

PEASENHALL PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Peasehall Parish Council Extraordinary virtual meeting held via Zoom Meetings on Wednesday 19th August 2020 at 7:00 pm.

2020/45 Attendance and Apologies

Attendees:

Cllr. Stephen Pewsey - Chair
Cllr. Frank Potter – Vice-Chair
Cllr. Roger Benstead
Cllr. Kenneth Parry-Brown
Cllr. Nick Levett-Scrivener
Cllr. Ric Earle
Cllr. Peter Dance

Apologies for absence:

Cllr. Norman Ball
Cllr. Stephanie Liston – written and accepted

In attendance:

Sharon Smith - Clerk/RFO
3 members of the public

The Council noted that Cllr. Norman Ball has not attended a meeting since January 2020. The coronavirus pandemic has not changed the requirement for Councillors to attend meetings. Under s.85 of the Local Government Act, members automatically vacate office if they fail to attend Council meetings for a period of six consecutive months since their last attendance, without Council approval. The Council agreed to contact Cllr. Norman Ball to ask for his reasons for absence.

ACTION: Clerk to contact Cllr. Norman Ball.

2020/46 Declarations of Pecuniary and Non-Pecuniary Interests

- a) Cllr. Nick Levett-Scrivener declared an interest in item 2020/48d.
- b) Cllr. Frank Potter declared an interest in item 2020/49a.

2020/47 Public Forum

a) A member of the public, referring to the Sizewell C Development Consent Order application, said that the time for the public to agree or disagree was gone and it was now in the pre-examination stage with the Planning Inspectorate. He advised the Council to include all of its concerns in its Relevant Representation as the Planning Inspectorate may question why matters subsequently raised were not raised earlier. He suggested that the Relevant Representation should be an impact statement and should make reference to the DCO application which is a different approach to the previous EDF consultations.

Cllr. Stephen Pewsey replied that the Council has been very concerned about the Sizewell C proposals and has expressed those concerns at every stage of the planning process. The process has now entered a new phase and the Council intends to become a statutory consultee in the discussion, which will take place later this year and into 2021. Once that is achieved, the Council intends to initiate discussions in the village about the Sizewell C proposals. The Council will need to be innovative about these discussions, if the government guidance continues to prohibit public meetings, so that the Council's views are truly representative of Peasehall opinion.

b) A member of the public, referring to the Local Plan Main Modifications consultation, said that 12 responses were submitted to the District Council about the site adjacent to Farthings, Sibton Road. These responses were available to view on ESC's website but not the follow up letters sent from the Council and the Trustees of the Church Lands Trust relating to the incorrect letter sent by the Trust Secretary. Cllr. Stephen Pewsey thanked the resident for this information but said the deadline for the consultation had passed and the matter was now closed.

2020/48 Parish Matters

a) The Council considered the Relevant Representation to be made to the Planning Inspectorate to register as an Interested Party to EDF Energy's application for a Development Consent Order for Sizewell C. Cllr. Stephen Pewsey thanked Cllr. Kenneth Parry-Brown for his previously circulated draft response and Cllr. Frank Potter for his technical comments on the draft. Cllr. Ric Earle tabled an alternative draft response. Following a lengthy discussion, it was agreed that Cllr. Stephen Pewsey would draft another Relevant Representation, based on both responses, and circulate it for comments. It was further agreed to

approve the final Relevant Representation by email. Both responses are attached as Appendices I and II.
ACTION: Cllr. Stephen Pewsey to draft a Relevant Representation and circulate. Clerk to submit the final version to the Planning Inspectorate.

Cllr. Kenneth Parry-Brown left the meeting.

b) Cllr. Stephen Pewsey raised again the idea of producing a Neighbourhood Plan and summarised the necessary steps that need to be undertaken. Cllr. Pewsey agreed to circulate this summary for further discussion at a future meeting.

ACTION: Cllr. Stephen Pewsey to progress.

c) The Council discussed the old primary school and agreed to write to County Cllr. Stephen Burroughes to inform him that several reports had been received from concerned residents about the building becoming dilapidated and unsecure and consequently being at risk of weather damage, vandalism, flooding or fire. It was agreed that the Council and the residents value the building as a parish amenity and they need to be confident that the County Council will maintain the building in a safe and satisfactory condition. It was further agreed to request that the County Council conducts a site visit, accompanied by a Parish Councillor, and it undertakes any necessary remedial work before the weather worsens or vandals gain access. It was suggested that Cllr. Burroughes is asked to confirm what is being stored in the building.

ACTION: Clerk to write to Cllr, Stephen Burroughes.

d) Cllr. Stephen Pewsey informed the Council that a successful fund raising campaign by the Village Store' owners had raised £600 from generous donations to refurbish the telephone kiosk. It was agreed to write to the owners to express the Council's gratitude for their kind offer to refurbish and maintain the kiosk and to formally handover responsibility for this. It was further agreed to inform the owners that the Council will meet any additional and ongoing expenses as required.

ACTION: Clerk to write to the Village Store.

