

**MINUTES OF THE THEBERTON AND EASTBRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL AND EDF ENERGY
VIRTUAL MEETING ON THURSDAY 11th FEBRUARY 2021 AT 10:30 AM**

1. Attendees

Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council

Cllr. Stephen Brett (SB) – Chair

Cllr. Paul Collins (PC) – Energy Projects Lead

Sharon Smith – Clerk

EDF Energy

Tom McGarry (TMcG) – Head of Stakeholder Engagement

Richard Bull (RB) – Head of Transport Planning

Carly Vince (CV) – Chief Planning Officer

Stephen Henry – Community Relations Officer

Stephen Roast (SR) – Marine Planning Manager (part of the meeting)

2. Purpose of the Meeting

TMcG thanked everyone for attending and read out the agenda.

The purpose of the meeting was two-fold:

- 1) to provide an update on the Sizewell C project and the current DCO application timeline;
 - 2) to review the key issues in the Council's Relevant Representation and response to the intra-examination consultation and to discuss these further.
- Prior to the PINS examination, EDF are required to discuss key issues with important stakeholders.
 - EDF are holding meetings in parishes where physical development will occur.
 - EDF recognise there is local opposition to the project but, if it goes ahead, there needs to be awareness of the key issues to prioritise for examination.
 - EDF may need to provide further information where required and to clarify any issues.

3. Project Update – Tom McGarry

- TMcG gave a briefing on the project to date.
 - PINS has not yet accepted the proposed changes to the DCO application.
 - Ongoing discussion with the Local Authorities and other statutory stakeholders.
 - DCO timeline – expect two preliminary meetings will be held in March/April.
 - Changes to the DCO will be considered for acceptance.
 - Then a six-month period for the examination process.
 - PINS have three months to make a recommendation to the Secretary of State
 - Secretary of State then has three months to make an announcement on its decision.
 - Period of six weeks to allow for any judicial reviews.
- Once legalities, planning conditions s.111 and s.106 agreed, and a Final Investment Decision has been reached construction would be able to commence. EDF aspires to a commencement date in the second half of 2022 once all the required conditions are met.
- SB – how does this timeline affect the timing of the Final Investment Decision?
 - TMcG - depends on a parliamentary decision. Statutory changes will be needed if a different financing model is approved. Government have indicated they are keen to align

the financing element alongside the DCO timeline. Negotiations are underway. If RAB model is accepted then government negotiations will also be necessary with investors.

4. DCO Timeline – Carly Vince

- PC - thoughts regarding the Secretary of State's deferred decision on Wylfa due to insufficient evidence in the DCO?
- CV – EDF look at the precedent of other projects and are confident that the Secretary of State will make its decision within 3 months. Secretary of State has delayed its decision 6 times but this is in the context of 25 times when the statutory timetable has been met. HPC was decided within the timescales.
- CV outlined the next steps in the DCO process:
 - expected first preliminary meeting in March/April;
 - 28 days' notice will be given;
 - Rule 6 Letter would need to be issued at the end of February;
 - 2-3 weeks between the first and second preliminary meetings.
 - Preliminary meetings will be virtual. PINS said worked well with EA1N and EA2.
 - Expected technical meetings will be face-to-face, depending on COVID.
 - Open Floor Hearings will be held to hear community voice.
 - Accompanied site visits for Local Authorities, Parish Councils and other stakeholders.
 - EDF want to make progress with parishes and understand their position and provide clarity about where information can be found.
 - EDF want to narrow and focus on nub of issues to enable them to articulate to PINS and not waste time clarifying issues.
 - Progress being made on s.106 agreements. Important to make headway and demonstrate how to mitigate impacts. PINS keen for s.106 to be well developed. First draft submitted end of December. Second draft by end of March.
 - EDF can signpost Council's issues to s.106.
 - Progress being made with Local Authorities and other statutory bodies regarding Statements of Common Ground.
 - Potential for PINS to ask EDF to enter into more Statements of Common Ground.
 - EDF confident they can deal with Council's issues in terms of its Relevant Representation.

