

TEXT_PRELIM1_Day2_SizeC_Session4_2403 2021

Wed, 3/24 4:55PM • 1:02:57

00:02

Good afternoon, everybody. And

00:03

thank you for coming back. It's now 330. And we are starting the adjourned. afternoon session. I'm going to hand straight to Mr Maund in just a second. Mr. Phillpot, we haven't yet asked you to respond on the points which were made since you were last. Last, you just bring those things all together. At the end, after we have dealt with the

00:33

accompanied site visits issues. Let's just say we haven't forgotten you, and we'll deal with you at the end.

00:39

I hope not to have any points. So I'll store them up.

00:43

Thank you very much. Indeed, Mr. Maund, I'm not going to hand over to

00:49

Good afternoon, everyone. I'm mindful of the time. So obviously, we've had quite a lot of debate over the last couple of days about open floor hearings, and what should be the topic of issues Pacific hearings. In particular, we have noted requests made yesterday and today, including for the size welding road and the two village bypass to be subject to specific hearings for the transport strategy and coastal processes, if I put it in those terms to be subject to specific hearings as well, in addition to the wicker market, traffic impacts on wicker market and the surrounding parishes. So it's not necessary to repeat those requests here. And so as I say, mindful of the time, it is important to hear from you, but please don't repeat those points that were made either earlier today or yesterday. So does anyone have any further comments that they would wish to make on the subject matter for issue specific hearings or open floor hearings? As we've drafted in the timetable? How come to the raised hands. So Clive Lovelock, your first on the list, Mr. Lovelock? Yes,

02:18

good afternoon, I'm climbing up Alok retired, we always signal engineer. I, I've actually put my hand up because I want to talk to the format of the meeting. issue. But since I since I am actually here, I'd want

just to make one point about this morning session, I introduced I introduced at all item where I said that the additional freight trains actually proposed actually meant that we weren't going to change in substance, making a significant change to the original proposal. And I said, then, that I thought that it would have an impact on the current train service on the Suffolk line. Now, Mr. Rhodes of EDF responded, I'm basically rubbish at it. Now, I think we have to listen to what he actually said. He said he didn't think on the for trains for freight trains a day issue, that there would be any withdrawal of services on the east Suffolk line. But I refer to EDF own document, which says that in 2025 to 2026, they propose to run four or five trains per day using both the green route and the laced and terminal, though, I've my statement stands, that it is not possible to run five freight trains a day without impacting on the existing passenger service, whether that is with the withdrawal of trains, and it could be in my estimation, up to eight trains a day, or by having to have the timetable completely recast so that we lose the current regular hourly service on the east Suffolk line. And I would like that I would like that to be recorded because I think Mr. Rhodes comment was misleading.

04:36

Okay, thank you for that. And please put that response in writing to deadline. Be please and obviously it's going to be subject to evidence once the examination commences and we'll need to hear both parties. So thank you for that Mr. Lovelock.

04:52

Now I want to carry on now and are we going to talk about format of the meetings because I can

05:00

continue. Yeah, if you can just concentrate on that particular topic, please, because we obviously are short of time.

05:08

Yes. And that's why that's why I specifically asked to this, I'm going to produce, I'm going to put something in front of you. That is a track and signalling diagram of the Suffolk knife. There are something like four of those that cover the section of line, which needs to be discussed. For the for the train paths issue, okay. Now, now, wait a minute, wait a minute. This is how I propose to do it, I propose to put all those drawings onto one long drawing. And I would like to put them on a table in front of people. Because I do not believe that it is possible for me to make to make an adequate presentation over a resume or a team's link. This needs an actual face to face presentation. This is not the this is not the way to make a presentation. I've, I've been here for the day and a half now. And I've lost count of the number of times people have been unable to be unable to speak, who when they have when they have frozen, when we have new yourself I think I think it's you have disappeared on occasions. So I cannot see how issues like the transport arrangements can be discussed, other than on a face to face arrangement. Failing that, and if you insist, insist on doing it electronically, then I think we need to be considering some other way of doing it. And I'm what I'm suggesting is that at some geographical suitable geographical points around suffer, that there'll be a space where we can come in and make a presentation, make a professional presentation. In other words, that there's a decent camera, there's decent sound, there's decent lighting, and there's a cameraman who can follow somebody making a visual presentation because otherwise, we are at a distinct disadvantage to EDF who have who have

the who have the technical capability, who have the it capability to make very, very good presentations. And I really think that if you are if you are really wanting to get a decent presentation from the from the lights of us that we should be afforded that that facility.

