

TEXT_Prelim1_Day2_SizeC_Session1_24032 021

Wed, 3/24 1:52PM • 1:20:53

00:02

Good morning. And welcome to day two of this preliminary meeting which is now resumed. We're going to consider agenda item five, the applicants proposed changes to the application. The applicant submitted its formal material change request for each of 15 proposed changes to the original application on the 11th of January 2021. The applicants cover letter of that date summarises the proposed changes in table one, and also provides an assessment of any new or different significant effects. It states that all 15 changes have been the subject of consultation, and environmental and other relevant assessment, details of which are included in the submission. The applicant accepts the proposed changes in combination of material, but submits that none of the proposed changes is so material that it constitutes a materially different project. Now the rule six letter annex B provides information about the scope of this item. And that has been supplemented by the details gender, are now asked people in turn to speak on this agenda item, and then I will ask the applicant to respond. There are two main topics for discussion that is set out in the detailed agenda. But I would ask you to cover all the points that you wish to make together to avoid the need for a report.

01:37

Could I ask first, Michael Bedford QC for Suffolk County Council?

01:47

Thank you, Madam Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. In relation to agenda item five, on the proposed changes you will have seen from our procedural submission, that on your first point that the county council is content, that the changes would not make the proposal a fundamentally different project to what was applied for. But secondly, in terms of your second aspect as to how the changes should be examined, that we consider very firmly that if the changes are accepted, then what is examined thereafter should be the application as changed, rather than requiring both the original and the changed application to be addressed by the parties in all of their submissions and documentation, which we consider would create an additional net.

03:10

Do we have a difficulty with Suffolk County Council? I don't know the case team can check that.

03:26

If we can't get that back immediately, then perhaps I could go on to east of that Council.

03:33

Hello. MCI tell us to lose from sharp Pritchard here who also represent Suffolk. I have tried to contact Mr. Bedford to inform him that he's

03:43

frozen. So hopefully, he will come back to life shortly.

03:48

I think it happened to me a few times yesterday. And so if I could hear from East Suffolk council that in the meantime, Thank you, Madam

03:59

agitate QC for the Suffolk we consider that the project with the changes would remain in substance that which was originally applied for in agreement with Suffolk County Council's position. And we strongly support the view that Mr. Bedford, I think had completed articulating, which was that if the changes are accepted, then they should be approached on an integrated basis rather than as a discrete agenda. So that, for example, the local impact reports and others who need to respond don't need to consider the project and then separately, consider the project with the changes. That's the second point. The third point is that that is not to say that there isn't information associated with the changes that we would still wish to see. And I draw it And in particular to the modelling in relation to the beach Landing Facility of the coastal defences, which we and other statutory bodies have requested. So that it's important that on the basis that the changes are accepted to changes to nine that relates to the modelling that we understand is going to be provided as received in good time. Well before that is examined in detail. I think Mr. Bedford has some is going to make some points

05:37

on

05:40

the transport strategy. The overall position is between Suffolk and East Suffolk is that we are taking a coordinated approach. And each authority is going to seek to lead on certain subjects. So in relation to transport, we have a common position in relation to the need for further information as to delivery of Network Rail improvements, and other associated points in relation to that. But I will leave this to bed for to make that point, given the allocation of responsibilities that we have indicated.

06:26

Alright, thank you for your time. And I think he's now returned. So we were just hearing that you were going to tell us something about the transport, perhaps the required rate improvements, perhaps. And the level of traffic I think, which you did indicate might change the change itself? We're not accepted.

06:54

Sorry, I misspoke. I can I just ask him, Charles Croydon. We've just admitted you now. Please, could you turn your camera?

07:03

Thank you.

07:05

Thank you, Madam, I apologise. I think in terms of where I froze, and I have to say, I'm not sure quite where that was. But I think that you've got our basic points.

07:16

basic points on that your first position on the change, yeah.

07:21

And then the second position was stressing the importance of, in our view, examining the changes, so that it is the changed application that is examined, and I think you've got that point also. And then I went on to make my third point, which was the point about the evidence base for the transport information. And that's where I think I froze and lost. And so shortly, the point on that is, you will have seen from what we said in our representation, that there is in the new information supporting the changes application, an indication by the applicant, that there is expected to be a 20% increase in the volume of materials to be imported to the main Sizewell construction site during the construction phase. We haven't given you a reference to where you find that easily in the application material, which if I can just do that briefly. It's paragraph 3.3, point 18 of appendix 2.2, point A, of the environmental statement agenda, which is pins reference a S dash 202. And it's applicants document six point 14. And that gives you that reference to the tonnage and it goes up by some 2 million tonnes from 10.1 to 12. Point 1 million, which is a 20% increase. And what we've said simply is that obviously, were you not to accept that part of the change application, you would still have, in terms of what is proposed the same tonnage of materials, but no transport base evidence, which assesses that scenario, that is to say, a scenario with a 20% increase in materials compared to the original application, but no changes to the freight strategy. And so obviously, we've invited you to think about that, because there would be practical timetable implications, both for the applicant and also for the parties who need to address that issue, where that element of the change not to be accepted. Those were the submissions I apologise. The fact that bizarre reasons I got struck by the Gremlin right at the point that I was invited to speak, but there we are.

09:46

Well done. And that thank you for resolving that so quickly. Right. Thank you. If I could now hear from the Environment Agency.

