

Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting held on 31 January 2017 at 2.00 pm in the King Edmund Chamber, Endeavour House, Ipswich.

Present: Councillors Colin Noble (Chairman), Jane Storey (Vice Chairman), James Finch, Tony Goldson, Matthew Hicks, Beccy Hopfensperger, Christopher Hudson, Gordon Jones and Richard Smith MVO

Also present: Councillors Sonia Barker, Peter Beer, Stephen Burroughes, John Field, Jessica Fleming, Julian Flood, Sandra Gage, Michael Gower, Len Jacklin, Inga Lockington, Sandy Martin, Guy McGregor and Bill Mountford

Supporting officers present: Susan Cassedy (Democratic Services Officer).

63. Apologies for Absence

No apologies for absence were received.

64. Declarations of Interest and Dispensations

Councillor Richard Smith declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 4 "Response to EDF Energy's Sizewell C Stage 2 Public Consultation" by virtue of the fact that he lived 30 yards away from the railway line in Saxmundham.

Subsequently Councillor Stephen Burroughes declared a non-pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 4 "Response to EDF Energy's Sizewell C Stage 2 Public Consultation" by virtue of the fact that he was a member of Suffolk Coastal District Council.

65. Public Questions

Three public questions were received as follows:

Question 1 – from Bob Hoggar

As a member of our local coastal community, can those of us who value conservation now trust that, having read and studied EDFe's Consultation 2, along with all relevant documents from EDFe, you will be unable to support Sizewell as being a 'potential site' for two French designed EPR nuclear reactors? Owing to the fact it will nullify the continued protection of the existing AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty) SPA (Special Protection Areas) SSSIs (Sites of Special Scientific Interest), in fact our heritage coast! I believe that instead we need to pursue the continued growth of tourism, recreation, conservation and not to follow a Government policy that will decimate this ecologically fragile area.

Response from Councillor Matthew Hicks, Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Protection

The report which is before Cabinet today makes the environment one of its central concerns. Both councils – ourselves and Suffolk Coastal District Council have stated that they want to see EDF Energy carry out this development as an environmental exemplar.

We have been reported extensively in the East Anglian Daily Times as saying to EDF Energy ‘*Sizewell C You Will Have to do Better*’. The headline was absolutely right. In the case of the environment we have firmly reminded EDF Energy that the site lies in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and because of this the bar is lot higher than it is in Hinkley.

EDF Energy need to recognise the special status of the Suffolk coast and do all they can to mitigate the impact of their development.

The stance of the County Council remains one of support for a nuclear power station on the Suffolk coast. Our policy is that nuclear power is part of the mix of energy sources which we must pursue if we are able to deliver the substantial reduction in our carbon footprint that our ‘Creating the Greenest County’ aspirations require.

The point in our report is that despite our support for a nuclear power station in principle, the proposal needs a lot more work if it is going to be acceptable to Suffolk. Your two councils are ready to do that and work with EDF Energy to make it work and to protect our special coast. I sincerely hope that EDF Energy are too.

Supplementary Question from Bob Hoggar

You keep referring in your Council’s response to EDF to mitigation and compensation. What do you mean by environmental exemplar? How can mitigation and compensation be relevant if this project will destroy internationally recognised habitat, tourism, recreation, and conservation? They are the current growth industries worth millions. The sheer scale of this development in a confined special space cannot be achieved and surely you, and we, should all be realising this?

Response from Councillor Matthew Hicks, Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Protection

In the case of the environment we have firmly reminded EDF Energy that the site lies in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and because of this the bar is a lot higher than, as I said earlier, at Hinkley. The problem, and this is what is repeated in the Cabinet paper, is that there is still not enough information in lots of areas for us to come out and make and decide the way forward. So we will continue to work with EDF Energy to cover the points you raise and I look forward and hope that EDF Energy will work with both Councils to fulfil this.

Question 2 – from Charles Macdowell

Will you press EDF for a Sizewell Relief Road - the 'D2' - to avoid substantial safety risks to local people, pollution and congestion at Yoxford, Middleton, Theberton and Saxmundham, and physical damage to buildings?

Response from Councillor James Finch, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport

The County Council understands the deep concern in Yoxford and in all the communities along the B1122. Sizewell C will bring opportunities for jobs and growth to Suffolk but it is the parishes along the B1122 that will probably experience the biggest impact on their lives.

