

EDF Energy
Sizewell C Community Forum
23 January 2019

Attendees:

Brian Stewart OBE, Community Forum Chair

Marjorie Barnes, EDF Energy

Richard Bull, EDF Energy

Rebecca Calder, EDF Energy

Jim Crawford, EDF Energy

John Hicks, WSP

Alan Lewis, EDF Energy

Tom McGarry, EDF Energy

Stephen Roast, EDF Energy

Carly Vince, EDF Energy

Peter Palmer, Aldeburgh Town Council

David Secret, Benhall and Sternfield Parish Council

Graham Bowles, Blaxhall Parish Council

Anne Smith, Bruisyard Parish Council

Robert Webb, Campsea Ashe Parish Council

Nick Mayo, Community Action Suffolk (CAS)

Michael Simons, Darsham Parish Council

Geoff Abell, Dunwich Parish Meeting

Simon Barlow, Environment Agency

Ian Norman, Farnham with Stratford St Andrew Parish

Graeme Hall, Hacheston Parish Council

Edwina Galloway, Kelsale cum Carlton Parish Council

John Staff, Knodishall Parish Council

Terry Hodgson, Leiston-cum-Sizewell Parish Council

Peter Chaloner, Little Glemham Parish Council

Richard Cooper, Marlesford Parish Council

Sharon Smith, Middleton cum Fordley Parish Council

Thérèse Coffey, MP

Jeff Hallett, Pettistree Parish Council

Adam Rowlands, RSPB Minsmere Nature Reserve

James Sandbach, Saxmundham Town Council

Malcolm Blakeney, Sizewell Parishes Liaison Group

Pat Hogan, Sizewell Residents Association

Russ Rainger, Snape Parish Council

Ian Bradbury, Southwold Town Council

Beverley McClean, Suffolk Coast & Heaths AONB

Miles Vartan, Suffolk Chamber of Commerce

Geoff Holdcroft, Suffolk Coastal District Council

Rachel Fulcher, Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth

Leigh Jenkins, Suffolk Constabulary

Richard Smith MVO, Suffolk County Council

Alan Miller, Suffolk Wildlife Trust

John Tesh, Sweffling Parish Council

Tim Rowan-Robinson, The Suffolk Coast DMO

Stephen Brett, Theberton & Eastbridge Parish Council

Joan Girling, Together Against Sizewell C (TASC)

Richard Jenkinson, Wickham Market Parish Council

John Walford, Yoxford Parish Council

Apologies:*Aldringham-cum-Thorpe Parish Council**Peasenhall Parish Council**Blythburgh Parish Council**Public Health Suffolk**Bredfield Parish Council**Rendham Parish Council**Gt Glemham Parish Council**Rendlesham Parish Council**Highways Agency**Sibton Parish Council**Melton Parish Council**Suffolk Resilience Forum**Nacton Parish Council**Tunstall Parish Council**National Grid**Walberswick Parish Council**Natural England**Westleton Parish Council**Office for Nuclear Regulation**Woodbridge Town Council**Parham Parish Council**Woodbridge Town Council***I. Chair's Introduction**

The Chair introduced himself and welcomed the attendees. Housekeeping rules were highlighted. The Chair confirmed that minutes of the meeting will be made available. Attendees were reminded to make any contributions in a respectful manner. Although the meeting was in public, it was not a public meeting. The Chair requested that the members of the Forum and Observers were seated in the correct area. Though there were no planned fire alarm tests, the attendees were informed of the rendezvous point in the event of a fire alarm. He also alerted the attendees that photography of the meeting would be made and all attendees were deemed to have given their consent to this.

II. Minutes of the Last Forum

The minutes were available on the website and the Chair proposed they be approved as a correct record of the meeting. The Chair's proposal was seconded by Jeff Hallett. The minutes were therefore approved as a correct record of the previous meeting.

III. Sizewell C Stage 3 Consultation and Proposals

Jim Crawford thanked the attendees for their presence at the Forum and presented the most recent proposals for Sizewell C. Sizewell C is a proposed nuclear power station that EDF Energy is proposing in Suffolk, comprising two reactors (known as the UK EPR), and it would be capable of generating enough electricity to supply six million homes. It would replicate the two units that were being constructed at Hinkley Point C (HPC). It was expected that the output from the power station would be consistent with that of offshore wind.

