

Summary Notes from Community Engagement Event 29.07.2020

Please note that this note summarises comments made by the Town and Parish Council representatives from the workshops. The comments do not necessarily reflect the position the Town and Parish Councils will take.

Group 1

Facilitator- Lisa Chandler (Energy Projects Manager, ESC)

Scribe- Brogan Mann (Executive Assistant/Project Support, SCC)

Snape Parish Council (Snape PC) raised concern over the energy output of nuclear power stations, who will primarily own the facility and how it is being funded. Snape PC also asked why issues surrounding financial and political vulnerability have been overlooked compared to impacts on transport systems and other problems. Facilitator explained that the site for new nuclear development has been allocated by Central Government and policy of the Government is for nuclear power. It is the role of the local authority to assess the suitability of the proposal rather than the principal of nuclear development. Funding of the site is more technical but EDFE are the primary investor contributing 80% and CGN 20% only until the DCO (Development Consent Order). The funding process has not been agreed after consent, we are waiting for the Government to publish an acceptable funding model.

The representative from Theberton and Eastbridge Parish Council (Theberton and Eastbridge PC) wanted to express his worry over EDFE selling the site in the future, and whether the new owner will pose a potential security risk. Although, he does recognise not much can be done at this stage in the process to act as reassurance.

Snape PC highlighted that Sizewell C is a huge public asset being led by a private business with foreign ownership/investment. We must rely on local authorities to ensure EDFE provides more than just adequate funding for supporting infrastructure such as the Two Village Bypass. Snape PC feel that EDFE are doing less and less as shown by their move from a rail lead plan to more road movements and ensuring that Leiston and surrounding areas receive more than just small amounts of money as mitigation for the project.

Facilitator asked for the parish council's views on community funds and what parishes will be looking to receive out of this?

Snape PC responded that they seek a significant input of money due to the impact of COVID-19 on art and tourism facilities to ensure their survival. An enormous amount of people's livelihoods in Snape and surrounding area rely on tourism.

Theberton and Eastbridge PC said that it is difficult to quantify the funds required by EDFE to prove the significant financial impacts.

Friston Parish Council (Friston PC) wish to have governance of the funds and support, communities need to identify areas for funding and contribute adequately, not just EDFE making decisions on applications. Potentially having a board of local/district councils representing the parishes. Regarding accommodation for workers associated with the site, what will the impact be for tourism on local towns, and how will this be managed going forward?

Aldeburgh Town Council (Aldeburgh TC) argued that EDFE are short-changing the local area and are not prepared to spend money to properly mitigate adverse impacts effectively. They are also disgraced by the term 'energy coast', and do not want the coast of Suffolk to have this connotation associated with it.

Aldeburgh TC highlighted the leader of the council was encouraged with the term 'Energy Coast' and expressed how this could bring increased funding to the area.

Aldeburgh TC expressed disappointment that authorities are not actively discouraging the Two-Village Bypass, and that is inadequate and should be rejected by the Councils.

Snape PC raised the concern of the Two-Village Bypass not being adequate to alleviate traffic. Congestion is likely to occur at the dual carriageway by Lt Glenham backing up onto the dual carriageway and run through Wickham Market. Snape PC reiterated that both Leiston and Saxmundham are in desperate need of proper investment and planning as opposed to receiving small funds. Although happy councils are pushing back with EDFE, still anxious that more investment is needed. Theberton and Eastbridge PC added that cumulative impacts have only been considered properly with SPR.

Friston PC emphasised their revulsion of such a concentration of energy infrastructure happening in a relatively small area. Central Government have not taken this onboard and are depriving areas of the country with better facilities and space to accommodate such infrastructure

Facilitator asked the group for thoughts on re-opening the Leiston Rail-line?

Snape PC said that it would be a benefit if it is properly handled and routed in the way that suits everybody. During the discussion it was argued that the Green Route would be no good as it bypasses Leiston but hopefully it will become a passenger line and provide a legacy benefit for the community.