10:02

Good morning. My name is Cameron scads, and I'm representing the Environment Agency. I should say we've provided a written response to this item. But just want to thank you for the clarity of the discussion points made in the agenda. I think we would agree with the points made previously about modelling work still to come for the coastal defences and the beach Landing Facility. I think from the environment agency's perspective, it's probably worth noting that the review of that modelling can take some time, from our experience. I think we noted in the changing changes consultation that that could, in fact be a couple of months from receipt. And from our experience, there can be the possibility of some backwards and forth in, in really refining, refining that work. I think other than that, I think it's

probably worth observing that the changes consultation that was undertaken, it did have various options for coastal defences and the beach Landing Facility. However, we understand that the proposals that have been submitted,

11:29

have

11:30

now show that the jetty that's proposed is potentially 100 metres longer than was consulted in that consultation process. Also, in relation to the coastal defences, the soft coastal defence feature wasn't particularly detailed within that consultation process, other than to say that the design of the sacrificial soft coastal defence will be reassessed to maximise its longevity.

12:10

I mean, in terms of the additional information that you are looking for, you're looking for that pretty promptly to give you saving the time you need to assess that properly.

12:25

Indeed, yes. Thank you.

12:28

Thank you. And in terms of further consultation on some of the environmental material, thinking in the latest submission from gap indicate that they were intending to do that, perhaps on a non statutory basis. Is that something you would welcome? I think previously, I think they took it out, because they felt it might cause confusion. But from what you say, it seems to me that you would welcome the consultation.

13:02

Indeed, yes, we would do.

13:06

Right. Thank you very much. Thank you. And if I could now hear from Gregory Jones.

13:24

Thank you, madam. I foreshadowed some of my submissions yesterday, whether in the wrong some of them were more to do with this issue. On in terms of the amendments, madam you, you've got our position that we think that the decision should be made sooner rather than later. I won't repeat that. But picking up also the submissions made by the county and District Council. We are as you know, we've raised the issue of transport strategy because that has implications both in terms of the network rail system and by carriage by sea. On to the implications for road and the link road. We, therefore are concerned to have more information on it as soon as possible. As matters stand at the moment, we don't have a clear idea as to what the network capacity for example, is by way of rail and we regard that and we suggest to you and your panel, that that is a critical issue that should be ascertained at a much earlier stage. The amendments also as I indicated also have land take implications for the clients I

represent. And again, disappointingly, we are aware that greater land would be required should the amendments go through but disappointingly, we have little or no detail as to the, like the reasons for the locations of borrow pits, for example, that they're associated and environmental implications. So, in terms of for this, the proposed amendments, we do endorse the approach. I think that the both councils taken which Mr. Tate articulated that any approach has to be thoroughly integrated. So the amendments become part of the scheme. And that does mean that they have to be integrated throughout the whole examination process and environmental impact assessment process and to be done as early and with the appropriate consultation. So we do have come back to my opening point, we have real concerns about the ability to meet those legal requirements and also the requirements of fairness to the parties. Should there be any further delay in ascertaining which amendments are to be permitted and which are not? Finally, we're unclear as to still the funding case, from the proposers as to the extent to which your decision on amendments impacts on the funding case, and whether or not if you as a panel were to decide that you accepted some amendments, but not others, or no amendments are all of the amendments, what those implications could be for funding, which is, of course, a matter of great concern for our clients. I had I highlighted before that funding was an issue because we have doubts as to viability. But we also particularly have doubts on deliverability, which has been flagged by the council's and that impacts on the nature and type of mitigation. That can be provided. Thank you very much.

17:22

Mr. Jones, you've given some comments on further details and lack of information. Is there anything you want to add? You do say we've not been provided with full and sufficient details in relation to certain aspects of the proposed amendments? Do you want to expand on that? And that is No.

17:42

Yeah. Yes, we indicated in our we've indicated in our written submissions. So for example, the lack of details goes not just to the proposed amendments, but also to the original scheme itself. There. We haven't touched on it. But there's absolutely being no engagement, no proper engagement with my clients as to arrange site visits and things to see and explain exactly what is to be proposed. So it's not only in terms of borrow pits, but if you take for example, and I represent three different sets of landowners, very few Take, for example, the darlings, there's an issue as to the round about its impact in terms of lighting, visual, its impacts in terms of listed gates on the whether they're to be removed or what, what have you. So there are heritage implications, their ecological implications. And we've gone into some detail in the written representations. There's concerns as I flagged up yesterday in terms of hydrological impacts, in terms of the ability, the ability of other lands in you to be productive farm land. And this goes beyond compensation. Madam, as you're examining panel, we'll see that it's not simply the case you'd be compensated and then acquire suitable land near nearby that, that works with the rest of the holding. And we're severely lacking in any of those details. And my instructions are, we've been given little or no indication of what proposed mitigation measures there are any of those things. So, so clear evidence as to what the effects of the proposed amendments would be in environmental terms, but also absence of any proposed mitigation details.

19:53

thank you note.

19:54

That as I say, we set we set it out when we didn't have enough room in our box. Say we sent a hard copy. He said the hard copy travels to the spectra, the outline. So we just have the headings in our box. So the details are there. Thank you.

20:14

Thank you very much. Could I hear now from Councillor Marion fellows?

