

# Meeting Notes



Sizewell C Transport Review Group

**Meeting Title:** Transport Review Group      **Location:** Microsoft Teams  
**Date:** 16 January 2025      **Time:** 1400–1725

Attendees:

East Suffolk Council	<b>Carolyn Barnes (CB)</b> , Rebecca Brooks (RBr)
National Highways	<b>Thomes Lawman (TL)</b>
Sizewell C	<b>Richard Bull (RB)</b> , <b>Jez Porter (JP)</b> , <b>Rebecca Quigg (RQ)</b> , Joseph Hough (JH), <b>Si Middleton-Burrows (SMB)</b> , Patrick MacGuire (PMacG), David Stuart (DS), Nick Cottman (NC), Darren Benford-Brown (DBB), <b>Niki Pieri (NP)</b> , Alex Aherne (AA), Alex Fairhead (AF)
Suffolk Constabulary	<b>Leigh Jenkins (LJ)</b> , Kevin Stark (KS)
Suffolk County Council	Graeme Mateer (GM), <b>Steve Merry (SM)</b> , John Rozier (JR), Peter Langford (PL), Julia Cox (JC), Ashley Medhurst (AM)
Invited Observers:	Energy Security – Ryan Walker; Scottish Power – David Lewis (DL); ITP – Dean Johnson (DJ), David Cunliffe (DC)
<b><i>Voting members of the TRG are marked in bold</i></b>	

Apologies:

Notes:

Item	No.	Summary	Lead
1	<b>Introductions</b>	<b>1.1</b> Steve Merry (SM) introduced Graeme Mateer (GM) from Suffolk County Council. GM will be chairing the TRG, while SM remains the voting member for SCC.	<b>SM/GM</b>
	<b>1.2</b>	Rebecca Quigg (RQ) noted that the meeting has been extended by an hour to accommodate the extending programme.	<b>RQ</b>
2	<b>Notes of the previous TRG meeting</b> - 26 <sup>th</sup> September 2024	<b>2.1</b> RQ took the group through the minutes of the last meeting.	<b>RQ</b>
	<b>2.2</b>	Carolyn Barnes (CB) noted that there is some confusion of the initialling for Steve Merry and Si Middleton-Burrows (SMB). RQ confirmed that this would be corrected.	<b>CB/RQ</b>
	<b>2.3</b>	<b>Action 1 (Item 2.1): clarification of long-term HGV forecast and update on more precise timescale.</b> - SMB confirmed that defining the long-term HGV forecast was in progress but dependent on the	<b>SMB</b>



Sizewell C

Item	No.	Summary	Lead
		<p>overall design confirmation for the main site. This is due to be agreed at Board level at in the next quarter.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SMB did note that currently the actual figures are at 50% or less of the HGV forecasts in the DCO currently. SMB confirmed that SZC do not foresee any issues with the DCO caps while the design confirmation process is ongoing.</li> <li>- As soon as the design confirmation is complete, SMB confirmed that SZC will be able to attribute HGV volume based on material requirements. SMB also confirmed that this will include the AIL long-term forecast.</li> </ul>	
	2.4	<p><b>Action 2 (Item 3- TN03): SZC to meet with SCon to discuss the Traffic Incident Management Plan (TIMP)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Joseph Hough (JH) confirmed that this meeting took place following the TRG.</li> </ul>	JH
	2.5	<p><b>Action 3 (Item 3- TN05): AILS to be extracted from TN05 report</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- JH confirmed that AILs have been separated in TN05.</li> </ul>	JH
	2.6	<p><b>Action 4 (Item 3- TN05): SZC to arrange discussion around coordination of traffic management</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Richard Bull (RB) confirmed that this conversation is ongoing. Confirmation of the extended supply chain is critical to defining traffic management needs. RB emphasised that it is a critical discussion that is key to get right for local people.</li> <li>- SM noted that he views the role of the TRG as strategic, allowing this group to respond to the challenges and questions of the transport forums. The TRG could take a view on whether TM is managed as long duration closures with maximum work done in one closure, or more numerous short duration closures. Coordination with SPR, other NSIPs and utilities could also be covered at a high strategic level, rather than operational minutiae. RB confirmed that this approach was agreeable to SZC.</li> </ul>	RB/SM
	2.7	<p><b>Action 5 (Item 4): SZC to give SM a more in-depth view of the Delivery Management System (DMS)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SM and Patrick McGuire (PMcG) confirmed that this had taken place. SM noted that he had found this in-depth look at the system reassuring</li> </ul>	SM/PMcG