Aldeburgh TC asked if there has been a push to use more rail rather than road. Facilitator said that SCC and ESC are still arguing that there needs to be more rail movements and CEX's have been communicating with Network Rail to encourage this. Despite this, EDFE has said it cannot deliver a full Rail Led Strategy due to time and ability for Network Rail to provide this.

Aldeburgh PC stated that there would need to be a re-think to the footpath to the industrial estate.

Facilitator suggested an alternative option for a hop on hop off bus service directly to Aldeburgh which could be pushed in the tourism fund. Group said that there is already a

summer bus in place from Thorpeness to Aldeburgh, but it needs to stop in more places. Snape PC suggested that the bus could stop off at Snape Maltings on its route as there is no public transport to Snape Maltings apart from one bus in the evening.

The three key points put forward from the discussion were that investment in the area is not good enough, needs to be more investment in transport, tourism, and housing. Secondly, concern about HGV's using backroads and there needs to be more parking. Thirdly all members of the group disagreed with the term 'Energy Coast' and are against its use going forward.

Group 2

Facilitator- Karen Thomas (Head of Coastal Partnership East, ESC)

Scribe- Isaac Nunn (Senior Planning Officer, SCC)

Facilitator started off the session by asking the members of the group to choose a topic they wish to discuss. Leiston Town Council (Leiston TC) were primarily concerned with traffic coming through Leiston. Saxmundham Town Council (Saxmundham TC) wished to discuss overnight rail movements through Saxmundham. Westleton Parish Council (Westleton PC) wished to raise the issue of traffic in general. Leiston TC intended to gain more clarity on the 3,000+ workforce that will descend on the town as well as a variety of topics such as workforce demographics, traffic, HMO's, Fly Parking and legacy benefit for cycling. Westleton PC wanted to know more about tourism and amenity for locals.

Saxmundham TC raised the issue of rat-running because of the traffic impacts caused to the A14 during the construction of the project. Furthermore, Saxmundham TC are concerned about impacts on local housing, we do not have lucrative amount of properties and people may get priced out due to the increase in rents and house prices.

Leiston TC stated that there has been a lot of emphasis on HGV's but not enough discussion surrounding LGV's and their routing, monitoring and enforcement.

Facilitator put forward the first topic of traffic through Leiston, Westleton and Saxmundham and how this can be mitigated?

Leiston TC said that a S.106 Agreement is needed to make improvements to discourage rat running through Leiston, and traffic controls need to be in place during the early years before the Link Road is constructed.

Westleton PC mentioned that they have little support from Suffolk County Council (SCC) as SCC will not invest in traffic calming measure for current workers. Concerned that even without the full construction of the Northern Park and Rise there will be a huge volume of rat running which will need to be enforced to ensure they use the A12 instead. Westleton PC annoyed that the Four-Village Bypass is not possible as the Two Village Bypass does not solve all traffic issues.

Facilitator asked about the opinion of Saxmundham TC. Saxmundham TC said that they have had no contact with SCC or EDFE despite being only 6 miles away from the site. Additionally, Saxmundham TC did not have a presentation at the Stage 4 consultation and have not had a visit from the library.

Westleton PC emphasised the need to SCC to appreciate the transport issues will affect the Suffolk road system as whole including the western side of the county and not just east Suffolk/A12 corridor.

Saxmundham TC raised concerns about overnight rail movements. Saxmundham TC expressed interest in trials to see if they can make diesel engines quieter and the reduce vibrations.

A point was raised about there being a lack of appetite for wind projects using rail transport, and even with 9 other energy projects in the pipeline in-combination effects are unknown at the moment.

Facilitator initiated a discussion regarding workforce numbers, HMO's and impacts on housing.

Leiston TC stated they EDFE's initial figures are lower than they are now regarding the on-site campus, caravan site. Impact on overall infrastructure will outstrip demand for local services for example hairdressers.

