

BRADWELL B

Community Forum – 22 June 2021

Meeting Note



Meeting attendees

Chair: Sandra Fryer

Representatives from:

Althorne Parish Council	Maldon District Council
Asheldham and Dengie Parish Council	Maldon Town Council
Bradwell B Action Network (BAN)	Mayland Parish Council
Blackwater Against New Nuclear Group (BANNG)	Mersea Island Courier
Bradwell-on-Sea Parish Council	RAF Bradwell Bay Preservation Society
Brightlingsea Town Council	Representative of John Whittingdale MP
Chelmsford City Council	Rettendon Parish Council
East of England Ambulance Service	Rochford District Council
Environment Agency	South Woodham Ferrers Town Council
Essex County Council	Tillingham Village Council
Essex Police and Designing Out Crime Office	Tolleshunt D'Arcy Parish Council
Federation of Essex Colleges	West Mersea Town Council
Great Baddow Parish Council	Woodham Ferrers and Bicknacre Parish Council
Heybridge Parish Council	Woodham Mortimer with Hazeleigh Parish Council
Latchingdon Parish Council	

Bradwell B team:

Stephen Bray, Bradwell B	Kate Stinton, Bradwell B
Andrew Murdoch, Bradwell B	Tim Miller, Bradwell B
Matt Squires, Bradwell B	Paul Marks, General Nuclear System Limited

Secretariat:

Michelle St Martin, Bradwell B	Philip White, Bradwell B
Olivia White, Bradwell B	Michael Martinez-Cheng, Bradwell B

Environment Agency presenter: Alan McGoff

Hinkley Point C presenter: Andrew Cockcroft, EDF

Item 1: Welcome from the Chair

- The Chair welcomed all attendees to the third Community Forum and thanked everyone for their time. The Chair explained her role and set out the proceedings for the meeting.
- The Chair notified attendees that four questions had been received by the representative from BAN ahead of the meeting¹.
- There was one amendment to the circulated notes from the last Community Forum. The police were omitted from the attendance list but it is noted that they attended the Forum. The updated meeting notes will be available online shortly.
- It was also noted that there is a change to the Terms of References of the Community Forum. The secretariat of the Community Forum has moved from BECG to the Bradwell B team. The updated Terms of Reference will be available online shortly.
- No apologies for absence were heard².

Item 2: Bradwell B update

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

- Hinkley Point C socio-economic report;
- education and skills:
 - presentation in SELEP major projects meeting about the shared skills challenge; and
 - schools events at Brightlingsea Harbour.
- newsletter distribution;
- parish council meetings;
- local authority councillors' briefings approach;
- GDA comments process closes later this year; and
- UKAEA's inclusion of Bradwell on list for fusion development.

Item 3: Engineering in Bradwell B's project development phase

The Bradwell B project team provided a presentation on the development phase of the project ([please see accompanying slides](#)). The presentation included the key focus for the 2021 feasibility topics, namely:

- general plant arrangements;
- marine study – water intake and outfall scheme/cooling;
- foundation study;
- site seismic parameters; and
- site meteorological parameters.

Item 4: Environment Agency update on conclusion of GDA consultation

Environment Agency (EA) New Reactors Programme Manager, Alan McGoff gave an update on the EA's consultation on its preliminary conclusions for the Generic Design Assessment (GDA) of the UK HPR1000 reactor, which took place between January and April 2021. The EA confirmed it will be publishing a document of responses (52 total, comprising around 300

¹ Due to the meeting overrunning, the questions were not addressed in the meeting but have been answered in the appendix, subsequent information section of the meeting notes.

² Following the meeting it was established that one of the member representatives from Maldon District Council had submitted apologies by email.

individual points made) received as part of the consultation in early July 2021. The document consists of a summary of responses, but does not include the EA's response to issues raised at this time.

The EA confirmed it is on track to deliver a GDA decision early next year and that the GDA comments process, which people can still take part in, will continue until approximately four months before the end of the GDA.

The EA confirmed it has been sent a response on the Disposability Assessment for Wastes and Spent Fuel has been undertaken by Radioactive Waste Management Limited and that GNSL had made it available on the [UK HPR1000 website](#).

