

# **EDF Energy**

## **Sizewell C Community Forum**

### **13 December 2012**

#### **Attendees:**

Brian Stewart OBE, Chairman

#### **EDF Energy Representatives**

Ian Bryant

Roy Collins

Mike Lavelle

Steve Mannings

Tom McGarry

Angela Pearce

#### **Community Forum Members**

Paul Wood, *Suffolk Coastal District Council*

Martin Davies, *National Grid*

Simon Barlow, *Environment Agency*

Graham Saward, *Suffolk Resilience Forum*

Leigh Jenkins, *Suffolk Constabulary*

Jon Swallow, *Sizewell Parish Liaison Group*

Therese Coffey MP, *Suffolk Coastal*

Councillor Richard Smith MVO, *Suffolk County Council*

Councillor Tony Cooper, *Suffolk Coastal District Council*

Councillor Trevor Hawkins, *Suffolk Coastal District Council*

Joan Girling, *Communities Against Nuclear Expansion*

Pat Hogan, *Sizewell Residents Association*

Ben McFarland, *RSPB Minsmere Nature Reserve*

Miles Vartan, *Suffolk Chamber of Commerce*

Rachel Fulcher, *Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth*

Councillor Michael Roseveare, *Wickham Market Parish Council*

Councillor Mike Chandler, *Aldringham cum Thorpe Parish Council*

Nigel Suckling, *Blaxhall Parish Council*

Raymond Catchpole, *Campsea Ashe Parish Council*

Roger Coates Smith, *Darsham Parish Council*

Geoff Abell, *Dunwich Parish Council*

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

John Cross, *Gt Glemham Parish Council*

Edwina Galloway, *Kelsale cum Carlton Parish Council*

Councillor Terry Hodgson, *Leiston cum Sizewell Town Council*

Peter Chaloner, *Little Glemham Parish Council*

Councillor Roger Waterfall, *Marlesford Parish Council*

Roy Dowding, *Middleton Cum Fordley Parish Council*

Kenneth Parry Brown, *Peasenhall and Sibton Parish Councils*

Jeff Hallett, *Pettistree Parish Council*

Councillor John Fisher, *Saxmundham Town Council*

Neil Parsons, *Snape Parish Council*

Clive Brown, *Theberton & Eastbridge Parish Council*

Nigel Kerridge, *Yoxford Parish Council*

Roger Lintott, *Rendham Parish Council*

Paul Rosher, *Leiston Business Association*

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

The Chairman opened the meeting and welcomed participants. A summary note of the meeting would be circulated after the Chairman had authorised it. The Chairman explained the terms of reference for the forum and its overall purpose. The group was not here to discuss the principles of nuclear energy in general or at the site, as this had already been determined by Government. The purpose of the meeting was to consider the Stage 1 proposals.

The Chairman requested that participants afford each other respect, bearing in mind the group's diverse views on the site and EDF Energy. There was no formal constitution; the forum was an informal and light-touch mechanism. The Chairman reminded participants to fill in the form requesting contact details. This would ensure the secretariat could contact participants in the future.

Suffolk County Councillor Richard Smith explained that he had been chairman of the Sizewell A and B Site Stakeholder Group. As chairman of that group he had been paid an honorarium, which was a matter of public record. He queried whether the Chairman – as someone from a public-sector background – would inform the forum how much he is being paid. The Chairman said that he would not be divulging this information and invited Tom McGarry (EDF Energy) to discuss the terms of the Chairman's engagement.

Tom McGarry (EDF Energy) explained that during the process of trying to identify an independent chairman, EDF Energy had taken recommendations from Suffolk County Council, who had suggested various candidates for the role of Chairman. Brian Stewart was among them. Following the recruitment process, a private contract was agreed between EDF Energy and the Chairman. As a rule, EDF Energy would not divulge the details of contracts with suppliers, but Tom McGarry confirmed that the Chairman's salary was wholly in line with the honorarium referred to by Richard Smith, which was approximately £5,000 per annum.

