

TEXT_Prelim1_Day2_SizeC_Session3_24032 021

Wed, 3/24 3:49PM • 1:24:44

00:03

All right. Good afternoon, everyone. The meeting is now resumed. Now I'll turn to agenda item six, the draft examination timetable, dealing, firstly, with the deadlines for submissions and notifications, the set out in annex D, it will be useful to have that annex in front of you for this item. Before we start on the specifics of the deadlines, I will ask my colleague, Mr. Brock, to say a few words on the panel's expectations in relation to the responses to its questions, the revisions of the draft development consent order under Section 106 agreement, and then lead on matters raised under this item.

01:02

Sorry, Mr. Brock, your microphone is muted.

01:07

Thank you. It did something all of its own. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen.

01:14

I'm going to start some comments about examining authority's questions and then move on to the DCO and the section 106. So our intention is to make the examination clear and straightforward as possible. So to assist us the examining authority, interested parties, including the applicant, are requested to submit within the proposed timescales. Please full and informative answers to the questions which we intend to issue.

01:45

I'm conscious of the submission made by the Eastern England ambulance trust yesterday. And I will come to Mr. Lawson, about that in a few moments. That's sort of a heads up for you.

01:55

We should endeavour to make our questions as clear as possible. However, even if the rationale of why we are asking a question is not fully understood a one word or simplistic answer is usually very unlikely to be sufficient. Our expectation is the parties will act reasonably in answering all questions, and they should do so on time.

02:19

Let me turn now to the development consent order and the section 106 agreement.

02:27

Hello, Mr. Ridley, we will probably come to you later or somebody else from your authority. But you may want to turn off your camera.

02:40

Can you hear me Mr. Ridley?

02:45

I'd lost the case team if they'd just like to communicate with you.

02:51

So the develop consent order and section 106 agreement

02:54

are examining authorities questions first round will include questions on the development consent order and potentially on the draft section of 106 agreement as well. That draft sexualized script is due to come in at deadline B. We have already made some comments on the drafting of the section 106 agreement annex B of our fourth procedural decision, which was PD dollar nine.

03:24

The applicant has acknowledged those and has said that they are helpful which is our intention.

03:31

Let me emphasise the sexual monistic screen which is an important regulatory document. And it's important that it works. At this stage, we want to draw to the attention of the host authorities, the local planning authorities and the applicant, that the examining authority is not itself negotiating the document. That is your task the task of the applicants and the local planning authorities. And of course anybody else who is a party to that documents.

04:04

We do want to know that use of the host authorities. Their role is as local planning authorities on the document. You should advise your councils and ensure that you arrive at a valid and enforceable document which regulates the development no matter who carries it out, no matter what changes of ownership occur. That is of course only if the DCO is made.

04:32

That is also one of the reasons that we have asked the applicant to submit an explanatory memorandum in relation to the section 106 agreement similar to the explanatory memorandum, which is required for the draft department consent order

04:47

that takes me conveniently to the DCO. The only point I want to make at this stage is that each revision of the DCO must come with a clear Validation Report.

05:00

A simple a simple practical point unless we have that the final version of the Validation Report, of the DCO, which is submitted towards the close of the examination is likely to have many unresolved technical glitches, which date back weeks or months. And they do take an inordinate amount of time to cure and to sort out.

05:23

Let me pause there and ask if there are any questions on what I have said so far. I will begin with the postal authorities. And then I want to go to Mr. Lawson for the East of England, ambulance NHS Trust, and then Mr. Phil port for the applicant, then I will go to other interested parties and ask if they have questions or submissions on what I have said this afternoon. And then I will ask Mr. Philip bot, if he needs to respond to anything said by the interested parties, and then we'll move on to look at some specific deadlines. So can I ask the Suffolk council first, please? Is there anything which you want to ask about what I have just said?

06:12

Thanks, Andrew. Take you see for a Suffolk cancel, no doubt.

06:18

Very clear and line with our expectations.

06:22

Thank you very much.

06:25

Mr. Bedford for Suffolk County Council.

06:33

Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council. No, thank you. So I agree entirely with what Mr. Tate has just said. And nothing further to add. I'm grateful to you. Thank you.

06:44

Mr. Lawson. I hope that you are able to

06:50

come to the microphone as it were.

06:55

Yesterday morning, sir. morning, afternoon, sir.

06:59

It's been a long day. Good afternoon. And thank you for coming back, I want to make sure that I've got your clients request of yesterday, right.

07:10

On the draft timetable,

07:14

we have got statements of Common Ground due on the 12th of May, and written representations on the 26th of May. Now, I may have got this wrong, but my notes of Miss process submission yesterday was that you want to submit written representations on the 12th of May, which is before the days then timetable, and that you would like a delay in relation to standard common grounds or 27th of July. And that that would include submissions on section 106 agreement. And then lastly, she also asked if you could be excused any liability for costs as a result of unreasonable behaviour claims in relation to those matters. So first of all, how I got that right.

08:00

I think you're nearly there. So the

08:03

the position is, as sort of outlined yesterday is that the East are requesting an extension until the 12th of May 21, which I think is your procedural deadline, one, for submitting the substantive evidence what we're calling an activity impact model. So we are well on with that.

08:29

But there's still a bit to do with envisage submitting that, you know, by so it could come in before but by the 12th of May 21, for our evidence, obviously that goes to the to the Applicant and yourselves. And then we are hopeful that we could then have an initial statement of common ground, which would include heads of terms of agreement

08:58

to you by the procedural deadline for which is the 23rd of July 21. And the you know, you may be thinking that that that's obviously quite a time in the future. But better to be realistic. We wouldn't want to, you know, to suggest a deadline before those and then have to come back for more. And it's really just by dint of the fact that the services under such a high level of pressure with the pandemic and the vaccination programme, which is another obviously set of responsibilities on top of that. Thank you.

09:40

Okay, mosaic game, I've understood what you're what you're saying. I mean, it's very useful to have evidence early. So I think we welcome the suggestion that you submit your I'm sorry, I forgot what it's called or read. Right? Yes. Well, it's our evidence essentially, yes. A model an activity impact.

10:00

model, thank you activity about on the 12th of May.

10:07

I will go to Mr. Phillipot and ask him to comment on the 27th of July aspect.

10:16

Let me

10:19

just let me say to you that one of the points obviously, of the of

10:25

the statement of Common Ground is that it helps to narrow the issues. Yes, we are commencing issues specific hearings on the sixth of July for a period of two weeks.

10:40

So, and

10:43

I think I can say to that our, our, our informal thinking at the moment will be an early ISH on the DCO on section 106 agreement, socio economics, which I think probably is where your, your thinking fits in.

10:58

It are likely to be heard by other ice ages. But in that first set.