The stance proposed in today's report is clear:

“With regard to the proposed B1122 road improvements, these are not seen as appropriate mitigation, and EDF Energy is urged to consider alternatives”.

Neither do we believe that any of the proposals put forward to address the junction at Yoxford are acceptable.

In both cases we are saying clearly to EDF Energy *“You Will Have to do Better”*.

Since stage one we have commissioned two reports on the issues facing Yoxford and the parishes along the B1122. The AECOM report looked at a whole range of transport proposals which EDF Energy could consider. The Accent report drew upon the concerns expressed by the community and they are significant and in our view quite understandable. For example some members of the community along the B1122 are very concerned that damage may occur to their buildings.

Our concern is that EDF Energy have shown little or no regard for either report.

Suffolk County Council are not happy with the proposal as it stands. We have given EDF Energy a wide range of options to consider – yes including the D2 – but it is not for your local councils to come up with the solutions. Sizewell C is EDF Energy's development and if they are going to have Suffolk's support it is they that need to do better.

Supplementary Question from Charles Macdowell

Looking at this in a lot of detail what has become clear is that traffic modelling by both EDF Energy and by Suffolk County Council of the B1122 and Yoxford is fundamental in assessing the risk of congestion and accidents. Will you allow local groups to input into and be involved in this modelling and if not, will you release all the data so that alternative modelling can be conducted?

Response from Councillor James Finch, Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport

The first point I want to make is that we have been engaging with locals and we will continue to do so very much. I think the point I would make is the clear message that we have got coming up from here on this Stage 2 Consultation is that there is not enough evidence. We don't know, we see 60% we see 40% modal split whatever that means, we see the tonnages, we don't know the traffic

flows so we are not in a position and nor should we to come up with a recommendation for a traffic strategy because the data is not there. We will be collaborating, we have got our AECOM report, we have published that AECOM report, we financed that AECOM report and we believe that is a good start to continuing very urgent discussions on this subject.

Question 3 – from Alison Downes

Theberton and Eastbridge Action Group on Sizewell C welcomes the County and District Councils' expressed views concerning EDF's fundamental failure to satisfactorily justify the siting of the Sizewell C accommodation campus. We ask what steps the Council will take to ensure EDF responds to your call for a full review of potential alternative sites for the accommodation campus; to consider credible alternative sites which may potentially be considered to have less environmental impact, more legacy potential and/or better community integration - including the option of split sites?

Response from Councillor Matthew Hicks, Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Protection

The big picture is that at the peak construction EDF Energy will have a workforce of 5,600 plus 500 more people servicing associated development sites. To help deal with this massive influx of workers into coastal Suffolk, EDF Energy are proposing an accommodation block of up to five storeys off the Eastbridge Road which could house 2,400 of those workers.

The recommendation we will consider later expresses concern at this proposal not least because of its proximity to RSPB Minsmere.

Suffolk County Council is definitely not content with EDF Energy's accommodation proposals. The report states clearly:

"While the Councils understand the rationale of an accommodation campus located at or close to the construction site, we are unable to confirm our preferred location/layout due to lack of information and full appraisal of alternative site locations, as well as alternative layouts of the currently proposed site. The Councils are concerned about the environmental impact of the proposed location, particularly on the AONB. The Council strongly supports that the sports facilities, as part of any campus development, should be located in Leiston".

If the Cabinets pass the recommendation before them today I can confirm that I will want our officers to push EDF Energy for a full review of other potential alternative sites for the accommodation campus; to consider whether or not there are credible alternative sites in proximity of the development site, which potentially may be considered to have less environmental impact, more legacy potential and/or better community integration - *including the option of split sites.*

The fundamental problem with the EDF Energy proposal is that their proposed location is not compared to or evaluated against any alternative. For this reason, we cannot come to view on whether or not what is being proposed is the "least bad option". To allow us to come to a view EDF Energy will need to address precisely the kind of questions raised by you today.