## **II. Apologies**

Apologies were received from: Dr Hilary Graham, Benhall & Sternfield Parish Council; Graeme Hall, Hacheston Parish Council; Christopher Lister Knodishall Parish Council; Arlette Smith (Westleton Parish Council); Councillor Andrew Nunn, Suffolk Coastal District Council; Maureen Carr, Job Centre Plus; Naomi Tarry, Best of Suffolk; Nick Mayo, Suffolk ACRE; Nick Collinson, Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB; Julian Roughton, Suffolk Wildlife Trust; Sue Kelly, Office for Nuclear Regulation; Jane Griffiths, Marine Management Organisation; Glen Gillespie, Natural England; and Alan Kirkdale, Highways Agency; Bruisyard Parish Council; David Robertson, Friston Parish Council; Andrew Houseley; Parham Parish Council; Rendlesham Parish Council; John Tesh, Sweffling Parish Council; Geraldine Taylor; Tunstall Parish Council; Walberswick Parish Council; Julian Herbert; NHS Suffolk; David Tytler, Blythburgh Parish Council; Michael Kaff, Aldeburgh Parish Council.

## **III. Sizewell C Stage 1 Initial Proposals and Options – EDF Energy**

The Chairman noted that EDF Energy was consulting the public on its Stage 1 initial proposals and options for Sizewell C. Angela Pearce, Head of the Sizewell C Project and her colleagues presented the initial proposals and options.

The presentation covered the following elements of the proposals:

- An overview providing the nationally agreed policy context for new nuclear build
- The potential benefits and impacts of the proposals
- The scope of the Sizewell C Stage 1 consultation.
- The proposals for the main Sizewell C site
- The construction laydown area
- The landscape strategy
- Associated Developments: Accommodation and Transport Strategy

- Accommodation Campus locations
- Park and Ride locations
- Rail
- Lorry Management
- Roads
- Public Consultation

## **IV. Questions**

### **1. Preamble**

The Chairman thanked the EDF Energy team for their presentation. The questions segment would be structured according to the sections of the EDF Energy presentation. Questions were to be asked and answered in groups. The Chairman reminded participants to ask questions, not make statements.

### **2. Main Site**

Therese Coffey MP noted that the design of the station itself was important. Many people wished for a dome-shaped structure. A dome would ensure the structure was in keeping with the design of Sizewell B. Joan Girling (Communities Against Nuclear Expansion) queried how sewage from the construction site/development site campus would be catered for, noting that she understood that the Sizewell A sewage works, which had been built in the 1960s, was unlikely to have capacity. Additionally, further detail on the temporary bridges was requested. Jeff Hallet (Pettistree Parish Council) noted that there were no reassurances in the consultation documentation regarding safety aspects of construction, i.e. any guards against leakages and long-term geological and sea level issues.

Ian Bryant (EDF Energy) explained that the process was at a very early stage and this was the first stage of consultation. EDF Energy's approach to the layout of the power station has been to take into account the sensitive nature of the surrounding environment. The amount of land needed for the permanent development on the main site would be less than that proposed for HPC. This has been achieved mainly by locating some the buildings and uses away from the main site.

EDF Energy have been working hard on the land use aspects of the development seeking to ensure the power station as compact as possible within the AONB while recognising the need to construct and operate the plant in an efficient manner. To this effect, the permanent footprint had been reduced down to about 32 hectares. EDF Energy also appreciated the importance of design in terms of the external appearance of the power station and had recently appointed a leading UK architect to help articulate the development within the AONB. The applicability of the Hinkley Point C design would be an important design consideration as well as the surrounding environment at Sizewell. The architect would also need to take account of those regulatory issues likely to impact upon design. The Company would be developing its design principles, working with the relevant bodies, in preparation for further more detailed consultation on its proposals. By the middle/end of next year EDF Energy intended to have these design principles worked through with officials, all being well. Stage 1 proposals did not feature the external details of buildings, but rather concentrated on establishing land use.

Mike Lavelle (EDF Energy) noted that the old sewage works would have to be removed and a new sewage plant built to take waste from A, B and C. The temporary bridges would be there to span a strip of SSSI to allow wildlife to circulate through the existing passageways. The location of these, however, had not been finalised as designs for how the construction sequence would work were still being worked out. Joan Girling (Communities Against Nuclear Expansion) noted that the documentation stated that the temporary bridges would be used by the construction workforce. Steve Mannings (EDF Energy) confirmed this, noting that they would be removed following construction.

Regarding the issue of safety, Mike Lavelle (EDF Energy) explained that the Generic Design Assessment had been carried out by the Office of Nuclear Regulation and had satisfied the regulator that the design met all nuclear safety requirements for a plant operating in the UK. Aspects of conventional safety and longer-term effects have been considered in the design of the site including long-term climate change.

Roger Coates Smith (Darsham Parish Council) noted that Angela Pearce (EDF Energy) had mentioned affordable energy. In light of the fact that nobody would set up a business without knowing the price it could sell its product for, Roger Coates asked whether EDF Energy could discuss affordable energy and how Sizewell C would affect energy prices.