11:05

If we agree to lay or sit in Continental 27th of July, there are two things there. One is that the issues will simply be wider for everybody, but also it'll be wider for you at that point.

11:20

So I've made that point, just do here hold up point with you and response mode. The other point is that you've asked to be excused by virtue of costs as a result of unreasonable behaviour. And I understand what you're saying that you're flagging up now that you need extra time in which to do this. But you have a fear that this might look as though it's unreasonable behaviour if it if a cost claim would be made later.

11:47

I don't think I again say anything, Mr. Robot says but that I think is going to give us a bit of a difficulty, because you're effectively asking us to make a decision in advance, which would be I think, a fetter on our discretion.

12:00

And probably wouldn't work for you. So can I ask you to respond on those on those two points before I turn to Mr. Phillpotts?

12:12

Yes, certainly.

12:14

Not on the first point was in relation to the timetabling of the socio economic issues specific hearings?

12:23

Is the time during other hearings, which you're likely to be involved. Yeah, right. gonna come before you your SHCG. And if we do that, indeed, yes. So I'm bound to say that we wouldn't really be able to participate fully in it until, you know, the evidence has been prepared and submitted and considered by the applicant. So I think we're probably on the periphery of those discussions. Anyway, I don't think there's anything we can really validly contribute, you know, the applicant is clear about our concerns, and I think they realise the ball is in in East court. And obviously, we're just waiting to put the ball back with the evidence so that there isn't really much I can comment further on that. On the issue specific hearings. You know, we certainly wouldn't want to hold up the examination any way. I will just hopeful that given the unique circumstances associated with east as a service and how it how it's, you know, intrinsically involved with the coronavirus pandemic and the vaccination programme, but

13:38

it's its interest could be sort of just put further back into the examination process. So that that's really all I would say on the first point on the second point, yeah, obviously, fully understand what you're saying that and it was more in respect of any potential claims based on timelines rather than, you know, being completely

14:01

absorbed or immune from,

14:04

you know, cost claims, although I can't,

14:08

you know, we're hopeful that we wouldn't be doing anything that would be deemed to be sort of cost worthy. If you like this. I'm sure you'll

14:19

do that very responsibly. That's not that's not my not my concern. But I think what you have asked for it falls into the cost clinic and only kind of bottoms off one reason, behaviour and delays would fall into that category. But just let me be clear, you are going to be submitting to us evidence on the 12th of May. Yes. Is that not evidence which will form the basis of what you would say at a hearing? Yes.

14:44

Okay.

14:45

You may well be able to come along to an issue specific hearing, which is before you finalised your statement of common ground.

14:55

Yes, it's evidence by the 12th of May sir and then we're just building in

15:00

ample time, I think 10 weeks and two days until the 23rd of July. So the applicant has sufficient time and yourselves to consider the evidence and obviously, hopefully get a long way down if not fully completed a state with common ground and heads of terms so that, you know that I appreciate that 10 weeks seems to be quite a long time. But if you're just receiving the evidence on the 12th of May, it's probably not an unreasonable period for getting all the i's dotted.

15:34

So I suppose what I'm saying is it might not be it might be a little more than initial statement, common ground by the 23rd of July, it might be a substantive while advanced state with common ground.

15:48

Okay, I see, I hear what you say, when you say heads turn, heads the terms in relation to what the section 106 agreement? Right. Yes, absolutely. So I think what, what we envisage is a financial contribution to augment the services, the additional services, don't do worry about the substance of it now. But you're

16:13

fine. Okay. You're saying to be heads of terms in relation to that? Yes. Thank you do appreciate that the applicant has said it's giving us it's

16:22

it's second draft of the sexual monistic agreement at deadline B, which is then a couple of weeks away?

16:29

Yes, we do. So. Okay. All right. Okay. Thank you very much. You can switch your camera off now. But also don't please don't Please don't go.

16:41

Thank you very much indeed.

16:47

Mr. Phillpot.

16:49

I,

16:51

I would like to make sure if you're with me, thank you.

16:56

Thank you very much. I want to make sure you your clients have understood what the examining authority is saying about examining authority's questions, section 106 agreements and the DCO. First, and then I'll ask you to respond to what Mr. Lawson has been telling us. Yes, I can confirm that what you said about those earlier matters is both understood. And as anticipated, and I don't have any further comments to make on that. If you'd like me to respond briefly to the matters that you've just been discussing, with the representative, the ambulance service, I can deal with those now. Yes, if you would respond to what Mr. Lawson was saying to them and says I'd be helpful. Yes. And, obviously,

17:41

the earlier we have information, the better but I don't I don't anticipate at the moment that what has been said would cause insuperable obstacles the statement of common ground. We think that that can be

17:58

dealt with in the following way. We will have the evidence and the written representations. Well, ahead of the 27th of July, clearly, and a deadline three, we will have an opportunity to comment on the written representations that have been made. That would include an opportunity to make comments on the evidence that we receive in May, we are of course, able to put together a draft statement of common ground, what we anticipate will be in the final stages and

18:41

at that stage, it isn't agreed, we at least think we will be able to put something forward that will assist you. And we'll be there in time for

18:56

consideration at issue specific hearing. So we don't think that that is an insuperable obstacle, we will do what we can

19:04

outside the examination process, to seek to narrow down disagreement and clarify matters as much as we can directly party to party.

19:17

So far as the issue of costs is concerned, it doesn't seem to me that it is possible in advance for the examining authority to make a decision on whether parties should be liable to cost but but it seems to me that that what really lies at the heart of this is a request for more time for some particular steps. If you are persuaded that there is good reason why a particular document or a particular step should be submitted at a later date that would otherwise be the case. Then it seems to me that that would go to the reason

20:00

Bonus or otherwise, have the party then submitted at that point. It's really if you're not persuaded, or if not withstanding a date having been set having regard to the submissions made about what is and is not reasonable and possible that that deadline is not met that any issue of unreasonableness and costs

would arise. So I don't think it's necessary or possible to make a decision on costs in advance what really we're dealing with here is the reasonableness of the procedural steps that are set and once they've been set, having regard to the circumstances,

20:39

parties must then meet them or explain why in the circumstances they're unable to. So I'm not sure I can take that much further, but it doesn't really need to.

20:50

Thank you. That's, that is very helpful. guys get back on the on section 106. point I did. And we have asked for something which I think is perhaps slightly unusual, which is that your clients prepare an explanatory memorandum for Section 106 agreement. And I

21:11

recognise that it's unusual to do that, by your clients. And those who are instructing you are on board for how helpful that will be, and that they understand what it is that we are hoping to see in it.