07:48

Okay, no, thank you. It is important as it's been made before said before that your concerns about virtual events or face to face events are made clear and putting writing tourism that is understood Thank you. In fact, going now to Mr. Tate

08:14

makes 100 treaties he Suffolk. So far as the subject matter of any topics. If that is thought to be helpful, we will liaise with the county and put that in writing any suggestions, procedural deadline B, as well as dealing with the question of hybrid or blended hearings. That's the first point. Secondly, like Mr. Bedford were anxious to learn as soon as possible, which topics are indeed selected. And it goes beyond the availability of hotels. If there's physical presence, it goes to the question of their availability more widely, particularly where parties are relying on side experts. And thirdly, to reiterate the point that clearly there are some areas and we've focused on coastal processes where it'll be a factor relevant to the setting of the particular issue specific hearing the timing of that the relationship with the information that is to be provided, following along from the discussion on modelling. So those are the short three short points, I'd like to add.

09:26

Thank you very much. Our next person is Alison Downes.

09:35

Good afternoon.

09:36

Yes. Just

09:37

a very brief comment that I think yesterday in today's if evidence of the sheer numbers of people who would like to express themselves during this process to encourage you to make as much time available for open floor hearings as necessary according to that need. Mr. Lovelock has made an impassioned plea about the limitations of the online plan. I've received communications from a great number of people who've struggled to participate. And I've asked them all to communicate directly with you about it. But I would observe that other platforms such as zoom, use a lot less bandwidth. And I think that that has been an obstacle here. But of course, we all want face to face hearings to resume as soon as possible.

10:22

Thank you very much. Mr. Haile. No, too highly.

10:33

Thank you, sir. I'm speaking on behalf of Saxmundham Town Council. And bearing in mind what Mr. Lovelock said this morning, and just few minutes ago, I would like to request that if not already, so that the rail transport be made the subject of a issue specific hearing constant, not only the actual timetable, that was an issue, but it's also the noise vibration connected with the freight trains, air quality and another ratios. Thank you, sir.

11:11

Thank you very much. Korean events, please.

11:21

Good afternoon. And thank you very much. Just to briefly repeat, we also asked for open floor I mean, issue specific hearings on the northern park and ride on the Oxford roundabout, but that was dealt with yesterday. Our comment now, please is the number and timings of the open floor hearings and the issue specific hearings, given the evident interest in the application, and to echo the comments made by Miss bounds. It's clear that many people do want to participate. And we consider the number of dates currently allocated for open floor hearings, and issues specific hearings to be very low, which are currently around about 19 days in total comprised of three days for open floor hearings, eight days for issue specific hearings. And then a further eight days potentially available for open floor hearings, issue specific hearings, compulsory purchase hearings, and or accompanied site inspections if required. So given that number, we in particular, we think that additional dates should be designated for open floor hearing. And we also recommend that open floor hearings and issue specific hearings are rescheduled to take place three to four weeks after the submission of written representations. This is to provide interested parties with an opportunity to consider fully points raised by other stakeholders and to then incorporate those. We also request that the majority of these hearings take place earlier in the examination timetable. So at the moment, open floor hearings are scheduled for three days and Mays three days in May, with additional dates only becoming available in late August and mid September 21. And Firstly, we don't see the benefit of scheduling open floor hearings before the submission of written representations. And secondly, the risk of scheduling. The majority of these hearings towards the latter half of the examination timetable is that interested parties have fewer opportunities to make, you know, to comment and to act on any relevant information that comes out of those hearings. scheduling a number of potential hearings towards the end of the examination, timetable also restricts the amount of time that the applicant can react to any pertinent points that are raised. For example, by revising the draft VCO and any requirements or in terms of the drafting of the section 106 agreement. We therefore suggest that open floor hearings and issue specific hearings are scheduled to start from around the 16th of June, last into at least the second of July, which would come to around about 11 days of hearings, before resuming after a break that takes into account the summer holidays. Thank you very much.

14:10

Thank you. No more hands are raised. Does anyone have any further points on this topic? Before I move on? Regan Scott, you've no, Councillor Sanders.

14:28

Thank you very much. Hello. Your camera as well.

