

Pre-meeting Reports
15th January 2013

190. Public. Richard Smith explained that he had re-opened the interest at County in a D2 road link from the C site to the A12 at Benhall which had been proposed when C was being considered many years ago. Jan Lovell wished the Council to look at that route again too as she felt it was a good way to alleviate the traffic on the B1122 and would give residents in Leiston a clear run on to the A12 too as a legacy. Joan Girling outlined her concerns with the size of the site, the environmental damage that the laydown area and access road would cause and the problems with the jetty (which would act as a groyne). With all the difficulties that surrounded the site (SSSI's, the Leiston River, sea defences etc.) she felt that there should be a sequential test of all the potential sites the government had sanctioned as this was the only one in an AONB and with all the problems mentioned would not be the most suitable at all. Pat Hogan explained to members that her submission to the Council was the result of a meeting of 40 residents from Sizewell and that they were all very concerned that the C228 should remain untouched by this development. Mike Taylor outlined his concerns which included the piping of the Leiston River, that there was not enough room for two reactors on the site, the potential problems with temperature of the cooling water and the very real threat to Thorpeness and Aldeburgh from interfering with the coastal process by erecting a permanent jetty. Joan Girling reported the potential difficulties that had emerged when the D2 route was last considered as many farms had been split in two. June Oliver was concerned that there did not seem to have been a real public forum where residents could give their views.

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,
15th JANUARY 2013, at 7. p.m.

PRESENT

Councillor T. E. Hodgson (in the chair)
Councillor D. Bailey
Councillor R. Bailey
Councillor A. M. Cooper
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 A.V. Nunn
Councillor N. Parker

191. Minutes. It was proposed by Cllr Howard, seconded by Cllr Parker and agreed that the minutes for the meeting of 15th January 2013 be signed as a true record.

192. Apologies. Apologies were accepted from Cllr Sparrow, Cllr Boast and Cllr Nunn.

193. Declaration of interests. Cllr Howard and Cllr R Bailey both declared a personal interest in agenda item 6a).

194. Chairman's Communications. The Chairman introduced Mr Ray Ricks and Mr James Bailey from Boyer Planning who had been invited to attend the meeting and to help members formulate a response to the Sizewell C Consultation. Mr Ricks explained to members who they were and how, as an independent consultant, Boyers had been asked to help Towns and Parishes respond to the consultation by EDF. He assured members that he knew the area well and had done a lot of ground work to ensure his team were au fait with the Nuclear Policy Statement and all the other issues that were pertinent to this forthcoming planning application.

195. Sizewell C Stage 1 Consultation.

- a) The following minutes are produced to give a flavour of the debate and to try and capture as many points as possible that would go to making up the Town Councils response. The actual response will be attached to the minutes of the next meeting to show the final consensus members reached to go forward as Leiston-cum-Sizewell's official view.
- b) Cllr Ginger began the discussion by airing his view that the station footprint was too big and impinged far too much on the AONB and SSSI's surrounding the site. He wanted access to the beach from the Kenton Hills Walks to be retained and did not want an access road to go across the AONB to the north of Kenton Hills. His preference was for the access road to go from Crown Farm across the AONB to the south of Kenton Hills to the C site. He also felt that accommodation and car park should be built on the A site. It was pointed out that the A site had a Nuclear Licence which would not allow that but Cllr Ginger asked that EDF be asked to look at that anyway.
- c) Cllr Howard wanted EDF to give very clear details on how they were going to deal with the Leiston River and for them to cover all the possible consequences that could occur. He wanted clear mention made of the spent fuel that would have to be retained on site for possibly over 200 years. This would contravene the sustainable development strategy and leave a terrible legacy for future our children - clear compensation has to be sought for Leiston for having to endure this. He pointed out that the concentration of power supplies in one area could potentially make the grid vulnerable.
- d) Cllr Howard voiced what everyone else said at some stage during the debate that there just wasn't enough detail anywhere in the consultation document to allow serious and meaningful comment. This was particularly so with regard to transport and the well being of Leiston-cum-Sizewell residents.
- e) Cllr Ron Bailey explained to members how new nuclear build was not needed and went into detail, giving references, to support this. He understood that you couldn't challenge the government in our response but asked that EDF be challenged on their assertion that building this station and providing power was economically viable. He felt that it would cost taxpayers £2bn a year to operate. He also pointed out how more sustainable jobs could be made by everyone embracing energy efficiency and energy saving schemes rather than building new nuclear. Members noted his comments but declined to make mention of this theory in their response.
- f) Details of the effect that the rise and fall of sea temperature would have on the cooling process were requested. The potential coastal erosion was a huge worry to the coastal communities, not just Sizewell, and this had to be thoroughly researched and explained. There was also concern about the amount of potable water that the new reactors would take. Comment from EDF and Essex and Suffolk Water on how this was going to be achieved would be welcomed as soon as possible.
- g) The area of laydown site overlooking minsmere should not be used, the area of laydown beside Lovers Lane overlooking the Abbey should not be used and the Pill Box Field at Sizewell Gap should definitely not be used either.
- h) The last fences around the works on the beach came down 10 years after completion of B station. This must be ameliorated against and a pathway through the site on the beach should be made more friendly, more sensitive to the area and should be a lot wider than last time – 4.5ms.

