

# TEXT\_SizewellC\_Prelim1\_Session3\_2303202

1

Tue, 3/23 3:44PM • 1:20:03

00:01

Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome back to the Sizewell C. Project preliminary meeting part one, I hope you enjoyed your lunch. Just before we resumed with item four, we had a request from the eastern England ambulance service to participate at this point because they have an urgent operational matter they need to attend to. So with that, can I hear from them now, please?

00:32

Thank you very much, Mr. Humphrey. My name is Gita Prasad and I'm the Deputy Director of Business and partnerships from the East of England ambulance service. Thank you very much for the opportunity to address today's preliminary examination meeting. As we stated earlier, we are known as East and we submitted the section 56 relevant representations and responded to the applicants proposed changes consultation in September and December of 2020, respectively. These submissions, advise that any implementation of the project would have a significant effect upon our service, which we would wish to see appropriately mitigated through section 106. Funding for staff under state assets to deliver additional emergency ambulances. We would also request participation in community safety, health and transport working groups, and strategic relationship protocols as necessary. We are already preparing an evidence base in the form of an activity impact model to determine the level of education required, which will be submitted to the examination process in due course, with a view to agreeing a statement of common ground and draft section 106 terms with the applicants as soon as practicable. As previously advised by our planning agent, LPP in an email communicate to the applicants and pins on the 15th of January 2021. East is continuing to experience unprecedented demand for its services due to the coronavirus pandemic. The trust continues to operate under pressure and directly reviews the level of demand within the national resource escalatory Action Plan known as the weep framework, staff and resources have been redeployed to areas of critical functions with a focus on delivering frontline operations and patient care. In addition from January 2021 is three deployments of staff and resources to implement the critically urgent national vaccination programme has placed further pressure on an already overstretched system is the ability to meet the procedural decisions and timelines set out in the draft examination timetable for providing summaries of evidence. written responses, statements of common grounds and issue specific hearings is therefore greatly hampered by the pandemic and not realistically achievable. East does of course, appreciate that examination authority has a duty to conclude the examination process within a six month period from the close of the preliminary meeting, and will certainly use its best endeavours to meet appropriate timetables, timelines to exist, the examination process. With this in mind, it is requested that the scheduling of the examination takes the unique and extremely challenging position that is to find itself in into account by agreeing to extend the procedural deadlines for its impact evidence. The related things of common

ground and draft section 106 agreement work. Easter also requests special dispensation to preclude it from any potential unreasonable behaviour or award of costs claims arising from extended timelines required to submit evidence and continued statements of common ground and section 106 had some terms of agreement with the applicant in light of the effects of the coronavirus pandemic, upon east and following consultation with our Commissioner, who are in support of this approach, we request that the procedural deadlines are extended as follows until the 12th of may 2021 for submission of its evidence, incorporating an activity impact model until the 23rd of July 2021. Two submittal for submission of an initial statements of common ground with the applicant and cooperating draft section 106 heads of terms agreement for the evidence on highways and transportation effects. East is content to concur with the position adopted by certain other interested parties, such as Suffolk Constabulary and Suffolk County Council as the Highway Authority to help expedite to the statements of Common Ground process is evidence concerning effects on the highway network. is therefore likely to be reflected in the statements of common ground to be prepared by Suffolk Constabulary and Suffolk County Council highways as appropriate, which can be banned in due course. Thank you. And I'm now concluded for the purpose of this agenda item.

05:15

Thank you. Could you just bear with me a minute while just checking the panel members have a question for you. Thank you, Mr.

05:23

Chair. Thank you, Mr. Prasad,

05:24

very much for that submission.

05:29

When I was talking earlier to miss Lawson, I suggested

05:34

to we deal with that item six. It's really useful to have actually, the heads up now.

05:39

But is it okay to you?

05:40

If I spend some time?

05:43

We got a couple of us

05:44

thinking, thinking about what you said,

05:45

and then discuss it through with Mr. Lawson later

05:48

when we get to item six.

05:52

Yes, thank you, that would be acceptable.

05:54

Thank you very much.

05:55

It gets good.

05:59

Thank you. All. Right. Moving back to agenda item. Agenda item four couldn't now hear.

06:06

Humphrey, can you just put your microphone down account here?

06:09

All right.

06:12

Sorry about that. Okay, returning to agenda item four. Could we now hear from Nigel Hiley Saxmundham town council please.

06:28

Thank you, sir. Just trying to turn my camera on. It says a specific issues that we wish the planning Inspectorate to address and this inquiry are first off the overnight rail movements through the middle of our town and, and the noise and vibration issues that will be connected with those. And we would specifically request a site visit from the examining team. So they can actually see for themselves, the level of disturbance that will be caused within the town over a period of up to 10 or 12 years. Secondly, we would wish you to address the issue of the availability of rental and owned properties within the town. The EDF per se they are looking at around over 200 Sizewell workers and their families are moving to a town which has already a shortage of both rental and roll ownership property. And so we wish you to address the impact that that would have on prices and rents within the town and mitigation that would be taken to address that. We would like Additionally, some time to be spent on the increased local transport for running through the town, which already at peak times, such as school out and in the morning is significant. But build up of traffic the specifically at the traffic lights in the middle of the town. Saxmundham also has tourist industry, we have a caravan park and

08:35

our

08:37

four focuses within the town. And we would like the impact of the size we'll see construction on tourism to be to be addressed. And I think that that concludes what I'd like to say but we did. We did put in other issues as well in our written submission.