20:28

Yes. Good morning, Madam ladies and gentlemen. Thank you very much, Councillor Moran fellows. speaking today on behalf of over town council to item five, thank you. As you know, there are 17 changes, which are being proposed. And I think the most important thing to say is that if the examining authority decides to consider these as material, then obviously there is a need to act reasonably in accordance with the principles of natural justice, specifically, to require that any one affected by amended proposals must have a fair opportunity to have their views heard and properly taken into account. However, even if you don't consider that they are material, there may still be a need in the interest of fairness. And I'm quoting from previous guidance notes by examining authorities on other cases, so there is precedence for this. So there is a need in the interest of fairness to re consult and add new interested parties and give the opportunity for new or revised relevant representations. So in other words, and restart. Unfortunately, there's no legal definition of material, as I'm sure you're aware, but there are many examples of very good reliable tests that can be applied to assist us today. The first one that I've researched and can provide in written correspondence, all of the quotes I'm using today is that whether the development now being proposed is not in substance that which was originally applied for. So it doesn't actually have to have the word fundamental, doesn't have to be it's just in substance. So in flavour, is it the same as originally applied for If so, then this quote constitutes a different project for which a new application would be required, or previous spins advice. Next says, judgement may be based on whether the change would generate a new or different likely environmental effect, or should be changes should be treated as material if it would require an updated environmental statement, which I would say the least the beach Landing Facility, and some of the others would require that. Or if there's a new or different effect on the environment, or if there are new parties to compulsory acquisition of land, which there is or if there's need for a new HRA habitats assessment. So we've heard from the Environment Agency this morning that any work on the beach Landing Facility would take a couple of months and be quite substantial. So I would say that that change alone would make this material.

23:33

Just going on slightly further, if I may. I think the most important thing is to say that over town council questions whether the application is still of sufficient standard for examination, whether there has been sufficient consultation, and whether there has been author will be procedure requirements that can be met in the timeframe. We would say it's unconstitutional, and may be subject to judicial review. If the examination starts. So if the changes decisions and people being notified and everything prior to those new interested parties being brought into the arena. So if you look, for example, at the beach Landing Facility, which is proposed to be very different to the original, if you look at the extension of the landscape bond at Southern park and ride, if you look at the new bridge, bridleway link, the changes to

the public rights of way walk bond farm, the extension of order limits to size or link road, all of the things I've quoted that have been said makes something material, a new order extension. We've got those new people subject to compulsory acquisition, we may have that the new environmental statement, we've got that. So We would say, in fact, these changes are material. And they do require that the process either stops, and new interested parties or new relevant representations are invited. Or if they're accepted into the application, then the delay has to occur before the examination period of six months can happen. We need time to have a look at these documents and to take seek advice and to enable every one affected to be included. And I know you would want this process to be inclusive, and be fair to all. Thank you. Thank you.

25:42

Thank you. Could I now hear from Rachel butcher? I think that's suffered postal Friends of the year.

26:03

Again, on behalf of our bosses on Yes, good morning. Good morning. I'm the coordinator of Suffolk coastal trends of the our members can see the changes are substantial and material, because they will lead to other and different like case significant environmental effects from the original application. For example, the new beach Landing Facility, especially the very low one will be different, in fact, in terms of coastal processes, and also the ecology of beach, and the changed crossing, oversize or marshes, triple high has an hour culvert, which again will change the anticipated ecological effect. So again, I'd like to pick up on Maryann's recent points about the interpretation for the timetable. And we would like to support Well, we'll talk about it again on the next agenda. But certainly, we would like to see that this is all resolved well before the other nation begins. Thank you.

27:28

Thank you very much. Could I hear now from Mr. Chris Wilson. I think that's together again. sighs We'll see. Hello, can

27:41

you hear me?

27:43

Yes, I can. Yes.

27:44

Yes, sir. All right. Chris Wilson from together again. sighs We'll see. Okay, so just bear with me a second. Tasks would like tins to treat EDS new proposals, which include, amongst other changes, a 20% increase in materials imported onto the site, the new jetty more rail and sea journeys, higher sea defences development creep further onto the heritage coast as a material change. This, this is not because the final product that's two new EPR reactors will be that much different from the much different from the original application. But because the method of achieving that end result will change significantly. The way the construction project is conducted, and its impact will be fundamentally altered. As an example, reduce road use and greater sea transport will come at the cost to the attributes of the area of outstanding natural beauty. There'll be greater impacts on the marine

environment and greater restrictions on the recreational enjoyment of the heritage coast. Surely, if the proposed changes result in a substantial reduction in road transport, as the applicant claims, this would require a reassessment of other aspects of the development such as the need for the two village bypass or the new roundabouts and the new link road after all, these associated developments, or resulting environmental damage, and have negative societal impacts, so if they can be avoided, they should be for the aforementioned reasons task opinion is that this element now being proposed is not in substance that which was originally applied for. As tasks consider the applicants new proposals to be a material change. We would like the changes and their effects on the original application to be subject to the statutory consultation, after which the applicant should submit a new DCO application. Task also believes that the standard of consultation in November and December was very poor. Only containing outline proposals were very detailed to back them up. This came as no surprise as it continued the trend set by the all previous pre application consultations, most of these proposed changes are not new concept. So there's no reason why the applicant couldn't firm up on these issues during the eight years of the pre application period. Thank you.

30:16

Thank you very much indeed. I wonder if I could now hear from Joan Gerling.

30:28

Can I say Joan is not available?

30:32

All right. Is there anyone speak on her behalf? Or presumably she couldn't write into procedure deadline B on that point. Yeah. Okay. Well, well, perhaps you could pass that message on to

30:53

make it easy. And so could I hear them from Alison Downes, Stop Sizewell C. I believe this speaking on behalf of other people.

