

**Pre-meeting Reports**  
**7<sup>th</sup> August 2012**

65. **Presentation by Mr Nick Colfield and Mr Jim Crawford, EDF.** Mr Cofield introduced himself as the Planning and Development Manger with responsibility for Sizewell B and members knew Mr Crawford as the Station Director at the B Station. Mr Cofield explained to the meeting how this current application with regard to the proposed Dry Fuel Store was submitted as part of the ongoing process of discharging conditions set by the original permission plus, in this instance, a request to vary the construction programme to cope with the ground conditions that had been discovered as part of that process. A significant amount of legacy material had been discovered under the proposed site which would now require thicker foundations and removal of a lot of concrete. This would mean a longer construction programme and more HGV movements as rubble would have to be removed from site and concrete brought in. The possibility of using some of the rubble on site for other purposes was being looked at and the other possibility was for a crushing plant to be operated on site to deal with the spoil there. Overall construction would now take 104 weeks rather than 52 with overall increase in HGV movements from 2862 to over 6,000. The peak construction periods would be increased but now split into four (rather than two) so max HGV movements during these periods would be reduced from 234 to 106 a day. Cllr Howard asked why this was not known about/investigated and included in the original application. Mr Cofield explained that the detailed geotech survey had not been done until after the application had been submitted. Cllr Howard asked whether there were full radiological checks being done and being planned for all the spoil due to be removed from the site. Mr Cofield reported that nothing to date had been identified by the geotech survey which indicated a radiological presence underground but that there would be continual monitoring. Sizewell A Management Team had been consulted as the works were close to their workforce and could create dust etc. which needed to be controlled. Members were keen to be consulted on the traffic management plans that would be put in place once the concrete batching plant was decided upon, especially if it was the Clay Hills plant as residents had to be protected from the potential HGV movements that involved. It was pointed out that Sizewell Residents needed to be consulted if an onsite crushing plant was being considered and it was asked that local residents be given the opportunity to work for the chosen contractor. In answer to a concern Mr Crawford reported that the Visitor Centre traffic and construction traffic would be able to be managed as the Visitor Centre was on an appointment system. Cllr Last asked that timing of the construction traffic be stipulated and managed to avoid disruption at peak times or noise at inappropriate times. Members were very concerned about the further impact of EDF traffic on the Household Waste and Recycling Centre and felt that the increased traffic could be ameliorated against by safety improvements being made at that site entrance.
66. **Mr Bob Chamberlain.** Mr Chamberlain was requested to attend as a senior Planning Officer at Suffolk Coastal District Council to explain the procedures for identifying, agreeing and implementing section 106 measures during the application process of any developments. He discussed the recent agreement for the Dry Fuel Store with members and pointed out the need for evidence based requests when responding to future applications. Since the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations came in force it is now unlawful for a planning obligation (section 106) to be taken into account when a development is capable of being charged a CIL. Where CIL does not apply a planning obligation (section 106) can only be used as necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, must be directly related to the development and should be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Therefore, any requests for works to be done etc. must be made in this context.

During the above discussions, the time reaching 7.30pm, it was proposed by Cllr Ginger, seconded by Cllr Hawkins, and agreed, that standing orders be suspended to allow the public part of the meeting to be completed.

**At a meeting of the LEISTON-cum-SIZEWELL TOWN COUNCIL**  
**held in the COMMUNITY CENTRE, King Georges Avenue, Leiston, on TUESDAY,**  
**7<sup>th</sup> AUGUST 2012, at 7.45 p.m.**

**PRESENT**

**Councillor T. E. Hodgson (in the chair)**  
**Councillor R. Bailey**  
**Councillor D.R. Boast**  
**Councillor R. J. Geater**  
**Councillor Mrs S. M. Geater**  
**Councillor C. S. Ginger**  
**Councillor T. J. Hawkins**  
**Councillor W.H. Howard**  
**Councillor J. N. Last**  
**Councillor Mrs J. Sparrow**

67. **Minutes.** It was proposed by Cllr Ginger, seconded by Cllr Hawkins and agreed that the minutes for the meeting of 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2012 be signed as a true record.
68. **Apologies.** Apologies were accepted from Cllr Bailey, Cllr Nunn, Cllr Mrs Nunn and Cllr Cooper.
69. **Declaration of interests.** Cllr Ginger declared a non pecuniary interest in Agenda item 5b and one in 5c. Cllr Howard a non pecuniary interest in 5b and also 5c. Cllr Mrs Geater declared a pecuniary interest in 5d and a non pecuniary interest in 5b. Cllr Parker a pecuniary interest in 5b.
70. **Finance.**
- a) **Accounts for payment.** It was proposed by Cllr Ginger, seconded by Cllr Cooper and agreed that accounts presented in the sum of £17,303.73p along with £31,259.56p paid since the last meeting be approved for payment
71. **Planning.**
- a) **C12/1330 – Erection of a pair of garages (revised scheme C11/2347) at 45 and 45a Abbey Road, Leiston.**

**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

- b) **C12/1397 – Retention of caravan/camping electrical hook up's. Change of use of 1xmale and 1xfemale toilets from sole agricultural workers use to joint agricultural workers and camping/caravan people use at The Orchard, Abbey Road, Leiston.** The site in question was in possession of a site licence issued by the Camping and Caravan Club ("a certificated site") and could therefore accommodate up to 5 caravans or tents at any one time with minimal facilities. In this instance however electrical hook ups had been installed and toilet facilities provided. These alterations were felt to need planning permission. Members considered the enhancements to be a useful amenity for visitors and recommended approval.