Angela Pearce (EDF Energy) explained that in terms of the cost of generating new nuclear power, there was an ongoing process being carried out by the government to define the strike price for energy produced by new nuclear power stations. The principle was clear that over the coming years, for many reasons, it was likely that there would be increases in electricity prices, but new nuclear power represented one of the best ways of ensuring that electricity generation could continue on an economical basis. The Chairman interjected to suggest that this was somewhat outside the forum's purview.

Geoff Abell (Dunwich Parish Council) noted that there was a shelter belt of trees to the northwest of the site, which went over Goose Hill. If this remained, it would effectively mask the roadway from the Minsmere site and the north. Geoff Abell stated he had felt the presentation indicated that this shelter belt would be destroyed for the construction site and enquired whether EDF Energy could give any assurances that it would remain in place. Ian Bryant reiterated that EDF Energy sought to keep its construction footprint as small as possible. Woodland to the north had been planted in the 1990s. Geoff Abell felt the key issue was whether this shelter belt would remain. Ian Bryant (EDF Energy) confirmed that it would remain and was a key component in screening Minsmere from Sizewell C.

A participant noted that an area of woodland to the south of the site had been removed and turned into temporary heathland, querying whether this would be replaced. Ian Bryant (EDF Energy) explained that the majority of the northwest forestry plantation was nearing maturity. Over several years, as any woodland was felled, it would be replaced with a mosaic of new heathland and woodland planting, which would improve the ecological makeup of areas. Commercial forestry would not be replaced.

### **3. Campus Options**

Jon Swallow (Theberton & Eastbridge Parish Council) noted that option one would badly affect Eastbridge, while options two and three would affect other areas badly. Clive Brown asked why the campus could not be on the construction site. Kenneth Parry Brown (Peasenhall & Sibton Parish Council) enquired where workers would be clocking in, as this had big implications on where would be best for them to live. Between arriving at the Park and Ride and starting work, there might be long period of 'dead time'. A 45-minute commute each way was a long section of the working day. Richard Smith felt that 3,000 people was a sizable amount to house in one place. The documentation provided offered three options but, in fact, accommodation could be located in several smaller units; people were not being encouraged to suggest alternatives.

Steve Mannings (EDF Energy) explained that option one was our preferred option partly because it was located at the entrance to the proposed construction site. It was not possible to locate the campus within the construction site itself because all of this land was needed for other purposes. In terms of clocking in, this would be done at the entrance to the site.

Steve Mannings (EDF Energy) explained that the options process had looked at a large number of potential sites. The result of the process had been to select these three sites which EDF Energy considered best met its strategic and operational needs whilst having the least environmental impact. EDF Energy had a very clear wish to develop a single large campus on site. In that way it would be able to best reduce daily commuter traffic issues, recognising that traffic was one of residents' key considerations. A single on-site or near site campus location would also deliver important construction efficiencies having such a large, flexible workforce so close to site. EDF Energy had emphasised in the consultation documentation that it would be happy for residents to identify and propose alternative sites. EDF Energy would take any suggestions for sites seriously and consider them against its strategic and operational requirements and potential

environmental effects. If it were satisfied that a site met its strategic and operational needs and had an environmental impact no worse than its proposed options it would be considered further.

One participant explained that he had asked one member of an EDF Energy exhibition team why the accommodation campus could not be located inside the construction site and had been told that it was because the construction noise would disturb the workers. Steve Mannings (EDF Energy) apologised that this was not a correct answer and reiterated that it was not possible to locate the campus within the site because all this land was needed for other purposes and because it would also need to be situated outside of the construction fence for security reasons.

Therese Coffey (MP) queried how EDF Energy had reached the stated percentages of workers who would be local or not, additionally noting that a discussion was needed as to whether Leiston residents wished for their town to expand. Option three could provide legacy benefits for future housing. Joan Girling (Communities Against Nuclear Expansion) enquired as to the exact number of hectares taken up by all of these extra sites away from the main development. Pat Hogan (Sizewell Residents Association) felt it was unreasonable to expect that EDF Energy would maintain good relations with residents if it were to build on some of the sites proposed.

Roy Collins (EDF Energy) emphasised that the estimate of home-based workers was exactly that, an estimate. There would be considerable job opportunities suitable for local people during the construction phase and EDF Energy would seek to maximise these. Given the scale of the workforce and the specialist staff needed, particularly during the mechanical and electric phase, there was a need to bring in additional staff. The figures cited were adapted from the experience of building Sizewell B, which had achieved an average of 40% home-based workers at peak construction. For Sizewell C, more workers would be needed and so EDF Energy had made a conservative estimate. EDF Energy's objective, however, was to maximise local employment opportunities.