31:03

Good morning, Ms McKay. Yes, I am speaking on behalf of my organisation and around 22 other people, new since yesterday are Julia Brown, Mike and Mike Martin and Wendy Cooper, Alex Johnston and Bill Turnbull. And we too wish to request that you consider yes new proposals, leading to different and substantive environmental effects through major changes to the delivery of the project. And we'd like to endorse what has just been said by Councillor fellows Miss Fulcher and Chris Wilson. And we're very concerned that many of the applicants revised proposals lack detail, especially sea defences, the beach landing facilities, or jetty of the Environment Agency has just named it and including whether rail delivery is definitely possible at the level of proposed. And we're aware you share this view and that you've requested more information from the applicant. But I quickly like to emphasise that local people have had eight years of uncertainty about EDS proposals. The relevant representations everyone in this meeting put significant effort into may in fact no longer be relative relevant. And a consistent strong message from this area about traffic impacts to impacts on the SSSI crossing habitat loss and many other issues had been sent over those eight years. So for the applicant to an allowance less than a week after the end of Section 56 that it intended to put forward new proposals was breathtakingly

shocking. And so we are now in a situation where the document library has grown significantly, it's a very difficult task for pretty much all of us to read and digest this, were 10 months since the DCA was submitted. And we still don't know which proposals were supposed to be considering. And this situation, as others stated yesterday, which is already so stacked against us, frankly, the idea that the examination may start on the clock start ticking for written representations before we know which proposals we're addressing is something I'm really struggling to get my head around. So I begged the examining authority to address this problem urgently. Thank you.

33:09

Thank you very much. Could I have Councillor David Bevin, I do hope I've pronounced your name correctly.

33:23

Mr. Mr. Bevin is not

33:24

not with us today. All right. Thank you. Thank you. Could I then here is Rosie Sutherland of RSPB here.

33:37

Thank you, madam.

33:40

And also speaking on behalf of Suffolk Wildlife Trust,

33:43

again, very happy to rely on our rule six response. I just did want to raise or add one additional point. So thank you. It was basically just to support as Mr. Bedford and Mr. Tate have already helpfully covered the question of the integration of information. And for us, it's particularly the environmental statement and the environmental statement addenda. That now means that there are two sets of documentation covering points but obviously with the addenda, updating the information in light of the changes applied for I'm sure that a signposting document is

34:32

Unfortunately, we do seem to have another problem here. She's frozen on the screen for me. Is that the same for the case team?

34:42

Yes, unfortunately, Rosie Sutherland's frozen, she may wish to leave the meeting and then rejoin and we can admit it through the lobby.

34:52

Yeah. All right. That's very helpful. If I move on to the next speaker then if you let me know if she manages to Return, if I could hear from Alan Hatt.

35:08

Thank you. Yes, I

35:10

endorse both what Marianne Fellowes. And what Alison Downes. As said,

35:17

I've got no more to say, except that

35:21

not only could there be a judicial review, but there could be an injunction. Thank you.

35:26

Thank you. And do we have Ivan Murrell?

35:39

Ms McKay, I believe Ivan Murrell informed the planning inspectorate that Allison from Stop Sizewell C would be speaking on his behalf.

35:46

All right. That's, that's very helpful. Thank you, and Simon Mellen.

36:01

Oh, hello, hello.

36:06

Oh, good morning. Yes. It's just that I think that the, the changes are too fast to come under the remit of the initial planning application and should be disregarded.

36:26

All right, thank you very much.

36:28

Thank you.

36:34

I just wonder if we have the National Trust in if anything they want to say? I believe they sent their apologies, Mr. McKay. Thank you. And Michael Taylor.

36:55

Thank you, Madam Chairman. The comments are made and initially worked to do with the fact that the regulatory bodies were already commenting of the difficulty of them carrying out their statutory duties in order to fully understand the complexity of the project, to enable you, as a planning inspectors to be in receipt of all their information. I've been in contact because I'm a member of the officer nuclear

regulation, and NGO forum. So I have an understanding of the role of the regulators. And I've had to actually go to them to get information, which I could not find in the documents for media, particularly related to the size of the site. Are you hearing me?

38:04

Oh, yes. Yes. Yes, sorry. No,

38:13

there isn't a talk. And so we've where we've actually asked for a lot more information from the officer nuclear regulation, about the actual site itself. I'm due for a response because it's been treated as a Freedom of Information request, by the 12th of April, which obviously, I will hope to communicate to you yourselves, as it may be of interest to you yourselves. That there's a number of features there again, people have referred to the position to the sea defences. The impact on the triple Si, hopefully will, some of that information will become more apparent. I think from that. We've also asked because the regulators have a particularly the officer nuclear regulation, I've probably two years of work to do as I understand it. In assessing this case, there is always the question for me of how the secretary of state can be in a position to make a decision on a project of this enormity within a few like your six months statutory timescale, and then him making his decision within a certain number of months. And it does seem that that does not work in the case of nuclear power, where it is so complex, with all the regulatory needs an input To get the best decision, whatever that may be. Okay,

40:08

thank you.

40:11

We have Peter Chadway from Save Our Sandlings? If not, I'll hear from Charles Croydon.

40:44

I can't turn my camera on, oh it's on now sorry.

40:49

All right, well done.

40:50

That's okay. So I've just remind me which item we're on.

40:54

So we're on item five, the change request. Right.

41:01

So I submitted something at reference 66.