Supplementary Question from Alison Downes

Councillor Hicks your comments about the proximity of the EDF's proposed campus to RSPB Minsmere is a concern we all share, not only because it is likely to exacerbate environmental impact of the build, but also exacerbate damage to tourism in the area, but my question concerns your commitment to push for a review of the options EDF have put forward including split sites and I ask if you will raise with EDF the precedent set at Hinkley Point where workers will be split across three sites, two of which will be in Bridgewater, a town with a population of 40,000 people that is at least 30 minutes from the construction site. Now EDF tell us that contractors do not like this arrangement, but surely contractors' wishes must not be given precedence over Suffolk's unique and important landscape and its local residents.

Response from Councillor Matthew Hicks, Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Protection

You make a very good point about Hinkley and that has been picked up on by Councillor McGregor. And absolutely I want to make it clear that we are absolutely behind doing what we can to make sure that EDF absolutely take account of the location of this site and we will do everything we can to raise that as we go forward.

66. Response to EDF Energy's Sizewell C Stage 2 Public Consultation

A report at Agenda Item 4 by the Director for Resource Management invited the Cabinet to consider the County Council's response to EDF Energy's Stage 2 consultation for Sizewell C.

Councillor Matthew Hicks, Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Protection invited Councillor Guy McGregor, Member with Responsibility for Outside Bodies, to present the report.

Decision: The Cabinet agreed by majority:

- 1 That the Council should respond to the EDF Energy Stage 2 Consultation, and agree the approach to Government and key partners to maximise the benefits of the proposed development.
- 2 That following agreement by the Cabinets of Suffolk County Council and Suffolk Coastal District Council (referred to as "the Councils" in the recommendations below), the response set out in detail in the Appendix and summarised below will be submitted jointly, and that both Councils continue engagement with Government and key partners as set out below:
- 3 That EDF Energy is informed that, in line with previously determined policy, the Councils continue to support the principle of a new nuclear power station at Sizewell, recognising the significant benefit that such a development would bring to Suffolk. However, based on the information put forward in the Stage 2 Consultation, the Councils are not yet able to fully support the specific proposals by EDF Energy, as the impacts of the

proposed development are not yet fully developed or evidenced. As such it is not possible to confirm a definitive position on many aspects of the emerging scheme nor comment fully as to whether the impacts have been appropriately mitigated or compensated. Therefore, the Councils are not yet fully convinced that the benefits of EDF Energy's proposals are considered greater than the impacts. We will welcome the opportunity to further engage with EDF Energy to help them develop their proposals, including seeking to mutually resolve the necessary mitigation and compensation. In particular, the Councils wish to note:

- a) That the Councils support the following options put forward in the consultation:
 - i) The Councils support the aspirations set for the socio-economic areas, although they ask EDF Energy to be even more ambitious in increasing the percentage of locally based workers (see also recommendation 3.c.iii) below);
 - ii) With regard to road improvements of the A12 in Farnham, the Councils agree with proposed option 4, for a 2-village bypass for Farnham and Stratford St Andrew, as the bare minimum mitigation at Farnham. The other three options put forward in the Stage 2 Consultation should be discarded;
 - iii) With regard to the options for the site access crossing over the SSSI, subject to further information, the Councils currently prefer option 3, the three span bridges, as this would be likely to have the least ecological impact;
 - iv) The Councils accept the proposed site for the Northern Park and Ride at Darsham, subject to satisfactory access arrangements;
 - v) With regard to the rail options, the Councils prefer option 1, the temporary extension of the Saxmundham-Leiston branch line into the construction site (the "green route").
- b) That, in the absence of further details, the Councils are not yet content with the following proposals put forward in the Stage 2 Consultation and would welcome further engagement with EDF Energy to develop appropriate solutions:
 - i) Due to a lack of information on the proposals and an absence of assessments of alternative options, the Councils do not support borrow pits and the proposed level of stockpiling due to its impact on the sensitive environment of the AONB and Minsmere, unless there is evidence that a) alternative options have been fully considered, including whether the option of moving soil to the RSPB site at Wallasea Island, which EDF Energy refer to as a fall back option, remains possible (see reference to Court of Appeal judgement in paragraph 5.25) and b) it is proven that the preferred approach does not have an unacceptable impact on the AONB

and any impacts can be appropriately mitigated or compensated for;

