

**At a meeting of the LEISTON-cum-SIZEWELL TOWN COUNCIL  
held in the COMMUNITY CENTRE, King Georges Avenue, Leiston, on TUESDAY,  
7<sup>th</sup> August 2007, at 7.30 p.m.**

**PRESENT**

**Councillor Mrs A. V. Nunn (in the chair)**  
**Councillor D. Bailey**  
**Councillor B. A. Barnes**  
**Councillor A.M Cooper**  
**Councillor J. L. Geater**  
**Councillor T. E. Hodgson**  
**Councillor F. R. Huxley**  
**Councillor J. Morrissey**  
**Councillor A J Nunn**

- 47. Minutes.** It was proposed by Cllr Huxley, seconded by Cllr Cooper and agreed that, with the venue correctly minuted as the Council Chambers, the minutes for the meeting of 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2007 be signed as a true record.
- 48. Apologies.** Apologies were received and accepted on behalf of Cllr Mrs Geater, Cllr Boast, Cllr Hawkins, Cllr Howard, Cllr Ginger and Cllr Blowers.

It was proposed by Cllr Huxley, seconded by Cllr Cooper and agreed that Standing Orders be suspended to allow Mr Boydton to address the meeting and to allow public participation.

- 49. Mr Frans Boydton.** The Chairman welcomed and introduced Mr Frans Boydton and Mr Tim Allmark from the Nuclear Installation Inspectorate of the Health and Safety Executive. Last year, members were informed that the population limit specified in the “remote site” criteria used for nuclear installations applicable to Leiston had been exceeded and, consequently, the NII began advising against new builds in the town when they were consulted by the planning authority (SCDC). Members were content that this was a sensible step to take to ensure the safety of Leiston’s residents. Early this year though members were informed that the NII had changed the parameters and new builds would again be allowed. Mr Boydton was asked to come and explain to members what was behind the decision and to just clarify the current position vis-à-vis population limits etc.
- Mr Boydton explained how the government (Department for Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform [DBERR] – formerly Dti) was responsible for setting the policy for siting criteria and that the NII just advised on that policy. The current limits are based on a Hansard entry from 1988. The licence holders on the sites are responsible for the safety cases and on-site emergency plans (off-site emergency plans are the responsibility of the Local Authority) and, the NII are the regulators who ensure that the licence holders do this effectively. With regard to the demographic limits included in the current siting criteria; these were based on a worst case scenario happening which was agreed to be a radioactive iodine cloud escaping from the reactor and the need to evacuate residents fairly quickly from near the site. In this respect an operating Magnox reactor (Sizewell A) was more of a risk than Sizewell B (PWR) as Sizewell B had a containment building around the reactor which would also have to be breached for this cloud to escape – the Magnox reactors have no containment. When the criteria was applied to Sizewell as a whole the more restrictive numbers for the Magnox reactor were applied and it was also agreed that, initially, as there had been no previous UK experience of PWR, these should apply to Sizewell B as well. The objections the NII had been making to planning applications were based on the demographic limits and not how that increase in population affected emergency plans, this had to be assessed and reported on by the site license holders and the Local Authority. Basically, if the license holder said they were happy with the planning application and that their and the Local Authority’s emergency plans catered adequately for the increase in population then the NII were content – they were just concerned that a government produced demographic limitation had been reached and their job was to advise upon that policy.
- Once Sizewell A shut down however there was no possibility of this worst case accident happening therefore, although there was no mention in the limits for a “decommissioned” site, it was felt by NII that a relaxation on the criteria could be made bearing in mind that the situation the criteria was based upon could not now happen. It was also felt that, after 10 years of operation at Sizewell B of a PWR, plus accumulated worldwide experience and the fact that a containment building was now de rigour for all nuclear installations, it was considered that the application of Magnox limits to Sizewell B could also be relaxed. This led to a relaxation on the limits and the consequent lifting of objections to any planning applications presented for Leiston prior to December 2006. NII continue to apply the relaxed policy on a case by case basis.
- Members and the public asked many questions and, although Mr Boydton, had no authority for the emergency plans, he was however able to report that he had been to see Mr Topliss (Emergency Planning Officer) that very afternoon and that Mr Topliss had stated quite categorically that he was also now confident that evacuation plans were

sufficient for the current (and increasing) population and was only really concerned about a lack of clarity regarding timing and availability of Potassium Iodate tablet distribution (which he was currently addressing). Members were slightly concerned that this seemed to be a shift of position by Mr Topliss but couldn't take that any further as he wasn't present.

