BRADWELL SITE LCLC

Minutes of the 78th Local Community Liaison Council (LCLC) meeting

held via Zoom

7.00 pm Wednesday 26 March 2025

ATTENDANCE

LCLC Executive		
Brian Main	-	LCLC Chairman
Cllr John White	-	Deputy Chairman
LCLC Members		
Alan Walker	-	Bradwell/Dungeness/Sizewell A Site Director
James Heavingham	-	Environment Agency
Kayleigh Ridley	-	Communications Lead, NRS
Cllr John Lambert	-	Latchingdon Parish Council
Cllr Andrea Luxford Vaughan	-	Colchester City Council
Cllr Matthew Neall	-	MDC
Cllr John Driver	-	Maldon District Council
Members of the Public		
Cllr John Akker	-	West Mersea Town Council
Linda Gemmill	-	Bradwell BAN
Varrie Blowers		BANNG
Andrew Blowers		BANNG
Ian Clarke		BANNG
SSG Secretariat		
Kim Avery	-	Virtual event host
Charlotte Molyneux	-	Marick

I **Introduction**

3352 The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked new members to introduce themselves.

II **Apologies for Absence**

3353 Received from Paul Burgess of Althorne Parish Council, Gill Winsor of Latchingdon Parish Council and Shirley Swan, member of the public.

III **Approval of the Previous Minutes**

3354 John Akker pointed out that he had been incorrectly noted as a Councillor of Tillingham Parish Council; he was not a councillor at that time, nor from Tillingham. The Chairman noted that, in addition, John Noble was recorded as being a member of the public when, in fact, he had represented Bradwell-on-Sea Parish Council. The minutes were then approved as a true record of the meeting on 2 October 2024.

IV **Matters Arising from the Previous Minutes**

3355 There were no matters arising.

V **NRS Corporate Update**

3356 No representative of the NRS Corporate was present but Alan Walker offered to talk through their presentation as part of his Site Director's report.

VI **Bradwell Site Director's Report**

3357 Alan Walker, Site Director of Bradwell and Sizewell A sites, started by referring to the Government spending review. He stated that NRS sites, excluding Dounreay, had received a one-year settlement of around £540 million, which he said was flat funding and did not allow for inflation. A number of NRS projects had been due to start, which required more funding than was allocated, so some had been paused or slowed down, which may have some minor impact on Bradwell, such as a delay in the receipt of ILW packages from Sizewell A. Final site clearance at Bradwell may be affected by this but elements could be accelerated to keep it on track for the 2070s if more funding became available. The outcome of the spending review should be known in June, enabling us to plan up to the financial year 2029-30.

3358 Regarding Bradwell:

- Safety, compliance and environment: no incidents, accidents nor security issues at Bradwell since the last LCLC meeting. The security exercise (in collaboration with Essex Police) in December had gone well. The Environment Agency had completed a year-long review of management arrangements of the site in Care & Maintenance (C&M). Fly tipping was still an issue. The Bradwell mobilisation had started on 17 March and would run for 15 weeks.
- Waste received and dispatched: one waste package had just been received from Dungeness A. The Interim Storage Facility (ISF) crane had been out of action for a long time, but a new hardware/software system had now been installed.
- Asset and infrastructure care work: outage scheduled for March to June, when the reactor building void defects would be repaired. If the system of repair proves successful, the inspection intervals could be lengthened. 200 compliance and maintenance routines will also be carried out.
- Socio-economic funding: remains at £1.1 million pa, including £6,000 per site for 'Good Neighbour' projects. Three Bradwell projects had been funded to date, totalling £44,953.65. Applications for projects of under £2,000 should be sent to Kayleigh Ridley and for projects over £2,000 to Jessica Dawson. This year support had been given to

the Saltmarsh coast walking festival, U Fest and Maldon District Council's productivity in rural economies project.

3359 John White asked for confirmation that Bradwell mobilisation was about all the things that had to be inspected annually. Alan confirmed this and added that some things need five-yearly inspection.

3360 John also asked whether the Police participation in the December exercise had raised any concerns from members of the public who may have seen it and not known it was an exercise; there were no concerns raised.

