

Confirmed



Minutes of an Extraordinary Meeting of the **Strategic Planning Committee** held via Zoom, on **Wednesday, 20 January 2021 at 9:30 am**

Members of the Committee present:

Other Members present:

Officers present:

Liz Beighton (Planning Manager), Sarah Carter (Democratic Services Officer), Lisa Chandler (Energy Projects Manager), Matt Makin (Democratic Services Officer), Sue Meeken (Political Group Support Officer (Labour)), Nick Newton (Arboricultural & Landscape Manager), Philip Ridley (Head of Planning and Coastal Management)

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Tony Fryatt; Councillor Maurice Cook attended as his substitute.

Councillor Tony Cooper declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest in item 5 of the agenda as both the Ward Member for Aldeburgh and Leiston and as a member of Leiston cum Sizewell Town Council.

Councillor Craig Rivett declared a Local Non-Pecuniary Interest in item 5 of the agenda as the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Economic Development.

Councillors Paul Ashdown, Melissa Allen, Stuart Bird, Chris Blundell, Jocelyn Bond, Norman Brooks, Jenny Ceresa, Maurice Cook, Linda Coulam, Graham Elliott, Andree Gee, Debbie McCallum, Malcolm Pitchers, David Ritchie and Craig Rivett all declared that they had been lobbied by email on item 5 of the agenda and had not responded to any emails.

Councillor Tony Cooper declared that he had been lobbied by email on item 5 of the agenda and had responded to some emails.

Councillors Mike Deacon and Colin Hedgley both declared that they had been lobbied by email on item 5 of the agenda and had acknowledged receipt of emails only.

Councillor T-J Haworth-Culf, who was attending the meeting as Ward Member for Aldeburgh and Leiston, declared that she had been lobbied by email on item 5 of the agenda and had acknowledged receipt of emails only.

The Committee received report **ES/0631** of the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning and Coastal Management.

The Cabinet Member introduced the report, which confirmed the details of the proposed fees and charges schedule to be applied to planning and building control matters from 2021 in terms of statutory and discretionary fees that had been agreed by the Cabinet. The report noted that in particular that it was proposed to update and replace the existing pre-application charging schedule and also outlined additional services that were to be offered to customers engaging with the service.

The Cabinet Member invited the Planning Manager to address the Committee.

The Planning Manager explained that officers had looked to rationalise and revisit pre-application charges following discussions with applicants and agents over the current schedule, which did not have an equilibrium between charges for different sizes of development; this had the unintended effect of putting off smaller developments.

The Planning Manager said that the new schedule would cover more of the services offered by the Planning service including policy fees, planning support and information and would tie in with the Building Control service.

The Committee was advised that the document contained all the fees and services offered by Planning and Building Control. Fees and response times had been revisited and the Planning Manager outlined the reduction in response times for simpler householder planning application and permitted development rights enquiries from 28 days to 5-10 days.

The Chairman invited questions to the Cabinet Member and the officers.

There being no further questions, the Chairman invited the Committee to debate the report.

Members of the Committee commented on the clarity of the document and thanked officers for their hard work in producing it.

The Cabinet Member with responsibility for Planning and Coastal Management advised the Committee that if it endorsed the document, it would be placed on the East Suffolk Council website and take effect immediately.

There being no further debate the Chairman moved to the recommendation to note and endorse the document, as set out in the report.

On the proposition of Councillor Ritchie, seconded by Councillor McCallum it was by unanimous vote

RESOLVED

That the Fees and Charges document for services offered by the Planning and Building Control service be noted and endorsed.

The Committee received report **ES/0630** of the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, which related to planning application DC/20/4646/FUL.

The hybrid application sought outline planning permission, with all matters reserved, for up to 9,500 square metres Gross External Area (GEA) to provide administration, storage, welfare and canteen facilities and a visitor centre of up to 1,000 square metres GEA.

Full planning permission was sought for demolition of some existing structures and redevelopment to include a training centre and interim visitor centre, an outage store, laydown area, car and cycle parking, landscaping, associated infrastructure (including utilities, plant and highway works), tree felling and other relevant works.

The application was before the Committee as the redevelopment, although submitted separately from proposals for a new nuclear power station, was necessary as the existing Sizewell B buildings were on land proposed to be developed as part of a new nuclear power station, Sizewell C. The site was identified in the National Policy Statement EN-6 as a potentially suitable site for the deployment of a new nuclear power station. Although EN-6 was subject to review, it remained in force until such time as it was replaced, as most recently confirmed in the Energy White Paper (December 2020).

Given the strategic nature of the proposal, the scale of the development proposed, and the importance of nuclear generating energy to East Suffolk, it had been determined that the application should be considered and determined by the Strategic Planning Committee.

When introducing the item, the Chairman referred to the large number of representations and consultation responses received on the application, several of which stated that the proposal should be considered as part of the Sizewell C DCO proposal that was with the Planning Inspectorate.

The Chairman highlighted that this concern was raised with the previous planning application for the proposals to relocate facilities at Sizewell B in 2019, which was determined by the Committee. The 2019 application was subject to a lengthy judicial review process; however, the legal claim was dismissed by the High Court in October 2020 and an application for permission to appeal that decision was rejected by the Court of Appeal in November 2020.

The Chairman said that this validated the decision-making processes of this Committee and referred to the detailed explanation at pages 85 and 86 of the report which explained that why, as with the 2019 application, this new application could be determined by the Committee.