09:05

Thank you very much Mr. Hiley. So could we now move on to Robin's Thunders of Woodbridge town council please. Hello, good

09:16

afternoon. Thank you for calling me on rep will resign Council and the issues that are objecting want to bring in our with respect to the scope of some of the issues of specific hearings. And I will start with the noise and vibration one that it should examine some of the fundamental assumptions and factual basis of the noise assessments along the East Suffolk lines, particularly through Woodbridge and from their premise of the noise and vibration survey for the assessment. We have concerns that some of these fundamental assumptions are incorrect and therefore completely affect the assessment. This would obviously impact on Proposed mitigation measures which currently are little. Moving on to from there, it's really into the scope of the issue specific carrying on air quality. And we would request that this also examines the impact of rail freight option, as the assumptions adopted, we think are maybe incorrect would impact on air quality in Woodbridge and other populations in urban areas along the East Suffolk line. And therefore, we'd like that scope to cover the air quality in those urban areas in particular, Woodbridge the scope of the issues specific hearing on biodiversity and ecology, terrestrial and marine, we feel should also consider the impact of the rail proposals, particularly the noise on the adjacent table Valley ramps RNs, pa which are very close to the railway line through this area, and specifically relates back to the guidance in the 2019 planning, practice guidance or noise which specifically requests assessment of noise on those sorts of sites. Moving on from there, and related to this, this this scope of the ISH, on health and well being. This should examine the most appropriate methodology for assessment of impact in relation to noise and vibration. Currently, the 2018 who gardens on environmental noise for the European region is being considered by the government has been written into being considered for railway noise in specific in a 2019 def republication and has not been considered in any of the evidence provided by the applicant in this case. Those are the principal issues that we wish to raise the one other issue which has been raised by others, particularly Wickham market, we should also like to raise is regarding cruelty impact through Woodbridge itself, with any diversion traffic when there are any disruption to the traffic, and Jude between Woodbridge and the southern park and ride, we are the primary diversion route, and no consideration seats have been given to how that will impact on the time. Thank you very much.

12:27

Thank you, Councillor Sanders. Okay, moving on now to Paul Collins of Minsmere level stakeholder group, please.

12:39

Thank you for letting me speak on this item. We're very pleased that the let me just move that over here. It's it. The original DCO

12:52

One moment, Mr. Collins, Councillor Sanders, could you turn the camera on your microphone off, please? Thank you continue.

13:02

Sorry. Yeah. with reference to the original DCO application. We're pleased that you've now while actually following I suppose the changes that have been proposed by EDF to include coastal geomorphology, the soft coastal defence and the beach Landing Facility as requiring separate considerations as additions to the principal issues. The Hard and Soft coastal defences indeed critical safety issue for the integrity of the site of over for over 140 years or more, and this development will present size well. And I'm sure that this is an issue that the office for nuclear regulation are well aware of in their consideration of their site licence application. Unfortunately, none of this can be assessed because no design has been presented at any time during the for consultations. And in this DCR submission, given the potential impact of the structure to the Suffolk coastline, and its continuing emission from any consultation or application documents, we are surprised that today no request has been made by the examination panel to rectify this admission, as part of the acceptance of the development consent order for the examination, unlike the changes proposed and to be considered the next in the next agenda section in item five. We request that the dcl design used for modelling impacts and the results of that modelling by the applicant be made available immediately for assessment when the start of the six month statutory examination did period be delayed to allow interested party assessment? It's not it is not understood as to why we can have modelling impacts quoted at us when we have no designed to assess it against this it seems to be a complete misuse of the process. Thank you.

14:55

Thank you, Mr. Collins. Can we now move To Alison downs of stop signs well see, please.

15:06

Thank you, Mr. Humphrey. And in this agenda item I'm speaking not only on behalf of my organization stop Sizewell C but on behalf of William Kendall, Steven Beaumont, Henry Coan, Sue Osborne, Nigel Smith, Maryland Hans, Neil Cool. John Walton. Glen asking hell, Charles Mack down burfield clarity Ivan Morales, Sheila Galpin in Galloway and Bridget Chadwick. And like other speakers, we're grateful for your consideration to include coastal geomorphology and community impacts for issues specific hearings. We'd like assurances the following issues will be included in the scope of the issue specific hearings that you've identified, and the previous speaker said specific consideration of the sea defences. Under climate change. We would very much like specific consideration under the carbon footprint of the project's lifecycle assessment of carbon emissions, and the contribution of the project to the UK is net zero targets. We consider this to be especially important as EDF has never placed its calculations to support its claimed lifecycle assessment to get in the public domain. Indeed, this was also the case that the Hinkley Point C inquiry, the planning Inspectorate never received that documentation which was referenced in the application, under policy and need, and we consider very

important here that financing questions are considered not just under the issue specific hearing you're suggesting on compulsory acquisition, you'll be very aware that the applicant has made it absolutely clear that unlike Hinkley Point C it's not in a position to finance this project itself, which leads to great uncertainty, and it is the great fear of local people that the project could be started but never completed. So the financing side of things is extremely important. Also under policy or need or under alternatives, and we urge you to examine the applicants case for a ropery imperative reasons of overriding public interest, and specifically, what consideration alternative cites the applicant has made. as other speakers noted, the energy national policy statements are currently being reviewed and we consider that that review should also be taken into your consideration under marine ecology and fisheries with port mentioned by the council's of can reconsidering the cooling systems for this project, and also the implications of EDS lack of proposing an acoustic fish deterrent, which you may be aware they're seeking to withdraw from their Hinkley Point C project. And under air quality and soil, under air quality or under agriculture and soils. We urge you to consider the effect of EDS proposals for quarries or borrow pits and large spoil heaps on the neighbouring community. Thank you.

18:01

Thank you very much. Mrs. Downes. Could I now move on to Rachel Fulcher of coastal Friends of the Earth please?

18:16

Thank you. Hello. My live

18:30

we can't hear you. Oh.

18:34

Shall I just go ahead anyway,

18:35

if you if you don't want to.

18:37

Oh. Okay, I think it's all Yes, we just have a few points we'd like to make. Yes, I'm Rachel Fulcher, of Suffolk coastal Friends of the Earth. Under alternative. We'd like to see material the lack of alternative ie where none have been put forward by EDF, not just the considerations of routes, locations, design, etc. Under the biodiversity and ecology, you list the designated site, the European the SSSIs themselves, but not the county wildlife site. We'd like to suggest that they are explicitly mentioned perhaps under the weight to be given to local interests, because two of these are very, very high risk. Also, our members are very concerned about the small mammals, which have been scoped out by EDF in particular those that are protected under the wildlife and countryside act or the ACT and they may not be Suffolk priority species. They wouldn't necessarily come under that category. We want to be sure that they will be included in the examination. And we'd like to support Joe Girling requests that geology into this. And within that, the question of peat extraction and transportation, because as soon as it is extracted, it will be highly acidic and could be a severe risk to the adjacent designated site. Thank you.

