

**EDF Energy**  
**Sizewell C Community Forum**  
Minutes of Meeting held on 25 April 2013 at Sizewell Sports and  
Social Club at 7.00pm

*Attendees:*

*Brian Stewart OBE, Chairman*

*Cllr Peter Cox, Aldeburgh Town Council*

*Cllr Eric Atkinson, Aldringham-cum-Thorpe  
Parish Council*

*Jeff Hume, Blaxhall Parish Council*

*Andrew Miller, Bredfield Parish Council*

*Raymond Catchpole, Campsea Ashe Parish  
Council*

*Nick Mayo, Community Action Suffolk*

*Joan Girling, Communities Against Nuclear  
Expansion*

*Geoff Abell, Dunwich Parish Council*

*Sheery Sassoon, EDF Energy*

*Kate Stinton, EDF Energy*

*Roy Collins, EDF Energy*

*Stephen Walls, EDF Energy*

*Mike Lavelle, EDF Energy*

*Steve Mannings, EDF Energy*

*Tom McGarry, EDF Energy*

*Simon Barlow, Environment Agency*

*Ian Norman, Farnham with Stratford St  
Andrew Parish Council*

*John Cross, Great Glemham Parish Council*

*Maureen Carr, Jobcentre Plus*

*Edwina Galloway, Kelsale-cum-Carlton  
Parish Council*

*Christopher Lister, Knodishall Parish  
Council*

*Cllr Terry Hodgson, Leiston-cum- Sizewell  
Town Council*

*Peter Chaloner, Little Glemham Parish  
Council*

*Cllr Margaret Carswell, Marlesford Parish  
Council*

*Bob Perrett, Middleton-cum-Fordley Parish  
Council*

*John Morris, Middleton-cum-Fordley Parish  
Council*

*Kenneth Parry Brown, Peasenhall and Sibton  
Parish Councils*

*Peter Hayward, Pettistree Parish Council*

*Cllr Lisa Boswell, Rendham Parish Council*

*Mike Stevenson, Rendlesham Parish Council*

*Ben McFarland, RSPB Minsmere Nature  
Reserve*

*Jon Swallow, Sizewell Parish Liaison Group*

*Pat Hogan, Sizewell Residents Association*

*Graham Saward, Suffolk Resilience Forum*

*Leigh Jenkins, Suffolk Constabulary*

*Therese Coffey, MP Suffolk Coastal*

*Michael Wilks, Suffolk County Council*

*Cllr Andrew Nunn, Suffolk Coastal District Council*

*Cllr Michael Roseveare, Wickham Market Parish Council*

*John Tesh, Sweffling Parish Council*

*Patricia Mulcahy, Woodbridge Town Council*

*Clive Brown, Theberton & Eastbridge Parish Council*

*Nigel Kerridge, Yoxford Parish Council*

*Arlette Smith, Westleton Parish Council*

### ***Apologies:***

*Naomi Tarry, Best of Suffolk*

*David Edwards, Public Health Suffolk*

*Alan Mackley, Blythburgh Parish Council*

*Sir Peter Batho, Saxmundham Town Council*

*Roger Coates Smith, Darsham Parish Council*

*Bill Jenman, Suffolk Coasts & Heaths*

*Graeme Hall, Hacheston Parish Council*

*Cllr Tony Cooper, Suffolk Coastal District Council*

*Alan Kirkdale, Highways Agency*

*Cllr Trevor Hawkins, Suffolk Coastal District Council*

*Crispin Clay, Leiston Business Association*

*Cllr Richard Smith MVO, Suffolk County Council*

*Steve-Knight Gregson, National Grid*

*Paula Warner, Nacton Parish Council*

*Julian Roughton, Suffolk Wildlife Trust*

*Glen Gillespie, Natural England*

19.00 – 21.45

## **I. Welcome from the Chairman**

Brian Stewart introduced himself as Independent Chairman of the Sizewell C Community Forum and formally opened the meeting. New members were welcomed, and the Chairman asked anyone wishing to speak to introduce themselves before making their point to aid correct attribution in the Minutes.

