

BRADWELL B

Community Forum – 3rd February 2021

Meeting Note



Attendees:

Althorne Parish Council

Asheldham and Dengie Parish Council

Bernard Jenkin MP (Harwich and North Essex)

Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group (BANNG)

Bradwell Action Network (BAN)

Bradwell-on-Sea Parish Council

Brightlingsea Town Council

Burnham-on-Crouch Town Council

Cold Norton Parish Council

East of England Ambulance Service NHS Trust (EEAST).

Environment Agency

Federation of Essex Colleges

Heybridge Parish Council

John Whittingdale MP (Maldon)

Latchingdon Parish Council

Representative from Maldon District Council

Maldon Nub News

Maldon Town Council

Mundon Parish Council

Othona Community

RAF Bradwell Preservation Group

Representative from Chelmsford City Council

Officer from Essex County Council

Representative from Rochford District Council

Rettendon Parish Council

South Woodham Ferrers Town Council

Tollesbury and Mersea Native Oyster Fishery Company

Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre Parish Council

Woodham Mortimer and Hazeleigh Parish Council

Chair – Sandra Fryer

Bradwell B Project Team

Sofia Bouhrizi, General Nuclear System Limited (GNSL)	Philip Rew-Williamson, Bradwell B
Stephen Bray, Bradwell B	Kate Stinton, Bradwell B
Neil Burke, Bradwell B	Olivia White, Bradwell B
Chris Hall, General Nuclear System Limited (GNSL)	
Paul Marks, General Nuclear System Limited (GNSL)	

Environment Agency

Alan McGoff, Environment Agency	Paula Atkin, Environment Agency
---------------------------------	---------------------------------

Community Forum Secretariat

Daniel Fryd, BECG	Sam Tankard, BECG
Phoebe Sullivan, BECG	

Item 1: Welcome from the Chair

- The Chair welcomed all attendees to the second Community Forum and thanked everyone for their time. The Chair explained her role and set out the proceedings for the meeting (Agenda item 1.1)
- Apologies of absence were heard from Maldon and District Community Voluntary Service (Agenda item 1.2).
- The notes from the last meeting were approved (Agenda item 1.3)
- The feedback summary from the last Forum's survey was presented to the Forum. It was heard that most people had felt the aims of the Forum were met 'well' or 'somewhat' (Agenda item 1.4)

Bernard Jenkin, MP for Harwich and North Essex noted his attendance.

Item 2: Update from Project Team

The BRB project team provided an update on the project covering the following items:

- UK Government's Energy White Paper
- Granting by Ofgem of a generating licence
- Update on the planning appeal on GI works
- Tsinghua University graduate opportunity
- Bradwell B's work plan and upcoming activities for 2021

Item 3: Generic Design Assessment presentation from the Environment Agency

The Environment Agency presented its work and preliminary conclusions for the Generic Design Assessment of the UK HPR1000 reactor, and information about how people can engage with its current public consultation on GDA.

NB: The EA's slides are available on Bradwell B website at <https://bradwellb.co.uk/communityforum/>.

Item 3.1: Questions to the Environment Agency and General Nuclear System Limited

(This section sets out questions raised, and discussions held, categorised based on key themes following the GDA presentation in item 3 of the Agenda)

Technical Questions

BANNG asked which party had requested the GDA process, and if the technology would be implemented elsewhere.

BRB team response: The Bradwell B project team confirmed that GNSL, the joint venture taking forward the GDA, was part of the agreement that EDF and CGN had with the Government. GNSL had requested that GDA was held for the UK HPR1000 [note post meeting – the GDA was initiated by GNSL in 2017]. BRB confirmed that as it is generic, in theory it will allow for the technology to be used elsewhere but is currently being taken forward at Bradwell B and there has not been discussions about use at other sites.

Questions from Latchingdon Parish Council and other attendees asked whether specific aspects such as Acoustic Fish Deterrent, earthquakes, flood risk, marine coastal zones and SSSI's were included in the GDA process.