14:34

I know I can hear you. You

14:36

could seem fine. Thank you. Um, can I just suggest that there is some form of hearing whichever. I wouldn't have any expertise on but obviously about net zero and climate change. And the reason for asking, you know intervening about it is that carbon footprint is tacked into climate change but the climate change agenda on the one On the menu of issues is about the impact of climate change on the project. But of course, the you know, the public narrative is dominated the other way round. And EDF, you know, make various claims about being low carbon net zero, and so on and so forth. So I think it's a major public issue. And in particular, I would like to point out that the climate change committees, six carbon budget, which is a virtual statutory instrument, does involve a very, very tight new target for the electricity industry's own net zero, Target, which changes some of the assumptions about the role of low carbon. So it's just a suggestion that, you know, for public purposes, there is actually a, an open hearing or issue specific hearing about net zero. Thank you.

15:59

Thank you. Councillor Sanders. Was there something further you wish to add?

16:06

Yes,

16:06

I'm representing counsel, I did raise a matter in Under Item eight. But it's has been mentioned now by Mr. Lovell, often it really relates to this. And that's with regard to presentation at meetings, particularly, they are virtual. And what I did raise was whether the examining authority itself will be able, I'm sorry, people provide information.

16:37

Sorry, sorry, you broke up for a moment. They're so happy, right?

16:43

Like in the virtual meetings, obviously, we will have given you with written representation. But at times during the oral presentation, it would be very useful to be able to have you as examiner's look at the various documents that are cross referencing, and I don't know whether you have the facility to be looking at documents at the same time as listening to your presentation, because that will be very useful is something I'm used to when I'm dealing with giving expert evidence in courts. Alternatively, if that's not possible, will it be possible to use presentations so that I as the interested party can present that lock feeling?

17:31

And something we'll have to consider Mr. Sanderson, do take on board the point you've made and that point made earlier by Mr. Lovelock. Thank you. Now, if there's no further points from anyone, Mr.

Sanders, if you could put your hand down, that would be appreciated. now hand over to just obviously point out that in addition, we will have or there's likely to be if requested, compulsory acquisition hearings. And obviously, my colleague earlier has advised you of the need to request those should you wish to have them. Now, I just asked Mr. Phillipot if he's got any further points he would wish to make on behalf of the applicant.

18:29

Sir, can I be heard?

18:32

Yes, sir.

18:33

Thank you. So I only have a very small number of points, first of all, in relation to deadlines. And you heard a suggestion that statements of Common Ground should be brought forward. And there was also a suggestion about local impact reports being brought forward and that that's been responded to already. On behalf of the council's what I would say in terms of statements of common ground, of course, is that, as you might imagine, arrangements are in place to work with the relevant interested parties in order to produce meaningful statements of common ground by the relevant deadlines. And we'd resist any suggestion of those being brought forward in the timetable. Because a that's not likely to be possible but be to be extended happens, they will simply be less useful and less complete documents. So that's the only point I wanted to make under that heading. Second heading relates to dates and format of, of hearings. And, Sir, I've got a specific point and the general point to make here. This specific point is simply this when you and your colleagues Time to decide which issues require issues specific hearings. And also, when those different issues should be considered. In other words, the dates for specific topics, we anticipate that you might find it helpful for the parties to identify the next deadline, if there are any particular availability or other constraints in relation to particular topics. So that they can be taken into account as appropriate, when you're considering which dates to sit down for which topic. So I don't propose to go through those matters now, that ultimately, ultimately just be a factor that you might want to take into account. But if we have any such points, I was going to suggest that we deal with those at the next deadline. If that's convenient,

20:56

it would be helpful to understand if there are specific constraints, yes. For the parties that are hoping to come and support.

21:06

Thank you, sir. And then the third point, which is a general point, and I hope it, it might provide some comfort in relation to issues specific hearings. And I hope you'll forgive me for saying these things, because I know they're very familiar to you and your colleagues. But I wanted to emphasise This is intended to be primarily a written process. And the process does not assume that in order for interested parties, to be able to make their case effectively, and to get their points across effectively, that they necessarily have to do so orally, that issue specific hearings are commonly held. But as has been referred to that the statute makes specific provision as to when that should be done. And the reason