21:26

So yes, I can say yes, on both counts. First of all, we think we've got a pretty good understanding of what you would find helpful. And secondly, we agree that it will be helpful, one of the things that we're very keen to do where we can, and the expansion memorandum is an example of that. The expansion memorandum to the DCO is also an equivalent document, is to enable people to understand, hopefully, in a reasonably accessible way, what is being proposed, and the section 106 obligation agreement could be off putting to someone who's not well versed in how they're structured and how they work. So we certainly see the advantages, both in communicating and to interested parties, how it works and what it's intended to achieve. And thereby hopefully, to save some time

22:25

for interested parties who otherwise have questions that would actually be answered by that document. So we are

22:33

enthusiastic about the idea. And we will produce something which we hope is helpful. Good. Thank you. I think from our point of view, here, to have a clear statement of how the thing is working legally, is is important, you'll be able to read the comments that we made a PDF below nine, I think you're familiar from past experience with some of those issues.

23:01

Thank you. Right, I will now want to turn to interested parties, other interested parties in relation to those matters we've just been talking about.

23:14

That's to say the examining authorities requirements in relation to examining authorities questions or the answers to those questions in Section 106 agreement. And the drafting of the development consent order, and I'll turn first of all, to anybody who is on the telephone.

23:31

Is there anything which anybody who's on the telephone alone would like to raise?

23:39

Perhaps I lost the case team. Is there actually anybody who's just here on the telephone? Sorry, Mr. Brock, we don't have any participants by telephone. Thank you very much. Do we have any participants who don't have the hand function? Or are we if there are any participants who don't have the hand function? Would they like it? Or do they have any questions?

24:00

You will simply have to switch on your microphone and button if you do.

24:06

I'm going to take that as a no as I see the hands begin to go up.

24:11

Right, and that turned those who put up hands. So just on the question of responses to zoning authorities questions. And what I've said about sexual wellness experience in the DCO.

24:23

Regan Scott, I see your hand has been out for a few moments. You were first in the queue.

24:31

Yesterday, thank you. I've a different issue. I apologize. Very good. Thank you very much. Do you please don't forget to raise it when we get that.

24:40

Mr. Haile in Saxmundham. I see you. I see your hand.

24:46

Good afternoon, sir. Thank you. Just a brief point I was just looking through the draft section 106 agreement between the council's and sides was see

24:58

and I noticed that

25:00

Is there a section in there for noise mitigation. But there's nothing there for vibration mitigation. And that is sort of possible damage caused to

25:12

buildings within the as a result of the rail and freight transfers.

25:19

Thank you very much. Thank you. That's, that's helpful. I'm sure you'll make that point to the applicant as well.

25:26

And they'll have heard it from you now.

25:30

Gregory James, I see your hand.

25:36

Thank you. Thank you very much, sir. Gregory James QC.

25:40

Just a very short point on the section 106 is and of course, welcome from Mr. Phil Park and his team, any explanatory guidance on the section 106, can I just raise for consideration based on experience, particularly for interested parties, because section 106 is inevitably for reasons that you will appreciate, tend to become quite bilateral or a series of bilateral meetings with the relevant bodies, who are going to be signatories to them, that that any thought could be given thought to ensure that those interested parties who, who would want to participate on a particular topic or anything, whether there can be thought to be given to a practical and I'm aware of the amount of third party interest and I realise those constraints, practical way to ensure an efficient participation.

26:36

So that it isn't you just get them at the new version out of the blue as it were, for each deadline. And whether there is scope for exploring opportunities for some engagement

26:50

in a practical way, with certain, you know, interested parties with the applicant and authority, so just raise that point, because that tends to be a practical difficulty.

27:02

Okay, thank you. Mr. Jones. I mean, let me just saying give a bit of guidance to other members of other interested parties who are here it is, as you say, Mr. Jones, a bilateral document was documented between the landowners and the planning authorities, which is the host authorities on this on this this occasion. And I will leave it to you, Mr. Jones, and to others who want to seek to be involved to raise those points with the applicant. I express new view.

27:41

Fine, I don't see any more hands up on that apart from Mr. Jones, yours is still up, but I'm sure you'll pop it down at the root in a moment.

27:51

Mr. Phillips, do I need to call on you in relation to this points, which has just been made by interested parties?

27:59

Can you hear me? I can hear you.

28:03

I don't think I need to. So I could, but I don't think anything I say will necessarily move matters on. Thank you very much. Okay, so I will move on.

28:15

So turning now to the specifics of the various deadlines for written submissions and for notifications, I want to

28:22

highlight one or two in relation to the timetable. You can find the timetable at annex D of the rule six letter which is PD w nine.

28:36

Please note the notification date for the hearings. I'm saying this to everybody who's in the room.

28:45

open floor hearings, and compulsory acquisition hearings are not automatic. open floor hearings only take place if before the relevant deadline, an interested party notifies us of their wish to be heard at an open floor hearing.

29:06

The deadline for giving us notice of that is in the draft timetable at D1, deadline one.

29:14

The position this position is exactly the same for compulsory acquisition hearings, we must hold a CA hearing but only if an affected person gives notice of their wish to be heard before the deadline.

29:28

So if you fall into either of those categories, please make sure that you understand where the deadline is, and that if you want to be heard, you have to give a notice Otherwise, the law does not require us to hold a hearing.

29:46

An affected person. Let me help an affected person is defined in several places in the legislation. It's got slightly different meanings in different places. But it seems to me that relevant definition for this purpose is to be found in Section 92

30:00

Planning Act 2008, which says this, a person is an affected person for the purposes of this section, if the person's name has been given to the Secretary of State, you know, notice under Section 59 request.

30:15

So it's essentially a person who owns land or who owns rights over land which are proposed to be subject to compulsory acquisition or whom rights are going to be

30:27

acquired. compulsory acquisition is a complex area. Partly it's complex because people's land is at stake. And if you think your land is being compulsorily acquired, or REITs are created here, but you may want to protect your position. And we were mentioning this because we do not want people to miss the deadline for requesting a compulsory acquisition, hearing. And that deadline in the draft timetable, I emphasise is the draft, is it the one we expect that the timetable will be finalised and sent out with the rule eight letter shortly after the close of the preliminary meeting, it's got a date in the draft timetable at the moment that is in about a month's time, according to the current draft.

31:11

I am now going to turn to the first of the

31:18

three items which form this agenda item.

31:24

That is deadlines for submission, submissions and notifications. On this whole Agenda Item Number Six there are slightly over 100 interested parties have expressed a wish to speak on it. Many interested parties make points about the effects of COVID-19. And some council fellows as one and Catherine bacon as another are among those who make points about the forthcoming elections. And the Purder period which begins on the 24th of March, which is today. We heard many submissions about elections yesterday. So if you spoke on that, then there is no need to repeat what you said then, but I will ask for the if anybody wishes to speak on that now. Uh, may I start please with East Suffolk council? And ask if you have any submissions, which you wish to make to us about the election period?