The Committee received a presentation on the application from the Energy Projects Manager, who was acting as the case officer for the application.

The Energy Projects Manager drew the Committee's attention to the update sheet that had been published on 19 January 2021 which made a minor amendment to paragraph 8.2.2 of the report and noted two additional representations received since the report had been written; the representations received outlined similar concerns as the ones set out in the report.

The Energy Projects Manager also noted that members of the Committee had been approached via email by both Together Against Sizewell C (TASC) and a private individual; the Energy Projects Manager stated that the email from TASC had not been sent to officers and the email from the private individual had been received after the cut-off period to be included in the update sheet, as set out in the East Suffolk Council Constitution.

The site's location was outlined; Sizewell B Power Station Complex was located on the coast at Sizewell and was adjacent to the town of Leiston. The power station had been in operation since 1995 and members of the Committee had visited the application site on 2 September 2019 and viewed the operational site, Pillbox Field and Coronation Wood.

The Energy Projects Manager explained that a second site visit had not been proposed due to site visits only being permitted during the COVID-19 pandemic if considered essential; the membership of the Strategic Planning Committee had not changed since the previous site visit and the changes proposed by the new application could clearly be demonstrated via photographs so it had been considered that a site visit was not essential on this occasion.

The Committee received aerial views of the Sizewell Power estate, demonstrating the application site's relationship with the Sizewell A and B sites and the Galloper and Gabbard substations, as well as the location of the former Coronation Wood site. The existing site plan was also displayed.

The Committee was shown a summary of the changes proposed from the approved planning permission (application DC/19/1637/FUL) detailed in the report. The Energy Projects Manager said that the key areas of change were the removal of car parking from Pillbox Field and the removal of one storey from the training centre through a redesign of the building. Other elements of the scheme had also been able to be revised as a result of the laydown area being located on part of the Sizewell A site.

A comparison of the original and proposed plans was displayed. Pillbox Field was now only proposed for landscaping and the laydown area would now be located on part of the Sizewell A site. The existing Sizewell B car park to the north of the site would be used for outage parking and a new operational car park would be created.

The proposed site plan was detailed, including the use of the former Coronation Wood site, the location of the administration and training buildings and the access to car parking zones. A demolition plan was outlined that showed the buildings to the north of the site proposed for demolition. The areas containing Sizewell B facilities to be

relocated for the potential Sizewell C development were also highlighted.

Further detail was provided on the proposed development areas for the former Coronation Wood site including its relationship with the proposed laydown area.

Photographs taken from the roof of the ESB of the former Coronation Wood Site looking south and south west were displayed. Felling had taken place in line with the extant planning permission; one tree remained as it contained a known bat roost and the applicant was in the process of seeking a bat mitigation licence from Natural England to fell this tree. The Energy Projects Manager highlighted the remaining tree belt adjacent to the site.

A block plan, elevations and a computer-generated visualisation for the proposed training centre was displayed.

Parameter plans for the administration and visitor centres, part of the outline planning permission sought, were displayed. The Committee was advised that these plans would be discussed in more detail with the applicant and a more detailed submission would be made under Approval of Reserved Matters applications.

The Committee received an aerial view of Pillbox Field, as well as a drawing showing the extant planning permission on the field. The Energy Projects Manager confirmed that planting on the field had already started to replace the trees lost on the former Coronation Wood site at a 10:1 ratio. The Council's Arboricultural and Landscape Manager had been involved in discharging the replanting condition on Pillbox Field to ensure an appropriate planting mix on the site. The Committee was also shown photographs of the planting that had taken place so far.

Elevations for the proposed outage store were displayed; the design remained unchanged externally from the 2019 consent, however internal changes had been made a basement area was no longer proposed.

An aerial view of the land on the Sizewell A site proposed for the laydown area was displayed. The land was the site of the former National Grid building for Sizewell A; the applicant was negotiating with the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority for use of this land and it was expected that the land would become available within the required timescale.

The details of the proposed car parking were outlined; the replacement car park would provide 579 spaces and the existing west car park would be used for outage parking. A computer generated visualisation of the proposed new car park and its landscape design was displayed.

The recommendation to delegate authority to approve the application to the Head of Planning and Coastal Management was outlined to the Committee.

The Chairman invited questions to the officers.

The reduction of the training centre from two storeys to one storey was confirmed to result in a small increase to the footprint of the building, approximately two metres. In

response to a question on the proposed condition to submit Approval of Reserved Matters applications, the Energy Projects Manager advised that the applicant wanted to discharge any planning permission as soon as possible as construction was estimated to take four and a half years, so it was expected that further applications for reserved matters would be made much sooner than the three-year time limit.

It was confirmed that Councillor Tony Cooper would continue to be the liaison for any developments on the site and further updates would be provided to the Committee at future meetings.

The Energy Projects Manager said that in the event the DCO application for Sizewell C was refused, the development would not be reversed but conditions were proposed to ensure that the land to the north of Sizewell B would be landscaped and brought back to AONB standard.

The Arboricultural and Landscape Manager advised that a mix of trees, shrubs and woodland edge scrub suited to the soil and character of Pillbox Field were being planted, including species such as pine, oak and spindle. Pine species more resistant to red band needle blight had been selected due to the problems in the area with the disease.