that's important is because inevitably, it will be a matter for you and your colleagues to strike a balance between how much is most effectively examined orally, and how much is most effectively examined in writing. But when it comes to the issue specific hearings, and the likely utility of hearings and allowing, examination, effective examination of the issues, and proper questioning and probing of matters, that can't be dealt with in writing, but that that's a, that's a judgement that has to be made. It's not a hearing of the sort that people might otherwise be familiar with, if they haven't been involved in these processes. It's not the sort of hearing where people come along, and present their evidence in the way they would, as an inquiry. And where people are concerned about putting documents up and putting documents before you, those documents ought all to have been submitted in writing at the relevant deadlines. And so if it's a particular interested party wants to direct attention to a particular document, it should be available in the electronic library. So we can all look at it. And that may help to resolve some of the problems that people have raised about being able to show you documents in the hearings. So that's a general point, it's not really directed at trying to persuade you of anything, because these are matters of your judgement. But I just wanted to offer some reassurance to people that this is a primarily written process 100 they shouldn't be waiting for the hearings to present their cases, their cases should be presented in writing, because that's the primary method of examination.

23:47

Now, that's understood, thank you very much. So I will now move over to my colleague, Mrs Cassini, to talk about site inspections. And if Mr. Philpott if you could switch your camera off, that'd be appreciated. Thank you.

24:08

Thank you. I'm going to make some general points about site inspections. The procedure rules enable a panel to make unaccompanied site inspections before or during the examination without giving notice to persons who are entitled to take part in the examination. As we've already mentioned, the panel has carried out various owner company site visits and the details of which have been published on the project page of national infrastructure planning website. The list will be updated as and when we carry out any more on a company site visits. I am aware that a query was raised regarding whether the proposed northern Park and Ride site had been visited. Just to confirm this site was visited on day three of the unaccompanied site inspection held in August 2020. Turning to a company site inspections. This is an opportunity for the panel to visit locations which cannot be seen from a public viewpoint. And for features or sites to be pointed out to us, these inspections are not an opportunity to give any evidence. Draft examination timetable indicates that dates are reserved for company to site inspections between Tuesday the eighth to Thursday the 10th of June 2021. The timetable also makes provisions for the applicants draft itinerary for the company to site inspections to be submitted by procedural deadline be on the seventh of April 2021. Comments on the applicant's draft itinerary and for interested parties to submit suggested locations for site inspections. With justification a timetable for deadline was on the 12th of May 2021. Just to confirm that the comments made in writing by Julian cusec, Charles cries and Bill Parker and also from Nigel highly during yesterday's meeting in relation to suggested locations for the panel to visit have already been noted. But please do submit these in writing for deadline one. Other comments made yesterday in the meeting regarding the company's site inspections have also been noted and do not need to be repeated again. I would like to ask for any views on the consideration of moving the company to site visits until after the 21st of June this year to

be submitted in writing to a pitch procedural deadline be. And could you also with this provides some suggested dates. At this point, I'd like to hear from parties as to whether they have any additional points or questions regarding timings and arrangements for the proposed to complete site inspections. I'll invite interested parties to make comments first and then I will turn to the applicant. I'd like to start with Mr. Tate for his civic council please.

27:22

Thank you, Madam No, I got nothing to say the president we will respond deadline one to the to the draft that is provided.

27:31

Thank you very much. Mr. Bedford for Suffolk County Council.

27:40

Thank you, Madam Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council How can be little sir echo I agree with Mr. Tate.

27:46

Thank you very much. Are there any other interested parties which wish to make? Comment? I see Rosie Southern. Do you have your hand up? Thank you, madam.

28:01

And again, I won't attempt the video just in case. Just a quick short point of

28:08

Thank you.

28:09

Thank you. In the past, sometimes it's been beneficial to actually provide suggested routes for the both accompanied and on a common accompanied site visits and I just wanted to check whether that might be helpful. And then we can work with other interested parties and the applicant to try and come up with a consensus of possible order and route for both of those site visits. If you think that might be beneficial for the panel.

28:36

Yes, I think that would if you would like to, obviously put those details in writing and then work with the applicant when appropriate. Brilliant,

28:45

thank you very much.

28:46

Thank you. I see that Allen hat has also raised his hand.

28:54

Thank you. In 2018 in November signs will see sent to a number of residents of Bebbington, including myself a process known as land referencing, and that is prior to a compulsory purchase. Although we had not had a compulsory purchase, we still are under this land referencing and it's a number. It's a number of houses on the west side of the BLM 22 would you be visiting or could you visit this area?

29:42

Mr. Hart if you want us to visit that area, if you would like to put those comments in writing per procedural deadline be with your justification we can take that into consideration.