20:36

Thank you very much. And now, could I hear from Mr. Chris Wilson of together against Sizewell C, please.

20:47

Hello, I'm Chris Wilson. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak today on behalf of task quest together again so I see and our supporters tasks would like to mention a number of issues that we believe should be included in the examining authorities list principle issues, as well as suggesting other matters that could warrant inclusion on real issues.

21:10

interrupt you a second is your camera on Mr. Wilson?

21:15

just double check Hold on a second place. is telling me it Yeah. My computer is telling me my camera is on

21:31

my end, I'm not seeing it, but I can't hear you. So please carry on.

21:37

Sorry, tasks would like to mention a number of issues that we believe should be included in the authorities list of principal issues, as well as suggesting other matters that warrant inclusion under the principle issues headings currently set out in annex c There are six letter regarding additional principal issues TAs would like the examiner authority to consider the following. Due to the large number of matters that need to be considered under ecology and biodiversity heading. Task Li the terrestrial marine should perhaps be treated as separate principle issues. The Marine ecology and biodiversity heading should include the impact on all fish and marine biota. Presently only migratory fish eels and mammals are mentioned in your list. And in for all aspects of the development specifically including the potential impacts of the cooling water system, and the sewerage output from the development site. Under terrestrial ecology and biodiversity, we like to see this include the impacts on the county wildlife sites as Fauci just mentioned, as well as assessment on the cumulative loss of trees and hedgerows. We would also like to see the access road including the triple si crossing the road up from the beach treated as a separate principal issue because of the major impacts. This will have on the local environment list including examination have access to the site in the early years of the project. Task also consider the suitability of the licence site should be examined as a principal issue covering such matters the geology and land quality of the entire licence site, the adequacy of the size of the site to accommodate all the buildings and structures required. After all, no detailed plans or decent map showing grid lines appear to have been provided by the applicant as yet. Task would also like to see adequacy of electricity transmission lines and implications for the stability of the National Grid treated as print principle issue. This references the cumulative requirements, the wind farm size will be interconnectors with size we'll see and considers the potentially destabilise sorry destabilising high output from each size we'll see EPR reactor task would also like to see the suitability of the developer

and operator to be identified as a principal issue, which would cover such matters as the competence of the developer security risk of the Chinese government control partner, unproven nature of the European EPR design for review of the funding statement as we're aware, as Mrs. Down said a little while ago, that the main partner EDF has major financial problems, and admitted they do not have the funds available to build title See, and this should incorporate a review of the value for money assessment. We'd also let's see emergency planning examined as a principal issue. So this is looked at now rather than left until sighs we'll see is almost ready for operation and common with others we'd like to see potable water and non potable water as a principal issue because we pray that it's very important for this area. And we'd like the exam this examination to cover the entire period of operation at the moment you just mentioned during the construction period. also like to see a separate principal issue, which I've called exit strategies, which basically would examine the timeline for completion and restoration of the main and associated development sites after construction operation sees

25:18

it as well as cutting. Just one second. Mr. Jones, could you please turn the camera off, please?

25:25

Oh, I'm so sorry.

25:27

On your microphone. Thank you continue

25:34

to come back on so they

25:37

Okay, yeah, so exit strategies. See as

25:53

Mr. Wilson, your microphone is muted. I'm sorry. We're not picking up your where you resumed

26:01

just as connecting on mine.

26:04

I could see him but he's still muted.

26:08

You okay, now, can you hear me? Yes. Okay. Thank

26:10

you very much.

26:11



Thank you.

26:12

Thank you.

26:16

So, I have to find where I was. Yes. So in terms of tight timeline for clearing up the main and associated development sites after construct construction operation cease, who would like to say this, including an examination of level of penalties for any overruns, as all these projects never seem to happen when they should do it a full assessment of decommissioning including its carbon footprint, and the finances available to meet all the decommissioning costs. And we don't see plans for restoration of the licence site after it's used I once spent fuel leaves the site. In terms of other matters that we'd like to see sort of listed under the principal issues are currently sent set out in annex C, the rule six letter. Under air quality, we'd like to see inclusion of the impact on all the designated sites, the wildlife sites, and the climate change and resilience task, we'll be pleased to see the assessment cover the full period of interim waste storage, not just for the period of operation, and for the carbon footprint to include a transparent bespoke assessment of the full lifecycle calculations. The entire Sizewell C development, as well as examination of whether this project will actually help meet the government's 2050 carbon targets. For radiological considerations we'd like to see this include lack of consultation with local residents regarding plans for Sizewell C to be a nuclear waste or an indefinite period. assessment of the risk that a GDF is never found to store the radioactive waste and consideration of the lack of proven storage medium, the spent fuel cell disposal in a GDF anyway. There are two flood risk assessment of the size we'll see development play the should be expanded to include its potential impact, particularly in relation to the Heartsea defences on residents, businesses and landowners throughout the Suffolk, including the examination of who would be held liable for any damage that could be caused as a result of this project. Would it be the developer operator owner, investors, the government, under policy in need, excuse me a second. On the policy and need be this should include a review of how the project meets the aims of meeting the government's 25 year plan on the environment, the praises of sustainability, the 2017 scoping report, of the size will see site written ministerial statement that's been referred to on page three of the rule six letter and meeting the requirements of the Energy Act. Apologies is something that obviously overlaps how other people but I guess that happens when you come into the scene a bit later. Thank you.

29:09

Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Wilson. Okay, at that point has gone through all of the organisations that wanted to speak to so now it could go to people want to put their hands up and I see a few people have put their hands up to say at this point, I'm having a bit of a problem. I can't see any video at my end. But I assume it's still working. All right. If the case team could just confirm that for me.