There were still two months remaining for the consultation process. EDF Energy will use the feedback to consultation, and further environmental and technical studies to inform the development of its proposals. EDF Energy will continue to learn lessons from HPC in order to

further form the development of plans for Sizewell C. The deadline for responses for the Stage 3 consultation was 29 March 2019.

IV. Questions & Answers

Thérèse Coffey MP noted that both park and rides now required 1,250 spaces rather than 1,000, though 2,400 places at the campus remained and 400 pitches had been added. She queried the change in thinking. Richard Bull explained that EDF Energy had used a high case assessment for workforce within their transport modelling. The central case assessment for the workforce number remained at 5,600. All the traffic flow numbers that had been included within the Stage 3 documentation included a higher case assessment of 7,900. In any scenario, EDF Energy could confirm they had assessed an adequate number of workers. Sizewell outage traffic flows had been included within the assessment as well as the busiest days during the week. The higher case assessment had been driven from a transport perspective. Thérèse Coffey outlined that it appeared more people would be travelling by car, while the amount of accommodation would be increasing. Richard Bull stated that the increase in the capacity at the park and rides was to incorporate people travelling to the park and ride sites and getting the bus to the site. Thérèse Coffey explained that it seemed as though more people were involved than previously thought, whether staying on site or travelling to site. Rebecca Calder reiterated that the increased number was to reflect the higher case scenario. It was also to control unlicensed caravans in farmers' fields.

Bev McClean queried how EDF Energy were meeting the requirement to avoid damage to the AONB. Alan Lewis responded that EDF Energy were undertaking a full LVIA of the main development sites and associated development sites. There were 29 viewpoints at the power station site, which had already been agreed with the local authority. There would also be a meeting with the local authority in order to agree the viewpoints for the associated development sites. EDF Energy would also undertake a tranquillity assessment. EDF Energy were very aware of the AONB context and it had been working with its designers and landscape architects to address the issue. The matter would be fully addressed in the environmental statement and the supporting planning statement.

Richard Smith MVO highlighted the beach landing facility and queried its role during construction and the possible 60-year operational period, and the effects it would have on the beach and shoreline.

Stephen Roast echoed that the beach landing facility would be in place for the construction period and the operational life of the station. It would be used to help transport large pieces of equipment during the operation. The landing facility would have a removable road bed so that only the piles would be left in place when deliveries were not being made. With regards to the impact on the shore, the modelling had shown that only a small number of piles were out into the tide and sub-tidal shoreline. The effects on shore by the location of the piles were exceptionally negligible.

Carly Vince noted that Planning Aid England (PAE) were being funded to work with all of the parish councils throughout Stage 3. Jim Crawford stated that EDF Energy could circulate CGI images which demonstrated the beach landing facility with the platform in place and with it removed.

Richard Cooper asked where Forum members could locate additional information regarding the rejection of the marine-led option. It was highlighted that within the consultation document the rail-led option appeared to have been fairly heavily caveated around the work that Network Rail had yet to conduct. He asked if EDF Energy could provide an assurance that they would push as hard as they could to obtain government intervention if necessary in order to effect a rail-led strategy.

Jim Crawford stated that he was happy to provide an assurance that Network Rail would continue to pursue a rail line option. EDF Energy had to ensure that Network Rail could deliver to the schedule of the overall project.

Geoff Abell queried EDF Energy's assessment of the private rental market and the anticipated impact during the construction period. Rebecca Calder noted that EDF Energy had been looking at the impact on the private rental sector. Currently, EDF Energy had looked closely at Leiston and it was known that there would be two and three-bed houses in the low 30% of the rental sector. This did not only relate to the general sector but which parts of the sector and which locations would be affected. This would then be targeted by housing fund measures. Jeff highlighted that the transfer of the demand into the tourist rental market was another issue of concern. Rebecca Calder stated that this would be addressed in the accommodation strategy.

John Walford outlined that EDF Energy were showing a maximum of 6,000 people working, though its booklet showed 5,350 car parking spaces for its workers. He asked if EDF Energy could review any mitigating measures, such as car sharing. John Walford also highlighted that the Yoxford roundabout had grown considerably in size since consultation two. The nearby school would be within 400 metres of the roundabout. John Walford questioned why EDF Energy were spending so much money on such pieces of roadworks. It appeared as though the anticipated tinkering would lead to an economic, business and community catastrophe. It was suggested that EDF Energy embraced a more positive approach, such as the D2. John Walford wanted to ensure that Yoxford had a real legacy.