A discussion surrounding affordable housing was initiated by Westleton PC, it was asked whether there has been any discussion between EDFE and East Suffolk Council about building affordable housing in response?

Leiston TC expressed that they have learnt from the construction of Sizewell B the temptation for landlords to rent a room rather than a house but all the NHB workers bring cars which creates a large increase. Leiston TC are trying to create a permit system with EDFE.

Leiston TC agreed that anti-social behaviour needs to be dealt with strongly.

Westleton PC expressed desire to have access to conversations with other organisations. EDFE not trusted to have regard for the environment but as a village it is difficult to grapple with these matters.

The three key issues to come from discussion were transport improvements/mitigation across the whole of Suffolk. The influx of workers and the effects on parking, local services, and anti-social behaviour. In-combination effects with other projects particularly wind energy.

Group 3

Facilitator- Steve Merry (Transport Policy and Development Manager, SCC)

Scribe- Beth Rance (Graduate Town Planner, ESC)

Middleton-cum-Fordley Parish Council (Middleton PC) raised a concern that they did not feel listened to by EDFE. EDFE's duty is to mitigate impact of development and transport and they feel this has not been shown enough. Key areas that Middleton PC feel have not been investigated fully are alternative roads, a proper jetty to allow transport of aggregates by sea, ecological impact (specifically Marsh Harriers) and congestion (recollecting the issues caused by Sizewell B construction).

Yoxford Parish Council (Yoxford PC) the site where Sizewell C is proposed to be built is not suitable for a nuclear power station due to the high vulnerability of the local wildlife and landscape. Yoxford PC and Middleton PC justified this by saying tall pylons and the demolition of Coronation Wood are required to incorporate the scale of the project therefore proving the site is too small.

In relation to the Sizewell Link Road Middleton PC are concerned about the increased probability of crashes (especially head on) between HGV's and LGV's. Moreover, the B1122 particularly in the early years before the link road is fully built will see an overwhelming number of vehicles and this is made worse by having just one access to the site. Middleton PC suggested having two approach roads to break down the volume of traffic and if not mitigated the B1122 will become unusable.

Kelsale-cum-Carlton Parish Council (Kelsale PC) shared the same view as Middleton PC and believes that the link road will not help at all as there will be too much concentration of traffic. Kelsale PC opined that car sharing will not be as prevalent as expected and it is still not clear how HGV movement leaving the site will be managed.

Regarding the Beach Landing Facility Middleton PC are very cautious of the eroding coast, it is not manageable or defensible and potentially the power station could become an island as a result. EDFE seem to be blind to the problem.

A discussion ensued on the Transport Strategy. Kelsale PC said that Kelsale could be isolated from the surrounding villages due to the construction chaos. Yoxford PC understand that it will be difficult to manage and prevent private car traffic where workers are using minor roads to get to the site. They have no faith in number plate recognition and said that controlling private car traffic at Hinkley Point C has proved to be hard. Kelsale PC would like to see EDFE implement rigorous obligations for car sharing, it should be greater than the estimated 1.1 people per car. Although this would be ideal, not sure EDFE can properly control how people travel to and from the site. Middleton PC added that car sharing should

be written into contractor's contracts, and Yoxford PC mentioned that during the construction of Sizewell B police used to turn cars around in certain areas.

The next topic of discussion was on Associated Development. Kelsale PC emphasised that Hinkley Point C and Somerset are not comparable to the transport system in Suffolk. Once there is a blockage on the A12 it turns into a very long car park with few options to circumvent. Yoxford PC concerned that the flow of traffic will be reduced due to the lack of roundabouts that were originally proposed to be built. Crossovers at locations such as Friday Street will add to this congestion as vehicles turn right. Middleton PC reiterated this point and added that where the traffic meets the new link road it will be butted by a 'T' junction further preventing the flow of traffic. Considering these points and the increase in HGV's and LGV's trying to leave/join the link road, it is their opinion the road will be useless at meeting its purpose.