Steve Mannings (EDF Energy) felt that he had tried explaining the process that EDF Energy has gone through to identify the site options contained within its consultation adding that he hoped it was apparent that EDF Energy had sought to avoid building on land close to local people but that it was impossible to avoid everyone and that where there are residents nearby it has tried to limit amenity impacts as far as possible through the initial layout work that has been carried out. There was a drive to reduce any potential amenity issues as far as possible. The consultation process had only just begun and, as such, further work was needed in respect of all of the prospective sites. Pat Hogan (Sizewell Residents Association) felt that some of the sites put forward were often jealously guarded by residents; residents would not want certain options to be chosen and would want sites along the Sizewell gap road protected. Jon Cross (Grt Glemham Council) asked whether there had been an assessment on impact on local schools.

Tom McGarry (EDF Energy) noted that in terms of hectares, the size of the campus options was: for option one, 34 hectares; for option two, 45 hectares; and for option three, 41 hectares. Roy Collins (EDF Energy) agreed that it was a valid point that different campus options would be closer to Leiston than others and thus would impact the town differently. EDF Energy had indicated its preferred option for the reasons given in respect of efficiency and traffic, but the consultation was interested in – and would take account of the views of all residents.

Therese Coffey (MP) sought further clarification regarding the assumptions used for calculating the workforce and queried when the accommodation would be required. Roy Collins (EDF Energy) explained that EDF Energy had used a very similar but slightly different assumption on the proportion of home-based staff than was used for Hinkley Point, where the proportion had been 36/64. Assuming permission were to be granted for Sizewell C and the associated developments, the campus was one thing which EDF Energy would seek to have constructed relatively early on in order to have it in place to meet demand.

#### **4. Park and Ride**

Roy Dowding (Middleton cum Fordley Parish Council) questioned the statement EDF Energy had made that Middleton would be the best place for the Park and Ride on a strategic basis. It seemed to him as logistically worse than other options. All traffic going to it would have to negotiate the Yoxford junction and level crossing. The A1120 and B1122 were simply too far apart to be negotiated by a roundabout, as

proposed. Roy Dowding queried whether anybody had definitively determined what increased traffic levels might be, adding that there was no indication as to whether traffic flows would be 24/7 or zoned to times, as was currently the case. Steve Mannings (EDF Energy) explained that the notion of the site being strategically strong was on the basis that it is located on the direct route to the site, rather than requiring drivers to divert further north on the A12. The alternatives involved a short diversion of a relatively small proportion of workers travelling along the A1120, perhaps approximately 200 people. If these people were forced to divert to a more northern site option such as Darsham it would mean 200 miles driven extra a day which over the course of such a long-term project like Sizewell C is arguably significant. Steve Mannings added that the other way of looking at it is that such a diversion represents only a small proportion of the total journey time to the park and ride site and is arguably not significant.

Roy Dowding felt that this was not a significant consideration as the length of any diversion was very short. Roy Collins (EDF Energy) understood the point, noting that in terms of journey time, if workers were driving north to Darsham, it was recognised that the difference was not massive as the diversion was not a huge distance, but the broader issue was that many people at exhibitions had made the point that park and ride proposals were attractive in principle, but how would EDF Energy ensure that workers actually used them? EDF Energy had to ensure that park and ride facilities were in viable positions, which ensured reasonable journey times. In this context requiring some workers to make a diversion to use park and ride facilities was not the ideal – though it was recognised it was a matter of judgement and further assessment as to how significant the issue was.

Roger Waterfall (Marlesford Parish Council) queried how many buses would be operating on each day and in each direction. Ian Norman (Farnham and Stratford St Andrew) stated that his concern was that light pollution would be a problem on all sites, as Sizewell would operate 24 hours a day. Terry Hodgson (Leiston Town Council) queried what proposed bus routes for the southern Park and Ride service would be.