## **II. Approval of minutes of last meeting**

The Chairman asked the Forum to approve the minutes of the last meeting held on. He noted that they were very long and said in future they would be shortened. No clarifications or corrections were requested and accordingly the minutes were approved and cleared for publication on the consultation website. <http://sizewell.edfenergyconsultation.info>

### **III. Presentation from EDF Energy and Q&A session with members**

The EDF Energy team provided a presentation on the Sizewell C Stage 1 Consultation feedback. This included a breakdown of the numbers of responses received, and the broad views of consultees on the project as a whole and on the overarching transport and accommodation strategies. The key themes and issues raised during the consultation were outlined, as well as identification of where consultees expressed a clear preference for specific proposals.

The PowerPoint slides, which accompanied the presentation, have been provided to the Community Forum as part of these minutes.

#### **1. General Issues**

The first question came from Terry Hodgson, who asked if the presentation was going to be made available in written form as he was finding some of the slides difficult to follow. The Chairman confirmed that it would.

Bob Perrett asked how the proposed jetty was going to work in such shallow water. Roy Collins said there were a range of factors bearing on the design of the jetty and that further work on the design was being carried out. He agreed that there were issues about what size of boats would be able to access the jetty and this would be taken into account in the final design.

John Morris asked whether EDF Energy's presentation was going to contain any analysis leading to new proposals from EDF Energy, rather than just feeding back the responses to consultation questions. Kate Stinton said the presentation would be illustrating the main themes in the feedback received, with charts and diagrams and that she hoped this would give insight into the responses received.

Therese Coffey asked for EDF Energy's response to the volume of responses they had received – 1,298 to the stage one consultation process, 49 of which were from Parish and Town Councils – in comparison to the Hinckley Point consultation. Kate Stinton said the overall response rate was roughly double that of Hinckley and that EDF Energy were pleased with it.

Referring to EDF Energy's pie chart presentation, Ben McFarland asked if it was too simplistic to split responses into 'for' and 'against'. He also asked how they dealt with the 'many shades of grey' in between. Kate Stinton said the chart was actually split between support, support with caveats and those who oppose. She said the caveat portion dealt with the range of opinions that were supportive dependent on other points raised by the consultee. She also stated that the graph only covered responses where consultees provided a clearly stated view, hence the numbers of the graphs not matching the total number of responses received.

Terry Hodgson asked if EDF Energy had considered whether individual responses could be biased depending on where the people lived in relation to the proposed development sites. This would suggest that some parties would simply favour sites further away from them. Kate Stinton replied that their ability to do so was partly dependent upon the respondents providing them with an address, but that they were very aware of that possibility. This was one reason why purely looking at the numbers of respondees could give a distorted result, with smaller population clusters being swamped by responses from larger places.

## **2. Accommodation**

Geoff Abell asked for clarity on the accommodation strategy. He also asked about the correlation between those who supported that strategy and their support or opposition for the Sizewell C project as a whole. He asked if it was the case that those who did not support the project automatically did not support the accommodation strategy, and therefore that those who did support the strategy overwhelmingly backed the accommodation strategy. Kate Stinton said they had not looked at it in that way; they had treated each question individually and given the overarching result for each option. Geoff Abell said he thought the relationship between responses to different options was an important piece of analysis to carry out. Kate Stinton said they had to take into account everybody's views on each point regardless of their views on other things. Steve Mannings supported this, saying they had a responsibility to take account of people's views on everything and not simply discount some views depending on the respondents' answers to other questions.

Jon Swallow pointed out that one of the accommodation options would see 3,000 workers sited close to the villages of Theberton and Eastbridge. He described this as an ill-conceived proposal that would have a devastating effect on the community. Kate Stinton said they had read his written response and taken note of his comments.

Lisa Boswell asked which accommodation option was preferred. Kate Stinton said more respondents to the consultation had considered the Development Site Campus to be more appropriate than for the other options.

Joan Girling asked how far the Development Site Campus was from the construction site. Steve Mannings acknowledged that this issue had caused confusion for some people. The Campus would be located at the entrance to the construction site. Joan Girling said this was rather misleading, as this would still mean that the Campus was about four kilometres from the actual buildings of Sizewell C. Steve Mannings repeated that it would be right at the entrance to the construction site. Joan Girling repeated that it was still a long distance away from the building site and meant that the development would stretch over four kilometres.

