

MINUTES OF THE THEBERTON AND EASTBRIDGE PARISH COUNCIL AND EDF ENERGY VIRTUAL MEETING ON FRIDAY 26TH MARCH 2021 AT 11:30 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

2. Review of Relevant Representation

Wildlife assessments are out of date (CV)

- In November/December 2020, the additional ecology surveys were submitted and they did not change EDF's conclusions.

Hydrology (SH)

- Read out a response from James Hansen regarding the effects of hydrology disturbances which was previously sent to the Council.

Impacts on tourism (CV)

- EDF are working with Local Authorities and Destination Management Organisation.
- Early intervention at Hinkley Point ensured perceived impacts did not materialise.
- The Tourism Fund will be Suffolk specific.
- Details will be submitted to PINS on 7th April.
- EDF are working with LAs to agree shape and sum of the Accommodation Management Strategy.
- Working with LAs and the DMO to agree scale of Tourism Fund.
- EDF will pay funds to ESC who will administer.
- Working group to review data and agree how money will be split and this will be proscribed in the s.106.
- Funds will be flexible to target what's happening on the ground.
- Also consulting other stakeholders: Natural England, Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB, SWT, Visit Suffolk, Anglian Energy Projects Alliance and RSPB.
- The Community Fund will be administered by three people who will be regularly refreshed to ensure fresh ideas come forward.
- PC – concerned that ESC are not engaging with Town and Parish Councils – views may not necessarily be the same.
- Suggest request to review the Statement of Common Ground. This did not happen with SPR due to tight deadline.
- Responding to Relevant Representations and capturing views may give comfort.
- Could develop light touch SoCG. Would you like a SoCG or discuss through RR?
- PC – we would prefer ESC to engage with us and represent our views succinctly to ensure targeted. DMO may do a good job on tourism but do not have nuances of every Town and

Parish Council. Agree to leave at the moment but want EDF to be aware of issues with SPR and don't want similar with EDF.

- EDF could introduce a SoCG later down the line. Now is an exchange of information to assist the Council to write its Written Representation. EDF will be better informed of the driving factors. But if you want a SoCG we will consider it.
- TMcG – the DMO should represent businesses.
- PC – multiple organisations in the mix. If not talking to each other something could be missed.
- TMcG – we are having lots of talks with organisations over time but maybe Parish Council input is missing.
- PC – the link with ESC is missing.

Impacts on residents – poaching tradesmen/services (TMcG)

- A deeper strategy to address displacement is being put in compared with SZB.
- EDF will work with the supply chain so not siloed.
- Will bring everything together and address socio-economic impact.
- EDF are investing in schools and colleges – not just work force delivery but skills attainment so there is a conveyor of skilled people coming into the labour market to address displacement.
- This is direct intervention so should address issues seen during SZB.
- This has been successful at HPC.
- But must consider in post COVID recovery as people are looking for jobs and need skills in the new labour market.
- PC – the issue is that there are 40,000 people in Bridgewater and 5,500 in Leiston. The next big towns are Lowestoft, Ipswich and Felixstowe which are a considerable distance. The impact will be greater locally which may not have been seen at HPC. This is a simple population statistics issue.
- CV – lessons learned from HPC and others. It is helpful to a point but TMcG has been doing work over the years with many organisations to ensure s.106 is relevant to Suffolk.

Pressures on local housing/disadvantaged renters (CV)

- Blend of measures – campus/caravan park.
- But will be an element of pressure on local rental sector.
- EDF are working with ESC on Housing Fund and are cognizant of where issues are.
- There will be specific measures to ensure housing market.
- Level of detail will be in the s.106.
- SB – has there been large rent rises at Hinkley Point?
- There has been clustering as people want to live close to the site so Cannington has had high demand.
- There have been drawdowns from the Housing Fund and the Contingency Fund – more quantum than cost.
- TMcG – we will ask Lidia Bosa for an answer on rent increases at HPC.

Sizewell Link Road – farms no longer viable (CV)

- This is being considered by the Land Team.
- Both parties have land agents acting on their behalf. There is good dialogue.
- SB – when are you hoping Heads of Terms will be signed?
- Asap before compulsory purchase acquisition hearings which are mid-August.

- Hope to do a deal at any stage. Hope not to use compulsory purchase powers – if done before we could remove need from the DCO. Sooner the better for all parties.
- We have agreed an equalisation clause – to ensure everyone is paid the same amount and all landowners are treated fairly.
- But we recognise individual needs – not just a blanket approach.
- SB – farmers want to farm, where will they find other land? It would be helpful to find this land.
- We will pass that back and see what we can do. We want what's best for the landowners.
- SB – we don't want extra information, we just want to make you aware of the issues.