In response to question on the situation should the application be refused, the Energy Projects Manager explained that the applicant would still be able to proceed with constructing the extant planning consent, which they had started to do. This would result in a training centre building that would be taller and parking being developed on Pillbox Field; it was the view of officers that it would be more detrimental to the AONB to build out the approved scheme and that any new consent would include a Section 106 Agreement that would ensure that Pillbox Field would not be developed for car parking.

Officers were content that the proposed mitigation met the needs of the surrounding villages.

It was confirmed that the new application did not propose a new access for Pillbox Field; a condition for a pedestrian crossing point at Sizewell Gap Road remained.

The Energy Projects Manager reassured the Committee that it was legally obliged to determine the application before it and was content in that position following the High Court ruling on the 2019 application.

The comments of the Internal Drainage Board, regarding its consent being given prior to determination, would be dealt with by condition.

The Energy Projects Manager explained that although there was a possibility of the land on the Sizewell A site not coming forward, the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority was keen to enable development of former Magnox sites such as Sizewell A and it was hoped that a deal could be reached between the Nuclear Decommissioning Authority and the applicant and if necessary the Council would step in to express its support for the use of the land. The Energy Projects Manager considered that it was not necessary for the Council to do so at this stage and that the applicant had assured

her that legal processes were being pursued to transfer land from one nuclear site to another. The fallback position, should the land not become available, was the Section 106 Agreement to prevent car parking being built out on Pillbox Field.

In response to a question on the timescales for visualisation of planting, the Arboricultural and Landscape Manager noted the difficult planting conditions at Pillbox Field; the applicant remained confident that successful growth could be achieved. Between 300-500 millimetres of growth per year could be expected and between five and seven metres of growth was expected over a 12-year period.

The Chairman invited Ms Kirtley, an objector to the application, to address the Committee.

Ms Kirtley confirmed that she was speaking on behalf of Together Against Sizewell C (TASC) in objection to the application.

Ms Kirtley noted that Coronation Wood had been felled despite significant objections and considered that East Suffolk Council had prematurely approved its destruction to make way for Sizewell C, which was still uncertain. Ms Kirtley said that in EDF Energy's haste to fell Coronation Wood, it had failed to obtain a bat mitigation licence and may not have taken steps to protect small mammals in the wood.

The inclusion of the western access road was considered by TASC to be little to do with the relocation of Sizewell B facilities and was to give access to the Sizewell C site, given there was already road access to Sizewell B. Ms Kirtley was concerned that the creation of the western access road would result in significant heavy traffic movements and place a massive burden on Sizewell Gap Road, which was the single point of access for Sizewell beach and surrounding amenities. Ms Kirtley suggested that, should the western access road be approved, a condition be added to restrict its use for Sizewell B only.

Ms Kirtley expressed concern about earthworks being moved to the Sizewell C site and the flood risk this would create; Ms Kirtley added that soil should not be put on the site without a properly managed translocation procedure for local wildlife.

Ms Kirtley confirmed that TASC was of the opinion that the application should be considered as part of the Sizewell C DCO application process.

The Chairman invited questions to Ms Kirtley.

In response to a question on the comparison between the proposed development and the extant consent Ms Kirtley said that although it was pleasing to see that the car park had been removed from Pillbox Field and that the area would be replanted, TASC continued to have concerns about the negative impacts of the development.

The Chairman invited Mr Jones, agent for the applicant, to address the Committee.

Mr Jones described the application as being of significant importance as it would allow for the earlier relocation of facilities at Sizewell B than if EDF Energy waited until the conclusion of the DCO application process. Mr Jones noted the extant planning

consent in place and the work already undertaken; Coronation Wood had been mostly felled and replacement planting had already begun on Pillbox Field. 2,500 native trees had been chosen for planting that were suited for the conditions and there would be a tenfold increase on what had been lost at Coronation Wood.

Mr Jones said that the proposed scheme had been amended to bring in elements such as a less visible training centre in the AONB and the use of land on the Sizewell A site for the laydown area. Mr Jones stated that doing so allowed for a different way of relocating facilities at Sizewell B and that the outage car parking would no longer be located on Pillbox Field.

Mr Jones highlighted that the elements of work already undertaken under the extant planning consent did not differ in the new application and that the applicant was committed to signing a Section 106 Agreement to prohibit any further work under the existing planning permission once work begins on the new scheme.

The Chairman invited questions to Mr Jones.

Mr Jones explained that the proposed western access road would allow vehicles to access the car parking at the north of the site and would provide straightforward access to both the operational and outage car parks. The western access road was at the lowest elevation of the former Coronation Wood site and would be relatively well screened with planting and retained vegetation. Mr Jones said that the existing access road did link through to the north of the site but did not connect through to the car parks in an appropriate way for the number of vehicles that would access them.

Mr Jones confirmed that the officer recommendation included a condition for future landscaping details and a landscape management plan, which was also included in the extant planning consent, that would need to be signed off by the Council to ensure effective management of the planting at Pillbox Field. Mr Jones said that the layout of the planting had been chosen to ensure that there was no planting immediately south of the pillbox to retain the existing sight lines.

In response to a question on the felling of Coronation Wood prior to the obtaining of a bat mitigation licence, Mr Jones confirmed that a single tree containing a bat roost, and adjacent vegetation, had not been felled and that a cordon had been set up around the area. Mr Jones confirmed that an ecological clerk of works had been appointed and that the tree had been climbed and it had been confirmed that no bats were using the roost. The remaining vegetation would remain in place until the bat mitigation licence was issued.