5. Review of Relevant Representation

Pretty Road – Richard Bull

- EDF recognise community concerns about severance of access.
- Trying to keep Pretty Road open - direct response from parish meeting held in December.
- Continue to engage with SCC Highways and structural engineers.
- Current DCO has non-motorised pedestrian bridge.
- EDF propose to provide road bridge over SLR.
- RB showed technical diagram of proposed design.
- Prerequisite to reduce speed limit to 40 mph to bridge approaches and through village as national speed limit not appropriate.
- Bridge would remove link to SLR. Access from village over the SLR.
- EDF think potentially deliverable. Highways seem receptive.
- Presenting proposed idea for feedback which is important if EDF are to progress this solution.
- SB – initial reaction is positive. Would need to see plans in more detail. Feel community will be relieved and consider with an open mind.

- PC – village speed limit is 30 mph so reducing to 30 mph would be favourable and consistent.
- TMcG – will work with RB to produce a less technical diagram with landscaping.
- Will need a short consultation period for Council and residents.
- Consultation limited to Theberton and Eastbridge parish boundary to keep manageable and timely.
- PC – will entrance to Theberton Hall remain open?
- RB – this has been a challenge. Grade of road will reduce to maintain entrance. Diagram shows existing Theberton Hall access. Highways queried visibility but not a problem as piers will be set back.
- TMcG – this may be a potential solution but need to consult properly in locality with respect to parish and residents. Helpful for all concerned to gain feedback.
- RB – need to consult with local farmer about movement of cattle. Another option may be to provide an underpass/culvert. May need to change design of bridge. Cannot commit to design until this feedback is received.
- CV – this is an informal, local consultation. Feedback to go to PINS to ask if can be deliverable. EDF need a scheme which is locally endorsed before formally proceeding.

ACTIONS:

- EDF to provide a detailed plan of proposed bridge.
- Council to consider plan, discuss how to consult locally and work with EDF to progress.
- SB to contact local farmer regarding cattle movement and inform EDF.

B1122 Mitigation – Richard Bull

- Current DCO has no proposals about interventions for the B1122.
- EDF discussing with Local Authorities what B1122 will look like should the SLR be retained.
- Redesign, repurposment and betterment for traffic using the B1122 will be part of the s.106 discussions.
- However, during early years, when constructing SLR, there is nothing in the proposals.
- SB – read out list of Council's proposals:
 - SLR and by-pass to be removed after construction period;
 - Temporary pedestrian crossing during SLR construction period as all traffic will be using B1122;
 - Survey vulnerable properties before start of SLR construction and continue to monitor for vibration damage;
 - Triple or secondary glazing for properties bordering the B1122;
 - Quiet road surface dressing;
 - White gates at either end of Theberton to denote village;
 - Monitoring of traffic speed.
- PC – regarding the pedestrian crossing, the SPR proposals include kerb lowering but in the wrong place. A proper crossing is needed when traffic is at its peak.
- TMcG – noise amelioration is part of our proposals.
- CV – in terms of noise, EDF's Code of Construction Practice and Noise Mitigation Scheme will align with the measures and aspirations of the Council.
- EDF is also engaging with ESC and appointing noise consultants to set threshold expectations.

ACTION:

- Council to send list of B1122 mitigation measures to EDF.