Therese Coffey asked if there were any other suggestions for accommodation apart from the three options that had been presented by EDF Energy. Steve Mannings said there had been a small number of responses which suggested housing workers in Ipswich or other more urban areas.

Michal Roseveare asked if EDF Energy had received any comments about legacy and the alternative use of facilities after construction had finished. Steve Mannings said there had not been much discussion of it, but that consideration should be given to greenfield legacy and the maintenance of some of the landscaping that had been carried out.

## **3. Transport**

Therese Coffey wanted to know more about the Southern Park and Ride scheme, asking if there had been any support for combining the lorries and cars. Kate Stinton said there had been some support, but the more common view was that people did not want the two combined. Therese Coffey had a follow-up question on possible alternative locations that had been suggested. Kate Stinton listed Martlesham, Saxmundham, the turn-off of the A12 towards Sizewell, Orwell Bridge, and 'generally further south' as being among the responses they had received.

Raymond Catchpole asked how much detailed research had been carried out into the effects on commuter traffic. He pointed out that the Wickham Market site was very busy with traffic trying to

get on to the A12. Roy Collins replied that these issues had been raised in connection with the Wickham Market site and confirmed that more traffic modelling work would be done.

Bob Perrett said he was very worried about the impact of Sizewell C on the roads, and wanted to know if any figure could be given for the percentage of transport that could be diverted to rail and sea. Roy Collins said EDF Energy was aware that many people wanted more information, and the reason that precise figures had not been provided at Stage 1 was because the jetty and rail proposals were still being developed. Until those were finalised EDF Energy could not confirm how much freight could realistically be brought in by boat or train. He emphasised that EDF Energy wanted to maximise the use of rail and sea but they had to fully understand the physical constraints on this before more precise figures could be provided. He hoped to be able to provide those figures at the next stage of consultation.

Patricia Mulcahy pointed out that no decisions had been made and asked how far the contributions they were making at the meeting would be taken into consideration when those decisions were made. Kate Stinton said the meeting was a major part of the process and that all comments would be fed in, along with the studies and traffic modelling, to bring them to a conclusion. At that point they would consult again, so all parties would be consulted at every stage of the process.

Terry Hodgson had a question relating to the positioning of lorry parks, and asked if any consideration had been given to traffic arriving from the north. Roy Collins said that was a fair point that would need to be looked at in more detail. The current assumption – based on an analysis of the construction of Sizewell B – was that 85% of deliveries would come from the south.

John Cross said that a very clear comment had been made in the previous meeting about the A1120/A14 becoming a conduit for lorry traffic. Roy Collins said those concerns had been raised during Stage 1, and EDF Energy did not see the A1120 as a lorry route to the site and would take steps to manage that. John Cross pointed out that anyone with a satnav would circumnavigate EDF Energy's desired routes.

Therese Coffey asked if consideration had been given to the lorry park being used as a consolidation site instead of a holding site, to try to reduce the number of lorries going up the A12. She also wanted to know if any specific options could be ruled out at this stage. Kate Stinton said nothing was being ruled out at this stage and that only once all necessary information was taken on board, including the consultation responses, would decisions be made prior to moving onto a further stage of consultation. Roy Collins added that some people had raised the consolidation issue and that EDF Energy had proposed a consolidation facility for post and smaller items – to be co-located with a park and ride development. For larger items and materials the view was that the scale of Sizewell C construction was such that these would be in fully loaded vehicles anyway.

Joan Girling asked if EDF Energy would eventually put a lorry management plan in place, and if this would be in co-operation with the County Council and the Highways Authority. Roy Collins said the answer to both questions was yes. Joan Girling then asked when that plan would be made public, saying it could allay a number of fears if people knew what was going to happen. Roy Collins said it would form part of future consultation proposals and referred back to EDF Energy's proposals at Hinkley, which included a construction traffic management plan. Joan Girling asked if EDF would manage the final approved plan or if they would get a separate body to manage it for them. Roy Collins said policing and managing lorry movements was vital and that EDF Energy expected to apply similar principles at Sizewell to those proposed at Hinkley Point.