29:38

Yes, that's fine. Mr. Humphrey, we can see you fine.

29:41

Okay, I'll carry on. And so the first hand I've got up would be Alan Hatt, who's had his hand up for a while I think.

29:55

Thank you.

29:59

Yeah. Cameras on. I'm Alan Hatt, retired mechanical projecting here and I live at Theberton adjacent to the B1122. And this is a letter received on myself and the number of the neighbours on November the eighth 2018 from Sizewell from EDF energy, it says, as part of this DCO process EDF energy wish to identify those parties who have an interest in and all rights over land and property potentially affected by the project. This process is known as land referencing, or you missed it pulled expressions of interest. And I request that these those people that are affected by such land references be subject to the same treatment by PINS as those unfortunate enough to be under a further order of compulsory purchase.

31:02

Okay, thank you, Mr. Hatt.

31:05

I have

31:06

also put that in your written submission to you.

31:09

That's very good. Thank you. Thank you very much. Could you put your hand down, please turn your microphone camera off now. Thank you. Okay, could we go to Simon Island, is it? Yes. Thank you. Good

31:25

afternoon, sir.

31:32

One second guess. Mr. Huck, could you turn your camera off, please. Thank you, carry on. Thank you. Good

31:44

afternoon, sir.

31:45

My name is Simon Ilett. I am the church warden of St. Peter's Church in Theberton and I'm speaking on behalf of the PCC the residents of Theberton, the parishioners of Theberton and also more widely the Yoxmear benefis. I would like it to be considered the impact of the link road which is effectively dividing

the east of our area from the west. And in particular, accessing towns like Saxmundham where there is a railway station and shopping areas in the fact that there is no direct way of getting across the proposed link road, other than joining it and coming off it. And there are a number of elderly residents, particularly church goers. And I include who are not elderly, but including myself, that will be adversely impacted and no longer being able to either walk or cycle to church. And indeed, the only way to get to church on Sunday, or any other day would be to join the road with all our hundreds of lorries that are proposed and other vehicles and then come off the other side. So there's no bridge or way of getting across and also on link road. And the carbon footprint there is a suggestion that may be lifted after the project is completed because effectively it's a useless piece of engineering, and would that be considered in the carbon footprint of the project in his totality?

33:23

Thank you, sir. Sorry, Mr. Humphrey. You're

33:35

muted.

33:38

Sorry, could we move on to Peter Etheridge, please? Mr. Etheridge, you're muted in a moment. So Mr. Etheridge? Mr. Etheridge Stallard you're muted at the moment. Sorry, Mr. Average could so rather rich perhaps we'll come back to you could. Could I maybe hear from Francis crew, please? Yeah. Hello. Yeah,

35:05

thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak. I've covered quite a few points in my written response, but particularly wanted to cover a couple of some issues now, further to Chris Wilson's submission, or particularly like the examination to give consideration to evaluating the capacity of future generations to safely secure the site, and the waste that will have been generated, wherever, wherever that's ultimately located for its entire lifetime, although we don't yet benefit from a well being of future generations act here. As has been introduced in Wales, it's never the less really important. The inquiry examines the impacts fully, in particular costs, including Hill paid carbon footprint as has been discussed. And also equally importantly, the long term practicality of defending a site that may indeed be an island by this point, this evaluation needs to take into account the high level of uncertainty in predicting climate change impacts, and therefore model a full range of scenarios including the worst, as well as taking into account potential issues of resource scarcity. And the possibility that future generations may have to deal with multiple events at other sites at the same time. I want to add, we've had very recent experience of the partial destruction of sea defences, and Thorpeness, just two miles south of the Sizewell site. This has happened after any 10 years of their life despite it being expected to have an estimated 25 years. And although the defences were known to have a limited life span as bad, I don't believe any measures were put in place for its end of life management. And it now represents a significant hazard to beach visitors as well as being partially ineffective for the sake of future generations. We can't let afford to let such a situation arise with this project, even if it's decades or perhaps centuries and the future. Given this project will give some relatively short term gains, but will leave a massive long term impact. its viability from both a financial and climate change point of view,

should perhaps be made a principal issue in its own right. Secondly, I'd ask that the examination includes valuation of the cost and viability of protecting the development against cyber attacked, or other terrorist events, especially in the light of the government's recent defence review, which emphasise the heightened risk of this type of event. And it should be borne in mind that local residents, which I'm one and businesses will have absolutely no insurance cover at all in the event of any kind of incident at nuclear facility, given its exclusion from all our insurance policies. In the event of any kind of incidents, we could lose absolutely everything. If I've got time, I just briefly want to mention air pollution as well. Is that possible?

38:13

Yes, by all means.

38:15

I'm particularly concerned that ground level ozone, tropospheric ozone is emitted from all of the doctrine documentation I've seen so far. Even though that is the most significant pollution in in this area of rural Suffolk and it's likely to be exacerbated by increases in in other pollutants due to construction and traffic, which are ozone precursors. Shipping also could have a huge impact on air quality, which will need to be evaluated and mitigated for docking, maneuvering, idling close to the beach, are likely to have significant impacts. The needs to be seasonal meteorological and climate change impacts assessed in relation to air pollution. As all these are highly significant, and an action plan in the event of forecast air pollution exceedances with consideration of preventative measures for the worst effective for instance, children's schools outwardly those with respiratory problems. I'm particularly concerned about this as access to emergency services could be much more difficult in particularly where I live, you've got to get through Melton Woodbridge onto the a 12. And that can be terrible at the best of times. And also the adequacy of measures to monitor contractors compliance was measures taken to combat air pollution. Thank you.