Facilitator asked if the roundabout at Middleton was changed to a priority junction would this improve things? Middleton PC replied by saying that it's unlikely to alleviate traffic problems and might only encourage people to go through Middleton itself. D2 route would have been better because it kept 600m from the villages.

Facilitator asked whether the proposed relief road is better than not having one? Should it be removed or retained post-construction? Middleton PC suggested neither as it would sever many country lanes and reduce the permeability of the countryside. Yoxford PC disagreed with Middleton and said that it is better to have a relief road rather than not. Middleton PC concerned that the route of the link road has not been surveyed accurately. The group was asked if the offer on the table is the link road would they accept it or not accept it at all? Kelsale PC stated that it is unacceptable, it will turn the village into an island, encourage additional traffic bringing with it noise/pollution and loss of prime farmland.

Middleton PC would prefer to have the road removed after construction and it returned to its original condition i.e. prime farmland. To conclude opinions, Kelsale PC do not want the Link Road, Yoxford PC have less of a view on the retainment of the road and Middleton PC are in favour of the road but want it removed post-construction.

The group considered the potential impacts of the Northern and Southern Park and Ride sites. Middleton PC were not concerned with them as its proximity was not close enough to have any major issues. Yoxford PC raised the point of light pollution from the floodlights that could cause a 24/7 nuisance for residents.

In relation to the Two Village Bypass, Kelsale PC not convinced that this would alleviate the congestion issues and will not improve the traffic situation. Middleton PC suggested that this needs to be built before works start on the Main Development Site.

Middleton PC commented on the proposed Green Rail Route, Suffolk's tiny spur lines cannot handle long heavy freight rail at high speed. Kelsale PC added that they are worried about night rail movements and disturbance of residents by noise and vibrations.

The general traffic concerns were that there will be cumulative impacts on small parishes and that blue light services will not be able to get to where they want to go. This will be a

big concern for villages with an older population. Kelsale PC reiterated the earlier point of becoming a small island.

A brief point on ecology was put forward by Middleton PC concerned that Suffolk species will simply disappear.

The three key points to arise from the discussion were that the main development site is not large enough to accommodate a new nuclear power station. Secondly, the suggested Link Road is not the right solution and does not mitigate harm to the surrounding area. Most parishes are in favour of its removal post-construction. Lastly, there is a desire for a jetty to bring in aggregates by sea. EDFE have not demonstrated why a jetty is not practical.

Group 4

Facilitator- Paul Wood (Head of Economic Development and Regeneration, ESC)

Scribe- Joe Hough, (Senior Transport Planner, SCC)

Woodbridge Town Council (Woodbridge TC) expressed their concern over sea defences, they have not got a fully developed design but, have carried out modelling which could lead to a failure of defences and impact the wider area. Furthermore, the traffic around Woodbridge is already an issue, and the potential extent of HGV's passing through will be substantial. Woodbridge TC are also apprehensive of the material that may be transported through the town such as armour stone for the sea defences, it is not clear what will be coming through on HGV's. Waldringfield Parish Council (Waldringfield PC) agree with Woodbridge TC that the traffic is a big issue around Martlesham already especially concerning HGV's. The addition of over 2,000 houses at Adastral Park has and will increase congestion, everything they can bring by rail or sea should be considered.

Sudbourne Parish Council (Sudbourne PC) emphasised the same point as Woodbridge TC and Waldringfield PC and added that SPR projects will cause cumulative effects on HGV movements and adversely impact the local tourist industry. It is inexplicable that they have not ended up with a non-road led strategy.

Felixstowe Town Council (Felixstowe TC) are interested in the sea defence strategy and the conclusion that a practical jetty is not feasible because of the seabed. The mitigation is inadequate for the additional traffic and how sustainable is the Freight Management Facility at Seven Hills?

Woodbridge TC are concerned that EDFE have not factored in the extra cycle ways that the government has promised, and not happy about the volume of night movements on the railway. Adding to this the proposed consequences for RSPB Minsmere is also of grave concern. Woodbridge TC have expressed their stance to be against the construction of Sizewell C.