Mr Jones reiterated the planting being undertaken at Pillbox Field to mitigate the trees lost at Coronation Wood and considered that a conservative estimate of a 90% take up of new planting was not unreasonable.

Mr Jones confirmed that a transport assessment had been undertaken which had concluded that there would be no severe impact on Sizewell Gap Road as a result of the development. There would be a cap on the number of Heavy Goods Vehicle movements per day during the construction period and the application proposed a number of ways to reduce the impact of the development on the highways including a

Construction Management Plan and a travel plan to encourage car sharing.

Mr Jones did not consider that the recent challenges to the economy would affect the progression of the development.

In response to a question on the relocating of earthworks from the former Coronation Wood site to the potential Sizewell C site, Mr Jones explained that this was a result of works to level the former site. The earthworks were being temporarily relocated to the north of Sizewell B and this resulted in an 80 centimetre rise in levels on land within Flood Zone 3a, which would increase flooding during a 1 in 200 year event by approximately three millimetres. Should the DCO application for Sizewell C be approved, the soil would be used as part of that development.

Mr Jones noted the significant amount of land across the Sizewell power estate managed by EDF Energy and highlighted the positive comments from the Arboricultural and Landscape Officer regarding this management.

The Chairman invited Councillor T-J Haworth-Culf, Ward Member for Sizewell, to address the application.

Councillor Haworth-Culf noted that she had been lobbied extensively by email about this application; she was supportive of green energy but considered that it needed to be implemented correctly.

Councillor Haworth-Culf advised that many residents did not feel that they were being listened to by East Suffolk Council and that they relied on the Council to listen to them and take on their views. Councillor Haworth-Culf said that many residents had commented that there was no point having the AONB if it was going to be destroyed by energy projects.

The main concerns raised by Councillor Haworth-Culf related to tourism, access, light, environment and mental health, and she highlighted that residents in Sizewell considered that the application should be part of the DCO application process. Councillor Haworth-Culf said that no amount of mitigation or compensation would adequately fix the problems that would be caused by the development.

Councillor Haworth-Culf said that residents wanted to know that their correspondence was being read and that their views were understood.

The positive impact of the development on the economy and job creation was acknowledged by Councillor Haworth-Culf but considered that the former Coronation Wood site looked awful and could not understand why felling had been started before the bat mitigation licence was granted.

Councillor Haworth-Culf welcomed that Councillor Cooper would continue to be the community liaison.

The Chairman sought clarification from officers regarding the felling of Coronation Wood prior to a bat mitigation licence being granted. The Energy Projects Manager confirmed that the licence application was with Natural England, who hoped to

consider it as soon as possible.

The Chairman invited questions to Councillor Haworth-Culf.

When asked if the application was better or worse than the extant planning consent on the site, Councillor Haworth-Culf said that residents welcomed some improvement but still considered there was too much missing information to make a full decision on the development.

The Chairman invited the Committee to debate the application that was before it.

A member of the Committee, who was also Ward Member for Sizewell, said she understood the tremendously difficult position the Council was in when determining this application; she advised that in representing her constituents she had received numerous letters in objection to developments at the Sizewell power estate.

The Member considered that questions about the proposed development remained unanswered and suggested that this was perhaps indicative of answers not being possible and raised concerns about the development of greenfield land when brownfield land was available. The Member also noted that the review of National Policy Statement EN-6 had been delayed.

The Member concluded her statement by stating that she could not vote in favour of the application as although it was a slight improvement on the extant planning consent it was still not good enough and, in her opinion, should be part of the DCO application process.

Another member of the Committee, who was also Ward Member for Sizewell, stated that the Committee was required to consider the application that was before it and make its decision based on material planning considerations. The Member noted that the application was similar to what had already been approved on this site and this application had been upheld by the courts. The Member was in support of the application and highlighted that Pillbox Field would now be left as a green area with a 10:1 ratio of planting of trees to replace those lost on the Coronation Wood site; he highlighted that Leiston cum Sizewell Town Council had not objected to the application and noted the comments of those bodies consulted on the application.

A member of the Committee considered that planning law could not only be applied when favourable and that the application needed to be looked at objectionably and and dispassionately; he highlighted that the Council was able to determine the application under planning legislation and it would not be appropriate for it to be considered under the National Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) provisions. The Member said it was clear that the new application was preferable to what had already been approved on the site and that the use of land on the Sizewell A site allowed Pillbox Field to remain as a green area. The Member highlighted that, should the DCO application for Sizewell C be approved, the relocation of facilities at Sizewell B could reduce construction time by up to two years.

It was noted by a member of the Committee that although the loss of Coronation Wood was sad, the process was an evolution and that the habitat was changing rather

than being destroyed. The Member said that the tree planting at Pillbox Field would be beneficial and local wildlife would adapt.

Another member of the Committee stated that he had a mixed view on the wider development of the Sizewell power estate. He acknowledged the need for energy generation but was unsure if nuclear power was the only way to meet this need. The Member considered that if this application and the Sizewell C development went ahead it would have a detrimental impact on the AONB and the local community; he was also not confident that the land would not be restored to AONB status should Sizewell C not go ahead. The Member was of the view that the application should be part of the DCO application process and said he would not be supporting the application.

The application was described as "putting the cart before the horse" by a member of the Committee, who was disappointed that the application was not part of the DCO application process. The Member said he would have voted against this application if it was the first one on the site, but acknowledged that if the application was not approved the extant planning consent would result in a development that was not as preferable as the one proposed. The Member stated that he could not support the application but would not oppose it.

