

Q&A Combination of Chat Bar and Plenary session.

1.Theberton and Eastbridge PC: No changes or updates to the hard and soft coastal defences have been made in the DCO documentation. Increases in wave height to the shore will further threaten the proposed hard and soft coastal defence feature which is still not fully designed and terminates close to the beach and over 3 metres above the low spring tide mark which will ultimately expose it to undermining as the soft defence inevitably retreats.

Do the JLAG think this makes the site fundamentally unsafe for an installation that will need to be defended for close to two centuries?

RESPONSE- The Hard Coastal Defence Feature will provide protection to the site from erosion and flood risk. EDF Energy have not provided details of its foundation design. Until they do it will not be possible to comment on its resilience to potential coastal change over the site life.

Woodbridge Town Council: I note that Lisa says there is no fully designed coastal defence scheme in the DCO proposal which seems to be a major flaw. I was looking for it and as an engineer I fail to see how EDF has done reliable modelling of the impact of coastal flooding by overtopping without fundamental design details.

RESPONSE- That was a question from Theberton & Eastbridge PC submitted prior to the event that Karen Thomas just provided a response to. Your comment is noted.

Woodbridge Town Council: I agree with Karen and this seems to be a major flaw as it is a serious issue for any safety case.

2.Theberton and Eastbridge PC: The carbon footprint at Hinkley Point C was quoted at 4.8g CO₂/kWh using a Life Cycle Analysis which was not made public or submitted with the DCO to PINS and EDF now claim as confidential. Sizewell C, for some reason, is now quoted as 9-10gCO₂g/kWh despite no substantive change in design. A calculation methodology is discussed but no details of the actual contributions to this analysis are given and significant contributions are scoped out of the calculation. The carbon payback period has changed from less than a year during consultations to approximately 6 years in the DCO but once again, no substantiation of these figures are given.

Will JLAG be requesting more details and an explanation as to why the analysis has doubled compared to Hinkley Point?

RESPONSE- We agree that it would seem that there are inconsistencies within EDFE's submitted material on the carbon footprint of Sizewell C. We will raise this with EDFE and seek to get some greater clarity on the matter.

3.Theberton and Eastbridge PC: EDF's community impact claims in general do not seem to follow advice given by the Department for Housing, Communities and Local Government on how to assess these impacts. As a result, this means their assertions of impacts on local

employment, housing, rental accommodation, and tourism spend in the area are significant under-estimates. Theberton and Eastbridge have also been assessed as being part of a greater community with Saxmundham which significantly dilutes the effect on Theberton and Eastbridge. At the same time EDF claim that there is no “severance” of the community. However, with the closure of both Pretty Road and Moat Road by the construction of the Sizewell Link Road and Theberton bypass, if Theberton and Eastbridge are assessed as part of this EDF’s constructed greater community including Saxmundham ,there is physical severance of access via these routes. Do JLAG agree that community impact assessments by EDF, including liberal use of the word “perceived” when assessing impacts, are significantly downplaying the impact of this development on those communities most affected by the development?

RESPONSE- The Councils are assessing all areas of EDF Energy’s DCO submission and where appropriate and necessary we are employing consultants to provide additional technical expertise. Community severance is one area we are considering with regards to the whole of the project.

4.Theberton and Eastbridge PC: At Stage 4 last summer we were consulted on three transport strategies: rail-led, integrated and road-led. Everyone opposed the road-led strategy, so now in the DCO EDF has made much of its “pledge” to bring 40% of material in by sea and rail to reduce HGVs. BUT in fact the lorry numbers at peak are expected to be the same as or higher than the road-led strategy!

1. Stage 4 Consultations, Road-led Strategy: Typical day at peak 750 HGV journeys/day (375 in/375 out), Busiest Day 1,150 HGV journeys/day (575 in, 575 out)

2. DCO application: Typical Day at peak 790 HGV journeys a day (395 in, 395 out), Busiest Day - 1,140 HGV journeys a day (570 in, 570 out)

Why, when we all opposed the road led strategy, and EDF pledges to keep HGVs off the roads by using sea and rail, have we got more HGVs than previously?

RESPONSE- The Councils made it clear in their stage 3 and 4 consultation responses that they were disappointed with the move away from sustainable transport strategies and expressed the option that the evidence to support this move was weak. Table 7.1 states a maximum of 500 deliveries. The difference between this and the 570 deliveries quoted are the 70 which run between the LEIEE and the secondary site entrance or SZB entrance.

5. Middleton-cum-Fordley PC: Real concern regarding transport - the number of trucks etc during early years before link road built.

NOTED- links to question 4 above.

6.Saxmundham Town Council: Number of road journeys is excessive and inspector needs to take account of a probable housing development to the south of Saxmundham of circa 800 houses.

RESPONSE- Cumulative planning applications to be assessed by EDF Energy includes Local Plan allocations which includes Saxmundham.