- ii) With regard to the platform footprint and position, the Councils note that the proposed footprint is further seaward than Sizewell B, and that indicated at Stage 1, which gives the Councils significant concerns around the impact on coastal processes and coastline and may make this design unacceptable. Coastal process impacts have not been assessed in full, and neither have alternatives (such as moving the platform back inland, or redesigning the layout) been explored in Stage 2;
 - iii) With regard to rail or marine max scenarios, the Councils urge EDF Energy to maximise both rail and marine transport to and from site;
 - iv) With regard to the proposed B1122 road improvements, these are not seen as appropriate mitigation, and EDF Energy is urged to consider alternatives;
 - v) While the Councils understand the rationale of an accommodation campus located at or close to the construction site, they are unable to confirm their preferred location/layout due to lack of information and full appraisal of alternative site locations, as well as alternative layouts of the currently proposed site. The Councils are concerned about the environmental impact of the proposed location, particularly on the AONB. The Council strongly supports that the sports facilities, as part of any campus development, should be located in Leiston;
 - vi) Similarly, while recognising the principle of temporary caravan accommodation, further information is required on the assessment of alternative sites and proposed site design;
 - vii) With regard to the Southern Park and Ride site, the Councils would request consideration of sites further south of Woodbridge closer to Ipswich, as stated in the Stage 1 consultation;
 - viii) With regard to a Freight Management Facility, the Councils strongly encourage EDF Energy to reconsider its stance on the establishment of such a facility.
- c) That in the following areas EDF Energy has not provided enough detail for the Councils to come to a view and they would welcome early engagement with EDF Energy on these:
- i) Traffic modelling and gravity model: The Councils require further clarification in a number of areas;
 - ii) Modal split: No evidence or supporting information has been provided that the transportation of 60% of construction materials

by rail or marine can be achieved. The Councils' modelling must assume a worst case scenario, which, due to lack of evidence on feasibility of marine/rail modes, is assumed at 90 to 100% transport by road. Without this information it is not possible for the Highways Authority to make an evidence based assessment of EDF Energy's transport proposals;

- iii) Socio-economic aspects: More information is required on the delivery mechanisms to achieve the socio-economic aspirations and mitigations. The current assessment of the adverse economic impacts, on tourism and other industries, are not thorough enough. Further detail is required to determine and mitigate the impact of the proposal on public services, to ensure that the Councils and partners can effectively deliver its services to this increased population alongside Suffolk's current residents;
- iv) The design of Sizewell C: The Councils remain deeply concerned about the quality of the design of Sizewell C, given its location in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and expect improvement in the design and, where it is not possible to improve the design quality, a compensation package to compensate for the lasting impact on and damage to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. However, no further detail about the design has been provided since Stage 1.
- v) Platform height: While the proposed platform height has been confirmed, no further detail is available on the possible environmental impact of the resulting significant increase to the weight of the platform.
- vi) Ecological surveys and mitigation: There needs to be further significant work to seek to survey, understand, quantify and qualify and mitigate impacts of the development on the ecology.
- vii) Coastal processes: Further assessments are required. The Councils expect to establish with EDF Energy a robust process for ongoing monitoring of coastal change and Sizewell C impacts, with an obligation for EDF Energy to provide mitigation if actual change departs from anticipated baseline change.
- viii) Post construction masterplan: This has not been advanced since Stage 1.
- ix) Car park spaces: There is not enough evidence that the total number of proposed car park spaces, at Park and Ride sites, on site and at the accommodation campus, is required.
- x) Junction improvements at Yoxford A12/B1122: It is not evidenced that either proposed option (signalised junction or roundabout) would work effectively.