Richard Bull explained that the car parking space increase at the park and ride sites had been driven by EDF Energy's higher case assessment. A ratio for car share had been included within the numbers. The design and size of the Yoxford roundabout remained unchanged from Stage 2. EDF Energy had undertaken modelling of the efficiency of the roundabout in relation to local receptors. Within the modelling, the junction by the roundabout would have to be upgraded within five to seven years even without the Sizewell C project. EDF Energy had attempted to address comments from Stage 2 regarding the B1122 and they had looked at a number of alignments for a link road from the A12. EDF Energy felt the current proposal delivered the best alignment, which delivered the best mitigation for all of the villages. The proposal would also remove the majority of traffic moving through Yoxford.

Pat Hogan stated that the Sizewell residents required reassurance and consideration due to the major project at hand. She asked EDF Energy to clarify the use it expected to make of the road at Sizewell gap. Richard Bull replied that EDF Energy were aware of the early years impact along the Sizewell gap. It was a priority for EDF Energy to do what it could to mitigate this as soon as possible. There would be a 6 to 12-month impact whilst EDF Energy utilised the entrance to Sizewell B and EDF Energy were investigating whether they could further reduce the period. The speaker questioned the helipad. Jim Crawford explained that the helipad would be designed for emergency use only. This had only been included within the proposals as the construction of Sizewell C would remove the existing helipad facility for Sizewell B. This was not scheduled for any regular or planned use. The proposal was that the helipad would be situated on Crown Farm Corner.

Russ Rainger highlighted the outfall and intake from Sizewell C and queried how they would be constructed. Russ Rainger also questioned the fishing impact. Jim Crawford stated that there would be two intakes and one outfall from Sizewell C and they were designed to allow the discharge to dissipate and prevent Sizewell B receiving warm water from Sizewell C. This would be tunnelled in a similar manner to HPC. Stephen Roast noted that the fishing assessments were

ongoing. Mitigation measures were planned and EDF Energy were consulting with the regulators regarding the potential impact on fish.

Graham Bowles asked if there would be additional pylons going across the countryside from Sizewell B. Jim Crawford responded that there would be no change to the pylons that were currently running to Sizewell B. The only work required involved re-stringing of the cables. There would be no change to the pylon structure or the number of pylons running in and out of the power station complex.

Stephen Brett believed that the B1122 required a relief road. He queried how EDF Energy would prevent car, van and small lorry users from travelling through Leiston and Saxmundham and not utilising the relief road. Richard Bull noted that the route would attempt to capture HGVs primarily from the north and south, which would be on a designated route. Richard Bull queried whether Steven Brett was questioning whether cars and commercial vehicles of less than 3 tonnes would choose to take an alternative route to site as opposed to utilising the link road. Steven Brett confirmed he was. He felt EDF Energy's proposal would encourage rat running. Richard Bull did not believe it would. The link road would be the choice for the vast majority of people. Workers residing to the west of the A12 would be using the park and ride sites and would be travelling on a new route. Richard Bull felt that the current proposal provided the best option for mitigation to the B1122.

Richard Jenkinson asked if EDF Energy could confirm its current relationship with Network Rail. Jim Crawford stated that Network Rail had delivered everything they had promised within the agreed timeframe. As Network Rail were experts in their field, it was correct that EDF Energy paid for their services. Richard Bull stated that EDF Energy had a strong relationship with Network Rail, who had delivered a huge amount of information that had informed the Stage 3 proposals. EDF Energy would work with Network Rail to ensure that Network Rail could deliver a robust delivery timescale that was acceptable to EDF Energy. EDF Energy would be working closely with Network Rail within the next three to six months in order to obtain further clarity on the issues at hand.

Peter Palmer queried the economic net benefit to Suffolk during the building of the power station. Rebecca Calder noted that there were a lot of issues that were not only related to economics. EDF Energy were addressing negative aspects, such as ensuring the emergency services could still function as well as ensuring people were not displaced from the housing market. £100 million had been released into the local markets.