41:08

I have I have read what you've said. And I think you were saying that the new proposals, material changes. They will change your written representations on many aspects of the project. Yes.

41:21

I mean, I listened to the earlier submissions today, and I don't have anything to add to them. I think they've essentially covered my thoughts, and I support their views, but I just leave it like that.

41:37

Yeah, that's fine. Thank you very much. Thank you. And Anthony Ingram. He spendable

41:46

Yes, thank you for me to speak. I did make the general points yesterday,

41:57

out of sequence, which I apologise.

42:00

The points of again being made today. But for postponement the I've come back to the fact that the low quality of consultation carried out by EDF and the fact that we're missing a large amounts of information in order to move forward. And also, I'd like to reiterate the point that this is a community here a wider community here with problems of access to the internet problems of access to computers, and that it would be much better if this this exercise is being carried out on a face to face basis. So again, the issues of COVID are affecting people's ability to be able to participate and contribute. Thank you very much.

43:00

Thank you.

43:05

Miss McKay, can I just advise that your screen is frozen? Thank you very much.

43:21

Oh, joy with that.

43:24

No, I'm sorry. You're still frozen. Yes, we have you back now.

43:38

All right, good. Thank you. Right, I think it would be helpful now. If those participants could perhaps put their hands up. If they do want if they do have anything to add on this topic. And I'll take you in order. Right, Nicola Pilkington, sorry I did have you down is not having a handset facility black. I can see you on my list. here from Nicola Pilkington.

44:11

Good morning. I just wanted to follow on from what the previous speakers said about the need to return to face to face meetings as soon as possible. And the screened day has been absolutely dreadful for me. I've been exposed to flickering images. And many people, including myself, have sent in written comments about how bad internet connection is in Suffolk. So I really hope that when you're looking at the success of these two initial meetings, you're bear that in mind, just type drive Put, it's been for people. And I've actually felt that if internet connection goes on being as bad as it is, through the planning process, I actually had to withdraw full participation. Second thing is that the BBC last night reminded us that we were going to be in a continuing COVID public emergency, you know, even after restrictions are lifted. And I think we all know that what we really need is to have a summer, where we can get out again, start exercising, meeting our friends, doing all the things we need to do to actually heal from having had a year in full lockdown. And I would like to ask you, again, to consider postponing hope seizure, until people have had a chance to actually you know, spend some time going out with their families, and recovering from the last year. And also, I'm very concerned about your plans to find a venue, which would be large enough to accommodate face to face meetings. As I believe Snape Maltings is going to be under a lot of pressure, with music violence, getting going. So that's really all I want you to consider. And thank you for letting me speak.

46:58

No, thank you. And

46:59

just a reminder to everyone that yesterday, I did ask people to make comments on virtual events in the process to procedural deadline B. And I think that that has been highlighted in correspondence from us. So certainly, I would urge you to provide feedback to that deadline. Thank you.

47:21

Thank you.

47:22

If you could pass, take your hand down. And I'll hear now from Paul Collins.

47:31

Thank you. sort of surprised I wasn't asked as I was on the list of people who wanted to speak on this particular agenda item Paul Collins from Minsmere level stakeholder group. on our agenda, agenda item five, we agree with the previous speakers on the lack of modelling evidence associated with these dcl changes. As we stated in the previous agenda item, no current design for the or specific application has been submitted for the original hard costs and soft coastal defence that we can assess. We're now being asked to assess whether a design change to the hard and soft coastal defence is not in substance that was originally applied for as we have no plan from the original DCO application, it is not possible to say whether this change is substantially different. However, as a design is yet to be revealed by the applicant, then this item must be considered as a material change, even though we are yet again lacking the design and location detail details for this updated structure. Also, in the stage five consultation, the applicant submitted several proposals for the temporary beach Landing Facility based on self jacking platforms. There were four of them in total. In the DCR. This amendment has been

morphed into a light jetty which is 100 metres longer than any of those consulted upon there is a lack of sufficient information to accurately assess this new proposal in terms of geomorphological impact, which therefore must be considered as a very material change. It is wholly unsatisfactory for the substantial changes and additions to be left for a decision on whether and how to accept them into the examination until after the examination has started. And I will make that point again in item six. There is also little evidence submitted on the changes to the SSSI crossing into the site, which will affect potentially the hydrology which operates between the sidewall Marsh and the Minsmere levels and the Minsmere rebored reserve. There is also an indication in the changes that the northeast corner of the proposed platform and defences will be moved 20 metres south to ensure that access to the defences and structures is available without access to Minsmere designated land to the north. This will undoubtedly have an impact on the overall area available for the main site platform. It will also change the position potentially of the permanent beach Landing Facility. It will also change it also the hard and soft coastal defence will also have an impact on this area. But there is nothing presented about this change at all in terms of the platform size, as the site platform is already very constrained when comparing the site area in advice in E n six and several proposals have already been shelved to keep cabling underground in favour of 60 metre pylons this will change and further impact the nature and visual aspect of the site which we have heard is entirely within the area of outstanding natural beauty This is not acceptable. If the proposals are accepted for examination then as both Suffolk County Council and the Suffolk have suggested, then the change application is the only one which should be examined. I also agree with Council of fellows as the need to allow for a delay to allow for proper consideration of the changes along with the need for additional information currently missing from the application. which point the points put forward by stop sighs well see in terms of access. Thank you.

51:20

Thank you very much. And could I hear from Edwina Galloway? Hello.

51:32

Bear with me.