Roy Collins (EDF Energy) explained that in terms of the frequency of buses, EDF Energy's thinking at the moment was as indicated in the consultation document. There would be regular bus services during the shift changeover periods, when the bulk of the workforce would be leaving or arriving. During these times, buses would need to leave approximately every 10 minutes. Outside of these times, there would always be some workers seeking to arrive at or leave the site, which indicated that there should be a skeleton service that would run approximately hourly or half-hourly. Steve Mannings (EDF Energy) indicated that, in respect of light pollution, sites would need to be lit from a security and operational perspective, but EDF Energy wished to reduce light spillage on to non-operational land. A lighting strategy would be created to get this right. One key point was that the indicative red line of the site was not necessarily where the perimeter fence and lighting would be; the operational area sat within that wider space. In consultation, EDF Energy would be looking at ways to reduce light pollution through measures such as types of lighting columns and the provision of screens and this would be the approach taken in working up the more detailed layout plans for the preferred sites that are carried forward after the Stage 1 consultation.

Kenneth Parry Brown (Peasenhall & Sibton Parish Council) said that in a gravity study done by Suffolk County Council in respect of where employees for Sizewell C would be likely to live, it was found that they would likely be travelling from up to 90 minutes away, but hardly anyone would be travelling east on the A1120, which would mean the problem of workers having to divert from the A1120 to Darsham would not exist. However, if this 90-minute limit were not to include the time it would take to get to the Park and Ride car park, park one's car and get on a bus, this would change the situation considerably. Kenneth Parry Brown queried whether a new gravity study would be done on the basis of the shorter distances that would be necessitated by the time taken up at the Park and Ride. Michael Roseveare (Wickham Market Parish Council) expressed concern at the traffic arriving in Wickham Market, which would need to be managed to ensure it would not become lost in the village, which had two 'pinch points' that would need to be avoided.

Roy Collins (EDF Energy) explained that all of the bus routes were yet to be determined and EDF Energy is happy to receive views on those. Therese Coffey (MP) queried whether the A12 and B1122 would be used for the southern park and ride route, which Roy Collins confirmed was anticipated but not decided. The gravity model referred to was, in fact, EDF Energy's gravity model and it considered a range of factors including where existing centres of population were, where existing accommodation was and the assumption that workers would be willing to live up to 90 minutes from the site. The study had been based on the

evidence EDF Energy had gained from other projects and used a distance decay principle, i.e. the closer one lived the more likely one was to work there. This meant the number of people living the full 90 minutes away would likely be a very small proportion of the overall number. In building the gravity model, EDF Energy had included a transfer time at Park and Ride sites of 10-15 minutes, so this was factored in to journey time considerations for the gravity model. The gravity model had been shared with Suffolk County Council and comments were awaited. The model can be refined as the project progresses. In relation to Wickham Market and the southern Park and Ride sites, the plan was to intercept journeys from a wide catchment area, including Ipswich, Felixstowe and places further south. This was based on the gravity modelling that had been done. EDF Energy is confident that a majority of construction workers would wish to access the site via the A12.

It was noted by a participant that traffic coming off the A12 for the Wickham Market site would go onto a tiny roundabout and would back up onto the A12, which would cause people to go off the A12. If this were to occur in significant volumes, as it sometimes would, this could be an issue for residents in Blaxhall and beyond.

Nigel Suckling (Blaxhall Parish Council) noted that the EDF Energy team had said that the efficiency and effectiveness of the Park and Ride scheme would be partially determined by its convenience for workers. In relation to that, he enquired as to what considerations had been given to the human nature of individuals; at the merest hint of a queue, were likely to dive off into the rat runs into the villages. There was a concern that some of the rat runs authorised for use during traffic accidents were simply not up to the task.

Steve Mannings (EDF Energy) noted that these issues were recognised as potential risks, which would require detailed consideration following Stage 1. It was fair to say that rat running had been an issue during the construction of Sizewell B, particularly with regard to the B1125. This had been an important factor in the placement of the prospective northern Park and Ride sites – specifically to keep traffic on the A12 rather than going down the B1125. These issues were potential concerns and EDF Energy would work to ascertain the likely significance of them and work out strategies to overcome them, starting with signage and if necessary moving to other approaches. However, it was too early to settle all the details of these issues as no specific sites had been chosen and no fixed numbers reached. Stage 1 was the beginning of the process.

In relation to the earlier comment that bus routes had not been decided, Therese Coffey (MP) queried whether the 5-15% traffic impact on the A12 excluded journeys from the southern Park and Ride centre. In addition, EDF Energy wished to construct a lorry park on the south site; Therese Coffey wondered what size this would be if there were to be no freight consolidation. No answer had been given to the question on the B1122 traffic impact. One assumption was that nobody would be driving to the site, even if they were to live in Leiston.