B1125 / Sizewell Link Road / Theberton By-Pass – Richard Bull

- PC – remove link from B1125 to SLR. Staggered junction not required. Traffic continue to use B1122 through village and join SLR at end.
- RB – no desire to retain SLR during operational period despite traffic flows through village?
- SB – overwhelming view seems to be to remove the SLR and by-pass.
- PC – we are taking more advice on its retention – there are mixed feelings.
- RB – there is an opportunity for considerable betterment for Theberton by taking traffic out.
- TMcG – what if the parish changes its mind?
- PC – we hope to consult the parish and gain a view before the first preliminary meeting.
- SB – fear that if by-pass remains, a developer will enlarge Theberton.
- PC – we don't trust ESC and their planning policies.
- RB – EDF is considering construction methodology of SLR in more detail. Need to deliver SLR quickly but in a measured, managed way. Taking traffic off B1122 asap is EDF's aim.
- PC – your current scheduling is to begin half-way through year 1 and take 2 years to build.
- RB – hoping to improve on 2 years and start earlier.
 - Also have to consider other roads – site entrance, level crossings, roundabouts, etc and how to take a holistic approach to all these schemes and the priorities.
 - During examination, EDF will provide a lot of detail about the early years of construction.
 - Lots of experts being brought in and EDF will keep the Council informed.
- SB – EDF should not start construction on main site until the roads are built.
- TMcG – the supporting infrastructure including the rail route, the two villages by-pass, the Yoxford roundabout, the SLR, the BLF all need prioritising to get HGVs off the roads. EDF often hear this argument but roads are part of the construction process.
- PC – we understand there is a compromise with the preparation of the site to construct the SLR and traffic using the B1122.
- PC – is EDF involved in the proposal to add traffic lights to the roundabouts on the A12?
- RB – not directly but SCC is trying to source funding for intervention along the A12.
- Clerk – is it possible to have a speed limit in Eastbridge?
- CV – we can raise this with SCC Highways. This has also been raised by other stakeholders including Darsham Parish Council.
- PC – we have asked but there is a cost issue. Highways want the parish to pay for it.

ACTION:

- EDF to raise speed limit in Eastbridge with SCC Highways.

Property Blight – Carly Vince

- EDF have Property Price Support Scheme to ensure values are upheld.
- SB – how will EDF manage this scheme?
- CV – we will send the Council details of the scheme.
- TMcG – property matters are important to EDF. Residents can address private matters to Lidia Bosa and ask for a meeting with her.
- PC – concerned how scheme operates. We wait to understand mechanisms and ensure reasonable and fair.
- PC – Lidia Bosa categorically said that EDF will not buy properties. This should not be ruled out at this stage. It should remain as a last resort option.

ACTION:

- EDF to send details of Property Price Support Scheme to Council.

Insufficient Control of Light Vehicles / Rat-Running – Richard Bull

- EDF having detailed discussions with Leiston Town Council and Wickham Market Parish Council about light vehicle management.
- EDF liaising with delivery teams about how LGVs will enter main site.
- Proposal to book LGVs on to main routes using the delivery management system and control them.
- Also working on a detailed signage strategy at a local level, particularly for vehicles accessing from side routes.
- Localised signage strategy around main site and park and ride sites.
- Direct traffic to use main routes, need to understand behaviours and ensure drivers are adhering. Not a legal requirement, but encourage and monitor them.
- SB – Council proposes that EDF install ANPR cameras at the Eel's Foot Inn and the main site entrance. Single track roads in Eastbridge and some residents are not confident about reversing.
- TMcG – EDF is aware of the private road from Westleton to Eastbridge through the Minsmere reserve and the concerns about rat-running via this route.
- TMcG – for traffic coming from north of Blythburgh, the only parking site is at Darsham, why would anyone take Dunwich exit to the B1125 only to be turned away at the gate and directed back to the park and ride?
- SB – residents are concerned about the worst case scenario.
- PC – EDF are adding a lot of traffic to the area. SZB and its outage workers are not subject to the SZC controls and they use these roads. Also locals will use the back roads for convenience especially if there are blockages. It will not necessarily be SZC workers but others will use it because SZC traffic will cause main roads to be busier.
- RB – signage will help. There are issues with ANPR and private car users – whether they are travelling to and from work or for leisure. The legal issues present challenges which will need to be considered further.
- EDF will use GPS to monitor HGVs both to and from the construction site.
- TMcG – why don't RSPB put a gate on the private road?
- PC – they do close it for two days a year (Christmas and Boxing Day) to maintain its private status. The Eels Foot Inn would lose a lot of business from walkers if the road was closed.