Another member of the Committee echoed the concerns of the previous speaker and said that she would be supporting the application but continued to have reservations about the ecological implications of the development.

A member of the Committee highlighted that the Committee was not determining the DCO application but the planning application that was before it before it; he considered that the application contained clear improvements over what had been approved and had addressed the weaknesses in the original application. The Member did not consider there were material planning grounds on which to refuse the application and signalled that he would be voting in favour of it.

Another member of the Committee considered both the report and presentation to have been thorough and considered that the new application provided benefits in a reduced height of the training centre and the removal of the outage car parking from Pillbox Field, and contained contingencies to restore the area to AONB standard should Sizewell C not go ahead. The Member was satisfied with the answers and comments from the applicant on planting at Pillbox Field and was supportive of the application.

Several other members of the Committee spoke in support of the application highlighting the similarities with the approved application, the improvement on the extant planning consent, the removal of parking from Pillbox Field and the additional tree planting there, the improved environmental impact and the economic benefit.

There being no further debate the Chairman moved to the recommendation to delegate authority to approve the application to the Head of Planning and Coastal Management, as set out in the report.

On the proposition of Councillor McCallum, seconded by Councillor Ritchie it was by a majority vote

RESOLVED

That **AUTHORITY TO APPROVE** the application be delegated to the Head of Planning and Coastal Management subject to the signing of a section 106 legal agreement requiring a payment in relation to minor residual impacts on the AONB and ensuring the parking on Pillbox Field approved under DC/19/1637/FUL is not constructed alongside this consent, and the inclusion of appropriate conditions including those detailed below:

1. FULL AND OUTLINE:

The full and outline development to which this permission relates shall be begun no later than:

(a) the expiration of three years from the date of this planning permission,

Reason: To comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2. OUTLINE:

The relevant part of the development as hereby permitted shall not commence until the Reserved Matters of the relevant part of the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and that part of the development shall be carried out and completed in all respects in material compliance with the details so approved before the building(s) are occupied.

Such details shall include:-

- i) Layout;
- ii) Scale;
- iii) Appearance; and
- iv) Landscaping.

Development within the Outline Area shall be carried out and completed in all respects in material compliance with the details so approved.

Reason: These details are required to ensure that a satisfactory development is achieved.

3. FULL AND OUTLINE:

The development shall be carried out in material compliance with the following approved drawing(s) and/or document(s):

Site wide drawings:

- Existing Site Layout Plan SZC-RF0000-XX-000-DRW-100045 Rev.01
- Proposed Site Layout Plan SZC-RF0000-XX-DRW-100046 Rev.01
- Proposed Demolition Plan SZC-RF0000-XX-000DRW-100047 Rev.1

Full component drawings:

- Proposed Outage Store Block Plan SZC-RF0000-XX-000-DRW-100048 Rev.01
- Proposed Outage Store Roof Plan SZC-RF0000-XX-000-DRW-100054 Rev.01
- Proposed Outage Store North Elevation SZC-RF0000-XX-000-DRW-100057 Rev.01
- Proposed Outage Store South Elevation SZC-RF0000-XX-000-DRW-100058 Rev.01
- Proposed Outage Store East Elevation SZC-RF0000-XX-000-DRW-100059 Rev.01
- Proposed Outage Store West Elevation SZC-RF0000-XX-000-DRW-100060 Rev.01
- Proposed Training Centre Block Plan SZC-RF0000-XX-000-DRW-100061 Rev.01
- Proposed Training Centre Roof Plan SZC-RF0000-XX-000-DRW-100065 Rev.01

- Proposed Training Centre North and South Elevations SZC-RF0000-XX-000-DRW-100067 Rev.01
- Proposed Training Centre East and West Elevations SZC-RF0000-XX-000-DRW100068 Rev.01
- Coronation Wood Development Area Proposed Site Plan SZC-RF0000-XX-000-DRW-100070 Rev.01
- Proposed Car Parking Plan SZC-RF0000-XX-000-DRW-100073 Rev.01
- Outage Laydown Area SZC-RF0000-XX-000-DRW-100078 Rev.01
- Proposed Coronation Wood Development Area Landscape Plan – SZCRF0000-XX-DRW-100083 Rev.01
- Proposed Coronation Wood Tree Removal Plan - SZC-RF0000-XX-DRW100085 Rev.01
- Pillbox Field Proposed Landscape Plan - SZC-RF0000-XX-DRW-100088 Rev.01
- Landscape Restoration Plan SZC-RF0000-XX-000-DRW-100087 Rev. 01

Outline component drawings:

- Coronation Wood Development Area Proposed Site Plan SZC-RF0000-XX-000-DRW-100070 Rev.01
- Proposed Visitor Centre Parameter Siting and Height Plan SZC-RF0000-XX000-DRW-100075 Rev.01
- Proposed Administration Building Parameter Siting and Height Plan SZCRF0000-XX-000-DRW-100080 Rev.01
- Proposed Outline Development Zone Parameter Siting Plan SZC-RF0000-XX000-DRW-100077 Rev.01

Supporting documents:

- Design and Access Statement;
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment;
- Arboricultural Method Statement;
- Environmental Statement;
- Shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment;
- Transport Statement; and
- Woodland Management Plan

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

4. FULL AND OUTLINE:

Prior to the commencement of development (other than the Permitted Preparatory Works as defined in Informative 1), a scheme containing the details set out in (i) to (v) below shall be submitted to and approved by the Council.