Roy Collins (EDF Energy) explained that in terms of the Park and Ride scheme, EDF Energy was not saying that everybody would be forced to use it, but were proposing the construction of an on-site car park for use by people living east of the A12. Staff for example from Leiston or Aldeburgh would be permitted to park on-site. If staff were to live in Ipswich or Lowestoft, they would be offered a number of options (direct bus, bus pick-up from nearby rail stations or using park and ride). It would be vital that EDF Energy monitor, manage and enforce the Park and Ride system; there would be challenges, but EDF Energy was committed to addressing them. Compliance with the Park and Ride system would be part of the deal for workers: services would be free, convenient and regular. In relation to the traffic impact on the B1122, EDF Energy recognised that there would be a significant traffic impact on this road. EDF Energy had not sought to misrepresent that fact. The figure of 5-15% only applied to the four villages stretch of the A12. The traffic impact on the B1122 would be larger both in terms of the actual amount of traffic and larger in proportional terms, because existing traffic flows on the B1122 were much lower than on the A12. The current range of uncertainty on the scale of impact, however, was much higher in relation to the B1122. This was because the impact would be affected by a lot of factors including the final number of HGV movements and the final size and location of the accommodation campus and northern park and ride site. In relation to HGV movements EDF Energy was seeking to reduce the number of HGV movements during the construction phase. Based on current estimates, there would be between 100-300 HGV deliveries a day. Peak construction figures were subject to further work, however, and the figure could potentially be reduced further.

Steve Mannings (EDF Energy) noted that the southern park and ride sites had been sized to accommodate the co-location of a lorry park. The potential size and indicative location of lorry parking within these sites had been included in the consultation material.

## 5. Rail

Richard Smith (Suffolk County Councillor) noted that the proposed passing loop at Wickham Market station had been described as small, but freight trains were up to 500 metres long, adding that he presumed the loop was at least that size and possibly longer than the loop at Beccles. In addition, Richard Smith sought assurance that the railway junction between Saxmundham and Leiston would be upgraded. Currently, due to level crossings and other issues, trains took an hour to go from Saxmundham to Leiston. Rachel Fulcher (Suffolk Coastal Friends of the Earth) noted that both the green and red routes for bringing the railway line into the construction site, as proposed, would go through an area of woodland which was home to a rare species of bat and queried exactly how much woodland would be affected by the planned railway extension. Mike Chandler (Aldringham cum Thorpe Parish Council) enquired whether Network Rail had validated the proposed options for rail extensions, noting that the impact on passenger services could be serious, which would not be acceptable.

Roy Collins (EDF Energy) explained that the passing loop would be approximately 500 metres long; the word small had been used in the context of the East Suffolk line as a whole. EDF Energy had had discussions with Network Rail and had checked the wording of the consultation document with them to ensure its accuracy. Network Rail had indicated that they would be supportive of the loop proposal; it would have a legacy benefit of improving the infrastructure of the East Suffolk line. Obviously, there was a need to do further work in relation to the details of the passing loop and the condition of the line between Saxmundham and Leiston to ensure it was fit for purpose and that any necessary upgrades could be completed. In respect of level crossings, there were five crossings on the Saxmundham-Leiston branch line and the current journey time was indeed very slow for freight trains; this was one area which EDF Energy would need to work on to achieve better times.

Steve Mannings (EDF Energy) reassured participants that EDF Energy was aware of the rare bats, which was one of the considerations behind the proposed location of the Sizewell C construction area. Potentially, however, bats might be present in an area EDF Energy was looking to cross through with its proposed routes. The routes shown were, of course indicative routes; EDF Energy continued to look at vertical and horizontal alignments and optimisation strategies. If there were to be a requirement to disturb this habitat, this was something that EDF Energy would have to justify, as there would be licensing implications. Further design work was needed before EDF Energy's actual requirements were known. These alignments were very much indicative.

A participant queried whether railway lines might be used to transfer personnel. Therese Coffey (MP) noted that the topography of the land seemed to lend itself, in respect of the red and green routes, to bridges rather than level crossings. Raymond Catchpole (Campsea Ashe Parish Council) queried whether the passing loop proposal had the agreement of Network Rail.