51:41

Better? Yes.

51:45

Hello. Hello, I can hear you all good.

51:52

Edwina Galloway Vice Chair, representing Kelsale-cum-Carlton parish Council, yet another parish impacted by the proposals. We have engaged with the applicant for nearly a decade for a project, if approved likely to extend in excess of 12 years and its construction, up to 60 in operation and as yet an indeterminate period of decommissioned and site restoration. During that time, we have repeatedly drawn attention to the fact that in addition to heritage assets, our parish like others in coastal Suffolk is rich in ecological assets to which harm should be avoided. We'd have been advised the most of the application often to and including the DCO, that it was simply not possible without unacceptable environmental harm for the sea option and because of time limits and rail tracks, commitments, rail

options remain limited. We do therefore see the proposed changes as material and would request the proposals are viewed in that light.

52:55

Thank you.

52:57

Thank you.

53:01

Councillor Sanders, please.

53:08

Hello,

53:09

hello.

53:11

You can hear me Thank you. I'm actually giving a comment here as an individual as I'm an individual party, and it's related to my own relevant representation. And not that of Woodbridge Town Council although the issue was mentioned in part of the relevant representation in regard to the material change aspects are tricky want to discuss the coastal defence features which has been raised by Paul I have particular professional experience as a retired technical engineer specialising in construction of birthworks major threats in particular, in title beside tidal waters and within tidal waters. The change which has occurred with regard particularly to the heart coast of the defence is a very major increase in plant area and height of that feature on ground which has soft material at debt. Such material causes significant issues. And in particular, it raises the risk of catastrophic failure by a catastrophic failure, I mean failure which with which the contractor on site has no ability to prevent the completion of that failure. Such failures can be very major and those have occurred in East Anglia and I have had to give advice as to how to deal with it. And they have involved up to half a million cubic metres of material. These cause substantial long term environmental impacts and major impact upon the design and construction of the whole project. I am concerned that the detail that has been provided does not enable me to examine the risks of such failure, because it is insufficient to examine that potential risk. And I because of the risk is such a substantial risk, both in terms of the impact on the environment, and potentially for those working on site that I consider it is a material change and needs to be presented in full detail such so that such risks can be assessed. And I would therefore, wish to indicate that I considered this to be a substantive material change to the application. Thank you.

55:50

Thank you very much that I have for Susan Morris, please pass the salt as if you could turn your camera off.

56:03

Good morning.

56:03

Good morning.

56:06

I'm Susan release and speaking for myself and my family. I'm a resident of Theberton. And I've heard this morning that people are saying that the changes proposed by EDF may not make the substantial enough to make a difference, but the impact on local communities will be substantially different. For example, the number of trains running all the night has increased. communities will be impacted by closer footpaths, family businesses will lose more land. The details of the sea Landing Facility and the sea defences are inadequate. There was a proposed increase in the movement of construction materials to the site and there's no clear transport strategy. There's no guarantee that the rail or sea capacity can manage the increasing movement of constructions t rails. And yesterday I received an email from EDF informing me that road transport wouldn't would decrease by up to 60%. Yet none of the 17 changes that they have asked to be made have been accepted yet. EDF have been woeful in their abilities and their engagement with local communities. And which means that we are unable to make informed decisions. And we need EDF to be clear on what they propose to engage fully with local people. And we need the planning Inspectorate to make an early decision on whether the proposed changes are accepted or not. Failing to do this means that groups can't gather the information. We can't make informed decisions. And so it may be necessary for this process to be delayed until EDF can be clear on what they are proposing. Thank you very much for listening to me.

58:30

Thank you and apologies for mispronouncing your surname. I hope I get it right next time.

58:36

Notice,

58:37

right if I could hear my habit down. Well, I think it's called Hill Park. Is he here?

58:46

Yes,

58:47

it's fine. Good morning to you. I guess Really? I mean, Susan, the lady before me has nailed it. You know, please listen to her because she speaks for so many of us. I'm just a resident here. Love where I live. And I'm really concerned that after eight years, EDF have really not given the people that need to know the detail you know, you've got people like Gregory Jones, Allison Stop Sizewell C, Marianne Fellowes and Together against Sizewell,

59:26

they're all asking for the information so that if this his project goes ahead, they know what's going to happen and not be surprised. So I just again ask you Ms McKay as lead. Please listen to us local people because we really don't think that EDF are playing the game and given that they should have all this information. If I was to build a garage in my garden, I would have to give every single item the Claiming people would require so I please ask you to look after us. The residents have suffered and he suffered in particular. Thank you very much.

1:00:12

Thank you very much. Could I hear from Steven breads?

1:00:21

Good morning. Thank you very much. Can you see me yet?

1:00:26

Not yet. What? Well, I can certainly hear you loud and clear.

1:00:32

Thank you very much. Good morning. I'm Stephen Brett, chairman of Theberton and Eastbridge parish Council. To start with I would like to endorse the cut the submissions made by Marianne Fellowes, Alison Downes and Paul Collins, please, and also echo the heartfelt thoughts of the previous two people

1:00:51

who have

1:00:52

told you told us how it is. My point is over eight years of consultation to now have a proposed change to the DCO without any engineering plans for the hard and soft coastal defence means that any assessment of suitability and impact on the coast is compromised. Unless we know that these changes are accepted, we cannot proper, we cannot properly assess or discuss the impact of these changes. Thank you very much.