39:46

Thank you very much. Miss Crowe. Could I move on to Dr. David Lambert, please? Yes,

40:03

good afternoon. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to talk I just want to say that I'm a chartered water and environmental manager. I'm also the managing director of fish guidance systems. I just like to provide some sort of further comments on the points that some of the previous speakers have already raised regarding the marine and ecology and fisheries considerations related to this project, but also specifically to the cooling water system. The Environment Agency Best Practice Guide for the screening of cooling water intakes recommends the installation of combined acoustic fish deterrent system, along with a fish recovery and return system. AFD or acoustic fish deterrent systems are designed to protect fragile fish such as Spratt and to fish from cooling water intakes and prevent potential inundations, where you can get large quantities of fish been drawn in a very short period of time. integrations are known to occur along the east coast and have impacted size while another nuclear power stations in the past, causing a loss of cooling water and emergency shutdowns. An AFD system was originally included in the mitigation measures proposed by EDF about was subsequently removed between public consultations two and three. This was highlighted by the Environment Agency

at the time, but was not reinstated into the development proposals. So I just like to highlight EDS, removal of the AFD from the project's environmental mitigation proposals, and ask if the Inspectorate will ensure that the requirements for an AFD will be included as part of the review. And if it would be covered under an SU specific hearing or just in the general main hearing.

41:42

Thank you.

41:43

Thank you for those comments. Okay, can I move on to Claire? Gill, please.

41:54

Thank you.

41:56

Can you hear me? Okay,

41:57

I can hear you perfectly. Well. Thank you.

41:59

That's good. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I would like along with some of the other speakers to have the marine environment treated as a principal issue please. The adverse impacts on the marine environment will be considered as a different headings according to the agenda that you have at the moment. potential harm to the marine environment on Sizewell C comes from many sources, each your schedule to be considered separately approved according to the planning requirements, and the regulatory framework. Of course, this is welcome because each one serves its own consideration. There's I think there's a lot of public sympathy for maintaining and enhancing the natural environment and avoiding climate change. You only have to think of what we feel about the Brazilian rainforests being taken down to realise that we actually think, realise that we have a limited results in the environment we live in. And few would want to see the sea be used as a similar or degraded, even though this may be permitted by the legislation within the regulation, dietary favour for the separate activities. And so I think it will be in the public interest if a compound bind, and potentially accumulative effects on the marine environment would be considered by the planning Inspectorate, as well as the potential harm from the individuals which activities, and this is equivalent to dealing with landside such as Minsmere. It is environmental. And the other point is that it's particularly important to form a holistic view some of the water discharge activity, environmental permits will be considered by different government departments. And so it will be good if the pipelining and spectrum could consider the whole as well as the separate activities. So just to come on to a general point. It would also be helpful for people like me, if the planning Inspectorate could explain how it will judge the quality of the evidence submitted by the applicant. For example, how will the plumbing inspector judge the robustness of model predictions? Because we all know from the COVID crisis, that so many of these model predictions depend very much on the assumptions made? And yes, so that's one point. How will the scientific evidence and the evidence put forward be judged by people so we can understand how you'll form a

decision and then all So I think members of the public will be interested in understanding the consequences of the decisions taken. For example, if the project was to go ahead, and there were, for instance, and acceptable levels of people or microbes in the water, because sewage will be discharged with some with heated chlorinated water. Would they be warmed up to swim locally? with clear sand on the beaches? Thank you.

45:32

That's what Thank you very much. Miss Gill.

45:34

Thank you

45:36

comments. Can I go to a Gregory Jones now, please?

45:46

So I again, I hope I'm in the right, right place. Could I could I just say some of the topics you that we'd highlighted, that we'd like to focus on. We do think that there should be we agree with those who have spoken, there should be a focus on funding, not just for the CPO who were particularly concerned about the mitigation, the links to a point about environmental impact assessment, picking up what Mr. Tate said on behalf of the District Council on borrow pits. The amendments that are proposed, potentially have greater land take my clients borrow pits, but they're not detailed. It's not clear. It's not assessed. And we are concerned about that we will also repeat without getting into detail our quest and that may by others, that the amendments be dealt with earlier than before the second preliminary hearing. At the moment, the amendments raise a whole number of impacts, both in terms of land take for my clients. So borrow pits, and other things which are not detail. But also in terms of impact. In terms of the knee, as I've said for which we would like as a separate topic, the link road. So in terms of my clients funding experts to deal with the link road, it's highly important for us to know whether or not the amendments in terms of increased rail and carried by sea are going to be are going to be part of the project otherwise. And so we do say, again, repeat we'd ask the examining buyer body again to re examine whether or not it's fair and appropriate not to decide on the amendment earlier before the second stage. The other aspect we would just like to highlight in terms of

48:10

Can I just interrupt Mr. Jones? Is your camera on because up? At my end? I'm not seeing it?

48:16

It is on?

48:17

Okay, it must be a problem I am but I can't hear you perfectly clearly. So please carry on.

48:24

Yeah, I can see myself on the camera is on. In terms then what I was getting to just add on hydrology, we would again endorse a higher profile for hydrology, in particular, its impact on tendon grazing, and also its impact on agricultural act and other activities. So it's not just flooding and hydrology in the purest sense, but also its impact in terms of the commercial activities in terms main principles of agriculture.

49:12

Thank you. Thank you. Okay, I don't see any more hands up at the moment. But I do need to ask if there are any people who haven't got hands up facility want to make a point on this agenda item.

49:27

So I've had my hand up for a considerable time and ask to speak on this item. I'm Andy Smith Felixstowe Town Council.

49:36

I'm not showing a hand up on that. And

49:39

I wasn't the best

49:41

as well actually. I've

49:42

got my hand up. So

49:43

I was thinking

49:45

I had my hand up. I'm Charles Croydon.

49:48

Maya Gordon has

49:49

his hand up. To

49:53

write down.

49:54

Yes me as well.

49:55

But I can see 12 a total of 12 people to assist you, sir.

49:59

Are they enough for a long time?

50:03

No. Okay, I understand that. But what what I would say at this end, I'm not seeing any of those hands, unfortunately. So,

50:11

Mr. Humphrey, shall I assist you?

50:12

Yes, please.

50:15

The person at the top of the list is Sarah Morgan. And if you invite her to speak next, and then I'll inform you of the list so that we can go through those who are still outstanding.

50:29

Be very helpful. Thank you. So Sarah Morgan, could we hear from you, please?

50:39

You're muted. Sorry, Morgan. I'm sorry.