Felixstowe TC stated that the problem with the rail network is that it is up to full capacity from Ipswich, even though there is more room for night movements. The Port of Felixstowe wants more rail freight but cannot get the trains to the site. Felixstowe TC want to be reassured that the impact of Sizewell C on the railway will not adversely affect Felixstowe Port.

Felixstowe TC considering how to include issues of road network around Adastral Park and Foxhall Road in their response coherently. Waldringfield PC told the group that the environment is a major concern, and that EDFE have not paid enough attention to the Sizewell Gap and SSSI. In addition, this will also affect tourism which is a major player in the Suffolk economy.

SCC representative asked if we have any contacts at Hinkley Point C to understand how tourism has been affected. Paul confirmed that the Councils keep in contact with Hinkley Point C authorities regularly. Woodbridge TC noted that Sizewell will be the only new nuclear power plant situated in an AONB in the country.

Sudbourne PC raised the Suffolk Ecology Principles for Sizewell C that were agreed between SCC and Suffolk Coastal (now East Suffolk Council). The purpose of the Principles was to provide an exemplar of how a project of this kind could be delivered at such a sensitive location. Unfortunately, there is nothing to be proud of so far and it is not an exemplar project given our attitudes towards mitigation and compensation. Sudbourne PC asked, raised that Councils should identify aspects that could be a driver for innovating change in the economy.

Sudbourne PC argued that the tourism market in East Suffolk is based on tranquillity therefore, it is concerning when we are presented with infrastructure development. Should we accept that EDFE's proposals are the best that can be managed in an area of sensitivity? Do we try and limit the damage or just stick our heels in?

Felixstowe TC expressed their view on nuclear power, they are uncertain it is the right course of action but cannot affect this so no point in wasting officer time on the issue. However, comments submitted throughout the DCO process need to focus on the most useful suggestion that can mitigate the impacts that Sizewell C will have on the local area.

Waldringfield PC questioned whether the sea defences are adequate and that they do not impact on the coast north and south of Sizewell.

Felixstowe TC raised the issue of protecting RSPB Minsmere and how EDFE are managing impacts to this area. The current management plan is to manage the retreat rather than holding the line, this may affect Minsmere sluice that controls the drainage for the whole area. Felixstowe TC believe there should be a mechanism to re-evaluate impacts on RSPB Minsmere in relation to development, and if a clear problem has occurred because of the construction EDFE should provide compensation.

Woodbridge TC would like to see a definitive design for the coastal defence scheme. Currently it seems as though a broad-brush approach has been taken however, if you get the modelling/design wrong it could cause more complications in the future. Felixstowe TC very worried at Stage 4 of the consultations because of the vast amount of solid data but nothing designed so far.

Waldringfield PC closed the discussion on the topic of the on-site accommodation campus. They opined that it should have been built with a long-term legacy benefit rather than something temporary.

Group 5

Facilitator- John Pitchford, (Sizewell C Planning Adviser, SCC)

Scribe- Nick Clow (Energy Projects Co-ordinator, ESC)

Peasenhall Parish Council (Peasenhall PC) raised the issue of HGV movements on unauthorised roads, there is concern that as traffic builds up on the A12 HGV's will divert onto smaller roads through villages. Peasenhall PC suggested an ANPR camera system to track and trace vehicles that stray off the main roads. Furthermore, LGV's and privately owned vehicles may also follow suit as they look to avoid congestion. Pettistree Parish Council (Pettistree PC) agreed with Peasenhall and further voiced their concern for an influx of vehicles choosing to cut through small villages to avoid traffic. They said this will increase noise, dust, and vibrations.

Pettistree PC also voiced concern regarding the volume of delivery van movements, and whether EDFE have taken this into consideration.

Chillesford PC wanted to know if road improvement works would coincide with Sizewell C construction traffic. Will road improvements be finished before construction of Sizewell C begins?