29:55

Thank you. I've also boys probably not under your remit of all So I'm asked to be on the issue specific hearings on the bypass, but that's probably not in your remit.

30:11

If you put that in writing as well, we'll consider that. Thank you very much. Thank you can't see anybody else with Oh, no, sorry. Mr. Scott, I think you've got your hand up.

30:27

So just very, very quick point, you'll be familiar with the a 12. But I thought you might want to look at something you can't see yet, which is the county council and south east to put an application in to put smart traffic lights from seven hills, up to north of Woodbridge, because of the existing traffic problems, you won't be able to see that but just in case, nobody mentions it, I've just submitted a view as have many of the parishes to, to the, to the two councils who it's a government grant scheme at the moment, but, you know, it's a reflection of the very, very serious traffic problems we've got. Thank you.

31:13

Thank you very much. Mr. Christopher Wilson.

31:21

Thank you, Madam, I just wanted to make a point, not specifically that Suffolk visits but I just think the we'd recommend that the examiners actually visit the Hinkley c site to get an appreciation of the scale of the development. So when you visit sites Well, you can visualise how the replication EDF have promised will impact on our area of outstanding natural beauty and regrowth Mr. Phillpotts word from earlier on behalf of the applicant when you refer to the Hinkley c site as unusually large and complex, including substantial permanent elements and to the vast scale of development. Having seen the Hinkley c developer myself, I would request it when the examiners actually see your construction site, especially at night as well to get the full appreciation of how the light pollution would impact a dark sky site in an environmentally sensitive area in Suffolk. Thank you.

32:16

Okay, thank you very much, I think June Holmes. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

32:24

Thank you for allowing me to speak on June Holmes from Middleton as a resident and

32:29

it continued I just interrupt to miss up. Mr. Wilson, could you turn your camera off? Thank you. Thank you,

32:40

Madam Speaker.

32:41

Thank

32:42

just continuing on from Mr. Wilson's point about having the visit to Hinckley is it also possible for you to include in your site visit as well as the site itself, the actual residents in the locality of Hinkley to see to effectively look at our side of the argument and to see the impact that that Power Station has had on many of the residents there.

33:08

If thank you for that, if you'd like to put that in your written submission procedure deadline be I'd be grateful.

33:14

Thank you very much. Thank you.

33:16

Okay.

33:17

I think we have another hand. Do we have another hand up? I think it's Paul, but I don't have a surname.

33:24

This is Paul Tim Cook. I'm a resident in Kelso. I just wondered, because it's such a beautiful part of the world. Would you consider someone really from Southwold all the way down to Orford and looking at the coast because it is most exceptional, but you will see it Thorpeness the failing cliffs you will see offered where they've basically taken down the lighthouse. So I think that's another area is not just the site I'd be concerned with your own interest went to the EDS site and saw what they wanted you to see but get a feel for what we really love in this area. And I've been here all my adult life and unskilled finding wonderful things. In a few days, you're going to struggle to really understand our concerns. But we are in your hands very much. Thank you very much.

34:23

Thank you very much. I think we've got Robert Hoggar.

34:32

Yes, hello. Give me a second.

34:35

Hello, that's fine. I can hear it.

34:39

It's a it's interesting to hear that. EDF are proposing a 90 minute commute to the site. That's an hour and a half drive in each direction. There are many at Hinkley Point have decided that this is not a realistic situation. And they've taped the news they're taking up residence locally. around the area that accounts for 3000 of the workforce at Hinkley. Now, if this happens, that sizable population of Leiston is 5600. They intend to have a maximum of 8000 on site, but 3000 of them would be, well, many of that 3000 would be looking for local accommodation to men, in addition to go to travelling locally, not a 90 minute move. But that is a very serious situation that needs to be resolved because it could lead to chaos. Thank you.

35:34

Thank you very much. Mr. Phil Park, do you have anything you wish to add?

35:43

Madam, anything I would say is that we are very happy to facilitate a site visit at Hinkley Point C for you and your colleagues. If you'd find it helpful, we can include a suggestion as to how that might be arranged to deadline B.

35:59

That would be very helpful. Thank you. Thank you very much. And I'm going to hand over to Mr. Oh, sorry, I see that Jenny Kirtley has her hand up now. Miss curtly. Are you there?