ACTION:

- EDF to further consider using ANPR on minor roads.

Water Management Zones / Sizewell Drain – Richard Bull

- There is no hydrological effect in Minsmere.
- Discussions held with EA, IDB, RSPB and SWT. EA approved model and output.
- EDF will provide links to conceptual model and technical details.
- More work required on design of water management zones and outfalls.
- EDF feel they are in a good position regarding this.
- PC – the reservoir has been moved to Black Walks – does this alter the conceptual model?
- RB – apologies but we are unable to comment on that. We can provide links to the information.

ACTION:

- EDF to provide links to conceptual model and technical details.

Minsmere Sluice / New Cut – All

- SB – SZC might increase flood level on marshes – discussed at December parish meeting.
- SB – this winter, many roads and paths impassable even without SZC effects.
- SB – New Cut has not been dredged for years – we need this done.
- SB – we need the sluice modernised and a pump to decrease water levels at peak times.
- SB – the sluice footpath needs to be improved and raised in places – authorities can maintain once in a suitable condition.
- TMcG – we have heard for 10 years about the condition of the New Cut and the sluice but we are nervous about taking anything from EA.
- PC – IDB willing to take over management of the New Cut but not until cleared. But EA will only give it to them if IDB cleared and they are not willing. If EDF clear it, then IDB could maintain it. Might be a compromise that works for everyone.
- CV – we will take this away and consider further.
- TMcG – we hear this from the Parish Council, the MLSG and others – it might be extra-curricular to us but some good may come if we do it.
- RB – there has been engagement with SCC on this topic. Potential upgrades could be in s.106 agreements.

ACTION:

- EDF to consider dredging the New Cut, modernising the sluice and improving the sluice footpath.

Coastal Processes / Sea Defences – Stephen Roast

- SR – coastal processes element – we are increasing the crest height. Conversations with regulator agree to make future proof from beginning.
- SR – new crest height will be in place before date required and may not be required – depends on coastal processes.
- SR – redesign means the sea defence will advance seaward by several metres as western side unfortunately against SSSI. It will also go 1.5 metres deeper with the adapted design.
- SR – geomorphology assessment – risk management is in the DCO.
- SR – sediment transport along shore is picked up by softer coast feature used in the hard rock defence.
- SR – issues considered by ESC and MMO as part of their jurisdiction.
- Management plan ensures coastal geomorphology not interrupted but will need to start sooner as closer to sea.
- PC – we have not seen a properly laid out plan for coastal defence that we can understand. It is still not available despite the modifications. Makes sense that you are raising crest height from beginning. We understand that it needs to go seaward but this will have knock-on effects.
- SR – agree that mitigation proposed is for initial design. We are still looking at proposed changes.
- SR – other statutory consultees have asked for design. We are working as a priority to make it available.
- PC – will the sheet metal piling disappear behind the defence or will it be removed?
- SR – it will become part of the final structure.
- PC – we look forward to receiving the plans. How will you manage water ingress to the back and sides of the defence?
- SR – need James Hansen to answer. The intention is that it will not keep the site dry – water inundation may well happen during high tides and this is allowed for.
- SR – flood risk teams are looking at water ingress to back and sides – ties in with SZB flood risk management.

- TMcG – (read out note from James Hansen) There has been a shift in risk management by raising height. No intention to keep site dry during over-topping or over low rises.

ACTION:

- EDF to provide a detailed design of the sea defence and coastal processes.

Water Supply

- EDF are working closely with Essex and Suffolk Water – they will enhance water supply to Blyth area.
- But working assumption is that there will be no supply from the Blyth area and water will be brought in from River Waveney area.
- E&SW will upgrade the system and provide as much water as needed. E&SW are progressing detailed design of scheme.
- EDF also working with EA.
- A new water main may be needed to link up to existing system to bring in required supply.
- EDF investment to E&SW will benefit the network and provide better legacy to whole area.
- SR – we are a responsible operator and will not use potable water if possible.
- EDF plan to reuse water from SZB sewage output once treated.
- Discussions with EA to minimise amount of potable water used.
- PC – Will you use water from the WMZ to maintain the reservoir or will WMZ water still percolate down?
- RB – We will utilise a water management system. We just need seasonal storage especially for wetting spoil heaps or stockpiles.
- PC – will you use bore holes or rain water?
- RB – we will keep all options open. If a farmer has surplus that they potentially wish to trade, we would look at this.
- SB – EDF has a licence to pump water out of the New Cut if it is no longer needed for arable land.
- RB – we will take that away and consider. We are sensitive to the delicate balance of potable water supply.

