

Sizewell C discussion group notes

1st December 2020

Group 1

Alison Andrews, Alde and Ore Community Partnership:

Many new ideas without sufficient assessment. Dredging issues are contradictory. Dredging EIA suggested negligible to minor change is unacceptable. Treating us with contempt. EDF are not considering impacts to Thorpeness and further south. Orford Ness material that has derived from erosion of Dunwich exemplars the dynamism. Inadequate information given. Near field and far field effects unacknowledged.

Supports Tim Beach's comments and vice versa. EDF are not considering wider long-shore impacts.

*ESC need to press much harder for this info

Cllr Jocelyn Bond, East Suffolk Council:

Reiterates the feeling that the public perception is that ESC supports the application. The effected communities deserve to have more information about. Friston are at wits end with Scottish power proposal.

Cllr T-J Haworth-Culf, East Suffolk Council:

She works hard with council communities and towns and parishes committees. Feels strongly that the groups voices are being listened to and supported. The piling noise issue is one to take forward. So many questions remain without answers. Feels challenging to deal with from a Cllr perspective. T&P council meeting participants felt that their comments were not well reflected in the relevant representations.

KT offers to prepare a short report based on what participants have said. Council will need to take a decision on balance based on constituents feeling.

John Rea Price, Minsmere Levels Stakeholder Group:

Paul Collins and himself represent Minsmere levels stakeholder group and they are both concerned about the cumulative impacts of wind farms and interconnector. He strongly feels that ESC have sat back and let the consultation progress. He feels that all 4 stages of consultation have woefully underestimated the environmental impacts. He has lack of confidence in the nuclear reactor technology used by EDF, from examples in France and Finland.

KT response is one of concern at the public opinion. She reminds that the government identified SZC as a potential site to put a nuclear power station to meet the UK energy demand.

Simon Barlow, Environment Agency:

EA are struggling to work out how to respond to this additional info presented so late in the day. They see a scoping exercise necessary to identify what extra work (EIA) will be required. Expects the review of these changes will happen within the examination process. Fish loss is complicated. Permitted discharge responsibility to comment on pollution. They are

concerned about the number of fish lost. Will be assessed through HRA and WFD. Cooling water intake design impacts will be more closely assessed. The MMO will look at others.

Tim Beach, Alde and Ore Community Partnership / RFCC:

The impact on Slaughden and further south to Alde and Ore is unknown, unconsidered, unproved that there is no wider impact.

KT response is explaining that we will struggle to have evidence to determine what impact SZC will have along the coast.

Cllr Tony Goldson, Suffolk County Council:

ESC & SCC constituents feel that ESC have accepted EDF proposals. TG has grave concerns about the impact on the coast. Natural England have sand reefs designated and for instance in Cromer there may be a ban on crab fishing there. His concern is for the fishing impact on the jetty's. The damage the FRR schemes have on fish is severe. Large damage to the fish stock is greatest concern.

KT response – we need EIA. Until we get that ESC cannot support the project. Reiterates how serious the issue of joe public feeling like their anti-sizewell feelings are not being taken on or represented by the Council. An internal discussion is required. Pass to Michael Moll for comment

Michael Moll, Suffolk County Council:

SCC will refer to ESC's concerns about this issue.

Gary Watson, Environment Agency:

FCERM concerns of EA align with ESC's. Dredging issue raised. GW believes that dredging will impact the coastline more than a piled structure will, so he will be pushing that.

Cllr Russ Rainger, Suffolk County Council:

Big public perception problem about how the authorities are responding. Inshore community is interested in HGV reduction. Cumulative impact is a concern not covered well in change consultation. Plus the impact of other energy projects on the Suffolk Coastline. Sounds like a dreadful proposal.

Group 2

Bill Parker, Minsmere Levels Stakeholder Group:

Proposed adaptive solution for the HD in the document – increase from 14m to 15m in height. View diagram appears that there needs to be a 30% increase in the footprint of the defence and a deepening. Practicality of delivering that? Erosion of coastline/sea getting closer to defence.

Noel Beech, ENBE:

New design more buildable. Old design came to a sharp point.

Bill Parker:

What is the thinking/objective?

Noel Beech:

Foundations need to go deep enough for max erosion. Don't know what evolution is going to look like, element of subsequent design. Very large and seems to be getting bigger increasing footprint. Moving seaward has greater impact and sooner. EDF say little of soft coastal defence. HD easier to build/design. Soft structure min of own. Silent about that at the moment. Soft defence there to act as a corridor. Beach management. How will soft coastal defence will work needs to be considered.

Cllr Richard Smith, Suffolk County Council:

Lack of information. Are EDF clear about the detail or do they not have the information? Are they playing games?

Noel Beech:

EDF are being cautious about how much detail they want to convey. Doubts that they don't have full details of new defences. Worrying that we can't get hold of the information. Key what happens to the toe and toe design. Major question mark. The aspects are concerning. No plausible or robust response.

Cllr Richard Smith:

If the experts are concerned about lack of detail those responding with no expertise should be even more worried.

Noel Beech:

We are worried that we don't have the detail.

Paul Collins, Minsmere Levels Stakeholder Group:

DCO says HCD exposed 2050. New proposals 8m forward impacts 2046. 12 years into the operational life of the station. Scrape of material that is existing and lay again so it can grow. Approach to landscaping doesn't make sense. Has the whole coastal defence been properly thought through?