Item	No.	Summary	Lead
		and recommended other members of the TRG requested the same insight.	
	2.8	<b>Action 6 (Item 6): SZC to provide updates on Automatic Number Plate Recognition for Park and Ride sites</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- David Stuart (DS) updated the TRG on progress for the ANPR. He noted the need for a sourcing strategy for procuring the technology, particularly in terms of finding designs with appropriately incorporated power sources.</li> </ul>	DS
	2.9	<b>Action 7 (Item 6): SZC to provide update on AIL layby at Wickham Market</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SM noted that SCC had received the design for the AIL layby and a high level programme with approximate dates.</li> <li>- Leigh Jenkins (LJ) updated that the SCon AIL team supervisors had fed back to John Rozier (JR) on the layby design.</li> </ul>	SM/LJ/JR
	2.10	<b>Action 8 (Item 7): SZC to feedback traffic monitoring data to the TRG</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RQ confirmed that the Traffic Monitoring Report was on the agenda for this meeting of the TRG.</li> </ul>	RQ/JH
	2.11	<b>Action 9 (Item 9): SZC and SCC to understand accident rates and potential approaches to A12 Bredfield Junction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RQ confirmed that accident rates had been checked by SCC and the TRG would keep the junction under review.</li> </ul>	RQ
	2.12	<b>Action 10 (Item 10): SZC and SCC to review the recent collision on Kings Avenue in Leiston</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RQ confirmed that accident rates had been checked and Kings Avenue would be kept under review.</li> </ul>	RQ
	2.13	GM asked for the voting members of the TRG to approve and sign off the actions. The vote was unanimous.	GM/All
3	<b>Sizewell C Planning Technical Notes (require approval):</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- TN05- Early Site Accesses HGV Route Requirements</li> </ul>	3.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- JH updated the TRG on TN05, noting that all actions requested in the last meeting of the TRG had been undertaken.</li> <li>- SM discussed the need to futureproof the document to ensure it remained current between the quarterly meetings of the TRG.</li> </ul>	JH



Sizewell C

Item		No.	Summary	Lead
	(second issue)			
	Action		JH to undertake futureproofing exercise with delivery team	JH
	Action		JH to review figures for HGV movements with the delivery team and double check that these are correct	JH
	Action		TRG to consider the need for a smaller TRG between meetings to cover the time-sensitive issues like technical notes	RQ
	Action		RQ to update Community Relations team on changes to TN05	RQ
	Action		RQ to circulate new version of TN05 once HGV no. are checked and futureproofing complete	RQ
4	Transport Monitoring Report (November 2024)	4.1	JH introduced the report. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- JH updated the TRG on key points from the Transport Monitoring Report, noting that they had the full report to hand, and that this would be published on the East Suffolk website with the TRG meeting notes.</li> <li>- This report covers September to November 2024</li> </ul>	
	- Workforce survey and data	4.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- JH noted that workforce survey results were identical to the previous report.</li> <li>- Worker numbers have increased by an order of approx. 200 since the last quarter</li> <li>- Visitor numbers are at a similar level as the previous quarter</li> <li>- There has been no change to the cycle and motorcycle parking utilisation</li> </ul>	
	- Bus service progress	4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DS noted that the ITT for the main passenger contract would go out on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2025; in total there would be 6 bidders from 3 national and 3 local organisations.</li> <li>- DS updated that the hydrogen pilot was due to commence on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2025. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o DS noted that the facility in Ipswich was nearing completion, with fuel delivery undertaken in late January.</li> <li>o DS stated that the buses have been delivered and would be put into service at the end of January 2025</li> <li>o Initial services will be direct services from Ipswich</li> </ul> </li> <li>- DS also noted that staff are now almost entirely being transferred between construction sites by</li> </ul>	