Edwina Galloway stated that Kelsale had several residents who lived nearby whose homes were now blighted. This included Fir Tree Farm. She asked when EDF Energy would engage with residents who were blighted to inform them of compensation measures or the purchase of their homes. Jim Crawford responded that EDF Energy had engaged with a number of people who were affected. The highlighted examples would be receiving a letter from EDF Energy, which would outline its position. Jim Crawford underlined that the current suggestions were only proposals.

Joan Girling explained that Together Against Sizewell C (TASC) were concerned about the size of the potential buildings. TASC were disappointed to find that the berm that would protect the front of Sizewell C would go further and nearer towards the sea. This would also have an impact on either side of the site. Joan Girling wanted to know the exact acreage of the site. Jim Crawford stated that the size of the entire site would be 32 hectares.

Dick Jenkinson noted that neither proposal for the traffic and mitigation measures for the park and ride at the north end of Wickham Market was very effective. He asked if EDF Energy was prepared to work with Wickham Market in order to find a better solution. Richard Bull stated that

the route through to Wickham Market was a difficult problem to solve. EDF Energy felt that its two proposals would provide an improvement and the diversion route would likely be effective. EDF Energy were more than happy to listen to feedback and work with Wickham Market Parish Council in order to discuss how best EDF Energy would optimise the situation. EDF Energy's flows would be quite tidal and it would need to understand more about the current use of the road in order to determine how effective the proposal would be.

Dick Jenkinson suspected there would be two to three times more LGVs than HGVs and queried why EDF Energy had not installed a control system for LGVs. Richard Bull stated that EDF Energy would be controlling HGVs. EDF were forecasting 350 LGV movements per day. When compared to the HGVs, it was broadly equitable depending on the strategy one looked at. It would be very challenging for EDF Energy to control the LGVs on designated routes.

Ian Norman touched on the railway option and voiced his pessimism with regards to any jobs that EDF Energy would task Network Rail with. This would likely lead to a road-led option, which would blight the lives of many. EDF Energy had to get the proposal right with the help of the County Council. Ian Norman suggested that EDF Energy explored having the alignment of the Two Village by-pass to the east of Foxburrow Wood and linked into the existing lanes at Parkgate Farm.

Richard Bull stated that the proposed Suffolk County Council alignment route of the Two Village bypass had been included within Stage 2 and had been further developed for Stage 3. Richard Bull could not comment on the access of Parkgate Farm, though EDF Energy would identify if it could be better configured in order to take into account the roads mentioned by Ian Norman. EDF Energy would also review the alignment of the route in relation to Foxburrow Wood.

Ian Norman noted that there was a property to the east of the bypass route that EDF Energy did not know existed. The owner of the property would become isolated and unable to exit his property. EDF Energy had not reviewed this issue and this was a failing on their part. Richard Bull stated that this was not the case and that the proposed design was subject to further discussion with residents and landowners to confirm access requirements to land and property. EDF Energy would have to have individual discussions with homeowners in order to understand their specific access requirements for their homes and lands. It was not factually correct to state that EDF Energy were unaware of the property highlighted.

Jim Crawford explained that in relation to the SEGWAY scheme, EDF Energy would continue engagement with the County Council to maintain the potential for the SEGWAY scheme to commence within the timescales of Sizewell C. There had also been a number of conversations with local business owners to ensure EDF Energy found the best possible outcome for the business owners, should the bypass proceed as planned. EDF Energy was conscious of the issues raised and they would fully engage with Ian Norman and the Parish Council. Any comments would also be addressed once EDF Energy produced a more detailed design of the proposed bypass.

Leigh Jenkins noted that it had been stated that there would be 5,600 workforce members on site. He queried whether this figure pertained to shift patterns or if there would be an uplift of workforce that would not be on site and would be waiting to come on shift. Rebecca Calder responded that this was the total figure, though there would occasionally be an overlap.

Tim Rowan-Robinson voiced his particular concern of the combined effect of the variety of diverging energy projects that were being planned around the Sizewell area. He asked if EDF Energy had given thought to how they were communicating with SPR and queried the role of the Suffolk Energy Coast Delivery Board.

Jim Crawford explained that the Suffolk Energy Coast Delivery Board met on a regular basis in order to discuss potential projects. EDF Energy also met with them technically and EDF Energy would let them know its plans.

Carly Vince stated that EDF Energy are also working with the District Council to discuss the programme and approach to assessment. Within each submitted application each developer was responsible for producing a cumulative assessment that would look at the totality of the impact across all of the issues.

