

Minutes

Southern Transport Forum Meeting

Meeting Type: Southern Transport Forum

Attendees:

Meeting held on: 12 February 2024

Apologies: None received

Brian Stewart, Chair
Christine Abraham, Co-Chair
Richard Bull, DCO Lead Sizewell C
Chris Heaney, Transport Co-ordinator, Sizewell C
Jez Porter, SPM Associated Developments, Sizewell C
Marjorie Barnes, Head of READ, Sizewell C
Richard Knight, Senior Community Relations Manager
Zoe Botten, Community Relations Manager, Sizewell C
David Peacop, Site Operations Director, Sizewell C
Spencer Bowdler, Site Operations, Site Lead, Sizewell C
Tim Newton, Site Security Manager, Sizewell C
Steve Merry, SCC Highways
Julia Cox, SCC Highways
Carolyn Barnes, ESC Transport Lead Energy, ESC
Cllr Lucy Lavender, Hacheston PC
Cllr David Chenery, Wickham Market PC
Cllr Ian Norman, Farnham PC
Cllr Brian Hunt, Nacton PC
Cllr Richard Cooper, Marlesford PC
Cllr Robin Sanders, Woodbridge TC
Cllr John Bann, Melton PC
Cllr Michael Mahony, Friston PC
Cllr Tim Beach, Snape PC
Cllr Lee Reeves, East Suffolk Council
Klaus Fortmann, Campsea Ashe PC
Cllr Alexander Nicoll, Suffolk County Council
John Hicks, WSP
Beth Rance, Planning, East Suffolk Council
Sgt Rebecca O'Neill

Meeting Agenda

Welcome

Apologies for Absence

Introduction of Chairs and Panel

Purpose of the Forum – Terms of Reference

Sizewell C Project Update and Overview

Transport Review Group Overview

Presentation



Southern Transport Forum Meeting

Q&A – via Town and Parish Council representative
 Chair’s Concluding Remarks
 Date of Next Meeting
 Close

Meeting Minutes – 12/02/24

Minute Ref	Actions/Comments	Who	By when
1	Welcome		
1.01	Brian Stewart opened the meeting at 19.00 and welcomed the attendees. He explained that the meeting was in public but was not a public meeting. He outlined the required safety information and stated that this was the first meeting of the Southern Transport Forum.		
2	Introduction of Chairs and Panel		
2.01	The councillors and the Sizewell team introduced themselves. A note of the meeting would be made available.		
3	Purpose of the Forum – Terms of Reference		
3.01	Richard Knight outlined the forum schedule for the year. The purpose of forum was to hold discussions with the community elected representatives and for Sizewell to update on relevant construction issues and progress. The forum would be used to identify and minimise impact, maximise opportunities and understand community-related issues. The forum was a topline update, and the specific details of any issues would be taken to the working groups. Recommendations would be taken up to review groups who would agree on actions, and this would then be reported back into the forums.		
4	Sizewell C Project Update and Overview		
4.01	Marjorie Barnes stated that the DCO had been triggered on 15 January, which made forums such as the Southern Transport Forum possible. The forum would allow the leadership team to introduce the benefits of the project including mitigation measures and community funds released throughout the duration of the construction period.		
5	Transport Review Group Overview		
5.01	Steve Merry introduced himself as the chair of the Transport Review Group (TRG). Chris Heaney formed the link between the forums and the TRG. The TRG would agree how data would be monitored, assess the frameworks and ensure that targets within the management plans were met.		
5.02	Chris Heaney stated that the transport monitoring report was key in tracking compliance against the three management plans. This tracker would be live on the East Suffolk website and would demonstrate how Sizewell was meeting its obligations. He would attend the working groups and feed back to the TRG.		
6	Presentation		