Overall, members were satisfied that the apparent differences of opinion with regard to population limits that had emerged over the last 12 months had now been satisfactorily and logically explained. They were also reassured that the government (DBERR) were currently carrying out a strategic siting consultation (with all the inherent demographic considerations) for future builds and ongoing use of current nuclear installations. Mr Boydon stated that this would be based on actual risk assessments rather than the more evolutionary figures that had been decided upon previously and that they hopefully would be much clearer to understand than those that were currently being pragmatically interpreted to suit the varying conditions.

On completion of the talk and questions the meeting took a short break before resuming at 8.53pm to complete business.

## 50. Planning.

- a. **C07/1306/FUL – Erection of one two-storey detached cottage and construction of vehicular access in part garden of 40 Carr Avenue, Leiston.** Members were extremely concerned about the impact this development would have on the local environment vis-à-vis on street parking. The amenity of the residents in Carr Avenue has become almost intolerable when it comes to finding on street parking and this would unacceptably exacerbate the situation. The provision of an off street space for one car for No 40 and one for the new build is woefully inadequate. Family homes regularly and almost invariably have two cars. Carr Avenue cannot absorb this and there is deep concern about emergency vehicle access to this cul de sac already.

**RECOMMEND REFUSAL**

- b. **C07/1335/FUL – Erection of 3 two-bed dwellings on land in Orchard Road, Leiston.** Members were concerned that any more development in Orchard Road would increase the amount of traffic using the dangerous and unsuitable exit onto Kings Road. They also felt that the site in question was being overcrowded by trying to fit three houses onto it. Overall they felt that the infrastructure did not support three houses – two would be all that could be recommended.

**RECOMMEND REFUSAL**

- c. **C07/1117/FUL – Erection of smoking shelter at the Sizewell Sports and Social Club, King Georges Avenue, Leiston.**

**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

During the above item Cllr Hodgson, Cllr Cooper and Cllr Bailey declared an interest, remained in the room but took no part in the discussion or vote.

- d. **C07/1309/FUL – Construction of vehicular access (revised scheme) at 45 Abbey Road, Leiston.**

**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

- e. **C07/1242/FUL – Erection of front and rear extensions and replacement garage at 11 Southfield Drive, Leiston.**

**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

During the above item Cllr Bailey declared an interest, remained in the room but took no part in the discussion or vote.

- f. **C07/1245/FUL – Improvement to access at 124 King George Avenue, Leiston.**

**RECOMMEND APPROVAL**

- g. **C07/1367/FUL – Erection of two semi-detached houses and one detached bungalow including the formation of a car parking space to the north of 20 St Margaret's Crescent (demolition of lock-up garages) (revised scheme) on land to rear of 8-18 St Margaret's Crescent, Leiston.** Members were still very concerned at the loss of 26 garages. They felt that, if nothing else, the garages could be demolished and marked parking bays be laid out which would ease the atrocious parking problems in St Margaret's Crescent at a stroke. Instead, the erection of three residences on the site would exacerbate this problem. Purely on a planning issue though members felt that this proposal was an unacceptable backyard development and should be refused.

**51. Questions to the Chairman.**

- a. The Chairman asked members for their opinions on the two designs the Clerk had received for a Chairman's Badge of Office. The general consensus was very favourable. Everyone felt that the Long Shop and engine were depicted very well and that the Avocet in the foreground was also well placed. Sizewell was represented by sand and sea and the Abbey on the chain's central link was a very nice touch too. Cllr Huxley suggested that Mr Mael was consulted on accuracy just as a precaution. (post meeting note: Stephen thought the engine looked very much like the Princess Marina).

There being no more business the meeting finished at 9.30pm.

----- Chair

----- Dated