32:25

Take UC Santa cancel. No, I've got no comments on the election period. Specifically. I've got one or two other comments. But that's later I understand. Thank you very much. I'll come to you later.

32:39

Mr. Bedford for Suffolk County Council. Is there anything you want to submit to us about the forthcoming elections and the election period?

32:50

Thank you. So Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, nothing to submit in terms of any specific comments, but merely to raise as it were a question for you as to whether and we have no view as it were one way or the other. But whether you would find it helpful or not. If we were simply to provide you at deadline B, with a written note simply on governance arrangements that Suffolk County Council as a local authority puts in place during both the pre election period and the immediate aftermath of the post election period. I just pulled out neutrally. But if you would find it helpful, we can provide it if you don't think you would benefit from it, we won't provide it.

33:33

Thank you very much.

33:35

I suspect we will confer amongst ourselves and come back to you. Thank you very much. That's good. I was gonna ask counsel fellows if she wants to add anything, but I think she will have left by now. It's what she said earlier. is Catherine bacon here.

33:51

And do you wish to add anything?

33:58

That sounds like no, he was now.

34:03

Let me move on then to

34:06

COVID-19 issue

34:10

in relation to COVID-19. A number of parties and other interested parties have asked for changes to the timetable, including greater time because of the effects of the coronavirus pandemic.

34:23

You should know that the government has made it very clear that he expects the work of the planning Inspectorate to continue during the plant pandemic. I suppose it's also arguable that a good time to examine this application is over the summer, when for example, as a stronger prospect of in person meetings rather than over the winter. And there are many, many uncertainties and we all recognise that and all five members of the examining authority would like to have a restoration of greater predictability.

34:53

Please be assured that the examining authority has read all the submissions made for this preliminary meeting and we

35:00

We'll anxiously take them all into account.

35:03

If anybody wishes to draw anything new to our attention in relation to COVID-19, then please do so by all means, by procedure or deadline B. Now, is that clear? I see I've got two hands up already.

35:20

Mr. Haile, you had your hand up first.

35:26

Yes, I'm sorry, sir. And thank you for allowing me to speak I'm I'd expected that someone else will be speaking on the previous

35:36

topic of the district, the county council elections.

35:42

I'm disappointed that neither the District Council nor the county council, those spokespeople actually sort of referred to the problems that we will have

35:53

in having the county council elections running, particularly those of us that are participating in those elections, either officials or as candidates.

36:04

And I do consider that it produces a great strain on us to be able to actually partake, both in the inquiry at the same time as we're carrying out our election work. Thank you, sir. Thank you very much, Mr. Haile. Thank you.

36:22

And I've got Mr. Bill Parker. Your hand is up as well.

36:34

Mr. Parker, do you want to hear apologies, I'm having some technology problems. But that's okay. happens to the best of us. Okay, I can't get my camera. Yes, I can. I can hear you loud and clear. Now. I can see you very well. Thank you. All right. Thank you. Yes. Again, I wanted just to refer back to the timetable on the conflict with the Suffolk county council elections. I'm representing Sanborn parish Council.

36:59

Suffolk County Council obviously is a very key part of the whole process. And I've got a number of responsibilities, roads, etc.

37:08

Not having a county Councillor giving us advice as a parish Councillor, through this period, I feel is a challenge for the parish councils, we rely on the councilors to be able to give us good advice on particularly on this issue. The other thing I would highlight is that whilst the elections are on the sixth of May, actually awarding sort of the council's don't really come in back into action again until the end of May at the AGM. So the appointment of councilors to J lag to portfolios and so on doesn't actually happen until we get to the end of May. So the gap, the

37:54

unavailability of having guidance directly from our local counsellors actually goes a long period into the process. And therefore, whilst I know this conversation was rehearsed quite a lot yesterday morning, I feel that the nuance of it wasn't really understood. And I would ask the examining authority to take this into consideration when we're trying to respond responsibly, to all the challenges that this DCO process gives us. So I would just like to highlight that if I may. I have one further point. And that is, before lunch, Mr. Rhodes and Mr. Phil Park gave it a lot of information. And I think you asked for a summary to be supplied for a procedure deadline be I think it was, the challenge we have with that, of course, is that we also need to do any further comments about by procedure by procedure deadline B,

38:57

we would really like to see what they said in writing in a summary form for us to be able to comment on that, if it was possible for them to develop to buy that information in advance of the current seventh of April, that would be really helpful to ensure that we can get good responses back. So I hope that be helpful, that you're asking for that in relation to the responses that we got from Mr. Phillipot. Is it also what you've got from this? authorised Mr. Rhodes as well? Yeah. I mean, if that summary could be provided as soon as possible, then that would enable us to be able to consider that as part of our response for procedural deadline day. So do you mean the summary during the extra documentation which Mr. raisins just gave quite a lot of information in that in the presentation or their commentary, just a summary of that, about where they fail that, for instance, where the coast of

40:00

issues are and so on, that would actually be helpful for us to understand and process there's a lot of information being thrown at us at the moment, and having something written down will be helpful.

40:11

Sometimes I think there's quite a lot written down that

40:14

I got, I just remind you that there is the you can watch the recording of all of this. And if you, if you go back to it,

40:24

you may find that that helps, if I can help you because I wrote down I think I wrote down myself the time, which Mr. Rhodes was talking, it was about midnight, so slightly, slightly, slightly afternoon. So if you if you watch the recording from then on, you may find that, you know, tomorrow you can get all that information without waiting for Mr. Rhodes to produce it. But I hear your request. And we will, we will

consider at any time, feel free to look at the recording. Thank you. Thank you very much. And actually, you've reminded me of something which I did want to ask Mr. Phillpotts.

41:01

Okay, you can elicit Anything else? Mr. Parker, you can leave straight ahead. Mr. Philip, just remind you again to you came back for my question as to whether or not it was 32 hectares or 9.7, you came back with some concrete you do submit some more figures about it, and a promise of some others, to reconcile them. And you volunteer to put those forward at deadline be good if you bought them. But before we close today, I'd be grateful if you could give them not now, but sometime convenient when I've next got you on the screen.

41:35

Yeah, so thank you, dude, do you want me to respond now also on the point about

41:41

early written versions of what we've said?

41:45

Because I can do that and do that quite shortly. We'll just have like, got Mr. Collins has got his hand up as well. Let's ask Let's ask him to speak. And then I will come back to you. And if there's something we can deal with on him as well, you can deal with the two. Thank you, Mr. Collins. I've got your hand up. Yeah, it wasn't

42:03

a question for Mr. Phil. But it was actually one of clarification from you. And if you wouldn't mind.