- (i) The siting, design and external appearance of temporary buildings and structures to be erected and used during the period of construction of the development;
- (ii) Details of vehicular circulation roads, parking, hard-standing, loading and unloading facilities and turning facilities required during the construction of the development;
- (iii) Details of ground levels and heights of all permanent buildings and structures together with cross-sections through the site showing existing and proposed ground levels;
- (iv) Details of the colour, materials and surface finish in respect of vehicular circulation roads, parking, hard standing, loading and unloading facilities and turning facilities on site; and
- (v) Phasing of work.

Reason: To enable the Council to exercise reasonable and proper control over the design

and appearance of the Development.

5. FULL AND OUTLINE

Prior to the above ground construction of any building or structure (other than Permitted Preparatory Works as defined in Informative 1), details of the colour, materials and surface finish in respect of that building or structure shall be submitted to and approved by the Council.

The Development shall thereafter be carried out only in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To enable the Council to exercise reasonable and proper control over the design and appearance of the Development.

6. FULL AND OUTLINE:

Artificial lighting shall only be installed and used in accordance with the approved scheme in accordance with a detailed Lighting Plan to be submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority in tandem with details for each phase of development. No lighting scheme is to be implemented without the approval of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To limit the impact of light spillage during construction on the surrounding environment including the impact on nocturnal species such as bats.

7. FULL AND OUTLINE:

Other than in an emergency or when construction activities are required to be continuous, or if otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority, no heavy goods vehicle traffic, plant, machinery or earth moving equipment associated with the construction of the development shall enter or leave the site on any Sunday or Bank Holiday. On any other day, no such heavy goods vehicle traffic, plant, machinery, or equipment shall enter or leave the site except between the hours of 08:00 and 18:00 Monday to Friday and between the hours of 09:00 and 16:00 on Saturdays other than:

- i) When continuous periods of construction operations are required such as concrete pouring and steel works or;
- ii) For the delivery of abnormal loads to the site or;
- iii) Cases of emergency; or
- iv) If otherwise agreed by the Local Planning Authority.

When such operations or deliveries are required outside of these hours, the Local Planning Authority will be notified at least 36 hours in advance.

Reason: In order to safeguard the amenity of local residents.

8. FULL AND OUTLINE:

All activities associated with the construction of the development shall be carried out in accordance with BS 5228 Parts 1 and 2: 2009+A1:2014 Noise and Vibration Control on Open Sites.

Reason: To enable reasonable and proper control to be exercised over noise during construction activity and in order to safeguard the amenity of local residents.

9. FULL AND OUTLINE:

Prior to the commencement of the relevant part of the development (other than the Permitted Preparatory Works as defined in Informative 1), a schedule of plant items to be used in that part of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To enable reasonable and proper control to be exercised over noise during construction activity and in order to safeguard the amenity of local residents.

10. FULL AND OUTLINE:

External construction work associated with the development shall not take place on the site at any time on any Sunday or Bank Holiday unless continuous periods of construction operations are required such as concrete pouring or erection of steel. On any other day, no external construction work associated with the development shall take place except between the hours of 07:00 and 19:00, unless continuous periods of construction operations are required such as concrete pouring or erection of steel.

When such operations or deliveries are required outside of these hours, the Local Planning Authority will be notified at least 36 hours in advance.

Reason: To enable reasonable and proper control to be exercised over noise during construction activity and in order to safeguard the amenity of local residents.

11. FULL AND OUTLINE:

The commencement of the relevant part of the development shall not take place until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, a scheme for the monitoring of noise and vibration generated during the construction of the relevant part of the Development.

The scheme shall:

- (i) specify the measurement locations from which noise and vibration will be monitored and the maximum permitted levels at each such monitoring location; and
- (ii) make provision for such noise and vibration measurements to be taken as soon as possible following requests by the Local Planning Authority and such measurements shall be given to the Local Planning Authority as soon as they are available.

Levels specified in the approved scheme, shall not be exceeded, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority or in an emergency. In any instance where the noise levels approved are exceeded because of an emergency then the Local Planning Authority shall be provided with a written statement as soon as possible following the relevant exceedance and such statement shall detail the nature of the emergency and the reason why the noise levels could not be observed.

Reason: To enable reasonable and proper control to be exercised over noise during construction activity and in order to safeguard the amenity of local residents.

12. FULL AND OUTLINE:

Prior to the above ground construction of the relevant part of the development (other than Permitted Preparatory Works as identified in Informative 1) a landscape plan including the details set out in (i) to (vii) below shall be submitted to and approved by

the Local Planning Authority.

- i) Planting;
- ii) Management of existing and new planted areas;
- iii) Restoration of areas affected by construction works;
- iv) Details of the height, type, size and species of the shrubs and trees to be planted;
- v) Details of the measures to be taken to create new flora and fauna habitats and of the management of such new habitats;
- vi) Phasing of works included in the scheme; and
- vii) Details of protective fencing.

The approved plan shall be implemented within the first available planting season after the commencement of above ground construction of the relevant part of the development and appropriately managed and maintained for a minimum period of 5 years, any plant or tree dying within that 5 year timeframe will be replaced.

Reason: To ensure proper landscaping for the development and for the protection of semi natural habitats within the development site boundary.