3361 Ian Clarke asked for clarification on whether care and maintenance at Bradwell would end after final site clearance or after care and maintenance at Sizewell A has occurred. Alan explained that Dungeness A would be first, then work on Sizewell A would start before Dungeness was finished and Bradwell would start as Sizewell A approaches final site clearance, i.e. when the reactor bio-shield is to be worked on.

3362 Ian then asked what the end of care and maintenance and final site clearance at Bradwell currently looked like, bearing it mind there could be delays at the other sites, possibly due to funding. Alan agreed that there could be delays but, if more funding becomes available, things could move more quickly. Ian asked what dates were envisaged for Bradwell for the end of care and maintenance and the end of final site clearance. **Action: Alan Walker to check and report back**. *Post meeting note - Current forecast is that Bradwell starts Reactor Dismantling and Site Clearance in March 2075 and finishes January 2098. This is subject to change pending the final outcome of the spending review.*

3363 John Akker asked whether Alan would know more in June or July about funding. Alan confirmed that the amount allocated until 2029-30 would be known then, which would allow NRS to make plans, even if it was still flat funding. John asked for information on the situation to be made available in July. Alan stated that there would be no impact on maintenance work at Bradwell in the short term. Once the amount of funding is known, planning can be done to give an overall picture of future work. He would know more by the next LCLC meeting and would then report on any effect on the long-term planning at Bradwell.

3364 Andrew Blowers asked whether there were any signs of deterioration in the cores or elsewhere and how often the situation was being monitored. Alan reported that the pressure vessels were the most robust items on site and that no internal inspections had been done since defueling. External camera inspections during care and maintenance preparations showed no degradation.

VI Nuclear Decommissioning Authority Update

3365 No representative of the NDA was present. The Chairman asked for a report, if one was available, to be circulated after the meeting. **Action: Alan Walker**. *Post meeting note – the NDA report is included in the meeting pack attached to the LCLC invitation emailed Wed 12/03/2025 13:35, pages 8-15.*

VII Environment Agency Site Inspector's Report

3366 James Heavingham reported on his action from the last meeting to look at the flood defences: he pointed out that the EA did not own those defences but was responsible for maintaining them. Such assets were given a score of between 1 (excellent) and 5 (bad) plus a target score of how it should be maintained, based on the associated risk. The defences around Bradwell had been given a target score of 3 (fair) and all were rated as fair, apart from a 200 metre-long stretch to the north-west of the site, which was rated as 4 (needs improvement). The next survey would take place on 24 May 2025, when an improvement and repair plan would be put together.

3367 Ian Clarke asked how the risks from climate change, sea surges, etc were accommodated and were they included in the current assessment or for the future? James stated that climate change was considered when considering the risk of the asset failing but it was not considered as far ahead as the end of the century. **Action: James to find out how far ahead this is considered**. This would be reassessed every few years and the Bradwell assessment is done annually.

3368 John Akker was concerned about the impact of sea level and surges in the North Sea, and asked James to find out what authorities the assessments are based on to assess future risks. John was concerned that there were significant changes occurring on the Blackwater. James would attempt to find that out before the end of the meeting but stated that predictions were currently based on work done in 2018. John offered to have a conversation with the EA directly, if it would help. **Action: James to relay this offer to his colleagues**.

3369 Andrew Blowers suggested that a presentation to the LCLC on coastal change and climate change impacts would be helpful. He wondered how far the EA's site management plan tied in with this discussion about the state of the defences. He felt that a report on climatic changes and their effects on site management and predictions would be useful. The Chairman concurred. **Action: James to follow up and to ask a representative of the EA's flood defence team to report to the LCLC**, even though this was more than just a Bradwell site issue.

James asked for LCLC members to put together a list of questions they would like answered around the risks of coastal flooding. **Action: Andrew Blowers, Ian Clarke and John Akker to create and send a list to the Chairman and the secretariat** so it could be taken further with James.

3370 The EA continued to hold monthly meetings with the Sizewell A staff who looked after Bradwell. There had been no major issues but fly tipping was a concern. Regarding compliance: the long-term care and maintenance review had been completed, which had checked that assumptions made when Bradwell first went into care and maintenance were still valid. A summary report would be prepared.

The only issue that was not as originally assumed was the rate of ground water ingress into the waste vaults, which had increased. The EA will work with NRS on this issue, which was likely to worsen as climate change leads to an increase in ground water.