42:10

Yes, Paul Collins as part of Minsmere level stakeholder group. If we want to, if there's an interesting part of you want to actually appear at multiple issues, specific hearings, but don't exactly know which ones you want to be on, or talk as, because some will be more or less pertinent to what we're looking at. Is there a simple way of doing an ad? Or are we going to have to say we want at each one be able to ask for that

42:36

ability?

42:38

What do you forgive me, because I haven't got the detail of every single procedural point before me, which is a failing on my part, you might want to ask the case team or probably I would go If I were you to the examination procedure rules, which are on the website for the national infrastructure page.

43:00

I'll do that gets me to where I want to be. Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Phillpotts.

43:11

So yes,

43:13

I can What I can tell you is that the figure of 32 hectares which you gave on, which I think I also adopted in my submissions to you about the Pakenham site. That is correct, as I understand it, in relation to the size of the site as a whole. The other figures which I gave related to the creation of habitat within the site as a whole. What I'd suggest is that the other figure which I gave the 9.6, had to figure I suggest that be discounted. And I think that was that was a piece of information. And I'm sorry about that. But the first you have to figure is right. And I understand the other figures I gave were right, but it might help if we put in a note at deadline B, which just sets all of that out in writing. So sorry if I said that a hair running with the other figure.

44:12

But I hope that tolerably clear now. Thank you, I think we've caught the hair, that's probably the most with your assistance. Thank you for that.

44:22

So far as the request for an early version of the notes is concerned. So once we do try and be helpful, I think that this is a step too far if I may say so. There is a reasonable deadline set. For one we're to provide a written version of what we've said is even indicated it's possible to go back and watch the recording. Again, we have submitted

44:52

quite a lot of information which sets out all of these matters. The order explanation can be listened to

45:00

As people wish between now and the date for the written version, and I suggest that this would be an unhelpful precedent to set.

45:10

Thank you. Thank you very much. Okay.

45:15

So from here on, we are going to deal with three aspects of agenda item six.

45:24

Oh, Councillor Sanders, I see your hand has gone up.

45:30

Thank you, Mr. Brock. I wanted to I didn't raise my finger. So briefly run through it again. Because I may not have made it as clear as I could have yesterday. And that's with regards to the local government legislation of 1972, which may seem sorry,

45:48

for you may be aware of, but the government produced emergency legislation last year allowing us to meet virtually, but only for a year, therefore, from May the seventh councils and that means I've determined all councils will not be permitted to meet remotely and due to restrictions, which is much weaker discussing will not properly be prevented from meeting other committees or full councils, which will affect the way that we will be able to respond after that date and less challenges which are currently made by certain councils to that legislation, overturn the current legal position.

46:32

Thank you very much. Sanders.

46:35

Reagan, Scott, your hand is up again. I have heard you already. Is that a new point that you want to make?

46:45

Yes, camera as well? Yes. So it's best to see. Good, thank you very much.

46:51

I've got two specifics about the deadline for submissions and notifications.

46:58

They're both questions really. One is why is the Reese report so late? In the process? It's in September. And we've only got, like 1415 days to respond to it. And I'm asking because I've seen the horizon report, which I think the inspector have produced. And I think Tilbury as well, one of the one of the Tilbury infrastructure developments, there was quite important Rhys report, I just wonder whether that could come forward.

47:32

I mean, the Navy, very good reason for it being late. But if the so GCS and the S 106 is start quite quickly.

47:43

Many of the nature issues don't very complicated. It would be very, very helpful to have that earlier. So that's one question. The other one is arises from the

47:55

problem, what is the menu of principle issues, and Eropa is in there. But I'm aware that the there are new HRA regulations, there's the Brexit amendment regulations 2019. And they set out a totally different way, if you'd like a process for the discussion of a ropey so I'm wondering

48:24

maybe as a principal issue, it ought to be under policy and needs. Now that's all these things do overlap. But

48:34

the bit of paper I'm looking at which is the relevant state of the of the new regulations for 2019. It looks as though the nature issues involved in a ropey are to be handled by the joint Nature Conservancy committee.

48:50

But there's a specification, I think it's point D,

48:54

which is that any other person the appropriate authority considers appropriate, you know, lovely piece of language. But given the ropey involves, you know, public interest issues, what's overarching and so on and so forth, there's going to be very, very complex issue.

49:12

I'm also aware which I wasn't aware of some time ago that

49:16

the inspector of have a role in responding to the requests for Opie, which the developer has put in. So

49:26

I wonder

49:28

should this all come forward and be allotted

49:32

some more space rather than being less polite, legal expert? Certainly not.

49:38

thank you. Thank you. We'll take that into account. Thank you.

49:45

Right, I want to move to the deadlines.

49:49

Then Mr. mall is going to deal with dates and the format for hearings and then he will pass to Mrs. Cassini who will deal with site inspections.

50:00

So you see what the deadlines are in annex D, I hope that you've got a copy of annex D or they're electronically or in paper form ahead of you. The next procedure deadline is deadline be on seventh of April. And then we have various deadlines with quite a lot of information which needs to be provided at each of them.

50:18

There are 1238 the total of each running to through to October. So may I ask if there's anybody who wants to ask any questions about the deadlines?

50:38

Carina Wentzel? So I see you there. And Mr. Scott, could you put your hand down please. And also, if you could switch off your camera, that would be lovely

50:48

Good afternoon and thank you very much. But with regard to deadline number one and deadline number two, as it currently stands, the timetable requires interested parties to submit their detailed written representations by deadline to which is the 22nd, I mean the 26th of May. But this is only two weeks after deadline one on the 12th of May, as currently scheduled. And in particular, we know that is that deadline one the initial statements of common ground and local impact reports will be made available and published. And these documents will be of particular relevance to and assistance to interested parties, yet, they will only have a limited amount of time to renew their contents, and then to adapt their written representations as appropriate. So we therefore request that the timetable be adapted, and I do acknowledge points made by bodies such as East that they are already working hard and struggling to meet the existing timetables proposed that basically that the deadline for initial statements of common ground are split perhaps from deadline one and either brought forward. So to perhaps get interested parties three weeks to digest their contents. And particularly also the local impact reports, which you'll appreciate will be of huge relevance to interested parties. Or perhaps that the deadline, the date for deadline to is pushed back. So deadline one remains is currently scheduled. But then we allow interested parties a bit more time to digest the content in any initial statements of common ground or local impact reports. And that was my point currently on the setting. Right. Am I right that I should then hold back any other comments about hearings until later in this agenda item? Yeah, I just trust you with deadlines at the moment. Then the next thing is hearings. And then lastly, the site inspections that Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much.

52:55

Mr. Tate.

53:02

Thank you, sir.