The EA stated it is determining an application for an environmental permit in relation to ground investigation work. The EA has provided its assessments to Natural England, who has 28 days to provide comments. The EA will then determine if a permit can be issued and, if so, what conditions should apply. This decision is expected next month.

EA also stated it is looking to undertake local engagement meetings from September.

Item 5: Questions

The Chair asked for any other questions or comments from attendees on the presentations.

Engagement

The representative from Mayland Parish Council asked what response the project team received when they undertook engagement and asked if the majority of the community did not want the project, would the project still go ahead.

BRB team response: The BRB project team receive a range of responses on different issues. Some people are naturally opposed to the project, some supportive and there are many people in between. Some people are concerned about certain aspects of the project, for example the traffic proposals, whilst other want to discuss issues such as skills interventions. The project team do not have the percentage of people for or against the project.

The planning process aims to balance local and national needs. The project is at an early stage and the purpose of engaging early is to hear a range of opinions and look to take these into account as the project develops.

The chair asked for clarity on how consultation and engagement will change as the project develops.

BRB team response: There will be at least two stages of formal consultation as part of the planning process. Throughout the project there is also engagement with residents and groups including, parish councils, educational organisations and business groups. The project is happy to meet groups and tailor discussions to their interests and concerns.

External Hazards assessments

A representative from West Mersea Town Council asked what assumptions are made in the design work regarding climate change and rising sea levels. The councillor also asked if the Essex University report, referred to in the presentation, will be made publically available

The representative from General Nuclear Systems Limited, which is undertaking the GDA work, responded: External hazards are assessed as part of the GDA. Government and the UK Met Office are looking at climate change and rising sea levels and have identified a number

of climate change scenarios, which can be used to assess the impact of flooding and sea level rise. The design team uses a conservative approach to the information to calculate sea level rises and the height of the nuclear site platform and associated sea defences.

BRB team response: The Essex University Report outcomes will be taken into account as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment. The Preliminary Environmental Impact Report will form part of the statutory consultation, whilst the Environmental Statement, including all supporting evidence and reports, will be included in the Development Consent Order (DCO) application. The DCO application will be publically available.

Cooling water

A number of questions were raised about the cooling water design by Latchingdon Parish Council, West Mersea Town Council and Maldon District Council

An officer from Maldon District Council asked why BRB has chosen indirect cooling in its design when the GDA includes direct cooling.

BRB team response: The Bradwell B project is proposing to use indirect cooling at Bradwell B. Indirect cooling significantly reduces the effects on marine ecology that direct cooling would cause because much less water is taken from and returned to the estuary – approximately a 10th compared to direct cooling. More detailed assessment will follow in later stages of proposal development. The GDA in contrast uses a generic site for its design, which in this case is suitable for direct cooling.

EA response: The GDA design can be modified where necessary to suit site-specific needs. This approach is consistent with regulators' expectations and guidance. For example, all past GDAs have included one reactor, whereas the site-specific designs include two reactors. Any modifications from GDA to site specific proposals will be fully assessed as part of the safety case by the Office for Nuclear Regulation and by EA as part of the relevant environmental permit applications.

The representative from Latchingdon Parish Council noted that Hinkley Point C is currently going through an appeal in relation to its fish deterrent design and asked how the EA can make an assessment which is then subject to a material change.

EA response: The discharge of cooling water requires environmental permits, for which the EA has regulatory responsibility. Environmental permitting is complementary to the planning process and operators must comply with the conditions set out in their permits. Operators can apply to vary a condition of their permit at any time but any such future change would require regulatory permission from the EA. The site-specific design applied for by HPC included acoustic fish deterrent devices at the cooling water inlet heads. HPC believe that these are no longer required; the EA disagrees with this position, and HPC has appealed to the Defra Secretary of State against the EA's view.

Project size

A representative from West Mersea Town Council asked about the projected size of Bradwell B compared with Hinkley Point C.

BRB team response: The BRB site covers approximately 500 hectares. Within this, the permanent development footprint would occupy around 100 hectares.

Hinkley Point C response: The main development site at Hinkley Point C is 176 hectares, which reduces by approximately two thirds when operational.