Environment Agency (EA) team response: The EA confirmed that SSSI's, marine coastal zones and fish deterrents were too site specific for GDA consideration. It was confirmed that earthquake risk would be considered a safety issue, and therefore falls under the remit of the ONR in their assessment.

Bernard Jenkin MP asked about who investigates incidents or accidents.

EA team response: The EA confirmed that incidents would initially fall under the EA's remit if it affected the environment, and the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) would look into this further to address safety issues. A joint investigation is possible if it affected both.

BAN asked for clarity about the relationship between General Nuclear System Limited (GNSL) and Bradwell Power Generation Company (BRB).

BRB team response: The Bradwell B project team explained that they share the same shareholders, CGN and EDF. BRB is developing the Bradwell B project, while GNSL interacts with the regulators in the Generic Design Assessment for the UK HPR1000 reactor technology.

Heybridge Parish Council asked for clarity about the relevance of comments, as issues that are relevant for local people may not be for technical stakeholders.

EA team response: The EA confirmed that relevance relates to the scope of GDA but recognised people raise many issues. Those which are outside of GDA scope are passed on to the relevant body (e.g. ONR). It was also confirmed that the comments would be collated in a visible list, and a response would be fed back to people through the decision document.

Latchingdon Parish Council asked about the longevity of the safety measures.

EA team response: The EA confirmed that there are conditions and permits to ensure that there is suitable personnel and resource to comply with the permit conditions. These permits carry on into decommissioning to ensure the environment is protected and nuclear safety is maintained throughout the lifespan of the project.

BANNG recognised that the consultation is generic but asked how questions specific to Bradwell B would be dealt with.

EA team response: The EA confirmed site specific comments can only be dealt with once the developer brings an application forward and therefore is beyond their remit at this stage.

Item 4. Break

Item 5 Environment Impact Assessment Presentation

Please note that the slides are available at www.bradwellb.co.uk/communityforum.

The Bradwell B project team delivered a presentation on the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process, and how it is applied to Bradwell B. The scope of the EIA was outlined, and BRB confirmed how the EIA would include impacts on local landscape, ecology, heritage and other aspects, and how they might be affected by the project, and potential mitigation and compensation.

The next stages of the process for the EIA were outlined, as well as the documents that will be available to the public at a future consultation through a preliminary environmental impact report (or PEIR).

Item 5.1: Community Forum Discussion

(This section sets out questions raised, and discussions held, categorised based on key themes following the EIA presentation in item 5 of the Agenda)

Terrestrial and Historic Environment and Ecology

The chair first sought clarity on the timescales of the process and what had been produced so far.

BRB team response: The Bradwell B project team confirmed that the Stage One Consultation, Scoping Report and Scoping Opinion documents have all been produced to date and made available. It was stated that there is no specific timeline for the EIA process prior to the start of the application process and it could be a number of years before they have sufficient data.

BAN asked whether it is the Planning Inspectorate who decides if the Environmental Statement is fit for purpose as part of the DCO process.

BRB team response: The Bradwell B project team confirmed that the Planning Inspectorate takes advice from statutory stakeholders, including Natural England, the Environment Agency, and others, to account for specialist topics which would be part of the examination process. An examination authority would then be appointed to investigate whether the Statement is sufficiently robust.

RAF Bradwell Bay Preservation group and others asked how the data would be gathered.

BRB team response: The Bradwell B project team assured the Forum that the methods for data collection would be agreed with stakeholders. Data collection would be carried out in a number of ways, both desk-based and on site, depending on the data required. This was subject to a number of criteria depending on what needed to be collected, for example suitable weather conditions for visual images and the right seasons for certain species.

BAN asked a number of questions regarding the load test works, whether the EIA would be available for view prior to submission, and how local heritage would be taken into account.

BRB team response: The Bradwell B project team confirmed there was an impact assessment for the application for the ground investigation works and load test, and there were extensive discussions held with stakeholders to identify and mitigate issues that emerged.

BRB confirmed the public will have the opportunity to review the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) for the DCO application. BRB confirmed that heritage will be included in the EIA and over the next few years, it will be engaging with relevant stakeholders to develop mitigations for impacts.