Eligibility to access funds

- PC – comes back to s.106 agreement. We need to review that and talk to ESC. We may raise it in our Written Representation.

Speed limit in Eastbridge (RB)

- No objection - happy to speak to SCC Highways but we are not sure how we would weave it into the proposals.
- SB – if EDF can find funding, the Council will do the legwork.
- PC – we have spoken to Highways and they are cognizant of it.
- EDF would support and facilitate that and will take it up with Highways.

Fly-parking (TMcG)

- Most serious issue at HPC at beginning.
- Procedures were put in place to prevent it and draw downs on funds already allocated.
- Monitoring registrations at different times of day and employees warned not to do it.
- It has been managed at HPC and we can bring process to SZC.
- We are looking at car parks to see which are already under pressure. Could be a good pick up place.
- The Accommodation Management Strategy will ensure registered homes have adequate parking.

Cumulative impact of all energy projects (CV)

- Working closely with others to capture positions.
- SPR have provided an update recently but there is more work to be done.
- It needs to be a live document – submitted at Deadline 1 or 2.
- PC – two interconnectors and Gabbard/Galloper extensions not being connected at Friston. Could be at SZC which is the natural place for it. The interconnectors have changed design to put hardware offshore but cables coming in and probably connecting at Friston.
- PC – we want to ensure you are aware of our concerns about all the projects converging in a small area.
- We can only assess what's in the public domain.
- TMcG – the SPR traffic volumes were incorporated into the modelling.
- They keep submitting revised figures. We are waiting for the examination to close and then we will refresh.

3. Matters raised since previous meeting

Property Price Scheme

- PC – document about Property Blight was tightly controlled – pretty much every house is within the site boundary. This is disappointing to say the least.
- CV – we feel we have come up with a fair scheme and have considered those of other developers. We have some flexibility to look at individual cases but that is our position.
- PC – (read out extracts from Property Price Scheme) – the houses are primarily in the boundary – only includes Round House which is near the borrow pits and likely to be under compulsory purchase, other properties already owned by EDF and possibly one other. Any blighting going on elsewhere is not under this scheme.
- TMcG – you are correct. The scheme is discretionary and has been put in early. There is no guarantee scheme is going ahead. The proposal on the table is to provide for directly affected properties in red line with some certainty. Other elements will be done to address any environmental impacts for other properties. These will have to be developed further.
- PC – makes nothing clear about people outside boundary. One person told 20% reduction in property price and SZC is not even happening yet. The Council will be looking at how we can evidence this as the Property Price Scheme is not worth the paper it's written on as properties are under compulsory acquisition.
- TMcG – compulsory purchase acquisition needs to be applied for. This was to address the needs of those properties. Any evidence gathering needs not to be anecdotal.
- CV – we recognise that the planning system does not consider blight. We have benchmarked what other developers do and we consider this scheme is appropriate.
- SB – if elderly people need to move into other styles of accommodation what will they do if they get ill and cannot sell and they need to fund care? We have an elderly population.
- TMcG – Lidia Bosa is looking into this. We have direct representation on this.
- PC – not just a pensioner problem. We will address this in our Written Representation and ensure evidence is robust.

Pretty Road

- RB – we are still working on plans.
- TMcG – we are addressing with landowners first.
- SB – we are willing to coordinate a public meeting to hear views.
- TMcG – have you engaged with village on legacy of SLR?
- PC – this is ongoing. Not directly carried out by the Council.
- SB – there is an interesting cross-section of views.
- RB – if we collectively bring forward the plans for Pretty Road, is this essential or a nice to have?
- SB – it is vital as everyone wants a route out. Are you confident of a Pretty Road crossing?
- RB – yes.

B1125 Junction

- PC – is there an update? We are aware of the issues with traffic coming down the B1122.
- RB – modelling suggests that existing traffic will divert through to Theberton therefore there is an argument to keep the link there. This would keep permanent legacy of the Link Road.
- CV – the community view is important. It would be helpful to share it in your Written Representation. If the Council could come to a shared view that would be helpful and to articulate this by 12th May (NB: SS not sure if this comment was about Pretty Road, the Link Road or the B1125 junction).

New Cut

- SB – have you looked into the New Cut plans?

- CV – we have had a conversation with the Environment Agency but no detailed discussion.
- SB – have you looked into your abstraction rights?
- RB – this is an action for me. We will take it into account and report back.

S106

- Next draft published on PINS website on 7th April.
- A further iteration in July.
- Complete version published on 6th October.
- No sums yet.

Next Meeting

- Agreed to have a further meeting.
- EDF to circulate suggested date and time.