Pettistree PC asked if this discussion would allow to the local authority to act on the parish's behalf or whether they still have to submit their own Relevant Representation? Facilitator answered by giving the group a timeline of the process and instructions on how to register as an interested party and submit a Relevant Representation. Facilitator also added that parish councils can put points across either in writing or orally at hearings. Pettistree PC asked if there is any way that they can check if their Relevant Representation is satisfactory? Facilitator said that Planning Aid England should provide advice on what to include in the Relevant Representation. SCC's legal advisers are providing a presentation aimed at interested parties explaining the content of Relevant Representations and what to expect going forward.

Pettistree PC discussed the adverse effects HGV's would have on the surrounding roads and villages close to Bentwaters if it is used as a proposed lay down site for materials. Campsea Ashe has tight corners which may lead to damage to roads and infrastructure as well as hidden issues caused by vibrations. Pettistree PC added to this and opined that if the bulk of goods could be brought in via the sea this would alleviate most problems with road transportation.

In relation to the volume of train movements, Pettistree PC told the group that six night-time rail movements will be very audible due to their length and weight. Noise and vibration will be increased as a result.

Chillesford PC asked what impact Sizewell C will have on local tourism and expects this to be a cumulative impact for the next 10-12 years. Chillesford PC also raised concern over the

number of workers seeking accommodation and filling tourist accommodation as a result. Peasenhall PC added to this statement and voiced their opinion of workers travelling directly to the site rather than utilising the Park and Ride facilities. Moreover, shift patterns are also concerning as small villages may see an increase in early morning and late-night traffic. Pettistree PC opined that enough capacity needs to be incorporated into Park and Ride sites to encourage its use.

As a side point Pettistree PC mentioned that jobs created will be low paid, and higher skilled work will go to non-home-based workers. Moreover, the net loss of tourism will outweigh the potential boost to the local economy.

The three key points that arose from the group was that EDFE need to reassure the community that HGV movements will be monitored, and if Bentwaters is used as a lay down site mitigation measures need to be put in place to preserve the surrounding roads. Secondly a lack of sustainable transport of materials is concerning and an increase of overnight train movements will be a nuisance to residents in the vicinity of the tracks. Lastly impacts on local tourism/economy will be greater than EDFE have predicted and will be greater than the inward investment.

Group 6

Facilitator- Tim De-Keyzer (Head of Natural Environment, SCC)

Scribe- James Meyer (Ecologist, ESC)

Marlesford Parish Council (Marlesford PC) started the discussion by voicing their concern regarding the impact of the Southern Park and Ride site on Wickham Market. Particularly bunding, lighting, air, and noise pollution. Although EDFE do seem receptive to early engagement on traffic issues.

Wickham Market Parish Council (Wickham Market PC) told the group that they have had four meetings with EDFE, two in person and two virtual in order to come up with suggestions around mitigation for the Southern Park and Ride (particularly traffic measures). EDFE said they will fund some highway improvement measures. Wickham Market PC are concerned EDFE are not considering village roads and have another meeting lined up with EDFE towards the end of August.

Marlesford Parish Council (Marlesford PC) want to encourage EDFE to do as much as they can to encourage traffic use along A12/A14 rather than B1078. Wickham Market PC would like to see tracking of all vehicles to and from the Southern Park and Ride site, and any visitors should be encouraged to use local shops. Hacheston Parish Council (Hacheston PC) are concerned of increased use by vehicles of the B1078 and B1116 which has not been responded to. Furthermore, the postal consolidation facility at Southern Park and Ride site will also add traffic. Marlesford PC expressed that EDFE need to be held accountable if they do not work with local parishes to mitigate these issues.

Wickham Market PC not convinced with the design of the Southern Park and Ride as it remains the same as illustrated at Consultation Stage 1. Darsham Parish Council (Darsham PC) told the group that they share the same concerns about the Northern Park and Ride. Darsham PC believe that the Northern Park and Ride will act as a block to the A12 because the roundabout is on the carriageway. Adding to this, level crossings will also create problems and lead to rat running on local roads (B1117). Air pollution is a real worry as no mitigation has been put forward by EDFE.

