

# Sizewell C Town and Parish Event 6<sup>th</sup> December 2016

Facilitators: Lisa Chandler and Michael Moll

Scribe: Lucinda Prestwood

<b>Key issue: Accommodation</b>
---------------------------------

Town/Parish	Immediate comments
Aldringham-cum-Thorpeness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum benefit, maximum legacy. This doesn't seem to be the case with campus.</li> <li>• Move sports facilities to place where it has long term legacy.</li> </ul>
Middleton-cum-Fordley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3-5 stories high does not provide 'soft edge' to the development</li> <li>• Suggestion for campus aspect – impact on tourism of taking holiday accommodation is major concern. Years before properties come back on market for holiday makers. Tourists will go elsewhere.</li> <li>• Campus design at Hinkley is appalling, will they be same for SZC?</li> <li>• 2,400 in one place, disagree with this</li> <li>• Alternative suggestion: King George Ave &amp; Lovers Lane. Area close to curve of Lovers Lane. Better solution. Break into 3 parts (drawn on paper). This was an option in stage 1 and was dropped (we don't know why). Would only be small portion of the AONB.</li> <li>• <b>Facilitator note: Access still used as main access to SZB.</b></li> <li>• Could develop campus on old airfield (Leiston airfield), would mean crossing/going under B1122.</li> <li>• EDF trying to do everything cheaply</li> <li>• Cost a lot to remove campus suggested, no legacy value. This alternative suggestion could become hotel to be used for outage crews, therefore would have legacy value.</li> <li>• Impact of development is still concern</li> </ul>
Aldeburgh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legacy is essential, something Leiston can benefit from. Off-site sports facilities. If campus at entrance, option 2.2</li> <li>• Pressure on accommodation at certain periods, outages would need to be managed/coordinated.</li> <li>• Tourism – accommodation is expensive so workers will be priced out by tourists.</li> </ul>
Southwold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appearance of building is a concern</li> </ul>
Cllr Maureen Jones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EDF struggling to get investors. Money isn't available in same way it was for B. Have to ensure we get as much for the money available.</li> <li>• Stockpiles, noise and activity, will have enormous impact on AONB. Big area of concern</li> </ul>
Kelsale-cum-Carlton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rented accommodation/loss of housing. Planned</li> </ul>

	<p>outages every six months for 6-8 weeks. This would soak up all rented accommodation. People renting those properties would not vacate for SZB outage crews. What would happen?</p> <p><b>Facilitator note: we would say in our response that EDF would need to coordinate accordingly when these instances occur. They would have to scale back SZC development whilst outages occur.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It wouldn't just be 6 weeks – lead up time and clear down time for outages.</li> <li>• Major tourist areas – concern that tourism will be eroded.</li> </ul>
Darsham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can EDF do something similar to Olympic park? Leaving legacy potential afterwards. Leiston doesn't have that need.</li> <li>• Concerned impact on Eastbridge, transport movements from park &amp; ride</li> </ul>
Theberton & Eastbridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are EDF proposing greenfield sites only, because it's easier?</li> </ul> <p><b>Facilitator note: Distance from accommodation to site – if too great, people won't travel and will seek accommodation closer.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Main concern is 2400 people at top of Lovers Lane, strange movement of T-junction out of Eastbridge is another concern.</li> <li>• Should talk to EDF about buying some houses in Leiston</li> <li>• Lowestoft &amp; Martlesham are reasonable distance – could spread the burden there.</li> <li>• A lot of contradictions in proposals</li> <li>• Need to be more creative. Don't feel we have enough options.</li> <li>• Worry that area will be tarnished – people will not be attracted to move to the area.</li> <li>• Could a deal be struck with some local campsites by EDF to take them over for 10 years.</li> <li>• Impact of a large number of male workers influx into the area, elderly people currently living in those areas are concerned. Will the workers stay on campus to socialise? They will affect the community.</li> <li>• Even if a small proportion of the campus population want to go off-campus for socialising etc. it would have an enormous impact on local community.</li> <li>• Could we not use a disused ocean liner to accommodate people?</li> <li>• We feel councils are agreeing with proposal as it's an easy route, or that they are endorsing it.</li> </ul>
Yoxford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree we need a campus. Must be opportunity to build some houses distributed through East Suffolk, sort of houses people will buy (2/3 bedroom houses). Therefore we have housing stock in 10/15 years' time. Building through both construction and operation phase. Reduce size of campus and improve housing stock.</li> <li>• If housing fund was available to boost development in</li> </ul>