53:04

Andrew, at Suffolk Council. So one general point that we welcome the gaps identified between the issues specific hearings, because in an intensive programme, that's going to be very important with many other things to do. That's the general point. There are two very small, more detailed points. The first is that that deadline five,

53:31

and it

53:34

provides for as the first point post hearing submissions.

53:41

But

53:43

the issue specific hearings proceed deadline for so that seemed to be a redundancy at present. A very small point. But thank you. I see. Yes. Yeah. deadline for has the post here. I see. Yes. I see your point. Thank you. Yeah. And then the second point, similarly, it's a it says it's a small point that deadlines six, which follows the issue specific hearings in late August. So we need to be post hearing submissions.

54:17

I don't think present a they appear in that list.

54:25

Because we've had no we had ISH is on the week of the 24th on the 27th of August. Yeah. So if we did have them, we'd need to have the written submissions afterwards that D six. Got you. Yes.

54:41

Thank you. Was there anything else? No.

54:44

Thank you. I'm grateful for you for pointing this out. Thank you.

54:50

Can I pick Sorry, can I bet I've just been cut off completely. I didn't hear the answer to my question, Scott. I've only just come back on.

54:59

Thank you.

55:03

I think I simply thanked you for your submission and said that we would take it into account. Thank you.

55:08

Thank you. All right.

55:12

Thank you.

55:15

Rosie Sutherland.

55:19

Thank you, sir. I don't dare turn my camera on. I'm hopeful I can make three attempts without being cut off. It was a very, very short, quick point. Appreciate the points are already made by others. It was just being conscious that the change application determination may not be made until the 15th of April. And I was just thinking on behalf of Sorry, I should have said the RSPB and stuff at Wildlife Trust.

55:46

The first statement, Common Ground is then due on the 12th of May. And just wondering, would obviously be more helpful to you, if that's common ground did take account of the changes if they were acceptable. So could I please just flag a relatively short period of time between the determination and that first statement of Common Ground being?

56:08

Thank you got that. Thanks. Thank you very much.

56:14

Allison downs.

56:19

Thank you, Mr. Brock.

56:22

Again, reiterating this of ongoing uncertainty about when the changes may or may not be accepted.

56:30

Obviously, obviously, one solution is to push back the deadlines for written representations because many of us are wishing to appoint experts to look at things and don't want to replicate that work. But I I'm concerned that the statutory timeline for the examination of six months cannot itself be extended. So again, I'm hoping that you will consider delaying the start of the examination. And just to say in response to Mr. Phil port, I think the claim of urgency by the applicant is not a reasonable claim, because there's no agreed funding mechanism for this project, and not likely to be for some months, and if a regulated asset basis to be used that would require legislation and in fact, EDF sound financial report for 2020 outlines the many of the challenges patient.

57:18

I'm sorry, I'm going to pause you there. Mr. Mrs. Downes. Thank you. I understand those points that we made before and there may be ones that you want to make in substance later on when we get into the into things like funding.

57:32

Thank you.

57:35

Mr. Wilson.

57:42

Oh, hello. Thank you, Mr. Brock. Christopher. Awesome. Speaking on behalf of together against science, we'll see task.

57:50

Forgive me if I'm not too sure quite where in the agenda. I should come in to talk about the general work. item six. At the moment. I'm asking if you have anything you wish, anything you wanted to submit in relation to the dates, the deadlines, which was general observations in common with sort of previous speakers task are disappointed to see that the draft timetable

58:15

shows that the planning spectra are not planning to cite where the applicants changes, requests will be accepted until after the preliminary meeting closes. I think I think we've got that point very, very clearly. Thank you. Yeah, but I will just make the point that there's many reasons it would be beneficial for the

58:36

whole process to be delighted. And I just wanted to go through those if I may. Or is that should that be a different part of the agenda?

58:47

If you could keep your comments on it, concise, I'd be grateful. Well, I should try that. As with all the size of C issues, everything becomes quite complex and for leanness, and I just think delay would actually give the applicant more time to provide his final plans and impacts to their impacts to all interested parties, not just Suffolk County Council at Suffolk, who they tend to liaise with, we'd like to do those before the examination starts. Because it we've already been speaking about the possibility of material changes that were submitted in January. This may be further material changes that are on the cards on the 22nd of March in a centre for policy study webinar. Julia Pyke who is director of finance and Economic Regulation to EDF Sizewell C said the ADF are attending to you tonight heat from Sizewell C to produce heat assisted hydrogen district heating and direct air capture. These are developments in the DCO process, which obviously would have a significant implication as major alterations to overrule proposal.

1:00:00

would mean yet more documentation, regulatory and planning implications and a whole new dimension to the project for those who are already affected by the proposals for a new nuclear plant? If this is the case, would it not be sensible for the applicant to prepare their full plans and then basically reject the start the examination once you've actually decided exactly what they're going to build at Sizewell, and also thinking delay would give the regulators such as the ONR and Environment Agency, Natural England MMO. More times, they've already we're aware that there's a number of financial safety, health and environmental issues,

1:00:40

which are the prime responsibilities of regulators who may not have sufficient time to input and leave even an interim view on their areas of responsibility to the planning Inspectorate. Because of all the changes. According appalled at the suggestion by the applicant. So many important matters such as the design of the coastal defences would not be finalised until after the DCO is consented. We believe that the examination period should not end before the ONR and the Environment Agency have completed their licensing and permit work. Indeed, given the importance of the hardens, soft self say defences to protect a nuclear site. I really can't see any point in starting the examination at all without those detailed proposals.

1:01:24

There are other reasons as well, but you wanted me to keep it short. So I shall provide those in writing. Thank you very much. Please, please do make sure that you send them in the deadline be

1:01:38

Mr. Collins?

1:01:46

Sorry, I'm just trying to get my notes back up. Thank you.

1:01:50

Yes, strangely enough, I'd like probably echo to some extent of what the previous speaker Mr. Wilson has just said, having listened to the various submissions from yesterday, and today, it's made me reflect on the general adequacy of the consultation decision for acceptance of this DCF examination. statutory authorities clearly felt the applicant had met their limited divine goals agreed with the applicant for community consultation. However,

1:02:20

there is no please I will let you. I'm asking if you've got any submissions, which you may want to make specifically about the deadlines 123328, which are on the draft timetable. Okay, well, I'll go on to actually, I have an issue with all of them. In reality, the Environment Agency is, as our last speaker said, has consistently requested that their licence associated with the operation of the station be submitted at least six months prior to the DCR submission, to enable their determination to be available for the examining authority during the DCR application. These were submitted concurrently with the application, which means their determination are likely to be beyond the examination period. We have also heard that the oh and our site licence will not be determined prior to the end of the examination. The precise nature of the hard and soft coastal defence will be central to the determination of this licence on safety grounds. But the LNR not necessary are not the statutory authority for coastal issues. The parameters that have been given so far for this has been questioned by Robert Sanders, who has expertise in this and other coastal organisations and statutory council T's in prior consultations. So are also considered set have also said that they consider the design so far to be inadequate, and it must tell them. Can I just go there's a point that I'm going to interrupt you again, I'm sorry. But the points which you are making are really going to the bigger point, let me help you the bigger point which you're making about whether or not this is the right time to start the examination at all. I'm interested if you have points specifically about things which have to be produced at deadline, one or two or three or four,

seven growth, if you if you could relate your remarks to the deadlines which are there, or So are you saying this is going to be covered somewhere else? I'm saying we've had quite a lot of submissions about the amount of consultation about the amount of information the information which has or has not been supplied to, for example, Environment Agency, and I'm well aware, I do follow that the Environment Agency are saying they can't complete their process in the timetable, which is currently out there.