Mike Taylor asked where all the different components of the plant would be coming from and where they would be entering the country. Mike Lavelle said that at the pre-procurement stage it

was impossible to pinpoint which country specific parts of the plant would be coming from and how they would be transported. He also said that a significant number of the components would be manufactured in the UK.

Mike Stevenson asked whether any decisions had been made about what parts of the Sizewell B construction process would be replicated at C, and how the aggregates would be delivered. Mike Lavelle said aggregates would be delivered by sea, as it was impractical to bring them by road or rail.

John Tesh asked about the anticipated number of truck movements on the A12. Roy Collins said at Stage 1 EDF Energy had provided figures of between 100 and 300 deliveries a day, so between 200 and 600 movements. He said EDF Energy was aware of the level of concern about HGV movements and that this concern was entirely understandable. EDF Energy was seeking to reduce the traffic impact as much as practically possible while remaining consistent with a viable construction programme. He repeated that further work around the jetty and railway proposals should yield more solid estimates on the proportion of traffic that could be shifted off the roads by the second stage of the consultation process.

Ian Norman asked what guarantees EDF Energy could give that they would assess the traffic on the A12 more accurately. Surveys had been carried out in the past that had been inaccurate for a variety of reasons; much better assessments needed to be carried out. Roy Collins said that EDF Energy would do a rigorous and robust assessment, as required by the planning process.

Margaret Carswell referred to Roy Collins' previous comment that 'a rigorous assessment would be done', and asked if this meant it had not already been done. Roy Collins said that the project was still at an early stage and acknowledged that there was a lot more work to be done. EDF Energy stood by the work done and presented at Stage 1 but the need for further work had been recognised in the Stage 1 consultation material and EDF Energy had never sought to pretend otherwise.

Jon Swallow wanted to know when more precise information about traffic was going to be made available. Kate Stinton reiterated that more work would be done in the lead up to the next stage of the consultation. Stephen Walls added that further transport work would be on going throughout 2013 and that progress would be reported on as and when the project was ready to do so.

John Cross said that, with regard to the movement of HGV traffic and use of the A12, if EDF Energy did not get things right local people would be the ones to suffer. He suggested that EDF Energy might wish to control or limit the timing of HGV movements through the day to avoid the worst traffic periods. Roy Collins said EDF Energy would be looking at those kind of issues in detail once there was a firmer estimate of the number of lorries likely to be using the road and thus the numbers at any given time of day.

Nigel Kerridge also raised the issue of the A12 and the A1120, saying that the level of traffic on the roads coupled with the number of HGVs that would have to cross the A12 was bound to cause problems. Roy Collins said they recognised that this was a critical issue and reiterated his earlier point about active management of the routes that lorries would be permitted to use.

John Morris said that the adequacy or otherwise of the road network was the most concerning thing about the whole project, and criticised the quality of the questions that had been asked about this issue. He asked whether Forum members would have influence over the questions that would be asked at the second stage of the consultation, and commented that he would like the Forum to be able to vet the questions so that they could ensure the right questions were being asked such as on if there should be a four village bypass or a new access road from the A12. Kate Stinton said that

people were free to respond to whichever questions they wanted to, and that there were free text options within the questionnaire so that people could give general comments and not just respond to specific questions. People could also respond via letter or e-mail and were thereby able to feedback their views beyond any specific questions. The Forum insisting certain questions should be asked would not be appropriate as it is EDF Energy's consultation and they could only consult on what they were proposing. This did not prevent any particular issues from being raised by consultees and being taken into account, but would help to keep the consultation focused. Any views members of the Forum had on the consultation questions would nevertheless be considered when preparing the next stage of consultation, and if members wanted to raise any points on this with Tom McGarry in the Leiston office, they would be very welcome to do so.

With regard to the options on rail transport, Terry Hodgson said he found the responses to the proposed rail routes difficult to understand and that many of those questioned seemed to have no knowledge of the area.