Roy Collins (EDF Energy) reiterated that EDF Energy is happy to receive comments on rail proposals and the indicative location of the rail routes into site. In relation to passenger use of rail services, EDF Energy would encourage construction workers to use the existing rail services and would offer to pick staff up from Darsham or Saxmundham stations. EDF Energy had examined the potential of using the Saxmundham-Leiston branch line for moving staff, but had reached the view that this would be very difficult to feasibly achieve in a cost effective way. EDF Energy's priority was to use the branch line for moving freight, which would have by far the biggest benefit in terms of lessening the road traffic burden on the local area. In relation to bridges and level crossings for the rail routes into the construction site, Roy Collins added that this was something EDF Energy would need to do more work on. These issues had been given preliminary examination but the solution would depend on a range of factors for each route and would be looked at in the detailed designs for the options.

Raymond Catchpole (Campsea Ashe Parish Council) noted that the map in the consultation documents showing the red line indicating the location of the passing loop did not include 19 new houses adjacent to the East Suffolk line, which were now finished and occupied.

## **6. Lorry Management**

Kenneth Parry Brown (Peasenhall & Sibton Parish Council) noted that 100-300 lorries were to be controlled going in to the site using the A12 and A14, but when they returned to the Midlands, they could presumably use the A1120, unless there were to be a control system, adding that he wondered what EDF Energy proposed to do in order to solve this issue. Roy Dowding (Middleton cum Fordley Parish Council) noted that it in the presentation it had been suggested that lorries might have to report to a lorry park to get permission to go to the site. However, there was a concern that while lorries would be controlled on the way in, they could turn onto 'rat runs' which was a problem.

Roy Collins (EDF Energy) said that it would be vital to control lorry movements, which was a standard requirement for large construction projects. There would be an approved route, which EDF Energy would ensure was adhered to. There was a wide range of things that could be done: information, signs, monitoring, or cameras. EDF Energy would work on the details and would be in discussions with the highways authority regarding the detail of these proposals. The headline to remember was that lorry routes would be fixed. There would be a requirement for contractors and subcontractors to use them; this would be monitored and breaches would be taken seriously.

## **7. Road Improvements and Traffic Impact**

Roy Dowding (Middleton cum Fordley Parish Council) noted that in many surveys carried out by Suffolk County Council on the B1122, the condition of various sections had been found wanting. The B1122 could be considered unfit for purpose; Roy Dowding queried whether this was likely to be addressed. Therese Coffey enquired as to when EDF Energy were likely to have further information on the 5-15% increase in traffic relating to the 'four village' stretch of the A12. Joan Girling (Communities Against Nuclear Expansion) was concerned about the amount of traffic on the B1122 because traffic would have to cross it and this would mean stopping traffic to Leiston and Aldeburgh, noting that there might be a convergence of traffic that could be problematic.

Roy Collins (EDF Energy) said that some modest improvements to the B1122 would be made as part of the conditions for the Sizewell B Dry Fuel Store application. More generally, the B1122 was considered to be the best available route for taking construction traffic as other routes involved traffic passing through more residential areas. As had been said, EDF Energy recognised that there would be a significant traffic impact on the B1122; this road would experience the largest traffic impact of the project. EDF Energy was inviting further suggestions in relation to this and it had received a number already. It was important to look at the condition of roads and potential measures that might be taken. EDF Energy is happy to receive further comments. Technically there is spare capacity on the B1122, but traffic obviously had amenity impacts and EDF Energy was willing to consider these issues. In relation to the 5-15% increase on the four villages stretch of the A12, meetings tomorrow and next week were planned, where EDF Energy would explain this finding in more detail and make this information more widely available.

A participant noted that traffic for Sizewell B continued to travel well over the speed limit on the B1122. Roy Dowding (Middleton cum Fordley Parish Council) stated his belief that EDF Energy could not adequately manage the flow of traffic between the A12 and B1122 with just one roundabout, adding that he felt it could not be done without knocking down approximately eight houses. Therese Coffey (MP) queried whether any properties would have to be knocked down, adding that she wondered about the comparative impact on the four villages.

Roy Collins (EDF Energy) explained that he had not meant to suggest that there were no traffic issues presently on the B1122, as he had heard residents' concerns regarding traffic and speeding, adding that EDF Energy was open to suggestions in this regard. There were not, however, any traffic jams on the B1122; it was not at capacity. Regarding the roundabout at Yoxford, EDF had employed transport consultants to examine this issue and they had carried out some initial work that would be developed and presented at a

later stage of consultation. It was not anticipated that property demolition would be required for a roundabout at this junction.