1:04:41

But I so we we've heard quite a lot from that and you can make more submissions in writing.

1:04:48

Alright, well, I'll finish off by saying it will be preferred preferable that the examination would start so that all of these determinations are taken at the point and are available before the

1:05:00

End of this examination, so I am asking you to stop, or at least not start this examination until such time as those determinations can be made within the within the timeline for this. And that's what I'm trying to get at here. The actual structure of those

1:05:19

deadlines within that period are something that I mean, plenty of other people have made some points to you, which are fairly procedural, and I accept those, and we will try and abide by them. But if we don't, if we can't actually see the necessary information to make those written representations, sensibly, we are ending, we are going to end up with a bunch of

1:05:42

DCO,

1:05:44

draft DCO

1:05:47

clauses, which actually put the proper

1:05:51

view of those issues which are contested, beyond the scope of our ability to actually assess them and respond to them. And that is inappropriate and acceptable.

1:06:06

Thank you. I'm very grateful to you for making for making that clear. And for this submissions. But this is more you want to say please do send it in writing. Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you,

1:06:17

Mr. Murray. Mr. Graham Murray.

1:06:24

Good afternoon, Mr. Brock. I have to say, quite unusually for me, I'm feeling quite intimidated now sitting here. I'm sorry, please don't. I want to hear what you have to say. Well, I had prepared a statement yesterday and I have been faithfully sitting here for me unusually silent for nearly two days.

1:06:44

Please stick with me.

1:06:46

As you will see, sorry, let me introduce myself. And this is in my speak. This is an in Clause this paragraph that. So that's the only way, the only way I know how to communicate. So I hope I hope you will bear with me please. My name is Graham Murray. And I speak on behalf of the Anglian energy planning Alliance.

1:07:07

And as I said, I apologise in advance that this is in my speak. P I've only done apologise, we will hear what you have to say. Good, thank you. I want to say a few words about the burden of the hearing on the community as a whole. As was said yesterday, it's a monumental task for ordinary folk to stand up to corporate muscle.

1:07:29

And whilst I was thinking about what to say I was reminded, and this is where you have to stick with me Mr. Brock, please, I was reminded of a scene from the film, Indiana Jones, and the Temple of Doom.

1:07:44

In the story, the hero finds himself trapped in a small chamber. When mechanism is triggered, which makes the floor and the ceiling move towards each other large spikes protruding, suggesting a grim death awaits, as he slowly is to be crushed. However, he is fortunate to have a helping hand on the outside, and his companion is able to disengage the mechanism and save the day.

1:08:13

We all live in unprecedented times globally, with the rules of society, and how to conduct everyday life are constantly being changed and updated. except perhaps it seems, were DCOs in East Suffolk are concerned

1:08:33

the cumulative impact on our region and residents from this and other DCOs, current DCOs, and some more are already confirmed as being in the pipeline for East Suffolk in 2022.

1:08:50

This will be more transparent, some might say horrific, it surely is time to explode the myth that East Suffolk can possibly sustain this overloads many regional town and parish councils have written to express misgivings about the planning process, particularly with regard to timing to continue this

preliminary meeting on the now proposed timetable, particularly in light of obvious clashes with other DCO hearings, local elections, the ongoing menace of COVID-19 and therefore the combined effect on the local population makes this our own Indiana moment. Except as yet, our community doesn't seem to have anyone outside the chamber to lend a hand.

1:09:49

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much.

1:09:53

It's good to have illustrations as well to emphasise what is

1:09:58

what's being felt

1:10:00

Thank you very much. Thank you.

1:10:06

Mr. Mr. Regan. Scott, I see your hand is up again, or is it just it hasn't come down from last time.

1:10:19

So okay, in that case, I'm going to ask Mr. Bedford, whose hand is up? I see.

1:10:30

Thank you. So microcredit traffic handcuffs, I wasn't sure whether you were following the previous sequence of dealing with the local authorities

1:10:37

jointly, but so I wasn't sure what you, you're here now. So. So.

1:10:45

So just as a general point, we haven't, in our written submission, raised any particular issues about the sequence of having specific deadlines in the draft programme.

1:10:59

Can I just say, we wouldn't wish to see notwithstanding some of the comments that you have heard made, we wouldn't wish to see any change in terms of bringing forward the tasks for the local authorities deadline, one, for what I hope is understandable reasons that I don't need to elaborate on. But so I'm sure you will just note that I do have to related matters. On the deadlines. It's not the sequence of them. But it's actually what goes into the tasks at each deadline. And the two related points are these. Firstly, as you will see from our written submission, we are very anxious to learn as soon as possible understanding obviously, the difficulties that the examining authority has in this regard, but understanding as soon as possible, which topics will be selected for which issue specific hearing on which particular date. And that's obviously an important point for us. And if I could just

perhaps illustrate that that does have particular logistical issues for the county council, in terms of making our technical experts available.

1:12:17

In this regard, we have a number of technical experts who are not Suffolk County Council, employees, but our consultants. And whilst the world has been working remotely, their geographic location hasn't particularly mattered.

1:12:34

However, as we may be moving out of a remote world, we have, for whatever reason, technical consultants based in South Wales, Scotland, Northumberland, and Sussex, all of whom quite clearly will have to book overnight accommodation, or a week's accommodation, as the case may be. And as I think you will have picked up from a number of the representations, this summer holiday period, holiday accommodation, or hotel accommodation in Suffolk, is likely to be in short supply.

1:13:10

And therefore, I'm just making the practical point that we would like, obviously, to be able to assist the examining authority as much as we can. But we would also like to have as a early sight of those dates for those kind of practical reasons. Obviously, we've raised a separate point, which I think we pick up. And you've asked to be dealt with in writing under item seven, about blended or hybrid format events. And we'll leave that to the written submissions that deadline.