1:01:22

Thank you very much. So could I hear from Richard Cooper? Yes. Good morning, Madam, thank

1:01:39

you for asking me to speak. Sorry for having to shut the Sun out. Thank you for asking me to speak. My name is Richard Cooper. And I'm representing Marlesford Parish council. My concern is on the deliverability. And the way that the EDF proposals will be examined because it's not clear from their changes that any of the options that they've proposed are actually going to be deliverable either in terms of rail freight, or the beach landing, or the jetty or piers. Now, this is important for us as residents on the a 12 because the proposal suggests that up to 300 HGV movements per day can be saved. Now, if EDF failed to achieve the proposals that they're putting forward, then that means that we're back to the original number of HGVs, which has a huge impact on these parts of the A12. So I would

ask that the examining authority look very carefully at the deliverability of those proposals from EDF. And I would concur with all the Marianne Fellowes, Alison Downes and Paul Collins have said previously, thank you very much.

1:03:19

Thank you very much. So if I could hear from Ian Galloway.

1:03:30

Good morning. My name is Ian Galloway. And I'm a resident of Kelsale-cum-Carlton, and I'm a retired project professional with over 30 years experience. Prior to dealing with the overriding question, there are three areas where I'd like to understand a little more the expectations of the examining authority. Firstly, is the examining authority concerning themselves with changes of substance in the outcome? Or secondly, are they concerning the potential impact of the journey that delivers the products that comprise the outcome? And finally, are you considering each of the changes as an individual instance? or looking at the cumulative change? I'll leave the questions hanging because, from my perspective, at least some with a project background, irrespective of the answers to the questions, I currently hold the view that the proposed changes, whether they're perceived as positive or negative changes, certainly have enough cumulative impact or to determine them as being off substance. And I'll give you an example. revisions to the coastal sea defences. And the already mentioned increase of 2 million tonnes in the imported materials may or may not be connected. However, the increase in the hg v movements should the rail and See options fall away, would be absorptance in its own. Using a 29 tonne payload, the additional 2 million tonnes could increase HGV movements on the a 12 by over 138,000 movements, lifting the total to over 800,000 HGV movements over the period of construction, that sort of increase surely must be material. Thank you.

1:05:29

Thank you. Could I hear from David Grant.

1:05:38

Thank you, Madam Chariman. Ian has actually is more or less taking the words out of my mouth, I really don't understand how 20% increase in materials is not a fundamental change. Not a material change died, Echo Marianne Fellowes, and all the other experts as a humble, private individual.

1:06:02

If somebody was looking for a 20% increase in anything, I think that's very material.

1:06:07

Thank you.

1:06:09

Thank you. Could I hear from Robert Hoggle? Yes, thank you. Thank you very much.

1:06:31

And thank you, I just wanted to follow on I was trying to speak yesterday, I don't if I'm out of sequence, but I just wanted to follow Nicola ping Clinton's comments and Tony Ingram green economy and talking about this totally a fundamentally unsettled unsatisfactory way to conduct such an important inquiry and decision making process. EDF and not financially secure, they're inviting NMB general contract generation contracting, limited by for planning permission on their behalf, and then expecting us probably others insurance companies are not interested to pay the car limited company, it could at any time go out of business. And this leads the whole package unfinished on that the deliverability of this totally wrong, the environment is not considered at all. But this is well covered with an Maryanne fellows Alison downs called Paul Collins, Chris task, and many others who've done it excellently. And we're, we're the views of our our collective views. I just think that's more or less what I want to say. But I just want to emphasise the point that this is not the way to go forward. Thank you.

1:07:59

Hey, thanks. Thank you. And now I just like to emphasise and encourage people to submit their views on that to the procedural deadline beam will be held. Thank you. So if I could hear now from Jennifer Wilson.

1:08:19

Hello, I would also request you to ask to speak because I think the changes that are material, but most of my points have been mentioned. So I just want to endorse everybody, including Marian fellows stuff at coastal Friends of the Earth and task stop size or Minsmere levels. Because I think it's now I'm even more convinced the material. The changes are material and should be treated as So thanks

1:08:45

very much. Give me the opportunity to speak. Thank you. That's very helpful. And could I hear from Clive Lovelock, please?

1:09:00

Good morning,

1:09:01

Madam Chairman. Thank you for letting me speak. My name is Clive Lovelock. I'm a retard Well, we civil engineer and I have been involved in major tracking system including one particular power station so I'm quite aware of the works required to make major

1:09:27

noise in the background.

1:09:28

This cannot go Thank you.

1:09:31

I'm fully aware of the time and the works involved in major works for power stations. As far as railworks are concerned. I wasn't going to speak to this item. I was only going to speak to item six. But having

listened to what what's gone on this morning, I think I must say that this is a material change by EDF the previous proposals for the rail service moved trains overnight. It was dubious anyway as to whether they could actually manage that number of trains overnight. But that was their original proposal. They're now their new proposals, see five trains each way. And that is not possible to be done overnight. And my research and my modelling says that to do what they want to do 20% close on 20% of the current passenger trains on the east Suffolk line will have to be taken away. Now that to me, is a material change, and therefore, it should be treated like that. I will talk to you later this afternoon about strong. Okay.

1:10:57

Thank you. Thank you. And could I hear now from Alan collards.