13. FULL AND OUTLINE:

Prior to the commencement of the relevant part of the development (other than Permitted Preparatory Works as defined in Informative 1) a suitably qualified person must have:

- (i) carried out an investigation to assess the degree of ground contamination of the site and identify any resulting need for remedial measures;
- and
- (ii) submitted a written report of the investigation's findings to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that contaminated waste found on the site is disposed of properly.

14. FULL AND OUTLINE:

Contaminated material arising from the construction of the relevant part of the development shall be treated on the site in accordance with a scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Environment Agency, or shall be disposed of to licensed disposal facilities subject to such variations to the approved scheme as have been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that contaminated waste found on the site is disposed of properly.

15. FULL AND OUTLINE:

Prior to the commencement of the relevant part of the development (other than Permitted Preparatory Works as defined in Informative 1) a surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the relevant part of the development and infiltration testing, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in consultation with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority. The scheme shall be implemented, maintained and managed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To prevent the increased risk of flooding, to improve and protect water quality, improve habitat and amenity, and ensure future maintenance of the surface water drainage system.

16. FULL AND OUTLINE:

In the event that Sizewell C Nuclear Power Station is not permitted by the Secretary of State, or not implemented within five years of the development consent order being issued, a scheme of restoration in accordance with details first submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority will occur at the areas previously vacated by Sizewell B buildings and not to be re-used.

The scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing within 18 months of the date of the final decision by the Secretary of State to refuse consent for the Sizewell C Nuclear Power Station (or, if later, the date that any legal challenge to such decision is finally resolved).

All restorative works shall be carried out in accordance with a Restoration Scheme, including a timeframe for the restoration works, in accordance with details first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that development does not occur unnecessarily and to protect the environment.

17. FULL and OUTLINE:

Before the construction of any elements of the hereby approved built development are commenced, a detailed Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), based on the outline CEMP, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Construction of the built elements of the proposal (full and outline) shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved plan.

The Construction and Environmental Management Plan shall include the following matters:

- a) parking and turning for vehicles of site personnel, operatives and visitors;
- b) loading and unloading of plant and materials;
- c) piling techniques;
- d) storage of plant and materials;
- e) provision and use of wheel washing facilities;
- f) programme of site and all associated works such as utilities including details of traffic management necessary to undertake these works;
- g) site working and delivery times;
- h) a communications plan to inform local residents of the program of works;
- i) provision of boundary hoarding and lighting;
- j) details of proposed means of dust suppression;
- k) details of measures to prevent mud from vehicles leaving the site during construction;
- l) haul routes for construction traffic on the highway network;
- m) monitoring and review mechanisms;
- n) details of delivery times to the site during the construction phase (to avoid peak deliveries passing through Stratford St Andrew and Farnham at peak periods);
- o) ecological mitigation measures in relation to noise, vibration, and visual disturbance;

- p) the presence on site of an ecological clerk of works when particularly sensitive areas within the site are being developed (an agreed list of areas can be agreed with the Local Planning Authority for avoidance of doubt);
- q) ecological mitigation measures in relation to impacts from light disturbance;
- r) additional survey work (to ensure that the mitigation is appropriate to conditions at the time of constructions - primarily in relation to outline elements) as required in consultation with the Local Planning Authority;
- s) a revised methodology for relocation of reptiles within the development area;
- t) provision of biodiversity net gain measures at appropriate time scales during the construction works;
- u) vehicle emissions and non-road mobile machinery (NRMM) emissions to be minimised by incorporating best practice control and management measures;
- and
- v) Restriction of site access for members of the public.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety to avoid the hazard caused by mud on the highway and to ensure minimal adverse impact on the public highway during the construction phase, and to ensure the development is carried out in a considerate manner with regards to human and ecological receptors.

18. FULL AND OUTLINE:

No part of the construction works (other than Permitted Preparatory Works as defined in Informative 1) shall commence until emergency plans relating to the construction have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Radiation emergency plans cover the EDF Energy Sizewell B Operators emergency plan and SCC Off Site Emergency Plan issued under Radiation (Emergency Preparedness and Public Information) Regulations. Wider civil contingency arrangements cover Suffolk Resilience Forum emergency plans for identified risks e.g. flooding, that might affect the construction site and any associated infrastructure.

Reason: To ensure the ongoing nuclear safety of the Sizewell B site.

19. FULL AND OUTLINE:

The emergency plans, as required under Condition 18, shall be carried out as approved in relation to the relevant part of the relevant works, unless otherwise agreed after consultation through the Sizewell Emergency Planning Consultative Committee or Suffolk Resilience Forum as appropriate.

Reason: To ensure the ongoing nuclear safety of the Sizewell B site.

20. FULL AND OUTLINE:

No development shall commence until the implementation of a programme of archaeological work has been secured, in accordance with a Written Scheme of Investigation which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme of investigation shall include an assessment of significance and research questions; and:

- a. The programme and methodology of site investigation and recording.
- b. The programme for post investigation assessment.
- c. Provision to be made for analysis of the site investigation and recording.
- d. Provision to be made for publication and dissemination of the analysis and records

of the site investigation.

e. Provision to be made for archive deposition of the analysis and records of the site investigation.

f. Nomination of a competent person or persons/organisation to undertake the works set out within the Written Scheme of Investigation.