- xi) Marine Facilities: The consultation asks for a preference for a wide or narrow jetty, but there is not sufficient information on the implications of either to come to a view on the Councils' preference.
 - xii) The Sizewell C development will have a significant impact on the Leiston Household Waste Recycling Centre (Lovers Lane IP16 4UJ) by increasing congestion, leading to increased risk of queuing along Lovers Lane. The County Council will seek early discussions about how the impact can be mitigated so that Leiston and the surrounding area can continue to receive a good recycling service.
- d) That the following areas of mitigation or compensation have not been covered by EDF Energy in their Stage 2 consultation:
- i) Highway improvements at key pinch points of A12, as well as impacts on Leiston and rural roads
4. That the Councils urge EDF Energy to allow for a significantly longer consultation period for the Stage 3 consultation, of at least 12 weeks (14 weeks if over a defined major public holiday), noting the short consultation period of the Stage 2 consultation, and given the large amount of additional documentation expected to be submitted at Stage 3.
 5. That the lead officers (Head of Planning & Coastal Management at Suffolk Coastal District Council and the Assistant Director for Infrastructure and Waste at Suffolk County Council) in consultation with their respective lead members (the Deputy Leader for Suffolk Coastal District Council, and the Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Protection in conjunction with the Member with Responsibility for Outside Bodies for Suffolk County Council) be authorised to make any amendments to the draft response as agreed with the appropriate representatives of Suffolk County Council/Suffolk Coastal District Council.
 6. To effectively deliver infrastructure of this scale, alongside other large infrastructure projects in Suffolk, the Sizewell C development requires EDF Energy, the local Councils, the New Anglia Local Economic Partnership and Government to work closely together to minimise negative impacts and maximise opportunities locally. In order to achieve this, it is recommended that officers and Members continue to engage with Government, including through the Suffolk Energy Coast Delivery Board chaired by Therese Coffey MP, to maximise the benefits from the development. This includes:
 - a) That the Councils continue to further develop proposals for a four-village-bypass as part of the Suffolk Energy Gateway, and the Councils aim to persuade Government to provide funding for this;
 - b) That the Councils work with Government and relevant agencies on additional requirements for infrastructure to accommodate Sizewell C alongside other significant strategic developments in Suffolk;
 - c) To persuade Government to make the maximum level of community benefits for Suffolk available, including but not limited to

consideration of maximising the amount of business rates arising from Sizewell C to be retained in Suffolk;

- d) To continue working closely with the Energy Coast Delivery Board, MPs and other partner organisations to maximise the opportunities for skills and employment in Suffolk.
7. That the Councils continue to engage closely with all key partners to develop an evidence base on the impacts of all aspects of the proposal and develop the mitigation/compensation options, including:
- a) Significant local engagement, working closely with Town and Parish Councils, and other groups/bodies, as required, to develop a local evidence base;
 - b) Further work on the environmental impact of the development with the key environmental government bodies, including Environment Agency and Natural England, and with non-governmental organisations such as the National Trust, the Suffolk Wildlife Trust and the RSPB;
 - c) Further collaboration with the relevant organisations, including Chamber of Commerce and the New Anglia Local Economic Partnership, in partnership with EDF Energy, on maximising, skills and employment opportunities in Suffolk and the region, as well as engagement with Essex local authorities in relation to additional economic and employment opportunities from the possible presence of two new nuclear power stations (Bradwell B as well as Sizewell C) in the region.
8. That the Councils negotiate with EDF Energy to secure an improved Planning Performance Agreement to ensure resources are available to provide the necessary input into securing acceptable standards of mitigation for the development. This will also help ensure the Councils can respond on behalf of local communities to deliver the significant benefits from the development in a timely way to accord with EDF Energy's programme. Cabinet is asked to note that not all of the Councils' engagement can be funded through the Planning Performance Agreement, and additional Council funding and staff resources may be required to maintain a comprehensive engagement process over the next few years.
9. In addition, the Cabinet authorised the Chief Fire Officer in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Protection to make a submission for the Suffolk Fire and Rescue Service which is consistent with and expands upon the response to EDF Energy set out in the Appendix.

Reason for decision: These recommendations are based on many months of work led by the Deputy Leader for Suffolk Coastal District Council, and the Member with Responsibility for Outside Bodies for Suffolk County Council in the lead up to and during the Stage 2 consultation. It presents the Councils' proposed options and opinions on the way forward based on the information supplied by EDF Energy through their public consultation.

Comments by other councillors: The Cabinet Member for Adult Care pointed out the lack of detail and the impact on the community whether positive or negative and it was essential that the Councils understood the full impact of the proposals to the community through production of robust, detailed impact reports as it was about people not buildings or development proposals.

The Cabinet Member for Health raised concerns including the increase in traffic particularly in Wrentham, Halesworth and Blythburgh and the possibility of accidents from traffic on the A145 crossing the A12. He also expressed concerns about the Darsham Park and Ride with buses having to turn across the A12. He considered that the increase in traffic would cause considerable hold ups and make the area less attractive to tourists. He asked EDF Energy to look at a more suitable route.