1:11:08

Madam, good morning. Good morning to everyone else. And thank you for allowing me just a few moments here. I think if we reflect on some of the observations that are being made over this morning, and indeed yesterday, I can't help but fear we're witnessing here a very disturbing case of jewel standards. I think as was mentioned by a speaker just a moment ago, if I was to apply for planning permission for an alteration on my house, I would have to fill in all the information on the application form. And having gone through this process, I'm aware of what it entails. And if I didn't, the application would get rejected, not even considered. So I'm beginning to wonder, and I can't understand why we're even considering the DC the original DCO given the inadequacy of information that EDF have supplied, let alone the marriage or otherwise of this revised application. And certainly any application on my house would be considered a lot less material than what we're talking about in connection with a new capacitation. Thank you.

1:12:23

Thank you. I hear from Paul Whitby.

1:12:31

Good morning.

1:12:33

So Paul Whitby representing Martlesham parish Council. Martlesham has made written representation to the inquiry in regard to its sharing the wider concerns of other parish councils in the area on the applicants proposals, but specifically raising the question of traffic levels on the A12 through Martlesham, which already high and in fact, the Suffolk County Council has recently made proposals to substantially improve the traffic through Martlesham on the basis of the current projections for high traffic levels, so I just wanted to just to endorse the comments from other speakers that any proposed changes to traffic on the A12 whether they should go up or down and move traffic to rail or otherwise or to see must constitute material change to the proposal. Thank you.

1:13:28

Thank you. Could I hear from Nigel Healy please?

1:13:42

Good morning, Madam and thank you for allowing me to speak. I'm speaking on behalf of Saxmundham Town Council. And I would like first to endorse the previous comments, particularly those who Councillor Fellowes, Allison Downes of Stop Sizewell C. And Edwina Galloway of Kelsale-cum-Carlton Council. Saxmundham town council has been in consultation with EDF for over eight years, along with all other local authorities and local residents. We have faithfully submitted comments on all of their proposals. We have been those submissions have by and large been ignored and rejected. And on the latest round of consultations, EDF did not even see fit to hold a consultation in the town. Despite the fact that Saxmundham is the single community that will be most affected by the overnight rail movement. I am surprised and shocked by Clive Look, Lovelock's comments about the additional rail movements overnight and the impact on passenger trains. Many Saxmundham residents are commuters. And they will be badly affected by any significant changes to the railway timetable.

1:15:34

And I think that's all the comments I have on this particular item. Thank you, madam.

1:15:40

Thank you.

1:15:42

Could I hear from Paul Whitby

1:15:47

have already spoken up sorry, I'm sorry. Sorry, the

1:15:51

hand was up. I was just going through the hands up. I'd also have a hands up from Alison Downes is his

1:16:03

Apologies Ms McKay I realise I've already spoken but one of the people I'm representing, Gwen Urskin-Hill has contacted me to just ask me to quickly convey a point, which is that EDF proposed modifications are not detailed plans, merely suggestions on how they might proceed. And in many respects, particularly with sea deliveries are going back to issues that have been previously dismissed as and viable by EDF themselves in previous consultations. And so to express concern on that basis that, you know, we're in a situation of continually evolving and circular in some respects proposals.

1:16:41

Thank you. Thank you. Now, I do have going to be taking a break very shortly. I do have a John. With a hand up. I don't know who that surname is. It's not revealing?

1:16:59

That is me.

1:17:00

That's John Sutton. All

1:17:00

right, thank you.

1:17:04

Miss MCI,

1:17:05

thank you very much.

1:17:06

I've all I want to say very short. I've listened in detail to everything that's been said by the whole range of people who you've given opportunity to talk to, I have to say I have to endorse I come from the Oxford. I, like so many have been involved across the eight years of this, the series of consultations and dealing with this organisation. I just have I just endorsed everything that has been said further. That those will and thank you, and thank you for allowing me to speak.

1:17:37

Thank you. And then finally, before the break, Justin, Dally,

1:17:49

thank you very much. And bounce if the last week you could just turn this camera off. Oh, so right. I'm so sorry. I do. All right.

1:18:03

Thank you, madam. I'm just in Delhi. I speak as a private individual, but also as representative of our farming partnership business. I hope this is the right place to make this comment. My point goes to inadequacy of information. You've heard from others this morning. On the subjects of consultation engagement. The borrow pits and the roundabout at the main site entrance are proposed to be on our land. The hydrological impacts that others have mentioned, are likely to apply to our marshes, where we graze our large cattle herd. All of these, the borrow pits the roundabouts to hydrology likely to make much of the rest of our farm and farmable and to impact our farm buildings, farmhouse, etc. Yet since July 2012, it'll be nine and a half, nine years this July, when EDF first warned us that they might want some of our land, we've had no engagement, no engagement at all on the effects of these moves, and therefore impossible to gauge what mitigation either might be required or offered. We've been asking them to visit us on our land so we can discuss this. And most recently, their excuse for not doing so is that COVID prevents them far from conducting site visits. So there's been absolutely no progress at all in the last well in the last year. But actually, there was no engagement but it didn't seem so urgent in the seven years before that. So my messages. I mean, I don't know whether you're surprised by this. We are quite shocked by it given the impacts on our livelihood and all our employees. But there's been no engagement and no consultation. Thank you very much for listening.

1:20:06

Thank you very much for making that point. So, now we'll take a break. I'll get the case team just to check if there are any more speakers on this. I've come to the end of the hands up, we'll hear from the applicant, and then we'll move on to the next agenda item. If we adjourn now and resume at 20 to 12. I just mentioned to those watching on live stream, just to remember to refresh your browser participants to keep your link open. And we'll see you again shortly. Thank you.