Noel Beech:

Have queried landscaping of rock armour. Supporting of layer of soil is a little odd. Ultimately if the approach taken could become an armoured hill. Hydraulic properties of the defence relies on having voids in the rock armour. Remains as a solid mass could impair the performance of the defence. Raised with EDF.

Paul Collins:

Going to be difficult to decide. What is the danger in the long run. Can you throw concrete at this and keep the station safe? What is the impact (long term) on the coast and HCD. Is it a danger to coastal processes?

Noel Beech:

Latter point – what the influence may be on the coast. Structure itself has a robustness about it apart from the toe detail which is yet to be explained. As the defence is moving

forward it is moving into sediment transport corridor. Looks strange having a toe at that depth. Biggest unknown at this point. Interim quite a shallow toe. Comes down to how the coast is managed. Soft shingle defence.

Bill Parker:

Table 4.6 reducing reliance on mitigation measures – is this saying reducing the fact that the softer defence won't work. Soft defence can't roll back. HD will still be there when the station has been decommissioned.

Cllr David Ritchie, Chair Suffolk Coast Forum:

Bacton – bringing in sand engine. Would you be able to repeat this at SZC?

Noel Beech:

Reliance upon sediment moving. Don't have a good feeling about this. Anything that relies upon the movement of sand relies upon other things. Can it keep pace? What is the structure like?

Paul Collins:

Consultation 3 and what exists in DCO. Toe in the middle of the beach entire soft defence that exists today will go. Is that why EDF are saying that soft defence won't work?

Noel Beech:

Soft coastal defence have a finite life, HCD will prevail. From a coastal processes perspective its not satisfactory. We need to know how viable it is, how much material will move?

Bill Parker:

EDF have a perfectly good idea of what they are going to do. Managing information and what is available in the public domain. EDF will/must know what they are doing to protect the station.

Keith Martin, SCAR:

Wider concern around coastal processes higher up the agenda sooner. HDC will work but will have a greater impact on the coastal processes. Greater Sizewell bay being a discrete unit? Is that right? Problems at Thorpeness are not going to be impacted by SZC but are existing.

Group 3

Maureen Jones, Thorpeness Parish Council:

Concern about ongoing beach erosion at North Thorpeness that has increased through November; immense damage done along Thorpeness coastline. Concern that Sizewell works will affect the coast negatively. Need more protection for the coastline and extend the area of interest around Thorpeness. Thorpeness is a particular worry; village could be at higher risk of erosion and flooding once SZC works begin. Concern about potential loss of tourism because of SZC impacts. Thorpeness should be regarded as having a similar status as Aldeburgh.

PP noted the importance of ongoing monitoring if SZC is built to ensure that any negative impacts affecting Thorpeness that are attributable to the development are identified and mitigated

Andy Rouse, Bawdsey Coastal Partnership:

Why is the permanent pier (BLF) closer to the more ecologically sensitive area to the north? It is more likely to cause harm.

PP the northernmost permanent BLF, for abnormal loads, is positioned there because there is a ramp landward of the jetty there, known as the north mound, to enable vehicles carrying the large/abnormal loads to gain access to the site.

The temporary pier for bulk deliveries is located at least 200m south.

Andy Rouse:

SSSI Crossing - Culvert versus bridge decision, concerned whether best practice wildlife advice is being followed i.e. how big does a culvert become before not being used by wildlife?

PP The SSSI Crossing issue is not within the coastal zone and has not been assessed in the presentation.

Cllr Craig Rivett, East Suffolk Council:

Heavy water discharge is a concern for beach scouring. Pipe is temporary (around 2 years), so while materials are being taken off the beach, could water be transferred the other way. Need to ensure no other hazards are created by its use.

Lucy Ansbro, Thorpeness Coastal Futures Group:

Thorpeness resident, concerned about not enough coastal protection being guaranteed at this stage.

Cllr James Mallinder, East Suffolk Council:

Enormous concerns at impacts on marine biodiversity, around Sizewell project and further down the coast. Migratory birds may be affected by the project. Concern that any impacts on marine/wildlife/biodiversity will not be limited to the immediate Sizewell but will also be spread down the coast.

Andy Smith, RFCC:

Alignment of HCDF in Change Consultation differs from that in DCO.

PP – believes the new alignment shows the temporary piling only.

Concern at residual effects of cut off jetty / BLF piles.

PP – the cutting of redundant piles at sea bed level is proposed and is an industry standard approach.

Will the permanent BLF berthing platform act as a groyne?

PP – the EDF intention is to provide timber/concrete/steel beams to create a secure permanent platform for barges to ground on during construction phase (100m long, 30m

wide, 1m deep). It needs further assessment and consideration. Cannot be sure about the impacts yet, has been flagged up for further action.

PP interested to know how stakeholders/consultees feel about the consultation i.e. are materials easy enough to understand. Balance of technical details with lay-person information.

Andy Smith:

Difficult to form an opinion when there are no technical drawings or detailed designs provided.

Cllr Graham Newman:

Wider issue of missing detail in DCO more generally. Further issue of unpredictability e.g. severe storms along Thorpeness coast in recent weeks/months have created new problems which would not have been taken into consideration months/years ago when decisions were being made.

PP reiterates importance of monitoring and mitigation plans being in place during construction and operation phases. Important that continued monitoring and mitigation is included as a planning obligation and EDFE provide funds to support it.