ACTION:

- EDF to consider their existing licence to pump water from New Cut.

Light / Dust / Noise Pollution – Carly Vince

- We can provide links to EDF's Code of Construction Practice.
- Happy to discuss further at next meeting.

ACTION:

- EDF to provide link to Code of Construction Practice.

Spoil Heaps – Richard Bull/Carly Vince

- SB – can they be made smaller to reduce dust? 35m is too high.
- RB – this is tricky. Obviously trying to manage strategy effectively. Need to store materials to keep HGV numbers down. Pushing maximum currently but can consider further.
- RB – doubt they can be reduced but can challenge team further to see if possible.
- CV – we can look at HPC and measures to reduce dust and capture all these lessons.
- PC – HPC is not a sandy site. Eastbridge has bare fields that blow dust. Once sand dries it will blow everywhere and will require constant wetting. Not a significant issue at HPC.

- PC – how much material is destined to go back into the ground (borrow pits) and how much will be used in the build?
- CV – we can discuss this further next time.
- SB – huge amount of water required if dampening down.

ACTIONS:

- EDF to consider how reducing height of spoil heaps impacts HGV numbers.
- EDF to provide further information on spoil heaps and borrow pits.

Accommodation Campus – Tom McGarry

- SB – the campus is in the wrong place but, if we have to accept it, then it is a difficult subject as some residents want it to be smaller but this will have a knock-on effect on local properties to accommodate workers.
- SB – there will be an impact on rental prices therefore we are asking for a cap on the number of workers allowed to rent in parish.
- TMcG – is it possible to rent property in Eastbridge?
- PC – there is a mix, some rent on a 6 month basis and prices can be reasonable for a family sized house.
- CV – we will provide a link to our accommodation strategy. It is a difficult balance but we feel the campus size is right.
- CV – EDF is working on a Housing Fund to ensure any impacts on housing sector are mitigated.
- CV – EDF is discussing with ESC to ensure type and breadth of measures are appropriate and then we will discuss funding.
- PC – there will be around 7,900 people on site at peak with 2,400 in the campus, 600 on the caravan site and others in local accommodation. This is a huge increase from the original 5,600 people on site at peak as originally proposed. Rents are rising around HPC and people are being pushed out.
- TMcG – Lidia Bosa is looking at the accommodation management strategy.
- TMcG – plan to build campus incrementally to meet demand. EDF will consider not over-developing if not necessary.
- TMcG - lessons have been learned from HPC, more efficiencies, fewer on site, impact of COVID, EDF is 'fleet of foot' and will reduce forecast impact if possible.
- PC – we are aware it is to be built incrementally and shrunk. What is the occupancy rate at HPC?
- TMcG – last update – onsite campus is full, Bridgwater campus is close to capacity but COVID has had an impact. As HPC progresses to peak, occupancy rate will increase at the Bridgwater site.
- PC – will campus be big enough considering 7,900 maximum?
- TMcG – yes.

ACTION:

- EDF to provide link to accommodation strategy.

6. Next Meeting – Tom McGarry

- Only 10 points from Relevant Representation discussed. 6 more to discuss.
- Also need to discuss Council's response to the changes to the DCO application.

- The change application documents may be made available on a USB stick soon but EDF are conscious that PINS has not accepted changes so do not want to give impression they are accepted.
- CV – EDF encourage use of PINS website to access documents as all are available.

ACTION:

- EDF to arrange next meeting date and time.