36:23

Yes, sorry. Can you hear me now? I can't. I would just like to warn you that if you do go to Hinkley like I did myself to two summers ago, you may find yourself caught in a three hour traffic jam. Just to warn you of that because I'm sure EDF won't. Thank you.

36:39

Thank you very much. Mike, I don't think there's anybody else with their hands still up. So I will now hand over to Mr. Brock for Agenda Item number seven.

36:54

Thank you. Thank you very much, Mrs. Cassini. Okay, when our agenda item seven, which is procedural decisions, which have been taken by the examining authority, I just wanted to draw everybody's attention time is now seven minutes past four. We do hope this is the penultimate item, we do hope that we can finish by five o'clock today. However, we are prepared to go on after five if needs be. So starting might I ask people to think about whether they still need to speak if their point has not

also been may already been made. And think also about the fact that it may be a point which you can put in writing deadline be having heard from other speakers.

37:47

So

37:48

first of all, your decision relates to statements of common ground, and once said a few words about those stones. The common grounds, as I said before are very helpful in ensuring that the examination focuses on material differences between the main parties. A number of initial SOCGs have been requested. The suggested topic areas should not be taken as precluding any other matters, which the parties consider important and relevant. But I want to point out that the statement of Common Ground does not mean that the parallel will not examine those points further. The draft timetable sets a deadline for the receipt of initial steps of common ground, we've heard quite a lot about those and whether or not they might be moved. We'll take that into account. The deadline is currently 12th of may 2021. Deadline one, the information available at the time in order to meet the date set by the timetable should please be submitted. So make it as common as it can be. And work should be continued to seek confirmation of agreed information and areas of dispute with reasoning please. The draft timetable provides a final SOCG is to be submitted deadline eight on the sixth of October. The word final is chosen carefully doesn't mean said there aren't interim SOC G's so please don't and please don't let the fact that we have asked for them by deadline eight to stop you from reaching agreement before then and submitting a final SOCG on between you and the applicant before then. Put a detail point which I'd like to clear up Suffolk coastal Friends of the Earth have in their deadline a response which was on 10th of March suggest that they should be included in the list of parties to agree statements of common ground. We obviously always welcome the narrowing of issues. But I have understood from the case team that suffered coastal Yes Now proposed to join with RSPB and Suffolk Wildlife Trust, which is fine as far as we are concerned. Is that the correct position? I haven't heard from anybody from Suffolk coast guard in sessions which I've been dealing with. Are they here and can say yes or no on that. Perhaps the lady from RSPB could help us.

40:25

Thank you, sir. Yes, Rosie Sutherland RSPB and Suffolk Wildlife Trust. Just if we if we could come back to on that. So Friends of the Earth have helpfully been in touch. And we're just having a quick discussion about that. But if it does help to reduce the number of statements of common ground, we are we are very keen to see if we can facilitate that.

40:47

Thank you. I will leave I will leave it with you. If Suffolk coastal friends yes want to put in something as well joining with the applicant, then then that's fine as well. And we'll try and deal with that in our rule eight procedural decision. Letter. Thank you very much. Are there any other comments from interested parties, which people like to make? I'm looking at the hands. Mr. Tate, thank you,

41:28

Andrew, take free Suffolk cancel two very short points. First is that the council will be joining with the County Council to provide a statement of common ground and also a local impact report jointly.

41:45

And

41:46

that's the first point. And secondly, in the agenda, there's a reference to suggestions for others, including between the applicant and Suffolk case destination management organisation. Yeah, was a suggestion that I believe that his counsel did make. But we're not asking for a formal decision. From the panel in relation to that, we just thought that they may be in a position to provide some helpful information to your decision making process, and we will be liaising with them. And the applicant, if that is thought to be potentially worthwhile. They've been very closely involved in discussions about the tourism fund and destination funding. So it's closely allied with section 106. issues. We'll probably be reflecting that anyway, in what we are saying, but it may be separately that having something directly from them will be useful. But instead, I just repeat we're not asking for a decision from the panel and we can incense, manage that with those parties.

42:56

Okay, thank you. Do I take it you're not asking us to make a procedural decision to ask for the statement of common ground with Suffolk case destination management?

43:05

That's correct. We were just bringing the potential to your attention. But we're not asking for a formal decision today.

43:12

Thank you very much. That's good. Okay. Thank you, Mr. state. Mr. Jones, there's no need for you to come to your computer but or not, not to the camera. But it is noted that you've asked a question, where changes the DCO are proposed or sought by a non statutory third parties can or must they proceed? By way of stating the common ground? I think I realised I was puzzled by your question, but I don't think you need to do it that way. If you want change the DCO. Ask them for them in a normal way with your written representations. Thank you.