Peter Cox asked if any thought had been given to passenger movements by rail or just freight. Kate Stinton said there had been quite a few comments on this, with people wanting to see rail as a transport option for workers and as a legacy of the construction project. Roy Collins added that EDF Energy would be looking at the issue further. The priority was to move freight by rail to try to reduce road traffic, but the passenger aspect was something EDF Energy would take into consideration.

Raymond Catchpole raised the issue of a passing loop on the rail line at Campsea Ashe. He said the map that was being used by EDF Energy in looking at this was out of date, which meant the proposed location of the loop ran across the gardens of 19 new-build houses. He had raised the issue at the last meeting, but had had no feedback. Roy Collins said he was aware of the issue and stated that this had arisen because the OS maps that were licensed for use had not been up-dated to include the recent new housing. He confirmed that EDF Energy would be speaking with Network Rail further to discuss a range of issues arising from the consultation, including the location of the passing loop, but that he could not give any commitments at this stage to the siting of the loop.

Therese Coffey requested that EDF Energy let her know who they were dealing with at Network Rail. Roy Collins said that EDF Energy would provide this information.

Joan Girling asked if one of the proposed routes would be crossing the B1122, and if this had been taken into consideration. Roy Collins said EDF Energy were looking at where all the proposed rail routes would be intersecting with roads and would be considering the appropriate form of crossing, considering each case on its merits.

#### **4. People and the economy**

Kenneth Parry Brown said that EDF Energy's plans to accommodate up to 6,000 workers were unrealistic. Those numbers combined with the 1,000 workers who would be brought in during the outages of the B station were likely to swamp the area. Roy Collins said a significant proportion of the workforce would come from the local area so would not affect the provision of accommodation. They were working on their estimates of actual numbers as the project progressed; current forecasts were based on the assumption that workers would be willing to travel up to 90 minutes each way to get to work.

Mike Stevenson picked up on the issue of outages, saying that once Sizewell C was up and running there would be a pattern of outages across B and C that would mean 18 weeks of outages in 18 months. This equated to 25% of the time period. He asked for confirmation that this had been

taken into account in the accommodation strategy. Mike Lavelle confirmed that Mike Stevenson's calculations were correct and that the issue had been taken into account.

The Chairman asked if EDF Energy were able to elaborate on the future timeline of the Sizewell C project. Stephen Walls said the best way to forecast this would be to look back at Hinkley and pointed out that from the second stage of consultation to the point of DCO application was about 15 months. From that point there was a period of up to six weeks where the planning inspectorate would decide whether to accept the application. If it was accepted, planning rules would kick in and they would have 12 months to conclude their report to the Secretary of State. There would then be a further three months until the decision was actually made. EDF Energy had made the DCO application at Hinkley in October 2011; the Secretary of State's decision had come in March 2013.

Therese Coffey asked EDF Energy to quantify the extent of their consultation. Tom McGarry said they had sent their newsletter to 20,000 households within a 10 mile radius of the proposed site. They had also ensured that newsletters were sent to every residential and business address within a mile of every associated development site beyond that 10 mile radius.

Therese Coffey asked if there had been any 'surprise responses' during the consultation concerning issues that EDF Energy had not foreseen. Kate Stinton said there had been no big surprises as they already had a broad understanding of the general concerns, but that the detail within the responses was extremely helpful.

John Morris said he thought this was the most important question of the whole night, and that he was not satisfied with this answer. The implication of the question was whether EDF Energy's strategy and proposals were going to reflect anything different when they came to stage two. He said that people really wanted to know how good the company's strategy was and whether they had the right plan, not how well they were asking the questions. Kate Stinton replied that they would give feedback and formulate their own responses to the issues raised at Stage 2. She referred back to Hinkley and said they had made very clear at each point of the consultation how the proposals had changed as a result of community feedback. Stephen Walls added that at Hinkley one of the associated development sites was changed after stage two consultation, which illustrated that they were obliged to take account of the comments they received and to act upon them.

Andrew Miller of Bredfield Parish Council stated that he was disappointed by stage one of the consultation and said he felt the analysis of the data collected had not been very specific.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

The date of the next meeting was confirmed as Thursday 17 October 2013. The Chairman asked that any agenda item suggestions for that meeting which would not be covered by a general update should be submitted to the Forum Secretariat via email.

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