Sizewell C

Item	No.	Summary	Lead
		<p>SZC internal services, which run every 10 minutes from 6am to 7.30pm.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SM stated that he and RQ had established that bus routes need to be agreed by the TRG via the Transport Coordinator.</li> </ul>	
<b>Action</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RQ to meet with DS to discuss bus routes for circulation to the TRG</li> </ul>	<b>RQ/DS</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>HGV and LGV movements</b></li> </ul>	<b>4.4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The daily HGV cap has not been exceeded in the three months covered by this report.</li> <li>- The directional split for HGV movements for this period more closely reflected the assessed 85% from the South / 15% from the North, especially moving into October and November</li> <li>- Light Goods Vehicles (LGVs) are well below the assessed figures.</li> <li>- A number of vehicles were non-compliant in both timing and routes: these were all a result of night works needed to resurface King George's Avenue. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o SCC did agree that the night works could take place, so while these HGVs were non-compliant in their timing, they were approved to occur.</li> <li>o Their routing was also non-compliant; this was not approved, and was investigated. There had been a communication error at the contractor, which has been addressed by the SZC delivery coordinator.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>FORS and CLOCS compliance</b></li> </ul>	<b>4.5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FORS compliance is at almost 100%</li> <li>- CLOCS has slightly improved</li> <li>- Emissions standards are also all compliant</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Forums and Transport Working Groups</b></li> </ul>	<b>4.3</b>	<p>RQ introduced the section on community engagement –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Transport Working Groups have been arranged through 2025 to ensure that there is structure for the parish councils who attend, and clarity about next steps</li> <li>- RQ confirmed that when contractors are appointed for the local roads schemes, they will be asked to attend working groups to work on traffic management and programme for the schemes .</li> </ul>	



Sizewell C

Item	No.	Summary	Lead
5	<b>SZC Programme updates:</b>	<b>5.1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The TRG agreed that going forward the Transport Programme could be circulated with the meeting pack, removing the need for this item in the now very full agenda.</li> <li>- RB noted that it was now the 1<sup>st</sup> anniversary of DCO commencement, and that a lot of progress had been made, with thanks to the members of the TRG for their support</li> <li>- Work is commencing soon on the SSSI crossing, and work will be beginning on the front of the site.</li> <li>- Work has commenced on some of the Associated Development sites and SZC want to continue to keep up this momentum, with AD sites the main focus of 2025.</li> <li>- RB noted the critical need for coordination of road closures, traffic management and working with the community to minimise disruption.</li> <li>- RB also stated that working closely with colleagues at SPR and coordinating schemes with them was also of key importance.</li> </ul>	<b>RB</b>
	<b>Additional Bus Update</b>	<b>5.2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DS added that the procurement of the design of the facility in Ipswich for buses will be commenced by the end of January 2025. He also noted SZC take the lease ownership from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2025, securing the facility for the length of the project.</li> <li>- LJ asked whether the buses coming from Pontins will be included in the HGV numbers. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o DS confirmed that the buses are included on the DMS system and PMacG confirmed that buses coming from Pakefield will also be included in these totals.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
	<b>Rail update</b>	<b>5.3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SK was not available for this meeting. RQ suggested a longer piece on rail for the next TRG and agreed to take this as an action</li> </ul>	
	<b>Action</b>	<b>5.4</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>RQ to arrange for SK to give a longer rail update at the next TRG</b></li> </ul>	<b>RQ</b>
	<b>Worker Code of Conduct</b>	<b>5.5</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- DBB gave the TRG a summary of the Workers Code of Conduct and actions he takes to ensure it is complied with</li> <li>- LJ noted that there is a very good working relationship between Sizewell and Suffolk Constabulary, which was seconded by DS</li> </ul>	