With regard to the effect on health services, the Cabinet Member for Health stated that EDF Energy needed to carry out a health impact assessment to ensure that the development would not cause any health inequalities. The very minimum provision would be additional GP, Dental, Mental Health and laboratory service as all were already at capacity locally. He also pointed out the impact on ambulance services and accident and emergency (A&E) services noting that the nearest A&E would be Ipswich and that Aldeburgh Hospital was not in a position to be upgraded.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Protection noted that the Council was aware of work in progress with regard to ecology and landscape impacts and that there was insufficient information to enable the Council to accept the proposals in environmental terms and stressed the importance of working with all stakeholders to mitigate the impact. He requested EDF Energy provide more detail on the design of the reactor and landscaping suitability including the effects of stockpiling soil and provide an assessment on the seascape. The Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Protection also stated that EDF Energy needed to carry out a mitigation strategy for archaeological sites of major significance and an assessment on flood risk. He supported the principal of Sizewell C but stressed the importance of continuing to push EDF Energy on the issues of concern.

The Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Protection considered it very disappointing that EDF Energy did not include the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Qualities document which EDF Energy commissioned and developed in consultation with local councils and the AONB partnership as it was a vital base line from which environmental impacts could be assessed in order to minimise impact as much as possible. The Council was deeply concerned about the design of the main reactor site within an AONB and designated heritage coast and required more detail and guarantees on finish, design, lighting, compensation, flood risk and landscaping. A full seascape assessment would also need to be undertaken. Although Suffolk County Council supported the principle of Sizewell C it was not yet in a position to support EDF Energy's proposals until such time as alternatives to all issues raised had been addressed to their satisfaction.

With regard to Suffolk Fire and Rescue Services, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Protection considered that the Stage 2 Consultation did not provide adequate detail of the impact on blue light services and noted that a

working group would be set up to look at this. The key concerns were emergency service response times, congestion and safety and new high risk activity for which additional services would need to be provided. The response from the Fire Service had now been finalised and would be sent with the Councils' response and would be available on line.

The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport urged EDF Energy to investigate the options for rail use. He considered there to be a lack of evidence on how the aspirations of 60% of construction material would be taken by rail were to be achieved and requested information on how many tonnes and how many journeys. They had to look at the worse-case scenario of 90% or more being transported by road. He also requested that EDF Energy give further information on the park and ride and the impact on local road infrastructure. The Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport advised that EDF Energy was not proposing to have a freight management facility but a traffic management facility and requested that this be reconsidered. There was not enough evidence on traffic flows and no split between road, rail and marine therefore the Councils could not conclude on their preferred option and needed to engage further. He also urged EDF Energy to look at alternatives for the B1122 proposals.

In his role as Vice Chairman of Dedham Vale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport considered that three aspects needed to be taken very seriously: the visual impact; mounds of spoil and the accommodation site, all having a massive potential impact on AONB. He supported the paper but stressed the importance of the recommendations and conditions to defend a very important area of AONB.

The Cabinet Member for Children's Services, Education and Skills, on balance, welcomed the development of Sizewell C, however considered there were too many unanswered questions. He could not ignore the challenges facing the skills and employment issues and more work would be required. He stressed the need for meaningful dialogue with EDF Energy as engagement was not happening at the moment.

The Cabinet Member for Ipswich stated that with new jobs and homes coming to Ipswich, the power generated by Sizewell C would be needed, however, this did not mean that the Council was not interested in safety. It was not just a Suffolk need but a national infrastructure need for future generations.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Heritage raised considerable concern over the proposals from EDF Energy. He noted the countries where EDF Energy was currently building, at all of which sites were years behind schedule and hugely over budget. He expressed concern regarding who would supply the steelwork as there were no details provided on this and also asked if a risk analysis had been carried out by Suffolk County Council due to the possibility of delayed completion and the disfiguring of the landscape and coast. The Cabinet Member for Finance and Heritage's concerns also included the lack of detail about associated sourcing of aggregates, spoil heaps, the project's materials supply chain, unwanted peat, the unknown volume and frequency of traffic and the potential impact on nearby buildings and residents to the road and rail infrastructure, the 2,400 bed accommodation campus and the effect on tourism. The Cabinet Member for Finance strongly requested that the D2 route be considered as the Sizewell access road. He considered the draft response not

