brought along its supply chain from HPC to Sizewell.

Jim Crawford responded that EDF only wanted to transfer over a proportion of the supervision and project management capabilities. Carly Vince noted that EDF's assessment would have regard to all of the important designations around the site.

Adam Rowlands asked if it was possible to have more detail on the ecological impact regarding the marine-led option and the jetty. Stephen Roast replied that, regarding ecology, the recent designation of Special Conservation Area had rendered the jetty option difficult to implement.

Bill Banks asked if there had been any progress regarding the visual impact that would be caused by the four large pylons around the main building site. Richard Bull clarified that this would be covered during the Stage 4 consultation just announced.

Pat Hogan noted that EDF had not expressed any concern regarding the controlling of construction workers in the communities. Rebecca Calder explained that there would be a worker code of conduct that would have to be adhered to.

Richard Smith MVO explained that the road alternative around Wickham Market and the freight management facility had been two of the worst suggestions. He queried whether both options would be ruled out. Richard Bull stated that they would not be, but further proposals would be included at Stage 4.

Jeremy Smith noted that Saxmundham Town Council supported the major use of trains as a means of freight, though it wanted assurances regarding night time use. He also wanted assurances that the maximisation of the use for freight purposes would not get in the way of local residents and commuter traffic. Regarding the road development next to the A12, Saxmundham Town Council wanted assurances as to whether there would be a proper consultation between the local planning authority's local plan and EDF. Jeremy Smith requested an assurance that there would not be any adverse impact on local services. He also asked if the impact on tourism had been assessed.

Richard Bull responded that EDF had been working closely with Network Rail regarding double tracking, who had advised EDF that it needed one passing route in a location between Melton and Saxmundham. East Suffolk Council's proposed development at Saxmundham had no direct impact on EDF's roundabout requirement on the A12.

Rebecca Calder provided assurances that EDF would have a comprehensive occupational health service on-site. There would be an impact assessment on tourism. EDF do not expect huge impacts to the entire sector across the Suffolk coast and will work to mitigate the local impact of construction.

Richard Cooper wondered if the 2,000-unit development at Adastral Park, Martlesham, had been included within EDF's traffic assessment. Richard Bull confirmed that it had.

Stephen Brett noted that within Stage 3 EDF had communicated that it planned to close Pretty Road and Fordley Road, also interrupting a number of footpaths. He also highlighted the roundabout at the head of the site and the possible congestion. Richard Bull replied that EDF had been working on the Pretty Road issue and it would maintain the link onto Pretty Road from the proposed Sizewell link road. More detail would be available at Stage 4.

Mike Stevenson highlighted Adastral Park and suggested that EDF note what the County Council's highway proposals were for the stretch of road between Foxhill Road and Martlesham. 'Fly-parking' was a major concern for Rendlesham Parish Council. Richard Bull responded that EDF would not permit people to travel in from further afield past its own park and ride sites, nearer to the main construction site before taking an ad-hoc route to work.

Roy Dowding stated that during Stage 3 Network Rail had not clarified whether the rights of way and level crossings would be disrupted or destroyed as a result of EDF having to run five trains each day. The second issue pertained to roads. There had been the mention of D2 within Stage 3 but EDF had not indicated if the matter would once more be under consideration.

Richard Bull replied that the new road infrastructure, designed to the modern Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) standards, would improve journey times and the safety of people. Regarding D2, an independent study had conclusively stated that EDF had chosen the right route.

Edwina Galloway queried how EDF would ensure drinking supplies, and farming and tourism activities would not be jeopardised in the driest part of the country during the construction operation and decommissioning of Sizewell C. Jim Crawford explained that EDF intended for there to be no impact on local communities.

Rachel Fulcher asked if the code of conduct included anything pertaining to care of wildlife. Rebecca Calder noted that EDF would manage behaviour via the code of conduct and through constant reinforcement.

Ian Norman wanted to know whether EDF would assure Farnham and Stratford St Andrew that the construction of the road infrastructure would take place before EDF began to construct Sizewell C. The two-village bypass had raised a lot of objections for its route during Stage 3, and EDF had made very small mention of this. Richard Bull stated the two-village bypass had to be one of the

first schemes to be delivered based on the number of HGVs EDF would have flowing along the road.

Joan Girling asked if lifetime carbon emissions would include the entirety of the build programme or just the lifetime of the operations. Jim Crawford confirmed that the CO<sub>2</sub> figures for the nuclear power station included all of the emissions during construction through to operation and de-commissioning. Joan Girling asked if the figures would be made available. Katy McGuinness noted that EDF's assessment of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions would be available alongside the environmental statement and that the PowerPoint presentation would be published on the website.

John Walford highlighted the coincidental nature of Stage 4 occurring at a time when parish councillors would be unable to fully concentrate on the situation. Jim Crawford responded that Stage 4 would be a focussed consultation but with a 10-week period due to the summer holidays. EDF would again commission Planning Aid support to the parish councils.

## **V. Next Steps**

Jim Crawford explained that the Stage 4 consultation would principally centre on freight management and proposals for ecological mitigation around the main development site.

Kenneth Parry Brown queried why the proposals in the scoping review differed from EDF's Stage 3 proposals. Carly Vince replied that the scoping reflected the Stage 3 consultation proposals.

Edwina Galloway asked if EDF would make it easier for the parish councils to have paper copies of the next consultation. Tom McGarry said "of course". A summary document would also be available.

Rob Webb noted that there had not been a consultation regarding the timetable for Stage 4. Carly Vince explained that both local authorities had confirmed that EDF's approach complied with the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC).

Richard Smith MVO requested that EDF allow Suffolk County Council and East Suffolk Council to have early sight of the documents. Jim Crawford stated that EDF were obliged to make this information available to everyone at the same time. Tom McGarry assured the parish councils that support from Planning Aid England would be available at Stage 4.

Simon Amstulz wanted to know if there would be more environmental information at Stage 4. Jim Crawford felt that the EIA could only be concluded once all proposals had been firmed up. It was noted that the proposals could change as a result of the feedback.

Jeff Hallett expressed his concern with the Stage 4 timetable. Tom McGarry gave the reasoning for the timetable, whilst also providing assurances that Pettistree Parish Council would receive support from Planning Aid England should it be deemed necessary. EDF would also be happy to facilitate any presentation within the 10 weeks of consultation.

Maureen Jones asked if EDF could assure her that it was in consultation with Scottish Power regarding its plans. Richard Bull clarified that EDF was.

## **VI. Chair's Closing Remarks**

The Chair thanked everybody for their attendance and contributions. The next Forum meeting would take place towards the end of the year. There would also be a further meeting once the DCO application had been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate.

**This Executive Summary was produced by Ubiquis UK ☎ +44 (0) 20 7269 0370**  
**<http://www.ubiquis.co.uk> / [infouk@ubiquis.com](mailto:infouk@ubiquis.com)**