1:13:38

But the second related point on the sequence of hearings, and it touches on some of the matters that you already been hearing about earlier about information from the applicants, which is in the pipeline, but which is obviously not yet in existence for us to scrutinise. And clearly, we would certainly ask you in finalising your programme of issue specific hearings, to bear in mind that particularly in relation, I think, to transport and coastal process matters, subject obviously to all the other things that you've got to think about.

1:14:16

There would be merit in having those slightly later in the process in order to allow parties to engage with the new information as and when it emerges, as opposed to as it were having to have an early session and then a repeat session, because there's new information that there needs to be addressed and taken into account. So that was the those were the two main points. The third point which we'd raised in our

1:14:40

written submission, was simply as it were a human point and I think it's slightly echoed by what Mr. Tate indicated to you. If it is possible to identify that there will be periods where there will be no examination events, that would be enormously helpful again, from a practical and logistical point of view for

1:15:00

Certainly all those staff who would like to be able to book annual leave.

1:15:05

Thank you. That character, the terrible risks that everybody who's involved in Sizewell examination will meet on the same beach, of course, and we can have the same conversations.

1:15:15

In Lowestoft, that would be a jolly nice thing to do.

1:15:19

Thanks. Thank you. Yes, on the point, which you made about sequence and documentation, which is so in ko eight at the moment, it's not another form which Mr. Phillipotts clients can yet share it.

1:15:36

I expect we can put together the dates and the things which you're talking about from our notes and what we've heard. But if you could help us by making those connections in your deadline beat submission that would help us

1:15:53

or grievance mooted, thank you for Thank you very much, indeed. Very good. Mr. Scott's Your hand is still up. I'm anxious not to miss you. If there's something else that he wants to say.

1:16:09

No, I, my computer's being interfered with. And I don't know why. So thank you. Very good. Thank you very much, indeed. In that case, Mr. Jones, Gregory Jones, I've got your hand. Thank you. Thank you. So I can be quite short, notwithstanding Mr. Bedford's.

1:16:31

Comments, I without repeating I would like to endorse what Ms Wentzel said.

1:16:38

And her proposed solutions preference for my clients would be

1:16:44

bringing matters forward rather than for reasons I've already articulated and won't repeat

1:16:51

them putting back the second procedural hearing. But, would endorse both those suggestions in that order of priority. In so far as

1:17:06

also endorsed what Mr. Bedford said, of course, none of the experts that my clients are instructing are obviously employees, all of them are consultants. I haven't done the geographical exercise that Mr.

Bedford says, but I would just indorsed that. Could I book, the deck chair, then on the beach that we're all going to meet on though Can I put that first dibs, depending on the weather?

1:17:35

Mr. Bedford can sort that out, yeah, we can fight over the deck.

1:17:39

So those were the points against, so I'm not going to repeat the other points. But there is a concern, obviously, the iffy about being able for 33rd parties to respond to late information. And obviously, we look with care at what Mr. Bedford's clients put in in terms of whether accommodation on timetabling can help

1:18:05

accommodate that. I would endorse Of course, what Mr. Bedford said, it's much preferable to have it done in one go, where everyone's got the information, then have a session and then call people back, which is undesirable, but we have an interest of that are highlighted in in the transport strategy. Thank you for thank you very much indeed. Thank you. Okay, I think that deals that are no more hands that deals all the points which people wish to raise on the deadlines. I hit that those are all clear.

1:18:41

Just if you'll bear with me a moment.

1:18:49

Right.

1:18:58

I understand Mr. Barlow would like to speak from the Environment Agency or be it speak out of terms. He's got another commitment. Later, Mr. Barlow, if you're there. Now we can pick that up.

1:19:15

straightaway if you like.

1:19:19

Good afternoon, sir. I was actually expecting to contribute to agenda item eight. wasn't sure if this was going to run over into tomorrow and my commitments for tomorrow. I can speak later today if we're going to conclude before today's ended.

1:19:33

I hope we can conclude before today's ended. But this is the point where you're going to help us with some clarification on something I can come in now. I'm more than happy to do so. Just was just bear with me for one second because I'm getting information on another channel at the moment.

1:20:01

Electrons are flying across the ISA.

1:20:12

Good, that's fine. Yep. Please go ahead with what you were going to help us with on item eight, some clarification on your processes. I think that's right. Yeah. So it has to do with any other matters really. And first of all, I'll introduce myself. So I'm Simon Barlow. I'm the environment agency's nuclear new build project manager for the Sizemore seek project response that we are required to undertake, in the lead up to this application visa application. And indeed, the environmental permit applications, which are I'll be discussing momentarily, and have been, in fact, for 10 years now. So I've been, I've presided over the entire pre DCO application process, so I'm fairly well versed with it.

1:20:53

There were a number of matters raised yesterday. And indeed, there's been references to it again today, but specifically yesterday about the requests to examine certain aspects of the emissions that this operating power station might discharge the environment.

1:21:14

Now, we regulate nuclear power stations and will be required to regulate this one way to be given these permissions and constructed. And indeed, there will be operational permits required of the Environment Agency under the environment components regulations for waste emissions for radioactive wastes, combustion activities, from the diesel generators and water discharge activities from the cooling water system. And therefore, we will be considering in some details, some of those discharges, within those permit decisions. Those permit applications were submitted, they are current, and we are in the determination process. And when we reach our draft decisions, we will consult on those draft decisions and invite people's views and comments upon them. I thought it was appropriate to mention that and just help those attending this preliminary meeting with that clarity, because it would be, I think, probably

1:22:21

inappropriate to potentially stray into examination of those matters that we will be considering through our permit decisions with an examination space, we certainly want to avoid dual regulation of any activities. It's also helpful for people to understand that that process is ongoing. And there will be opportunity for people to contribute to that, as well as this detailed examination process. So it's really a it was a process. matter. I wanted to mention, I thought it would be valuable for people to hear that to know that we are involved in that process. There are overlapping issues. Of course, they will come out I'm sure during examination with regard to those impacts, but we wouldn't wish to, to stray too far into those areas that we are the regulator for

1:23:12

Thank you very much. Thank you very much. Can I just ask you one thing was supposed to have got you there are those permits, you're talking about the ones upon which we often be the normally be the sub also of less than no impediment?

1:23:28

Of what three letters of no impediment?

1:23:32

And

1:23:34

I believe, correct, sorry, I might have to ask my legal advisor is also in the examination. Sorry, the meeting to come down. Well, that's, that's, that's fine. I will I can check it elsewhere. We can provide you outside of this process.

1:23:54

Many thanks. That is very good.

1:23:57

Right. We have been going for almost 90 minutes since we began after lunch. So this is a convenient point at which to have a short break. I'm going to adjourn now for 15 minutes. And after that, I will pass you over to Mr. Moreland, who will be looking at the dates and format for hearings. But now it's 3:16pm by my watch. So we'll convene again at 330 Thank you