Southern Transport Forum Meeting

Minute Ref	Actions/Comments	Who	By when
6.01	<p>Overview Richard Bull stated that the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) set out how Sizewell C is required to manage traffic throughout the construction period under the DCO. The CTMP is part of the Deed of Obligation that has been signed by the District and County Councils and the TRG would be monitoring compliance. Any vehicle over 3.5 tonnes is classified as a Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) and would be required to operate on the designated route to the main construction site and would also be tracked. This would include all buses and HGVs. LGVs of less than 3.5 tonnes would still be required to book a delivery window through the Delivery Management System and would be advised to use designated routes but would not be tracked. The Postal Consolidation Centre would be situated at the southern park and ride and would be used to consolidate smaller packages for onward movement to the Main Site in larger vehicles.</p> <p>Sizewell would not track individual worker’s private car movements. Car drivers would be advised to adhere to project signage and take appropriate routes to the site. All workers would be allocated a park and ride location to use. The TRG was now live and would monitor performance on all transport matters. The TRG had access to the transport contingency fund, which could be utilised to mitigate any impact throughout construction.</p>		
6.02	<p>Freight Management Facility The Freight Management Facility would be key in managing HGVs to the Main Site in a measured way and within the hourly vehicle movement caps in the morning and evening peak hours. The site would allow parking for up to 150 HGVs and initial Enabling Works will commence in the Summer 2024.</p>		
6.03	<p>Southern Park and Ride The southern park and ride was located at Wickham Market with a total of 1250 parking spaces. Enabling Works on the site would begin in summer 2024. During the next few months a more detailed phasing plan would be developed.</p>		
6.04	<p>Two Village By-Pass Initial Enabling Works will commence on the bypass of Farnham and Stratford St Andrew in summer 2024. A detailed phasing plan would be developed in the coming months. The feedback from the meeting was that they had wanted work to begin as soon as possible.</p>		
6.05	<p>A12 Improvements – Wickham Market, Marlesford and Little Glenham Richard Bull gave an update on the A12 improvements. The team had worked with the working groups to design a good concept. A detailed design process would take place throughout the summer of 2024 to ensure that all working groups were comfortable with how the schemes would be rolled out. A procurement process would take place towards the end of 2024. The Wickham Market and Little Glenham scheme would deliver various road safety improvements. Sizewell were keen to begin to deliver these improvements in coordination with the working groups.</p>		
6.06	<p>Rail Line Update Richard Bull presented on the rail line improvements. There had been good collaboration with Network Rail on design. Work on the rail updates was scheduled for early 2025, starting at Saxmundham. The goal was to run trains at the end of 2025, moving to four trains by the middle of 2026. A number of level crossings would be upgraded on the East Suffolk line. Network Rail hoped to start the work in Q2 of 2025 and would be invited to a future meeting to present an update on the delivery programme.</p>		



Southern Transport Forum Meeting

Minute Ref	Actions/Comments	Who	By when
6.07	<p>Worker Code of Conduct Tim Newton stated that the team had been working with the Suffolk constabulary and Sgt O'Neill had begun the process of mobilising the team.</p> <p>Every team member who joined the project would go through induction, where they would be briefed on the Sizewell worker code of conduct. He outlined the elements of the code of conduct, and how members of the workforce were expected to behave while working on the project and within local communities.</p> <p>The working code of conduct had been taken from other large infrastructure projects and individuals in the past had been held to account.</p>		
7	<p>Q&A – via Town and Parish Council representative</p>		
7.01	<p>Klaus Fortmann asked whether the TRG had established a baseline to measure the future impact of the project. Steve Merry responded that Sizewell traffic had been monitored and not local traffic. Klaus Fortmann asked why data monitoring would occur without the establishment of a baseline. Steve Merry responded that there had been a baseline established in terms of transport assessment. Survey work had been undertaken separately to Sizewell to support local planning development, which had provided data. This had not covered all roads.</p>		
7.02	<p>Cllr Norman asked how the public could identify which vehicles belonged to Sizewell, and what the consequences would be for individuals who did not follow the rules. Richard Bull responded that any vehicle under 3.5 tonnes would not be tracked. The postal consolidation centre would be for delivering materials to the southern park and ride site, for moving to the main site in a larger vehicle. Spencer Bowdler said two individuals had been removed for poor driving following the receipt of a report of the vehicle. Individuals had reported incidents by the community helpline, which was an instant communication to the community team to instantaneously deal with issues.</p>		
7.03	<p>Cllr Mahony raised concern with the untracked LGVs which were more numerous and most likely to use rural lanes. Cllr Lavender stated that concerns in Hacheston had been raised about traffic volume and speed and she was not aware of any traffic calming initiatives. Brian Stewart stated that the responsibility for this lay with the county council. Steve Merry stated that the public consultation had provided traffic flow assessments, and the route from Framlingham through Hacheston to the southern park and ride had not indicated significant Sizewell-related traffic.</p>		
7.04	<p>Cllr Mahony asked how many police officers would be recruited to deal with the demands. Sgt O'Neill stated that there would be a significant increase of police with a community team in the Sizewell area, and other officers would be used as needed.</p>		
7.05	<p>Cllr Beach asked about the rationale for the 3.5 tonne limit. He recalled he had been told that the small worker vehicles would be monitored. Richard Bull responded that smaller vehicles would not be tracked and that the 3.5 tonne threshold was to align with noise assessment requirements. Cllr Beach suggested community speed watch for enforcement of the code of conduct. Richard Bull responded that LGVs booking into the Delivery Management System (DMS) would be required to provide the registration and therefore any complaint related to an LGV with a vehicle registration number could be checked against the database.</p>		