**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

- c) **C12/1325 – Submission of details pursuant to planning permission and variations to construction programme for Sizewell B Dry Fuel Store at Sizewell B, Leiston.** Members referred to all the points raised earlier with Mr Cofield and Mr Crawford regards the variation in length of construction time. The main issues were the transport plan which

was due to put between 13 and 14 extra HGV movements onto the road each day for 2 years with, at peak periods 10 to 14 an hour going through to the site. This did not even include the huge workforce who would be undertaking the project. Members were extremely concerned about the safety of residents using the Household Waste and Recycling Centre in Lovers Lane, especially when the gate closed for bin management and cars had to queue on the carriageway. The number of near misses at this location are legion and edf should be asked to contribute to a scheme to ameliorate these safety issues as, Magnox aside, virtually all the traffic using that road is theirs (with this latest proposed increase exacerbating the situation). Other conditions that could hopefully be applied to any permissions were that the chosen contractors be given an undertaking to use local labour and firms as a first resort, that traffic management plans are agreed and ruthlessly adhered to and that Sizewell Residents are fully consulted should an onsite crushing plant be considered.

#### **RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

- d) **C12/1620 – Application for a certificate of Lawful Development for a proposed B2 use at Abbey Road Service Station, Carr Avenue, Leiston.** This application was to just establish that the premises in question, due to the long standing business that had gone on there over the years, had the proper permissions for that business to be resumed after a period of vacancy. Members were pleased that the premises might come back into use and asked that, if possible, a condition be applied to tidy the site up as it was in a prominent position and could enhance the town for visitors and residents alike.

#### **RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

72. **Leiston Works Railway.** Members considered the request from the Leiston Works Railway Group for the Town Council to sponsor (and fund) a planning application to re-lay the track bed. Members were pleased to be able to support this venture and, by sponsoring the Planning Application, this would half the cost of the planning fee. It was proposed by Cllr Ginger, seconded by Cllr Bailey and agreed that the Town Council put in the application and pay the fee of £170.
73. **Leiston Film Theatre.** Members noted the report from the recent Film Theatre Committee Meeting which requested that Council consider the submission of two planning applications with regard to the proposed rear extension to the Cinema. The first application was the detailed plans for a second storey extension at the rear of the cinema to give the venue much better changing facilities, a rehearsal room, better storage, a lift and other improvements in working conditions for staff and users. The other planning application was for part of the car park on Central Road to be used for a dwelling which could, in the future, be considered as a possible means of funding the extension itself. It was emphasised that by submitting an application there was absolutely no commitment to build or sell anything. It was, however, a means to ensure the project was feasible and to allow the Council to go to tender to get an exact cost of the project for future consideration. It became clear from the discussion that an exact cost was needed as the projected maximum given in the feasibility study was being taken as true cost of the project and was disturbing some members. Cllr Ginger in particular was completely against even considering losing part of the car park as he felt that it belonged to the Leiston people and should not be sold off. He understood that by submitting a planning application this did not commit the Council to doing anything but felt that it should not even be considered. His views were shared by Cllr Howard and Cllr Bailey who also felt that the project was a non starter due to the probable cost. Other members were interested to see what the true costs would be however so that these could be looked at in context and against a business plan for the project to be presented by the Theatre manager at a future meeting. With this in mind it was proposed by Cllr Mrs Geater, seconded by Cllr Parker and agreed (6 for, 4 against) that the two planning applications suggested by the Film Theatre Committee be submitted, and that tenders be sought. Cllr Ginger asked that another feasibility study be carried out to possibly build a much reduced

extension to the existing ground floor out into the car park area.

**74. Neighbourhood Plan.** The Clerk reported that, since the last meeting, a letter had been sent to Suffolk Coastal District Council informing them of this Council's intention to produce a Neighbourhood Plan and a meeting date had been arranged with them to establish the procedure and responsibilities of both parties during its production. Cllr Boast and Cllr Howard agreed to accompany the Clerk to the meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> August. Cllr Bailey wished his objection to the wording of the letter sent to SCDC be noted as he felt it misrepresented, in one instance, what he felt had been previously discussed and agreed.

**75. County Matters.**

- a) The subject of the white van causing an obstruction on the western end of Kings Road was raised once more and the Clerk informed members that a move to increase the length of the yellow lines in that position could be discussed and moved at the September meeting if appropriate
- b) **Household Waste Site.** Cllr Last reported to members that he had again witnessed a near collision outside the Household Waste Site when the gates were closed and residents were queuing.

**76. Questions to the Chairman.**

- a) Cllr Howard asked that a meeting of the newsletter committee be arranged.

There being no more business the meeting finished at 9.30 pm.

Chair

-----

Dated

-----