Item	No.	Summary	Lead
6	<b>Traffic Monitoring</b>	<b>6.1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- JH showing report with an explanation on what the data shows.</li> <li>- JH reminded everyone that these reports are designed to monitor trends, but to wait for more data before any further actions.</li> <li>- For groups 1, 2 and 3, it has been recommended to further survey information is required and to review at the next survey (April 2025).</li> <li>- SM, RB and NC raised concerns over the data and how it would be published to the wider public.</li> <li>- RQ noted that these reports need be clear and precise to the public domain who may not have the experience and technical knowledge that the TRG have.</li> <li>- Open discussions on how to simplify the report.</li> </ul> <p><b><i>This report has been approved by all voting members of the TRG based on the actions.</i></b></p>	
	<b>Action</b>	<b>6.2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Ensure the report is clear and precise, with explanations about we've taken surveys, the data itself and a summary page added to the report. (All voting members agreed).</b></li> </ul>	<b>JH</b>
	<b>Action</b>	<b>6.3</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Change the title of "Screened out locations" as per SM request.</b></li> </ul>	<b>JH</b>
7	<b>Traffic Monitoring Extra Site Requests</b>	<b>7.1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- RQ giving a background explanation of the traffic site monitoring requests.</li> <li>- <b><i>All voting approved the requests, except for Ufford. Ufford, Upper Street has been approved, but more information is required on lower one.</i></b></li> </ul>	
	<b>Action</b>	<b>7.2</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>Obtain more information about Ufford, lower street traffic monitoring request.</b></li> </ul>	<b>RQ</b>
8	<b>Council National Highways</b>	<b>8.1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SCC are still awaiting non-prescribed signs application, but are making good progress with the technical approval for the 2 x 7-8 signs so when approval comes through, its ready to go.</li> </ul>	
9	<b>Latitude Festival</b>	<b>9.1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- NE noted that latitude is happening on Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2025, until Sunday 27<sup>th</sup> July 2025, the egress date is Monday 28<sup>th</sup> July. Traffic is not allowed to turn North onto the A12, only South so please prepare any planning activities or delivery accordingly.</li> </ul>	
10	<b>Addition of Disruption Mitigation &amp; Traffic</b>	<b>10.1</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strategic traffic management of the A12, need to have oversight of that. Long term programme to be put in place.</li> </ul>	





Sizewell C

Item	No.	Summary	Lead
<b>Management Programme</b>			
<b>Action</b>	<b>10.2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Add this to next meetings agenda, to discuss further.</li> </ul>	<b>RQ</b>
11 <b>Stakeholder Updates</b>	<b>10.1</b>	National Highways <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The update is being distributed after today's meeting, via email.</li> <li>- RQ suggested all stakeholders do this, and they can be circulated with the meeting minutes.</li> </ul>	
	<b>10.2</b>	Suffolk County Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Currently looking into their maintenance schedules for road resurfacing.</li> </ul>	
	<b>10.3</b>	East Suffolk Council <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A quick update on the previous issues for the council portal, there is a new link to it via the ESC homepage on their website.</li> </ul>	
	<b>10.4</b>	Scottish Power <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Focusing on highway condition surveys currently.</li> <li>- Must be kept in the loops on any highway disruptions.</li> </ul>	
12 <b>AOB (Any Other Business)</b>	<b>11</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Approve terms of Reference for the Rights of Way and working group. (circulate after the meeting, via email).</li> <li>- Post this meeting, Patrick McGuire will take on the ownership of the Delivery Coordinator role in place of Si Middleton-Burrows.</li> <li>- SM question whether the rail use of ACA through Leiston was a two-year deal or is that set for the duration of the construction? RB has assured him it is on the agenda, but no confirmation to date.</li> <li>- Next meeting is 1<sup>st</sup> May 2025.</li> </ul>	