50:44

muted.

50:45

Can you hear me now?

50:47

Yes, we can hear you. Thank you. Good.

50:50

My name is Sarah Morgan. I represent a group known as Fern who mostly who are most affected by the two village bypass. I'm here to request that the bypass is made a standalone topic. You've already heard from our parish Council and footmaster parish council about the wider effects of EDS proposals. But I'm here speaking on behalf of a number of laypeople to ask us to navigate through this complicated process. There are a number of different topics sessions, in our view, would lead to unsatisfactory and partial consideration of the impacts of what is actually a single piece of infrastructure. We feel it would be deeply as unfair as EDS justification for its alignment cannot be properly examined without considering all the relevant issues today. I'm sure you're hearing general



chorus. EDF has paid scant regard to many local concerns. And we're and this is why we will where we are here today. We found failing throughout this process, including proper assessment on heritage economic impact on tourism businesses, identified correctly the number of homes that will be affected deficient environmental assessment either by incorrect facts or just emissions. And so it goes on. It has not even paid adequate regard to ecological and landscape issues, ignoring major ecological habitats, whereas respect there is such a range of issues to be addressed on the appropriate alignment. It could only be fairly addressed we field as a single standalone issue that all parties including us lay people are able and capable of partaking in. Thank you.

52:25

Thank you.

52:29

The next person on the list is Andy Smith.

52:36

Thank you, sir Andy Smith, I speak today on behalf of Felixstowe Town Council. I'm a counsellor there, Vice Chairman our planning Mr. Committee and depicted to speak for because your town council size matters. But just as a matter of background would have some relevance to the topics I want to write on as a cabinet. I was a member of Suffolk coastal council from 1999 to 2019, a cabinet member from 1999 to 2019, with responsibility for coastal management all that time, and we're planning for much of it. So I've been involved with Sizewell ever since discussions with government about the strategy in 2007. However, today I speak on behalf of town council, I did ask to speak on this item in my phone, but that must have been missed somewhere I have in front of me. I want to speak on three topics, the capacity of the world network, the effects on traffic issues in and around and using the word around in quite a wide context Seven Hills roundabout and traffic access roads to the freight management facility. From Flagstaff course, size we are relatively peripheral to size when compared to many other people on the call. And the town council overtly takes no view on they should go through otherwise sighs well as a whole. But the communications effect on Felixstowe a town on a peninsula of course with only one way in and out be that rail road or rail is potentially quite significant. If I could address first of all the capacity of the Royal network, and we're talking here, not about the issue, which has been addressed in great detail from Westerfield to, to the site, but from Westfield and critically from Ipswich to the rest of the country. The country as a whole the freight the rail freight system is operating at a very, very high level of capacity. And from this part of the world, both South London and west to the rest of the country. We got the north northwest, the Midlands or the Northeast, it's operating at 100% capacity, that bears vary significantly on the port of Felixstowe, which of course is the largest container port in the country. Whether there is for all practical purposes, an insatiable demand on rail freight for there and every rail path becomes available is temporarily taken up. That figures currently stands at 38 paths trains per day in both directions. I think it was the QC for the county council who referred in passing to the question or deliverability of the transport strategy in the context of rail. And it is that which we're concerned about in that. To the best of our knowledge, there is no spare rail path capacity over and above what currently is in use to the south in awkwardly to the west of Ipswich. Now, I noticed it. So all these topics are speaking on, of course have to do with traffic and transport, which is an SI. But I have in front of me the paragraph, which highlights a number of bullet points, but it does not highlight these issues. It highlights

the mode of transport. We'll come back to that in a minute. It highlights a number of associative islands Park and ride sites for example, but it does not highlight the freight management facility. And it highlights the effect on the jurisdiction strategic road network but not the strategic rail network. My screens gone blank. Am I still in? Quiet? I've lost

56:20

sight of you, sir. You can still hear you, Mr. Smith, if you want to continue. Okay.

56:26

Um, we're requesting quite firmly that these three topics capacity the rail network westward switch, the effects on traffic issues that the Seven Hills run route in the widest sense and the root access to the freight management facility are included as specific overt topics within the traffic and transport issue. And I wonder whether I might dare ask your direct question you have an understanding on site because it's Did you and your colleagues, visit the freight management facility near Seven Hills roundabout?

57:02

I think Mr. Humphrey has had some technical problems. Sorry, I'll just switch my camera around. Hopefully I will appear. You'll see on the examination library there are two events listed there listing the sites we've visited. so far. We have attended and visited the freight management facility. And no doubt we will be viewing various places over the coming months as we continue. So if you want to carry on Mr. Thank

57:33

you for that. In that case, I refer quite briefly to Well, I said I think what I need to say about the rail network that does need very deep consideration as to whether there are in fact, any train paths or if they are absorbed by an additional three, four or five are absorbed by size well, that can only be to the detriment of the

57:58

ongoing

58:00

health of the long term of clinic Stockport, which of course is a port of national importance. In regards to the freight management facility, the town council takes no view on whether or not that is a suitable site that would be for parish councils directly affected. But we do have concerns on the traffic route, which is to come off the Seven Hills roundabout onto the minor road leading into Ipswich 1156. So eastwards to the site, but then to exit the site East would go back to along that same route involving a very difficult right turn onto the LM 56. It would appear that there's a much easier solution with much less traffic conflict, if traffic in inbound would have to go to the further Trembley roundabout on the a 14 back into the site which will have minimal traffic effects. And equally to lead the site initially a switch for about a mile and then there's a dedicated slip road back onto the a 14 we would like that to be examined. And several hills roundabout. The others I'm sure others on the call are aware and you're sure you are so the Suffolk County Council have currently proposed some improvements in that area, but they are less than complete. And it was an in particular should the existing route to the on off the LM 56 be used

international great difficulties. We think that they should be given greater attention by EDF. Given that much of it has been the improvements much of the move being funded by other developments in martlesham that others will know about. So we wanted to see those three items please as overt breakpoints or section heads whatever they will be under the traffic and transport issue.