Darsham PC agreed but would like to see changes to design of Northern Park and Ride by creating a foot connection to Darsham Station.

Marlesford PC suggested whether EDFE can use electric buses as part of transport strategy/carbon mitigation? Furthermore, the Two Village Bypass design precludes creating a Four Village Bypass at a later date. If we accept the Two Village Bypass, we shall be consigning Marlesford and Lt Glenham to no bypass for a long time, therefore the Two Village Bypass should not be accepted. Wickham Market PC added that barn owls need to be considered when designing the Two Village Bypass. Marlesford PC suggest that if Marlesford and Lt Glenham are not going to be bypassed then a quiet road surface is

needed. There needs to be a baseline survey carried out to track vibration issues and allow for mitigation when (or before) impacts occur.

Parliaments' representative expressed the view that a Four Village Bypass would be preferred as there is great concern on residents of Marlesford and Little Glenham.

Wickham Market PC asked if community impact mitigation fund is a separate pot to a community improvement/enhancement fund?

Marlesford PC raised the point of ownership for the Sizewell C project, as CGN has a 20% share does the project allow them to take control of nuclear generation if EDFE back out?

Wickham Market PC told the group that parish councils need to be proactive in securing transport mitigation. EDFE need to look at impacts on villages as a whole and cannot just look at elements of the scheme (such as Park and Ride facilities) in isolation.

Group 7

Facilitator- Cllr Richard Smith, SCC

Scribe- Sharon Bleese (Coastal Manager South, ESC)

Facilitator took a question from a member of the group regarding the construction of the Two Village Bypass and whether it would be up and running before Sizewell C construction starts? Facilitator replied to say that it would not be but will continue as the build progresses.

The group entered a discussion surrounding road, rail, accommodation for workers and water. The primary concern was the congestion that Sizewell C construction would cause on existing roads and rail and the exacerbated by the volume of workers seeking accommodation. The vulnerability of the water supply is also an issue for parish councils, vast amounts of water will be needed for construction as well as for the influx of workers.

Similarly, with other groups, another major concern raised was the cumulative effects with other major infrastructure projects such as wind energy. Road numbers initially predicted by EDFE are already much higher than promised. Although this had been raised throughout the four consultation periods, members of the group were still apprehensive that EDFE had not listened or changed anything as a result of the comments received.

Air quality, noise, vibration, and light pollution were all brought up by members of the discussion. The majority view was that mitigation measures proposed by EDFE are not sufficient, and in some cases, compensation is the only right solution. It was emphasised that the whole area is a very delicate eco-system and was strongly felt that the wildlife would not use the proposed causeway which is over 75m long. This is viewed as an inappropriate mitigation measure.

Noise levels were brought up by members of the discussion opining that that predictions were 600x greater in Potter Street. Leiston TC highlighted concern regarding the impacts on hedgerows and bird species. House Sparrows are the most vulnerable species because of this and although EDFE's proposals for mitigation are good, they only account for 15 years' time but not the immediate future.

Tourism is a major concern for many within the breakout group, particularly the impact to Theberton and Eastbridge of potentially 2,500 workers.

Campsea Ashe will see increased traffic levels and impacts of 6 night-time train movements. This is a concern for local residents because of the greater noise, light and vibrations.

All parties to the group agreed that a robust programme of monitoring would need to be in place for both ecology and the coast. A discussion ensued around the design of coastal defences and the need to see designs before they are properly given. Comments were made

on the monitoring commissioned by both councils from Oxford Brookes University that demonstrated the monitoring was inadequate at Hinkley Point C.

The final points put forward concerned the exceptionally small site for the infrastructure that is to be included in the project, it will be a tight fit meaning that the project will not sit well within the environment.