Southern Transport Forum Meeting

Minute Ref	Actions/Comments	Who	By when
7.06	Cllr Sanders asked whether the 3.5 tonne limit was a dry or a gross weight, and whether drug testing would be random. Richard Bull responded that the weight was gross. Tim Newton stated that every individual coming on to site would be subject to random drug and alcohol testing. Cllr Sanders asked why the freight management did not include all vehicles. David Peacop stated that vehicles with perishable goods would not go through.		
7.07	Cllr Mahony asked if a vehicle would be refused entry if the registration was not recognised on the system. David Peacop confirmed this. Cllr Bann raised the impact of subcontractors and asked whether they would have to book HGV deliveries into the DMS and be provided with designated routes. David Peacop confirmed this to be the case. Cllr Bann requested a link to the deed of obligation document. Brian Stewart responded that relevant links would be provided.		
7.08	Cllr Cooper asked when re-engagement on the Marlesford project would occur. Richard Bull responded that he would follow this up and arrange a meeting within the next Quarter. Cllr Ashton asked where the freight management site would be and what action had been taken to improve the traffic around the Seven Hills roundabout. Richard Bull responded that no upgrades were proposed for the Seven Hills roundabout and that peak hour movements for HGVs would be managed. The proposed freight site location had not changed at this time. Klaus Fortmann stated that he had not received information about railway line improvement and proposals for the Rail Noise Mitigation Scheme. Richard Bull responded that the Mitigation Scheme will be rolled out this year and that there would be more technical engagement with parishes on these matters and noted this as an action.		
7.09	Cllr Sanders asked what actions would be taken to re-examine the issue of Sizewell-related non-HGV traffic diversion during periods of peak traffic flow and A12 improvements. Steve Merry responded that team would work to manage traffic through Woodbridge. Cllr Sanders asked what measures Sizewell would implement to minimise impact of the residential part of Woodbridge being inaccessible to emergency vehicles during nighttime rail operations. He asked whether Sizewell would consider indemnifying insurance costs. Richard Bull responded that this item would go to the TRG to consider whether trains could be held for emergency vehicles to pass over the line through coordination with Network Rail.		
7.10	Cllr Chenery raised the road closures arising from severe flooding in Wickham Market. He asked how Sizewell would build resilience in terms of construction workers routing around Wickham Market. David Peacop responded that there was an Incident Management Plan to deal with these events and communicate to the workforce accordingly.		
7.11	Cllr Chenery asked whether Sizewell would assist in upgrading, repairing or cleaning signage on the driver network to alert drivers, and whether they would indemnify repairs for highway damage caused by construction workers. Richard Bull responded that there was a specific road safety scheme to be delivered for the B1078 that would enhance signage and improve visibility. Sizewell had a defined maintenance area within the DCO focused on the A12 and B1122 with a fund set aside for maintenance requirements. Steve Merry added that there would be a programme of inspections to assess the structure of the A12 and B1122. Under the Highways Act there was a mechanism for recovering damage through extraordinary traffic.		
7.12	Cllr Beach asked what work was going on to assess the cumulative overlapping transport and other impacts of Sizewell and the other power projects subject to statutory and non-statutory consultation, and what parishes could do to support this. Richard Bull responded that the DCO		



Southern Transport Forum Meeting

Minute Ref	Actions/Comments	Who	By when
	had considered this and there had been an ongoing collaboration with Scottish Power Renewables, who had been invited to attend the TRG to extend collaboration.		
7.13	Cllr Bann asked whether Steve Merry had received extra resources for highway coordination. Steve Merry responded that an individual had been seconded as a highway coordination resource and that funding had been provided for additional resource. Cllr Bann asked how Sizewell had contacted properties for noise assessment purposes, and why businesses had not been included. He asked whether horns would be sounded as they approached the level crossings in Melton and Woodbridge. Richard Bull responded that under ballast matting would be part of mitigation measures along with the upgrade of sections of track to continuous welded rail. The rail noise mitigation scheme was residential only. The scheme will be rolled out this year and individual properties will be notified. This can be supported by wider engagement with the Parish Councils. The upgrade of level crossings in the area will remove the requirement of sounding horns as the train approaches. With regard to the specific question on Melton, this crossing is not part of the upgrade scheme but will be discussed further with Network Rail. In terms of the noise mitigation scheme, eligibility was determined by refreshed noise assessments currently being undertaken. Klaus Fortmann asked whether Sizewell had engaged with parish councils on the assessments. Richard Bull stated that individual properties would be notified, but Sizewell will also engage with the parishes.		
7.14	Cllr Mahony raised local concern about congestion in peak summer months, and asked what contingency plans would be in place to address this. Richard Bull responded that a seasonality assessment had been conducted as part of the DCO and the mitigation had taken account for this. No further assessment would be made, and the focus would lie with managing the project appropriately and responding to issues effectively. He was confident that the mitigation along the A12 would be sufficient. Cllr Mahoney raised problems with HGVs using a single track quiet lane and asked what briefings had been provided to drivers. Spencer Bowdler responded that detailed routes would be provided to drivers at the outset, and each contractor would undergo training. The community helpline was integral to the reporting of issues.		
7.15	Cllr Sanders requested that questions were included in the agenda.		
7.16	Cllr Cooper requested a copy of the latest signage strategy.		
8	Chair's Concluding Remarks		
8.01	Brian Stewart thanked participants for the discussion.		
9	Date of Next Meeting		
9.01	Brian Stewart stated that the next meeting would take place on 15 May at Stratford St Andrew Riverside Centre.		
10	Close		
10.01	Brian Stewart closed the meeting.		