Water discharge permit

A representative from West Mersea Town Council asked what would happen if Natural England is not satisfied with the finding from the water discharge permit assessments. A representative of BAN asked when was Natural England informed by the Environment Agency regarding the water discharge permit.

EA response via meeting chat function: The EA informed Natural England approximately one-and-a-half weeks ago, so they have approximately two-and-a-half weeks remaining to respond. If Natural England is not satisfied they will usually suggest additional control measures – for example extra monitoring, a different method, a change to a process etc. In which case the Environment Agency may include these additional controls as our conditions on issuing a permit.

Marine Transportation

The representative from Brightlingsea Town Council asked if the project team has investigated further the use of marine facilities to bring material to site, along with the possibility of using a vessel as worker accommodation

BRB team response: Four different marine options formed part of the Stage 1 consultation material. The team is exploring these and continuing to develop them but are not at the stage to present more detail. The more developed proposals will form part of future consultation. The project team is open to other suggestions and has previously looked at marine accommodation.

Item 6: Break

Item 7: Learning from Hinkley Point C's development and construction phases

Andrew Cockcroft from EDF provided an overarching presentation on Hinkley Point C. The presentation showed the enabling construction undertaken to minimise impacts, including accommodation sites and ways of managing traffic impacts, including park and ride sites and freight management solutions.

Mr Cockcroft also discussed the experience around the site, including local environment work and the monitoring of environmental impacts of noise, dust, light and air quality; engagement with the local community and stakeholders; and community investment.

The final part of the presentation showed the socio-economic benefits of the project, including skills and training interventions.

Item 8: Questions

The Chair asked for any other questions or comments from attendees.

Mersea Island

A representative from West Mersea Town Council raised concerns about the impacts on Mersea Island in particular the potential jetty and emergency planning.

BRB team response: The project team are aware of concerns from Mersea Island residents. The environmental impact assessment would include impacts and mitigations to the area.

Regarding the jetty, a number of options were included in the Stage 1 consultation, including several marine transport infrastructure options. Our preference for marine infrastructure to support sea transport is a beach landing facility as it could be built more quickly with the least environmental impact, although other options have not been disregarded.

The issue of emergency planning is often raised at engagement events with West Mersea Town Council. We have a duty, with the emergency services and the local authority under REPPiR to address this part of the development of Bradwell B, in due course.

Learning from Fukushima

The representative from Heybridge Parish Council asked what has been learnt from Fukushima in terms of the seismic assessment.

GNSL responded: All external hazards are assessed in the GDA. The UK HPR1000 includes improved design features following the Fukushima accident review, which includes enhanced safety features to ensure safety at all times, both during normal operation and under a range of potential accident conditions, from minor to extreme events. This includes passive systems, which can be used if other systems go off-line in an emergency. These are outlined in chapter 2 of the pre-construction safety report found on the [UK HPR1000 website](#).

Hinkley Point C

An officer from Maldon District Council asked what advice could the Hinkley Point C team give to the BRB project about the assessment of transport and accommodation impacts.

HPC response: Learning lessons is very important to the nuclear industry. We are working with Sizewell C and Bradwell B to ensure lessons are shared with these projects.

An officer from Maldon District Council asked how Hinkley Point C assesses community organisations to receive funding

HPC response: The Hinkley project team works with Somerset Community Foundation. The project team sits on a panel who assess all the applications, against an agreed criteria, to determine who receives funding.

The representative from Essex Federation of Colleges asked if lessons learned from HPC are being shared with BRB regarding engagement with higher and further education.

HPC response: There are many opportunities for local education providers and Hinkley and Bradwell teams are working together to share lessons learnt.

Other questions

The representative from Mayland PC asked if the project felt workers would want to live on the Dengie area.

BRB team response: impacts from the project on the whole Dengie area will be fully assessed and mitigations identified as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment. In common with other projects, we expect many workers to want to live and stay in the area in both construction and operation.

A representative from BAN asked about awareness of the residential home for vulnerable elders within 900 meters of planned Bradwell B site.

BRB team response: the project is aware of the residential home near the proposed site. As part of the environmental impact assessment, over the years between now and submitting an application for development consent, the project will assess the impact of this as a sensitive receptor, with an understanding of how it would be mitigated, under the environmental impact assessment.