A participant queried the exact number of buses that would leave at peak times. Another participant enquired whether any new pylons would be required. Richard Smith (Suffolk County Councillor) felt it was disappointing that the document stated that there was no justification for the four-village bypass due to the level of traffic increase being only 5-15%. Information on traffic had apparently only been coming into County Council officers in 'drips and drabs'. Many local people wanted the bypass in order to take much of the traffic from Sizewell C. Ian Norman (Farnham and Stratford St Andrew) noted that the four villages in question had several meetings planned with EDF Energy in relation to this subject and had not thought this was the appropriate forum to raise their concerns.

Roy Collins (EDF Energy) said that EDF Energy had deliberately sought to avoid giving out a lot of detailed traffic numbers at this stage of the project as these would of course be subject to change, depending on the options chosen and further studies etc. In relation to buses the final numbers would depend on several factors, but to give an indication of broad scale, if there were to be approximately 10 buses per hour at shift changeover times, the consultation document information on shift patterns could be used to work out rough estimates. In terms of sending information to the County Council, EDF Energy had sent over a large amount last month in respect of traffic modelling and had sent some early because the Council had requested that it be sent as soon as it was available. Mike Lavelle (EDF Energy) noted that an existing pylon would be relocated from the existing substation complex for the new substation, but there would be no further pylons.

## **V. Agenda Points for Next Meeting**

The Chairman noted that the next meeting would be after the closing date of the Stage 1 consultation on 6 February 2013. Holding the meeting in March would enable the EDF Energy team to have done an initial analysis of the responses to the consultation and give some preliminary views about how they would take these responses on board. If there were issues participants wished to discuss in March beyond process updates and high-level analysis of consultation responses, it would be useful to understand that now.

Raymond Catchpole (Campsea Ashe Parish Council) felt that there should be some further discussion on the four village bypass, during the nine-year building of Sizewell C, as there could be a planning application for a big distribution space at Bentwaters, which might present further HGV traffic problems.

Jeff Hallet (Pettistree Parish Council) felt that an agenda item that was a simple presentation on particular safety aspects that participants could transmit back to people in villages would be helpful. Therese Coffey (MP) noted that Jeff Hallet could write to her office, who would ask the ONR for something like this. Jeff noted that it would be applied to the specific location at Sizewell.

A participant enquired whether EDF Energy would be in a position at the next meeting to report back on the responses to the questionnaires that had been sent out. The Chairman explained that there would hopefully be some high-level analysis, but he could not say exactly what the company wished to do. There would probably be some flavour of the responses but no great detail as consultation responses would take some time to be analysed. Angela Pearce (EDF Energy) agreed with this.

The Chairman noted that the four-village bypass remained an issue. Obviously, there would be some issues beyond this, but it was hoped that at the next meeting it would be enough for there to be an interesting agenda in terms of the high-level responses and the company's preliminary thinking.

## **VI. Any Other Business**

Joan Girling (Communities Against Nuclear Expansion) felt that one key concern in Leiston was the way in which offences would be policed. Leigh Jenkins (Suffolk Constabulary) noted that Suffolk Constabulary were talking to EDF Energy with regard to mitigating the issues Joan Girling had referred to; this would be sustained during the development and the Constabulary would remain engaged. The Chairman queried whether it would be possible to present something in relation to this at the next meeting. Leigh Jenkins noted that as the Constabulary were speaking to EDF Energy; they could have some dialogue with regard to

presenting something and had no aversion to providing an update. He said that he would discuss this with EDF Energy.

Angela Pearce (EDF Energy) came back to a question raised about any impact on schools. As had been previously said, EDF Energy was conscious of the impact of construction on health services, schools, policing, fire fighting and so on. This was an area that would be looked at in between Stage 1 and Stage 2; socioeconomic consultants had been engaged to look at the makeup of the workforce and examine potential impacts.

Simon Barlow (Environment Agency) noted that the terms of reference were unspecific in terms of the names of participants, adding that he was wondering whether participants' names would be circulated. The Chairman confirmed that they would be passed on to participants, which was why there was a form to fill in with contact details, which would assist with ensuring the membership lists and contact details were as up to date as possible. Obviously, councils could continue to have substitutions, but it was hoped that membership to date, will be made available.

It was noted that membership was somewhat prescriptive. A participant queried whether councils could choose who they sent, as in some parishes the chairmanship changed on a regular basis, but a continuation in membership would perhaps be advisable. The Chairman agreed, noting that it was a matter for each parish council or other constituency to determine their representation. By inviting chairmen, EDF Energy's intention had been to show the importance they placed on local representation. It was probably preferable that chairs had rights of first refusal, but if this was not suitable to a particular parish's circumstances, it was a matter for that parish. Whoever was nominated from each parish would be very welcome.

**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)