43:53

Thank you for that. Thank you. So

43:54

I won't put my camera off. But thank you for that clarification. I thought that was the answer. You'll understand why just wait, I think was worded. I just thought I could clarify what I was thinking. Thank you, sir. No,

44:06

that's fine.

44:07

I think we're all we're clear on PD one and PD two. pd three is the panel's request to the applicant to prepare draft itineraries for the accompany site visit by Wednesday, seventh of April. We've had quite a lot of discussion about that. Are there any new points on that? Mr. Phil part?

44:35

So not on not on that specific point, we've got the request and we will act on it.

44:41

Thank you. pd for rates to submissions of the navigation documents at each deadline, with the final version that deadline eight. On sixth of October, PD five drew attention to the need for low resolution documents or possible sharing on screen

45:06

and format and numbering. I you can see that in PD six. Mr. Phil, perhaps I could you'll forgive me if I just asked you to come back to the camera and say something about this. The numbering and navigating through the applicants documents can be something of a challenge. And so we're simply asking that please that you signposts these things as simply as possible and as comprehensively as possible. So things like quoting the examination library numbers for documented out ID vital and question the paragraph numbers and your clients have responded readily to a request, which we made earlier on about giving a sequence of headings, which could be traced back on the marine management document on the marine documents, ecology documents, and so on so forth. And it does help if you can use those as well. Thank

46:10

you. So that's been that's been noted, we obviously want to make life for everyone as easy as possible with those sorts of administrative matters. Thank you.

46:20

Thank you very much. Right since I called you for Mr. Phil Voss and you can retire back off camera now. Alison downs, you have got your hand up as well.

46:35

This was about the statement of common ground. Charles McDowell, who can't attend today asked me to convey the point that the B 1122 Action Group was also excluded from the list of organisations, you requested the applicants your statement of common ground. So just make sure that's noted, please.

46:53

So you'll catch that you say they've been

46:55

that they are they are on the list or not on the list. They're not on the list. And I think they feel they should be on the list.

47:04

Right. Okay.

47:06

So given

47:08

that was the B1172. Action grouping, b

47:11

1122, which is the name of the road.

47:14

Yeah,

47:14

enriching the site Action Group.

47:17

Thank you so much. Got that. Mr. Scott, I see your hand is up again. How can I help you?

47:37

If

47:38

I have a genuine point in annex, see the introduction. You talk about the Sustainable Development being moved to what I call pillar one to EIA issues, not exclusively. But given the sustainable development. I mean, it's very loose term, but it's it's a primary feature of the Planning Act 208 act. And I just wondered, if you explain, you know, why that decision has been taken Is it because the the project construction period is very, very long and therefore may be deemed to be have have impact which need to be assessed in terms of sustainability for a long period?

48:31

And if that were the case, then all I want to ask is, how would other issues of sustainability, you know, back on net zero and so on? How would they feature in the if like the menu of principle issues? Would they go into policy and need?

48:54

Thank you for that question. May I? I will check my papers, and we'll see if we can finish deal with that before the meeting. finishes. Otherwise, we'll find some other way of getting back to you on that question. Mr. Scott. Thank you. Mr. Bedford, your hand is up.

49:17

Thank you, Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So I don't know whether this is actually a matter for item seven as a procedural decision yet to be taken or it's a matter of right and eight. Any other matters. But so you recall, I raised a query earlier, as a question, an open question to the airline, you said that you would like to think about that. It's just that if we were to do anything for deadline be clearly wiki going to need to know this afternoon, whether we do have to do anything. And so I don't know whether this is an opportunity for you to tell us all whether you want further time or whatever.

49:50

That was on your offer to explain to us what your Purder period approach is. Yeah,

49:57

it was like we don't use that term. I think these days. But

50:01

I'm very out of date. Thank you. I haven't gotten an answer from you, for you on that at the moment. So we will seek to feed that back to you by other means.

50:12

I'm grateful. Thank you for

50:14

Thank you very much. Actually, Mr. Bedford and I, through other channels I am I have a message that yes, we would like you, if you would like it. And we I'm sure they do if we were lucky, or we would like it, if you would submit that as offered. Thank you. Oh, great.