Marine Environment

BANNG asked about the degree of independence, transparency and robustness of the research study on the estuary.

BRB team response: The Bradwell B project team noted this question related to an Essex University independent study on the thermal tolerance of oysters. It was added that this research would be available for viewing in future consultation, and is only one small part of the wider environmental and ecological studies they are undertaking.

Jobs, Socioeconomics & Accommodation

BANNG asked whether the EIA would be complemented by a Social Impacts Assessment and Health Impact Assessment.

BRB team response: The Bradwell B project team confirmed that socio-economic and Health Impact assessments would be part of the wider EIA. It noted that local authorities have a lot of expertise and existing data regarding socio-economic aspects and that the Bradwell B project team will be liaising closely with them to ensure there is good local knowledge as part of a robust socio-economic assessment.

Transport and freight

Althorne Parish Council raised concerns about traffic, and how the EIA considers developments elsewhere. The representative asked what the agreed route is and if there had been consideration for water transport.

BRB team response: The Bradwell B project team acknowledged that the EIA will cover all of the development in the proposals – including highways, park and ride, freight management, rail and marine. There is still work to do with stakeholders in developing the transport strategy and proposals. The project team is yet to publish revised proposals, which will include road improvements, rail and marine transport, and which will be put to the public again in further consultation.

Consultation and Planning Process

Heybridge Parish Council asked if there was one EIA or separate ones for the development phase and operating state.

BRB team response: The Bradwell B project team confirmed they are working to assess the effects throughout construction and operation periods, as well as aspects of decommissioning where necessary. The strategy aims to produce a single EIA to cover all aspects of the necessary permissions and consents to help streamline the process.

RAF Bradwell Bay Preservation Group asked which stakeholders agreed to consult with Bradwell B on the EIA.

BRB team response: The Bradwell B project team confirmed there have been agreements with Essex, Chelmsford and Maldon local authorities, as well as working relationships with other statutory bodies, in order to demonstrate a robust consultation process with the relevant parties.

NB: The various stakeholders for the EIA process are referred to throughout the various papers published relating to EIA on the Planning Inspectorate's Bradwell B page (<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/bradwell-b/>).

Latchingdon Parish Council questioned whether the National Grid connection would be included in this EIA.

BRB team response: The Bradwell B project team confirmed that the National Grid connection would be addressed under a separate DCO and that National Grid would therefore conduct a separate EIA. However cumulative impacts from both of these projects would be considered in Bradwell B's EIA where relevant.

Woodham Mortimer and Hazeleigh Parish Council asked whether parish councils are considered relevant in the consultation process, and whether they would have sight of consultation documents ahead of meetings.

BRB team response: The Bradwell B project team confirmed parish councils are regularly kept up to date and have routinely offered to meet with parish councils. Bradwell B are happy to present information and provide briefings to parish councils when the information is available.

EEAST asked when specific sub-groups would be approached within the EIA.

BRB team response: The project team acknowledged this would be done as soon as the scope for such groups is clear.

Item 6: Any Other Business

The Chair asked for any other questions from attendees.

Latchingdon Parish Council asked about the licence relating to marine transport works.

BRB team response: The Bradwell B project team confirmed applications to conduct marine works would be part of the DCO process where they must get a marine licence and permission.

BAN asked why CGN were pushing on with the ground works appeal, despite the broader political issues the UK has with China and the CCP.

The BRB Project Team confirmed they are not in a position to comment on geopolitical issues. It was stated that CGN is a globally-respected nuclear developer and operator, and the joint ventures with EDF in the UK are part of the continuing agreement it has with the UK Government. It was also noted that the GI and load testing works are necessary for the development of the project, and just one of many processes required to deliver the project.

The Federation of Essex Colleges offered their interest in engaging on the skills and careers throughout the lifetime of the development.

Item 7: Concluding remarks from the Chair.

The Chair thanked everyone for their attendance and contributions, concluding the second Community Forum meeting.