1:00:00

Thank you, Mr. Smith, and I've got Carina Wentzel next on my list. I can see you but I can't hear you at the moment.

1:00:22

Sorry, Is that better?

1:00:23

It is. Thank you.

1:00:24

Thank you very much. Yes, good afternoon. My name is Carina Wentzel and I'm a solicitor from Norton rose Fulbright Norton rose Fulbright acts for the heating and hold estate. The estate comprises over 2500 hectares of farmland, Parkland and woodland, as well as 32 heritage buildings, of which seven are in the Oxford part of the evening and whole estate is located south of the temporary northern Park and Ride site, which forms part of the applicant's proposed scheme. Another proportion of the estate falls within land required temporarily in connection with their proposed roundabout at Oxford. The evening Hall estate generally agrees with the examining authorities initial assessment of principal issues. However, it requests that in assessing traffic and transport issues, particularly the suitability of proposed associated development, the examining authority pay specific attention to the northern park and ride at Darshan and the Oxford round about the substantial nature of these elements of associated development and their impact on the local community and environment warrant individual attention and classification as topics in their own right. In this regard, we request please the northern park and ride is considered as a separate topic at an issue specific hearing, rather than in combination with other traffic transport and ecology matters. Such a hearing would allow related issues to be considered comprehensively in the round and that will facilitate a robust examination. For example, the proposed location of the Northern Park and Ride site the applicants justification for selecting the current site and the alternatives, particularly given the lack of connections and safety considerations arising from the rail level crossing at darsham. The scale form and features of the proposed northern Park and Ride site ecology considerations including light pollution and other impacts on ecosystems, and residential amenity in connection with the northern park and ride. Proposed mitigation measures, for example, landscaping, screening, Smart Lighting, and importantly the management of the Northern park and ride for example, hours of construction, hours of operation permitted activities and buildings and security measures. We also request please that the examining authority consider the Oxford roundabout at a separate issue specific hearing, again to allow interlinking issues to be considered in the round. For example, the design of the roundabout are the applicants modelling ecology considerations including light pollution in connection with the roundabout, proposed mitigation measures such as landscaping and screening, and the effect of the Oxford roundabout on heritage assets. For example, the nearby listed Cofield Hall. In addition to a thorough assessment of the Northern park and ride on the Yoxford

roundabout at separate issues specific hearings. The heaving Hall estate also requests that in examining the impact of the proposed scheme on the historic environment. The panel pays specific attention to the effect of 12 years of construction traffic on heritage assets with at this point in time does not seem to have been considered in great detail if at all. Finally, the healing Hall estate also supports the scheduling of issue specific hearings to fully consider broader topics already identified by the examining authority in its initial assessment of principal issues, in particular, and as already raised by others quality, alternatives, biodiversity and ecology, particularly the shadow habitats regulation, assessment and mitigation and compensation measures. cumulative impacts the draft development consent order, including the section 106 agreement, the historic environment, landscape impact visual effects and design, particularly the effect of temporary and permanent lighting. traffic and transport considerations more generally. Thank you very

1:05:04

much.

1:05:08

Thank you. Our next speaker is David Gordon. Hello,

1:05:16

I think you can't see me because my camera does not like Microsoft Teams, but I hope you're gonna hear me.

1:05:23

Yeah, I can hear you loud and clear. Thank you fine.

1:05:25

No, we'll do without a picture then. Right. Good afternoon. My name is David Gordon. I live locally. And I'm speaking in a personal capacity. We've heard many excellent presentations this afternoon on different principle issues. I would like to suggest that there are two overriding principle issues. If you've watched the recent David Attenborough documentary, you'll be acutely aware that the two crises threatening the future of life on Earth are the global warming crisis and the loss of biodiversity crisis. Governments are increasingly taking notice. And I think it is absolutely vital that Sizewell is measured for its impact on these crisis is Sizewell a positive or a negative for global warming is sighs Well, a positive or a negative for biodiversity loss. on global warming as previous speakers have mentioned, the measure is to assess the adverse impacts not just during the construction period, but also through to the decommissioning period and to compare those with the positive impact while generating and to ascertain whether overall that comes out positive or negative. So I believe that EDF need to be challenged to table their assessment of these impacts, and EDF assessment will need to be rigorously examined. Unfortunately, the impacts have already started. And the recent funding of coordination would before your examination is even started demonstrates EDF Cavalier approach to these matters of great importance. on biodiversity the Prime Minister has recently announced that 30% of the land area of the UK needs to be afforded protected status in order to address the biodiversity crisis. That is a very large increase on what is currently protected. The size of our project is going to destroy or severely damage a considerable area of land, which is currently protected as AONB or SSI. as well. Incidentally,

the associated infrastructure projects bringing offshore generated electricity ashore to destroy primaries of habitat owners to have to try to replace them elsewhere, in order to meet the Prime Minister's target seems insane. And of course, it is always more difficult to create new areas rather than conserve existing ones. far better to build major infrastructure projects like size Well, on brownfield sites. So again, as with the global warming, the pluses and minuses on biodiversity need to be carefully assessed and see whether the overall answer is positive or negative. Can these two issues please be added to the list in an annex C? Thank you very much.

1:08:30

Thank you, Mr. Gordon. My next speaker is Alan Collett.