3371 The RIFE (Radioactivity in Food and Environment) report had been published in November 2024 for the year 2023. For Bradwell, the dose for a representative person was unchanged from the previous year and was less than 1% of the Government limit.

3372 Linda Gemmill asked for clarification on the water ingress issue and whether "waste vaults" meant the intermediate waste storage facility. James explained that there was no water ingress into the reactor voids but there was into the waste voids. Linda asked whether water getting in could get out again and Alan Walker responded that it could not.

3373 Linda also asked about the discharge from the rainwater drain and the "small increase to the standard reporting values": what was its nature – was it water or something else? James explained that there were limits for radioactivity on the permit for surface water discharge and standard reporting values were used, which were an average of measured discharge, reviewed regularly. The reported slight increase was on the figures in the review of 2020 and was not indicative of increased discharge, more of a fluctuation in measurement values.

3374 Ian Clarke asked whether the waste vaults were decontaminated to the extent that the ingressing water was not active. Alan Walker stated that there would be traces in the water from the vault surfaces and a sampling campaign was monitoring the water. He emphasised that the amount of water ingress was very low, and James noted that it had been expected in the care and maintenance plans.

VIII **<u>Any Other Business</u>**

3375 Andrew Blowers suggested a change to the constitution: that the category of Voting Member shall be extended to representatives of Residents' Associations, Farming Representatives, Community and Environmental Groups etc. All other categories shall be non-voting and in attendance. Observers, by agreement of the Chairman are members of the public and the Press.

Andrew explained his reasoning: that the current constitution did not reflect our membership. He stated groups such as those stated above should be moved to the voting category as they have a role to play and might as well participate fully. He expected this to result in little change, as votes were rare and generally passed by assent, and that such groups should not have a subordinate categorisation.

3376 John Akker supported this recommendation and would encourage more people to participate. Linda Gemmill also supported it and said that Bradwell Action Network would like to be formal members of the group.

Andrew felt it would be useful to identify who the members actually were as some were active and some not. Each group should have one full member representative, and others could attend as observers, if they wished. He felt that we did not really know who our membership was because many people did not attend meetings.

Matthew Neall said he would like clarity on who the current voting members were and supported Andrew's recommendation.

3377 The Chairman asked those present whether they felt any disadvantage at all, as a non-voting member, in relation to our communications. He pointed out that we only vote on two issues: election of the Chair and Vice-Chair and changes to the constitution. No-one did; and the Chairman gave his view that voting members should be democratically elected. Owing to some instances of misrepresentation in the past, he was concerned about the legitimacy and real representation of significant groups. He felt that giving a vote on the election of the Chair and on the constitution to all groups would not be right.

Andrew Blowers believed that these points were covered in the constitution and thought that no groups who might be deemed 'illegitimate' would gain membership. Members should be identified so we know where they come from; however, the Chairman felt that the terms in the constitution were very broad and that council representatives had already been elected by large numbers of members of the public and therefore represented all views and groups.

3378 The Chairman suggested that this matter should be considered further and not voted on in the current meeting; an AGM would be a more appropriate forum for such a vote. He felt that the current situation facilitated discussion with any and all people and groups as anyone was entitled to attend and participate.

The Chairman proposed that this matter be put on the agenda of the AGM, which should be held at the next meeting.

3379 John White expressed disappointment that Bill Hamilton and John MacNamara were not present to represent the NDA, as these meetings were an opportunity for members of the public to communicate with them. **Action: SSG Secretariat to convey this message**.

3380 Andrea Luxford Vaughan said it would be useful for attendees at LCLC meetings to put their full name and who they represent as their username so everyone would understand who was present. It was explained that attendees could right-click on their name on the screen and input their name as they wished it to appear.

Matthew Neall suggested that everyone introduce themselves at the beginning of each meeting, to save needing to change names.

3381 The Chairman noted that meetings had changed from a morning slot to an evening one and asked if anyone found this difficult as it made the working day long for those representing corporate organisations but, on the other hand, enabled members of the public to attend. No-one had a problem with the evening slot, so it would remain. The next meeting would be on 24 September 2025.

There being no further business, the Chairman closed the meeting.