The representative from BANNG his opposition to the scheme during the meeting.

Item 9: Final remarks from the Chair.

The Chair thanked everyone for their attendance and contributions, confirmed written responses would be provided to unanswered questions.

Appendix: Supplementary Questions and Answers

The below questions were received during the Community Forum. They were not answered in the meeting but the below answers have subsequently been sent.

An officer from Maldon District Council asked what the total workforce at peak construction is at Hinkley Point C

Hinkley Point C response: Over 11,769 job opportunities created on the construction site to date and we are on track to supporting the creation of 25,000 job opportunities on-site during the build. The current projected peak workforce is around 8,500 people.

Maldon District Council asked how many apprenticeships have been completed at Hinkley Point C

Hinkley Point C response: HPC has trained 756 apprentice on the project to date and is on target to train 1,000 during construction.

The representative from Althorne PC asked if concrete would be delivered via water for Bradwell.

We will reduce construction traffic through use of marine and rail, to the greatest possible extent and we aim for at least 50% of freight to be delivered to site this way.

A representative for BAN asked the following questions in advance of the meeting.

1. How much Carbon will be produced in the construction/concreate including the transportation requirements of goods, materials & Staff of the Power Station and how long before it becomes 'Carbon Neutral'?

It will be some time before the project is developed to such an extent that we can assess the carbon footprint of Bradwell B. Although Hinkley Point C is a different project, site and technology, it does provide some indication in terms of the scale of both carbon emissions and carbon abatement from modern nuclear power stations. In its DCO application, Hinkley Point C projects that it will produce 4.7g of CO₂ per kilowatt-hour in generation; and in its 2021 Socio-economic Impacts Report it projects that it will take 2 months of operation to offset its construction CO₂ emissions. This is based on the carbon intensity of the wider UK energy mix; no energy production is carbon neutral.

2. Once CGN have crushed all opposition, how can it be justified a new nuclear installation that is too close to homes and gardens and with renewable energy sources proving more competitive financially, what is the reason to plough on regardless?

The UK needs nuclear energy as part of its energy mix to achieve net zero. Bradwell, as a site for nuclear new build is proposed by the Government in its strategic siting assessment and national policy statements, and the need for nuclear energy is reiterated in its more recent white paper, which will lead to a renewal of those policy statements, through which we fully anticipate continued support for Bradwell as a site. This policy has been adopted by successive governments since 2008 and the process has been subject to ample parliamentary scrutiny and public consultation.

There is additional scrutiny through the planning requirements for a Development Consent Order, which gives local people a voice in the process and enables the Planning Inspectorate to balance the arguments for and against the proposal, and make a recommendation to the Secretary of State for them to make a decision on whether Bradwell B can be built.

Renewables are an important part of the energy mix, but are intermittent and cannot provide baseload power. Nuclear is needed, and its costs will decrease over time as the UK nuclear industry develops and successive construction projects take place, in the same way that the wind power industry has benefitted. Over the course of 60+ years of reliable, low carbon electricity production, nuclear's costs are highly competitive in comparison with all other forms of electricity generation.

3. *Why are you continuing with the build of the Nuclear Power Station when the people of the surrounding areas are completely against it? Would you like it built down the road or in the next village from where you live?*

When we discuss the project with people in surrounding areas, they have a wide range of interests that influence their level of support for the project; for example, many support the opportunities it brings to the area at the same time as expressing concern about how the impacts will be managed. While we recognise some will take a position against nuclear power, their input is as important as anyone else's and we welcome constructive engagement with them. Nuclear industry workers do indeed live near to nuclear power stations in construction and in operation, and have no qualms in doing so.

4. *Will EDF and CGN still be working together following the leak at the nuclear power station in Taishan, which has been going on for the last 9 months?*

CGN and EDF have a 30+ year partnership in developing safe nuclear power in China and around the world, including at Taishan. That relationship continues.

CGN and EDF, along with the regulator in China (the National Nuclear Safety Administration) have all issued statements to the media about the specific situation you have raised. These have been widely reported: see [World Nuclear News](#), for example.