1:08:41

Good afternoon again, thank you very much indeed for giving me an opportunity to speak on this particular item. Referring to the list of principle issues, I would like to see three additions if I may just go through them. By way of background to my first issue. Since the DCO was submitted, two important reports have been released relating to the impact of business decisions on the world's biodiversity. First, the Dasgupta review called the economics of biodiversity. And the United Nations report called making peace with nature. For people who may not be aware of these two reports, the Dasgupta review was commissioned by Her Majesty's Treasury. And the report makes recommendations relating to pricing in the cost to nature of business decisions to reflect the impact these decisions might have on the environment and on biodiversity. The UN report on the other hand, as the title implies, claims that we have been raging a war with nature. And I hasten to add these are the reports words, not mine, and that this has to stop. When related to the subject of this planning, hearing, both these forward thinking reports raised the question as to whether accounting for the impacts and costs of building and operating a nuclear power station explicitly reflects the cost to lecture of using Earth's natural resources. By this, I mean, for example, the use of the air around us into which co2 will be emitted, or the use of the sea, which is going to be for used for cooling, and for washing out chemicals, and then for the pollution caused to the air, land and sea and for the damage caused to the wildlife that live within them. So the first issue I'd like to see added to that list of principle issues should be called the cost to nature of building size We'll see. And then as a separate issue, the cost of nature of operating size, we'll see this distinction between these two time periods is I think, important. And as an overarching point, and I think this has is a point that has just been made. I would add that it is this distinction. This distinction should indeed be explicitly made, in the case of a number of the principle issues already listed, where they have actually been grouped together as just one issue. The second addition I'd like to see is the suitability of using a protected area of outstanding natural beauty as a safe place to store spent nuclear waste. And in this case, on a heritage coastline, and of course, at a time of rising sea levels, paying particular regard to the high level of public access, and wildlife habitats. This doesn't seem to be specifically referred to in the current list. And the third issue that I asked be added is the potential impacts of a nuclear disaster on the environment, on the county and on its residents. And then on the country's energy supply. This should be considered against the background of the possible causes, whether due to technical or human failures, natural weather events, cyber or terrorist attack, and then include a consideration to what measures are in place to prevent them and the impact of them. This consideration should be set against the evidence around the world of the impact of such

disasters. I'd be very grateful if these three points be added to the principal issues list. Thank you very much.

1:12:46

Thank you, Mr. Collette. Next speaker is Jason Brown.

1:12:58

Hello, can you hear me?

1:13:00

I can. Thank you. Okay.

1:13:03

My name is Jacqueline Brown. And I'm actually just speaking for myself, I don't represent anybody else. First of all, I'd like to endorse previous comments by Chris Wilson. of together against size we'll see and comments from stop size we'll see and many, many other people. But I want to add something about the carbon emissions from size. Well see that hasn't been mentioned yet. I want I think, really, it's important to flag up the cumulative effect on carbon emissions that will occur not only from size, we'll see. And it's all it's related infrastructure, work, new roads, car parks, etc., etc. but also from the potential build first and substation. And indeed, all the new housing that's planning locally, it there's a lot of new houses planned all up and down the a 12. And just off the a 12. And, of course, plus the emissions from 1000s of extra vehicles and road movements. I mean, it seems to me that this is completely contrary to what we as a country say we're supposed to be trying to achieve this in this era of climate emergency. And I think that all together, they should be looked at cumulatively that's really what I wanted to say. So thanks very much for letting me

1:14:30

on. It's been a ghastly screen experience, although the spectrum so

1:14:35

all money is spent. I'm not sure who it is. But thank you.

1:14:44

Andy Smith, can you turn your photo, turn your thing off and also your video please?

1:14:54

Thank you. So the next speaker, I think Mr. kite, your hand needs to come down to Thank you. I've just got john. Hopefully have no surname.

1:15:07

John. Yes, that's me. Have I am I coming up? You are. Thank you very much. Yeah. My name is John Sutherell. I live in Yoxford. I'm speaking as an individual though I am also the church Warden, and I'm a member of the parish Council, I've got three points to make. The first is really in relation to the oxen itself, which, as most of you know, is on the junction of the A12, and A1120. And then with the

roundabout, which has already been mentioned, within your very helpful list of principle issues, you talk about local impacts. And I think one of the things I'd like to highlight is how you define local, because some people might think what yachtsmen is quite a way away from the actual site, although we can actually see the bubble of size will be from the high ground around here. Because so many people have highlighted this, there is essentially a cumulative impact on the community as a whole community impact commute, cumulative impact of what is going to happen, and that is certainly going to affect your Oxford and is a source of considerable concern here. Whether it is it's the issue of transport, or the environment, whatever. So cumulative community impact on the Oxford, I would endorse 100%, what was being said earlier by Carina Wentzel, who obviously referred to this, and indeed, to Jacqueline Brown. My second point is more general. And that is in relation to this issue of carbon footprint. You mentioned it in your list, it really needs to be gone into. One of the difficulties we're up against is the fact that those EDF and indeed, and I think quite a lot of people locally have sort of bought from the nuclear industry is that it's seeing that EDF size we'll see will be contribute to the green agenda. Whereas in fact, as a number of people have highlighted already, in fact, it's got a very high carbon footprint over time. And therefore, what one would ask is for that bullet point, to be really drilled into by you guys, to really try to measure what the total carbon input impact of this project is going to be. And actually how it's going to work out over time. Because I think a lot of people doing the calculations think that actually, it's only going to start delivering a benefit to this zero carbon thing, way beyond the time frame, which is the government target. My third point is that I think there's an issue here of the deliverability. This has been mentioned by a number of people already. Having been involved in the various reviews and consultations that have gone on, there is not a lot of confidence in this organisation, as an organisation, or indeed their ability to deliver. And that it was mentioned earlier on, there's a real concern that things are going to get started, damage is going to be done, no mitigation is going to be started. And then the thing is going to grind into the sand. Of course, circumstances are going to go ahead. My final observation is I was very impressed by the police presentation and the ambulance presentation. The concern about public services in the climate of this development is a very real concern here, and it needs to be addressed. Thank you very much. Mr. mourned for giving me this chance to speak. Thank you.

1:19:04

You're welcome. Before you despair, can I just ask your surname?

1:19:09

Yes, it is Sutherell S U T H E R E double L. And in fact, we, my wife and I are registered. I'm the registered spokesman that I'm speaking for her as well. Okay,

1:19:20

thank you very much. You're

1:19:21

on my list. And thank you very much.

1:19:23

Thank you. Now, I noticed that we've still got quite a number of speakers on this item, but I think it probably is a good time to take a break. As long as during this German you stay. With the link connected, I hope that your raised hands will still remain and the list that is before me will still be there when we return. So if I can call the break now and we'll return at half past three. And so for the moment, the meeting is adjourned. Thank you