- i) Regards the proposed Visitors Centres. A vote was taken as a proposal was made that there should not be a car park (and, subsequently, a visitors centre) on Goose Hill on completion of the station. This was lost. There was no real suggestion for a visitors centre during construction other than that the current one at the B Station should be used despite it not being a drop in.
- j) Accommodation caused a wide ranging debate with most feeling that one campus for 3000 personnel was too big and that smaller campuses should be considered. One would have all the leisure facilities, restaurants, medical centres etc. perhaps but these too would have to be duplicated to avoid unnecessary transport problems. It was also hoped that pockets of sustainable legacy housing could be negotiated outside the 106 agreement to allow key workers to live with their families in range of the site. Members all agreed that none of the suggested sites were suitable and that accommodation campuses would be better placed at Ipswich, Lowestoft etc. to allow the workers a better quality of life and more social activity. The sites at the top of King George Avenue were definitely rejected as unsuitable to protect the rural quality to the South East of the Town as compensation for the industrial pillage taking place to the North East. KGA residents would also suffer if either were built. A clear line of demarcation had to exist to ensure some quality of life was left for residents during the next 10 years. The C228 was felt to be that line. The site at Eastbridge was considered an eyesore (4 storey temporary accommodation) and that the workers, albeit being able to walk to work, would need a shuttle bus or motor car to come to Leiston (or elsewhere) in their time off.
- k) Transport was a huge issue and one where the lack of details completely negated real meaningful discussion. Members felt that sea and rail should take the strain (the jetty still a worry) and that the B1122 needed an upgrade to cope with the vast amount of private vehicle and HGV movements envisaged. Members did not see what sort of upgrades could be made however to compensate the residents of Theberton, Middleton and Yoxford (as well as our residents who travelled that direction each day) for the years of disruption to come. It was noted that a small adjustment at Farnham and some work in Yoxford were the only things noted in the Consultation which, along with an absence of any detail, was really rather unacceptable. Members agreed that D2 was not an option but felt that the 4 villages bypass should have been mentioned in the consultation document for consideration.
- l) No C traffic should come through Knodishall and Leiston. Full stop. EDF would be tasked to ensure all personnel and contractors were briefed on this and, if ANPR technology could be employed (or similar) this could be enforced.
- m) Orwell Lorry park eminently suitable for HGV's – drivers need comfort facilities while waiting.
- n) Park and Rides could possibly benefit from being pushed out further to north and south to be even more sustainable. Park and Ride buses must use B1122 too.
- o) Railway – no to Crown Farm – it would just increase HGV traffic on Lovers Lane and defeats the object. Trains also unacceptable nuisance to residents in Carr Avenue and Buller Road. Red route takes trains through Leiston still and we want to avoid that. Green Route not really achievable. Blue route best option and would take goods into site. Blue Route should take passengers too and should be mitigated by landscaping to protect Leiston Abbey. The current line to the Sizewell A railhead should be retained and continue to be used for defueling only.
- p) Railway – very important all crossings (including farm tracks) are automated. This would be an important legacy. There would be merit in dualling the line between Saxmundham and Wickham Market rather than putting in a loop at Wickham (Mr Cannon has details). This may not be more expensive.
- q) Cllr Ginger didn't gain any support for his suggestion to route the railway behind Crown Farm, across Lovers Lane into the AONB and then on behind Halfway Houses to Sizewell.
- r) The Crown farm laydown area would produce too much traffic on Lovers Lane and the lights dirt and dust are too close to Leiston.

- s) Emergency Services. Additional risks associated with the construction and operation should be identified ahead of the project to enable adequate planning, resourcing, training, site familiarisation and equipment provisions for the emergency services. Extra resources must be specifically bought in and must remain earmarked for the development. There should be absolutely no dilution whatsoever of current resources before, during and after construction. In the case of the police this should include extra personnel and vehicles permanently attached to the Leiston Safer Neighbourhood Team and a small response team based at Leiston Police Station. Evidential CCTV around the town (including residential areas if KGA accommodation approved) should be installed (not monitored) to protect workers and residents alike. A small custodial centre needed closer than Martlesham too.
- t) Employment – members noted the real concern about migration of labour from local businesses but were unsure how this could be managed. Fair and equal opportunities need to be applied to recruitment for the Leiston cum Sizewell communities. Cllr Hawkins called for greater emphasis and some financial help from EDF as soon as possible to allow local schools to concentrate much much more on maths and science to allow engineering to be a more achievable career for our youngsters. A lot more apprenticeships across the board also needed in the area.
- u) If laydown area goes head at Upper Abbey more of the estate there that isn't used should be opened up for recreation.
- v) There were no details of the dock or docking requirements.
- w) There were no details on how construction will be managed.
- x) The Recycling Centre must be improved and enlarged to allow local residents to safely queue there should any traffic increase be brought to Lovers Lane.
- y) Tourism will take a huge hit and, as one of the major employers in the area it is difficult to see how this will be mitigated against.
- z) Decommissioning must be hardened up into a detailed plan.

During the above item, the time reaching 10.00pm, it was proposed by Cllr Ginger, seconded by Cllr Cooper and agreed that Standing Orders be suspended to allow business to proceed for a further 30 minutes.

196. Community Fund. Members were adamant that Leiston should gain something from taking the brunt of the pain from this project and wanted any Long Term Community Fund to have an appropriate percentage attached to IP16. Other more tangible projects should also be put forward as per the Council meeting held in March. The Clerk was asked to refine these ideas and pass them to the consultants. To expand on the principles being used by Suffolk County Council "If Leiston(-cum-Sizewell) is doing right by Suffolk then Suffolk should do right by Leiston"

197. Correspondence.

- a) **PISCES disabled swimming club.** Members noted the request from PISCES for grant aid again this year and also for a letter of support to send to SCDC. On a proposition from Cllr Cooper, seconded by Cllr D Bailey it was agreed to grant £50 to Pisces and to provide a letter of support.

198. Questions to the Chairman.

- a) The Chairman closed the meeting and took some questions from the floor.

There being no more business the meeting finished at 10.20 pm.

Chair -----

Dated -----