EDF have revised some of the HGV numbers based on experience from Hinkley Point. That doesn't mean they will not be challenged. There are some inconsistencies in the % split of rail road in the document which we will be seeking clarity on.

7. Middleton-cum-Fordley: Will ESC see any of the business rates from SZC?

RESPONSE- it is anticipated that ESC will see business rates from Sizewell C but it is not clear what they would equate to.

Cllr Alexander Nicoll (SCC): of course the Business Rates garnered if SWZ C goes ahead (years away) might be undermined by loss of rates from collapsed tourism businesses on the 'heritage' coast.

8. Sudbourne PC: Are the quoted economic 'boosts' quoted on this slide gross, or net of negative impacts elsewhere?

RESPONSE-That calculation has not been carried out and would be very difficult to carry out as it is difficult to put tangible costs to some of the potential impacts. Like yourselves we are trying to balance the potential benefits against potential costs.

Sudbourne PC: But if it is easy to estimate benefits, how hard can it be to estimate impacts in the same economic areas? EDF have been talking about 'a' tourism fund for three years and still have no numbers to give.....

RESPONSE- We will be trying to estimate impacts in order to calculate what we would need for a tourist fund, housing fund, transport fund etc.

9. Middleton-cum-Fordley PC: Can the significant income figures be believed?

RESPONSE- We anticipate many of the roles being created by the development to be skilled and as such would attract relatively high incomes to reflect these skill levels.

10. Saxmundham Town Council: What do EDF mean by 'home-based'?

RESPONSE- please clarify? Do you mean working population within 10 miles of SZC? We do not have that calculation. The best we could achieve is from census data which is very out of date and by ward.

Middleton-cum-Fordley: I mean total working population resident within 10 miles.

RESPONSE- Again we would only have those figures from the census and at district ward level so we could not draw a radius of 10 miles around the SZC site and have that figure.

Yoxford PC: Tom M. has cited a 50 minute travel time as local.

11. Darsham PC: Local jobs availability will be diluted by ex Hinkley specialised workers.

RESPONSE- Modelling suggests that around a third of all roles will be taken by Home Based Workers i.e. within a 90 minute commuting zone. Whilst there will be some transfer of supply chain and workers from HPC we are working with EDF to maximise the higher skilled positions and supply chain opportunities locally and anticipate many 1000's of roles being taken by Home Based Workers.

12. Saxmundham Town Council: Are there actual figures given in the housing fund, tourist fund etc?

RESPONSE- No figures given in the Housing or Tourist Fund etc.

13. Middleton-cum-Fordley: What about LGV numbers?

RESPONSE- LGV numbers are included in the Transport Assessment but are not proposed to be controlled in the same way as HGV will. However, all vehicles above 3.5tonne will be classed as HGV.

LGV numbers are in the transport model. Unfortunately TA document is taking time to load so can't give numbers at the moment. From memory it was up to 20 trips in and 20 out per hour at the busiest time going to main site.

Cllr Alexander Nicoll (SCC) : The whole traffic/highways issue is the real killer and 60% HGV by roads dwarfs Hinkley. The carbon readings in many places will balloon over the construction period. And this is not starting from an HGV east Suffolk just now!

14.Saxmundham Town Council: 6 - 8 rail movements each night through the middle of Saxmundham for up to ten years.

15. Saxmundham Town Council: Will EDF be able to take extra land for the development once they 'discover' they have not allocated sufficient for the two reactors?

RESPONSE- the red line for the DCO is set. Additional landtake would require a revision to any DCO (if granted).

16.Middleton-cum-Fordley PC : Does anyone have info on the possibility of three test trains being run between 3rd and 13th August?

RESPONSE- that is news to me, if you have any further detail could you please email them to me at lisa.chandler@eastsuffolk.gov.uk.

17. Snape PC: No apparent reference to highway impacts on roads in area surrounding A12 corridor e.g. B1069 (Wickham Mkt - Tunstall- Snape- Friday St).

RESPONSE- colleagues at SCC Highways are looking into potential impacts on surrounding roads not specifically assessed by EDF in their Transport Strategy.

18. Middleton-cum-Fordley PC: Has EDF reviewed the possibility of a jetty with longer pile spacing to obviate silting problems etc?

RESPONSE- I am not aware that EDF have any plans with regards to a revised jetty option.

Middleton-cum-Fordley PC: But shouldn't they have tested this. Their suggested short pile spacing maximises silting problems and ecological impact.

Yoxford PC : The jetty is 16th century technology as proposed by EDF. The spans that One Arup et al are now creating show it should be reconsidered.

RESPONSE- the DCO proposes a beach landing facility and that is what we have to consider. Alternative options are not included in the proposal. However, you can still raise this as an issue in your responses to the DCO.

Middleton-cum-Fordley PC: A proper jetty would reduce road transport substantially. It needs to be properly tested.