	<p>local areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern – take up of tourist accommodation. Believe EDF's figures for Yoxford are wrong (335 tourist bed spaces – is this really accurate?) in reality they would be taking up the entire B&amp;B capacity.</li> </ul>
Little Glemham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A campus is needed in that area. Moving it further out, would impact transport strategy substantially.</li> </ul>
Cllr Michael Gower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accommodation campus doesn't need to be in the most sensitive area. There are other areas it could go</li> <li>• Taking over greenfield site, destroying it, disagree with this.</li> </ul>
Leiston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land on left hand part of site owned by Mr Dowley Theberton House, who will not sell. Can EDF go for a compulsory purchase?</li> <li>• Will they want to retain accommodation for outage workers? <b>Facilitator note: No nothing in this document.</b></li> <li>• We will find ourselves in continuous outage cycle, between B, C &amp; D. <b>Facilitator note: Do we need to attract outage workers to live permanently in the area?</b></li> <li>• this is unrealistic, those workers will move around the world with their job.</li> <li>• Cllr Sammy Betson – prefers option 3, keeping to Eastbridge Rd and facilities in Leiston. Less people on the road. It's the least-worst option.</li> <li>• Sports facilities in the town rather than on site.</li> <li>• Currently have the middle school, LTAA sites also as sports facility site options</li> <li>• Look at town's infrastructure and what it can cope with, where investment is needed to accommodate these people. Must be in position to service that number of people. Investment needed for this.</li> <li>• Links to comments on community table – please see.</li> <li>• (point for construction table) - When built B, increased hostel block size as they needed. Wasn't the standard EDF say they require but that type of accommodation could still be put closer to the site.</li> <li>• Sizewell A isn't included in these plans – why not? The land around SZA should not be discounted from this debate, could use some of A's land and facilities.</li> <li>• Won't be enough space on A for accommodation unless turbine hall is removed.</li> <li>• Housing fund – this should be able to support some of housing in town centre, taking pressure off surrounding areas. Need 1-2 bedroom houses. Neighbourhood plan has plan enough for 3-4 bed, now need 1-2 bedroom houses that people would continue to live in.</li> <li>• This would kick-start Leiston's regeneration.</li> <li>• Infrastructure – there are existing proposed developments in the town. So must not look at this in isolation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Facilitator note: Would you prefer campus in Leiston</b></p>

	<p><b>instead?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• traffic issues are bad already, highway infrastructure is poor and needs considering (shared space?)</li> <li>• Must look at overall picture, impacts on Leiston wherever accommodation is situated.</li> <li>• Could accommodation be placed on both sides of the road to make them lower?</li> <li>• Shuttle bus would be needed from campus to town centre.</li> <li>• Accommodation must come hand in hand with investment into infrastructure.</li> <li>• Height – views? Prefer lower if possible but not at a cost to other areas.</li> </ul>
Wenhaston/Mellis Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordable housing as a term is misleading – housing that is affordable, is what is needed.</li> <li>• Seems crazy not to have some legacy out of facilities being built.</li> <li>• Expand caravan site to start with.</li> </ul>
Hacheston Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could EDF have a register of approved landlords for their workers, could this mitigate fire risks/need for enforcement? Would EDF be able to resource doing relevant safety checks of housing.</li> <li>• Affordable housing – could it become a free for all for speculative developers building all over the place. Mitigation is needed to meet the need. The fund must be spent to properly mitigate.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
Southwold Town Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small resident population – could have an increase of resident population as result of SZC over 5-10 years, could be a huge benefit. Can't think of anything that would be compromising to Southwold.</li> <li>• Can't measure what impact on tourism would be, it may increase or decrease.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
Cllr Andy Smith	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved accommodation list – we should push this strongly</li> <li>• Is a campus at the site the least worst option?</li> </ul>
Fire & Rescue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Making sure we can respond, input at design stage. Campus – sprinklers would be needed, high-risk building environment. Would need to consider nearest resources.</li> <li>• 35-40 minutes travel time for a fire appliance from Ipswich to Eastbridge</li> <li>• Enforcement of housing where there are unsafe standards. If there is a need to restrict/inhibit use of premises.</li> <li>• People will seize opportunity to make money from housing workers. Poor accommodation standards has impact on fire service, more enforcement action (this has been the case in Hinkley)</li> </ul>
Waldringfield Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need a sustainable approach to housing. Would it not be possible to produce a type of accommodation that could be modified in time? Or even relocated.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What about accommodation for higher level workers (not construction workers) – can EDF contribute to housing for those people?</li> </ul>
Grundisburgh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suffolk Coastal needs to increase housing stock</li> </ul>
Martlesham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No specific comments.</li> </ul>
Anne Westover, Landscape Architect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alternative sports area, planning authority need to look at suitable sites now and earmark them.</li> </ul>
Wickham Market	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will workers spend all of their time on site? Where else will they spend time?</li> <li>• Suffolk Coastal Local Plan – numbers are wrong, underestimated need for housing.</li> <li>• In Wickham Market people looking to downsize to smaller houses.</li> <li>• Employment is a problem, not enough opportunities. Public transport is awful so mitigation would be needed.</li> <li>• The increase in demand will push house prices up. Could use housing fund to facilitate kick starting low cost developments/shared-equity schemes.</li> <li>• Need about 100 more houses before 2026. But must be the right sort of houses, and must have infrastructure to support it.</li> </ul>
Geoff Holdcroft	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need housing that workers can afford to pay for on a temporary basis and that they are content with. Focus money on infrastructure, roads, drainage, broadband etc.</li> </ul>
Melton Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will they enhance mobile signal in the area? They could contribute to the community as a whole by enhancing infrastructure like this.</li> <li>• Hotel space for visiting people, is notoriously difficult. More hotel space in east Suffolk is needed – there will be visitors/consultants etc needing very short term accommodation. A good hotel with conference facilities is needed</li> <li>• Tourist accommodation is too expensive for people.</li> <li>• Design of SZC station is unattractive, SZB is a landmark and a draw for tourists.</li> <li>• Don't think it would affect visitors to the area, because Sizewell itself is not a tourist destination.</li> <li>• Melton has no particular concern where it comes to accommodation. As long as it's a healthy pleasant place for the visiting workers to reside.</li> <li>• Mitigation fund – a good idea in principle but will be driven by market forces. It needs to be for local people, not for people looking to move into the area for other purposes/a free-for-all.</li> </ul>