The site investigation shall be completed prior to the commencement of development (other than the Permitted Preparatory Works), or in such other phased arrangement, as agreed and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safeguard archaeological assets within the approved development boundary from impacts relating to any groundworks associated with the development scheme and to ensure the proper and timely investigation, recording, reporting and presentation of archaeological assets affected by this development, in accordance with Policy SCLP 11.7 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan 2020 and the NPPF.

21. FULL AND OUTLINE:

None of the buildings hereby approved shall be occupied until the site investigation and post investigation assessment has been completed, submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, in accordance with the programme set out in the Written Scheme of Investigation approved under Condition [20] and the provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results and archive deposition.

Reason: To safeguard archaeological assets within the approved development boundary from impacts relating to any groundworks associated with the development scheme and to ensure the proper and timely investigation, recording, reporting and presentation of archaeological assets affected by this development, in accordance with Policy SCLP 11.7 of the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan 2020 and the NPPF.

22. FULL AND OUTLINE:

The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied until details of all Sustainable Drainage System components and piped networks have been submitted, in an approved form, to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for inclusion on the Lead Local Flood Authority's Flood Risk Asset Register.

Reason: To ensure that the Sustainable Drainage System has been implemented as permitted and that all flood risk assets and their owners are recorded onto the LLFA's statutory flood risk asset register as per s21 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 in order to enable the proper management of flood risk with the county of Suffolk <https://www.suffolk.gov.uk/roads-and-transport/flooding-and-drainage/floodrisk-asset-register/>

23. FULL AND OUTLINE:

No development shall commence (other than Permitted Preparatory Works as defined in Informative 1) until details of a Construction Surface Water Management Plan (CSWMP) detailing how surface water and storm water will be managed on the site during construction (including demolition and site clearance operations) is submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

The CSWMP shall be implemented and thereafter managed and maintained

in accordance with the approved plan for the duration of construction. The approved CSWMP and shall include:

A) Method statements, scaled and dimensioned plans and drawings detailing surface water management proposals to include :-

- i. Temporary drainage systems
- ii. Measures for managing pollution / water quality and protecting controlled waters and watercourses
- iii. Measures for managing any on or offsite flood risk associated with construction

Reason: To ensure the development does not cause increased flood risk, or pollution of watercourses or groundwater.

24. FULL:

As detailed in Chapter 8.7 of the Environmental Statement, a photographic recording of the buildings to be demolished is to be carried out prior to any demolition works on site, this record is to be made available to the Local Planning Authority and lodged with the Suffolk Records Office if required.

Reason: To detail the history of the Sizewell B nuclear power station and to maintain a record of original buildings on the site.

25. FULL:

Within three months of construction commencing (other than Permitted Preparatory Works as defined in Informative 1) a new unmanned safe crossing point is to be provided on Sizewell Gap Road at the junction with Sandy Lane, in a location and to a design to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority in conjunction with the Local Highway Authority.

Reason: In the interest of highway safety to ensure that pedestrians, cyclist and horse riders can safely cross Sizewell Gap Road.

Informatives:

1. Definition to be used in relation to the conditions detailed above (where noted):

"Permitted Preparatory Works" means:

- a. Felling of trees and grubbing out roots;
- b. Exposing of utility services within the site;
- c. Surveys and geotechnical surveys; and
- d. Provision for temporary contractors' facilities necessary for (1) to (4) above within the site.

2. BS 3998: 2010

The applicant should note that the work hereby permitted should be carried out in accordance with good practice as set out in the 'British Standard Recommendation for Tree Work' BS 3998: 2010, or arboricultural techniques where it can be demonstrated to be in the interests of good arboricultural practice.

3. Protected Species:

The applicant should note that under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981) (as amended) and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2017) (as amended), it is an offence to damage or destroy active bird nests; disturb, kill or injure bats or disturb, damage or destroy their roosts and similar protections exist for other protected species. You should note that work hereby granted consent does not override the statutory protection afforded to these species and you are advised to seek expert advice if you suspect that nesting birds, bats and other protected species will be impacted. Likewise, badgers are protected under the Protection of Badgers Act (1992) and if disturbance is likely, a licence may be required from Natural England before any work is undertaken.

4. Under the Environmental Permitting Regulations 2016 for England and Wales you may need an environmental permit for flood risk activities if you want to undertake work in, under, over or within 8 metres of a fluvial main river, flood defence structure or culvert or within 16m of a tidal main river, flood defence structure or culvert. Works beyond 8 or 16 m within the Flood Zone may also require a permit. This is set out in the flood risk activity meaning below. Please note an allowed activity is an activity which has been granted planning permission.

- (g) Any activity (other than an allowed activity) on a flood plain that is-
 - (i) more than 8 metres from a non-tidal main river or more than 16 metres from a tidal main river, or
 - (ii) more than 8 metres from any flood defence structure or culvert on a non-tidal main river or more than 16 metres from any flood defence structure or culvert on a tidal main river; which is likely to divert or obstruct floodwaters, to damage any river control works or to affect drainage.

Application forms and further information can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/flood-risk-activities-environmental-permits>.

5. Pollution Prevention

- i. Given the potential for polluting substances to be stored on the Outage Laydown Area consideration should be given to a valve or penstock in the surface water system that serves this area. In the event of a spillage this would provide a valuable last line of defence in preventing a pollution incident and enabling containment and retrieval of the spillage.

The meeting concluded at 11:28 am

.....
Chairman