Terry Hodgson highlighted his concerns relating to the housing of individuals within the town. There was a worry that this would lead to houses in multiple occupation and streets cluttered with cars. Rebecca Calder noted that both issues were being discussed with Suffolk Coastal District Council. Jim Crawford added that EDF Energy would be utilising an accommodation bureau, while every worker would be required to register their vehicle.

Geoff Holdcroft queried the amount of days the beach would be closed for during the construction phase. He also asked what other factors would be taken into account for the rail-led option. Richard Bull noted that EDF Energy's trains would be routed across the country and up the line from Ipswich. EDF Energy had been assured that there should be no issues with regards to them routing the trains from its supply points. EDF Energy also had to consider the availability of wagons and diesel engines. Such matters were being discussed with the freight companies and it was not felt that this would be an issue. The main area of concern pertained to the delivery of the infrastructure in a timely fashion.

Jim Crawford was unable to clarify how long the beach would be closed for. This depended on the construction schedule. The beach would be closed for as little time as possible. Abnormal and indivisible loads would occur from year five or six of the construction schedule for a likely period of two years.

Maureen Jones explained that following the conclusion of the meeting from the previous day, several people had been left horrified by the size of the pylons that would be erected. She asked if this could be reviewed. Jim Crawford stated that EDF Energy would continue to review the calculations.

Jeff Hallett noted that he was unable to locate any information relating to the rail loop. He had also expressed concerns about rat runs through Pettistree village and he was still worried that congestion in Wickham Market would provoke cars coming through the small lanes in Pettistree village.

Richard Bull responded that the 'loop' term was slightly confusing. Essentially, the scope of work involved the replacing of the track on the existing track bed to form a double track. There was no extension of the track away from the existing rail line. Information pertaining to the rail loop could be located within the rail chapter. The northern extent of the loop was just to the south of the existing Pettistree level crossing.

EDF Energy would review Jeff Hallett's concerns relating to rat running. Based on the road configuration, it was felt that this was unlikely to occur.

Thérèse Coffey highlighted the pylons. Jim Crawford had mentioned the safety and programme risks connected to the over ground line option and asked him to clarify what would be required if EDF Energy were to opt for an underground cable.

Jim Crawford explained that the key issues related to the size of the cables and the heat generated. If EDF Energy were to opt for the underground option, they would have to utilise more land and build additional underground ducts. The underground cabling would also compromise safety classified equipment that was already part of the design.

Richard Cooper asked if EDF Energy were prepared to consider alternative sites for the southern park and ride. Richard Bull stated that EDF Energy were fixed with their current option.

Graeme Hall asked if the route from Kenton Hills to the beach was to be reinstated after the completion of the construction. Alan Lewis stated that the route would be reinstated.

Peter Palmer asked if the overall design of the pylons would have a visual impact on the area. Carly Vince responded that the National Policy Statement identified the site as being suitable. EDF Energy would ensure that any proposals closely aligned to policy and struck the right balance between benefits and impacts.

Richard Jenkinson queried what EDF Energy had learnt about rail use from HPC. Jim Crawford stated that there was not a rail line into HPC.

Robert Webb asked if workers from Sizewell B would be encouraged to use the park and ride. Richard Bull noted that the park and ride site would only be for construction workers for Sizewell C.

Ian Bradbury asked how individuals would be able to make comments once the consultation period had elapsed. Carly Vince stated that EDF Energy would provide feedback to the Community Forum once it had analysed all of the feedback. EDF Energy would then look to finalise its assessments and proposals that would ultimately form the planning application. All stakeholders would have the opportunity to participate in the process and provide their views once the application had been submitted. Jim Crawford added that the planning inspectorate would give a presentation at one of the future Community Forum meetings.

Russ Rainger asked if EDF Energy's modelling had factored in the increase of HGV traffic on the A12 and the effects on air quality. Richard Bull noted that there it was not anticipated that there would be a significant impact, though EDF Energy recognised that it had to conduct further assessment work in this area.

V. Next Meeting

The Chair thanked everybody for attending. It was anticipated that there would be two further meetings of the Forum. The first would be likely to occur in the late summer after the Stage 3 consultation had ended, while the second would take place in early 2020 after the submission of the DCO application.