RESPONSE- Beach Landing Facility: without the detailed engineering design the Councils are not in a position to comment on the impacts of the BLF yet as we can't determine in combination impact of the interaction between the two structures.

Middleton-cum-Fordley PC: I'm talking about a proper jetty as advocated by EDF at Stage 2?

RESPONSE- A proper jetty is not being proposed by EDF Energy.

Middleton-cum-Fordley PCC: But why has it not been properly investigated as a mitigation measure?

19. Wickham Market PC: Lots of information on bringing materials in, what information is there on dealing with waste? Also will the extra housing development carbon footprint be taken into account?

RESPONSE- Waste will be considered by the Councils and the Environment Agency. There are construction waste guidelines and regulations that have to be followed. Details of waste for associated sites is included in volume 6 chapter 3 for each site. It appears that most relates to soil unsuitable for use but further information is needed

20. Marlesford PC: A Two Village Bypass of Farnham and Stratford is no doubt welcomed by many, but its design almost certainly precludes an extension to bypass Little Glemham and Marlesford. Marlesford PC would urge SCC to again push for a properly designed Four Village bypass and if the Two Village Bypass has to come first that it is capable of becoming a Four Village Bypass.

RESPONSE- The proposal of the two village bypass is a significant concession by EDF Energy considering that in the early stages of consultation only minor changes to the A12 within Farnham were proposed. This does have to be balanced against the additional HGVs that result from the move away from a marine or rail led transport strategy and we are looking closely on the impacts of SZC traffic on Little Glemham and Marlesford.

21. Pettistree Parish Council is still concerned that the B1078 traffic going to and from the Park and Ride at Wickham Market/ Hacheston will form "rat runs" through Pettistree to try to avoid the inevitable congestion on the B1078 in Wickham Market.

RESPONSE- We have similar concerns and they are being considered by the Councils as are EDF's proposals for this area.

22. Peasenhall PC: There are at maximum 5,500 non-campus workers. How does this match 1000 worker car movements per day?

RESPONSE- There will be considerably more than 1000 car movements per day during the peak construction period. Table 7.2 in the transport assessment details the realistic worst case scenario for car movements and these are the figures we are assessing.

23. Saxmundham Town Council: Are the two councils listening to the views of the various NGOs including RSPB, NT, SWT, FOE etc?

RESPONSE- Yes we are listening to all of the NGO's and meet with them regularly.

24. Snape PC: Who will own the facility the day it opens? Will it be mortgaged?

RESPONSE- I do not have an answer, the presumption is EDF Energy. Not sure how mortgages would work with a nuclear power station.

25. Wickham Market PC: How will ESC/SCC promote the need to develop roles and jobs within the Environmental sector, i.e. specialists in landscape design, ecology, landscape management and also within the nursery sector (i.e. trees/plant species). Ideally there will be a need to ensure local provenance of plant species, use of local contractors, local landscape managers etc. On a visit to Hinkley I sensed that this was not the case.

RESPONSE- Yes we recognise the potential demands and opportunities in the environmental services and supply chains to support such a major development, particularly given the wider context of other major projects, and the importance of meeting expected environmental standards, such as provenance of planting stock. We have a well-established environmental stakeholder group and will discuss these points further with them

26. Woodbridge Town Council: Northern Park and Ride drainage design is in my view flawed. It adopts SUDS infiltration ponds and swales despite the geotechnical studies presented showing the geology is Lowestoft Till, with Head to the west, both are predominantly low permeability clays in which infiltration potential will be minimal. Has this been queried yet?

RESPONSE- your concerns re: Northern P&R are noted, our drainage guy is not on the call today but he is closely looking at drainage proposals for all of the associated development sites. Matt Williams, SCC: I am here and we're aware of the probable lack of infiltration at Northern P&R. EDF have retained the option to discharge surface water to a watercourse at this location at a controlled rate

27. Felixstowe Town Council: On road issue Woodbridge / Martlesham / 7 Hills. EDF "hiding behind" iporemnst from Adastral Park -and conclude "SZC no significant impacts" ! What is SCC view, notably at 7 Hills?

Cllr Alexander Nicoll (SCC): A12 from Martlesham to top of Woods Lane roundabout will be choked and if a HGV breaks down major disruption will be guaranteed. We must get EDF to address this.

RESPONSE: Noted your comment re: EDF's assessment of the A12.

RESPONSE: A12 Seven Hills Woodbridge. SZC will have an impact on Seven Hills but as it is further from the main site and already carries a considerable volume of traffic the

proportional impact is less. However, both SCC and Highways England need to be sure that the SZC traffic and in particular the movements associated with the Freight Management Facility do not create capacity or safety issues at this junction

28. Snape PC: Is there new discussion about using Chinese technology?

RESPONSE- The Councils are not involved in any discussions with regards to Chinese technology.