2020/49 Planning Applications

a) The Council considered planning application DC/20/2737/FUL – new, two storey, eight bedroom house with studio and car port and associated landscaping works – OS 7554, Mill Road. Cllr. Stephen Pewsey noted that the plans on the ESC planning portal were incorrect. It was agreed to ask ESC to upload the correct plans and to ask for an extension to the deadline for the Council's observations.

b) The Council agreed to support planning application DC/20/2978/TCA – to fell copper beech to front of house following receipt of evidence of internal main stem decay and crown decline – The Ancient House, Church Street.

c) The Council agreed to support planning application DC/20/2839/LBC – to remove 1980s studwork and plasterboard, wc and basin from first floor wc enclosure. Remove existing tongue and groove deal timber 1980s door. Build a modified wc enclosure using studwork and plasterboard to a height of 1.8m and install a freestanding bath – Christmas Cottage, Hackney Road.

ACTION: Clerk to inform the District Council

2020/50 Councillor Resignation

Cllr. Stephen Pewsey informed the Council that he had received Cllr. Kenneth Parry-Brown's resignation.

ACTION: Clerk to inform the District Council.

The meeting closed at 8:40 pm.

Appendix I

The Council accepts that the decision on whether or not the power station is built is not a matter for consideration by the Parish Council.

However, assuming that the decision is made to build the station, the Council is mindful of the likely effects upon the village.

The major impact will be pollution by traffic, both of noxious exhaust fumes, vibration and noise. It makes the following comments:

1. HGVs

The Council notes there will be a Delivery Management System. It wishes there to be a strict and enforced ban on HGVs use the A1120 both going to and returning from the development site. They would also wish for a ban on non-essential LGV traffic using A1120.

Whilst indicating controls on HGVs travelling to the site, the proposal fails to indicate similar strict controls on vehicles leaving it.

The Council would wish for the installation of ANPR camera to back up contractual controls.

2. Workforce Accommodation and Travel

The proposal indicates that there will be required 5,500 workers not in campus accommodation plus another 600 associated personnel living at home. The Gravity model used by the to assess the likely location of the accommodation the Council believes is flawed.

The model indicates travel of up to 90 minutes travel to site (including 30 minutes from arrival at a Park and Ride facility to start on site). The model indicates travel from north of Norwich and South of Colchester. It almost totally omits the instance of travel from the west: 6 workers may live in Earl Soham.

Use of Route Planners would indicate that places such as Bury St Edmunds to the west and Stradbroke to the north-west are all within the time parameter and the planner indicates that the shortest route from these places is via A1120.

The Council believes that many of the construction workers will choose to live in such places as Stonham Barns, just as those employed by BT and its contractors have been doing for some time.

The traffic analysis in the proposal documents indicates an extra 250 movements per day on A1120 including white van traffic. The assumption is therefore that must be that there will be almost no worker traffic – the Council believes that this is wrong and that there will be much more use of A1120.

3. Shift Hours

The Council understands that the shift times proposed will mean worker traffic through the village both early in the morning (from 5.00am) and late at night (after midnight), an increase during daylight hours is measured in the proposal but is of lesser interest to the Council.

The village of Peasenhall is strung along the A1120 with many houses opening on to the road without front gardens. The Council asks that measures are put in place to stop noise pollution, such as sound insulation grants and that a Speed camera is installed.

Appendix II

The Parish Council objects to the application by EDF on the grounds that the entire proposal is flawed. The site is unsafe and unnecessary, especially when measured against EDF's poor track record. This includes design and other faults with the proposed reactors as well as cost overruns.

The major and devastating consequences caused will impact upon the environment, health and safety, wildlife and local communities, including Peasehall.

The site is also unsafe given coastal erosion, climate change and rising seas along with the legacy of nuclear radioactive waste which will remain for hundreds of years. By the time the nuclear power station is operational it will be out dated and overtaken by cheaper, greener renewables. These objections and concerns include :

1. TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND POLLUTION

There will be in the region of 1,140 HGV's and 700 buses a day as well as cars and vans affecting the A12 and local roads early morning, noon and night. This congestion is likely to cause other traffic to head for the A1120 causing delay and diversions as well as creating *rat runs* and additional parking problems. Peasehall is a bottleneck.

Congestion will be especially bad during the first 3 years of construction when building the roundabout at Yoxford, the link road off the B1122 and the construction road within Minsmere. There should be far greater use of sea and rail.

The construction will take 10-15 years to build causing light and air pollution, noise and vibration.

2. DAMAGE TO THE ENVIRONMENT

Much of the local areas and habitats, including Minsmere, will be destroyed or ruined by the huge carbon footprint, changing water levels, pollution, noise, traffic, vibration and 24 hour lights.

3. FINANCIAL CONSEQUENCES

The estimated cost is £20 billion. Council tax will rise to cover "road improvements". Water supply will be disrupted and electricity charges are likely to double. Tourism will be adversely affected causing material loss to local businesses.

4. COMMUNITY AND EMPLOYMENT CONSEQUENCES

Some 6,000 workers will be brought in to live on campus risking social problems including drug abuse and sexual predators. Although it is said that, in addition, 2,600 workers will be "local", at best, this is wholly exaggerated as local means commuting from up to 90 minutes. Ongoing monitoring of all aspects is completely inadequate at Hinkley Point.

Residents at Hinkley Point reported, amongst others, broken promises from EDF, shifting the construction boundary and failing to proactively address problems. Local businesses affected as too difficult to park, village tensions as locals rent to multiple occupants.

Despite representations at each stage of the consultation process, the application totally fails to consider the likely impact of the project on Peasehall and the surrounding areas.