robust enough and wished to register his displeasure in the strongest of terms and hoped the Councils would improve when considering Stage 3, although he considered it may then be too late.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Broadband, Rural Issues and Localities considered the response to be a relatively comprehensive document and stated that she did back the proposal for a Sizewell C in principle as there was a need to look at energy provision. However, there was not enough information in many areas and more consultation was required. The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Broadband, Rural Issues and Localities advised that the Suffolk Local Access Forum had also responded to the consultation and Council officers had referred to this in the report.

A Councillor who was the County Council's Member with Responsibility for the Greenest County programme raised concern over the environmental issues and the residual effects after the building was completed as these had not been addressed in the report and were difficult to predict. EDF Energy had not provided information on the effect of traffic and the use of National Rail and therefore the Councils were unable to agree to any type of mitigation. With regard to the marine transport role she raised concern about the effect on the coast. The Councillor also raised concern about where the hardware would be sourced from and hoped that it would be from the UK however, this supply chain was not mentioned in EDF Energy's consultation document. Concern was also raised with regard to the suitability of technology and the twin reactors.

The Local Councillor for Blything raised the issue of the strike price and the importance of this being the right one. He considered that the Councils' response submission did cover the most contentious issues identified but not resolved. He considered that Suffolk County Council's response to EDF energy had always been passive and stressed the importance of this changing and that a more robust approach was required moving forward. He requested there not to be delegation of responsibility and that the Councils lay down their precise negotiation points to be achieved and a plan be produced identifying all key issues to be used going forward and that EDF Energy state what it was going to do to ensure jobs and access to supply chain. He stressed the need to work closely with MPs and the Department of Energy to ensure interests were aligned.

A Councillor, in supporting the recommendations, stated that a very robust plan needed to go back to EDF Energy and currently there was a lack of clarification, evidence and analysis with major implications for the A12. He stressed the importance of looking at road networking re-modelling alternatives such as D2 and hoped for a 4 village bypass.

A Councillor noted that an increase in rail freight would also affect Ipswich, particularly at night. She also noted that previously EDF Energy had only employed people living within a certain distance from Sizewell and asked if this was still the case.

A Councillor agreed that the environmental impact, the impact on traffic and the impact of having the accommodation block on one site had not been fully considered by EDF Energy. There was also no information on how the rail or marine transport would be achieved. The B1122 and the A12 did not have capacity and the Council as the highway authority needed to be very careful

about what it should be asking for from EDF Energy. More information was required about doubling the rail track between Woodbridge and Saxmundham and how this would be used. The Councillor advised that there was significantly more information required from EDF Energy before she could support the proposals from a transport perspective. The Councillor did not agree with the proposals for the accommodation block and could see no reason for it to be in one place if the right transport links were available.

A Councillor considered the potential for delays in the Sizewell C construction to be considerable and that the wrong technology was proposed. He also raised the issue of the strike price and warned of the consequences of locking in the price of electricity. He considered that the proposals were bad for UK business, tourism and UK technology and that the Council was in a strong position to make demands of EDF Energy.

In summing up, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Public Protection thanked Councillor McGregor and all officers for their work. He also thanked the residents who played a valuable role which showed unity and which strengthened the submission. He wanted to see and welcome the benefits that Sizewell C could bring and the Councils would work with the government to reap the benefits. He hoped EDF Energy would do all it could to mitigate, and where the impact would be lasting damage, there would be appropriate compensation.

The Leader and Cabinet Member for Economic Development thanked the public questioners. He stated that this project was the single biggest infrastructure project ever in Suffolk and it was recognised that it would have significant impact on communities. He gave assurances that the Councils would continue to fight for those communities.

Alternative options: None considered.

Declarations of interest: Councillor Richard Smith declared a non-pecuniary interest by virtue of the fact that he lived 30 yards away from the railway line in Saxmundham.

Councillor Stephen Burroughes declared a non-pecuniary interest by virtue of the fact that he was a member of Suffolk Coastal District Council.

Dispensations: None reported.

The meeting closed at 4.20 pm.

Chairman