50:43

Well, thank you, sir. Very good.

50:46

In case I think that concludes now. Agenda item seven. And I am going to pass back to miss MCI, who will deal with agenda item eight.

51:07

So before you do compete that agenda item I was promised I'd get a chance to respond. I just had a couple of points by May.

51:16

I am very, very sorry, I was to fill up more, please go ahead. And thank you for interrupting

51:20

that site. So it won't take long. Just three short points on statements of common ground, you indicated that when they are submitted, you'd like the information available at the time submitted. And I just wanted to clarify what you had in mind with that comment so that I made sure that we have understood it and kind of missed.

51:50

We're simply saying please, if we've got stuff which is agreed, then please agree it put it in the statement as sent and send it in. Don't hold it up whilst you're still thrashing out other issues.

52:02

So that's clear. Thank you very much. Second point, the suggestion of a statement of common ground with Suffolk coastal Friends of the Earth, we are content to have a separate statement of common ground with Suffolk coastal Friends of the Earth is indicated in the procedural decision. We haven't had any approach or discussions about seeking to combine that with the state of common ground with the RSPB and the support wildlife trusts. We are I have to say a little skeptical about the likely utility, oxygen to combine those things. And our preference would be to keep those separate statements of common ground and you'll appreciate the RSPB in the southern Wildlife Trust have a particular angle and area of involvement. And we'd like to have a statement of common ground on those matters. The Suffolk coastal Friends of the Earth, there may be some overlap, but there may be separate issues they're interested in. We think that that might be better dealt with separately.

53:14

I think I think the key thing is to say please get together.

53:17

Well, so we're certainly content to pursue matters on the basis of the procedural decision that was indicated to us and we'll provide a draft and update you in due course, the third matter, Mr. Tate helpfully clarified in relation to the Suffolk coast destination management organisation that he wasn't seeking a board decision. But just to reassure you, we have a draft in progress. What such a statement of common grounds so we are intending to pursue that. We hope that it will be helpful, but it sounds like that no matter where you from pursue outside examination.

54:01

Very good. Thank you very much indeed.

54:05

Thank you.

54:06

That does conclude item seven, I think and I will now hand back to miss Mackay.

54:18

Thank you, Mr. Brock. The next agenda item is agenda item eight. That's any other matters. Just to remind you that we will not be hearing comments on the merits of the application under this item. So I wonder if those any people who do have any other matters to raise could put their hands up. Jedi Kirtley

54:52

Hello, can you hear me?

54:54

Yes, I can. Thanks. Good.

54:55

Thank you. I was rather alarmed to hear from Mr. Hara. with Phil part a little while ago that he rather appeared to be suggesting that we shouldn't be allowed to speak so much at these hearings, and that it should be mostly on written representations. Well, personally, I think it's been very enlightening to hear people in the last two days talking so passionately about this dreadful, this dreadful construction that we're going to have on our doorstep. And I would encourage the examining offices to allow us all in the future to speak, as we wish on these subjects. Thank you.

55:37

No, thank you. And I'm sure there will be many, many opportunities to speak during the examination. Thank you very much. I do have who's the next person with their hand up? I'm afraid I don't have a name against it. I just want

55:54

to introduce yourself. Paul Silcock, a resident of Kelso, please may ask, could you clarify something that the applicants representative that, that they do not have to supply full details of many of the items until after the DCO consent is granted? Is that correct?

56:21

I'll ask Mr. Phillpot to respond to that.

56:24

Okay. Thank you. It just doesn't, you know, we're trying to get through this the best we possibly can. And the more detail we have, surely that that that's a good thing, isn't it? We have the detail, we can see what you're trying to achieve. And I just I find that as a lay person, I find that a bit hard to believe. But as I say I'm in the examiners, inspectors hands. Thank you,

56:54

Madam would you like me to respond straight away to that?

56:56

I would actually

56:58

great Well,

56:59

I'll try and deal with this man as neutrally as I can. For significant nationally significant infrastructure projects such as this, it is common that the application is submitted, not in detail in all respects, but

using something which is known as the Rochdale envelope, which is a reference to a case, which was dealing with a level of detail that is necessary for large projects, which will develop in terms of their detail design over a period of time. And this is an example of a large project, which is using the Rochdale envelope approach. And what that essentially means is that instead of setting out a detail application, what you do is you identify parameters, using parameter plans and controls within the DCO. To set the limits within which each element can be developed, that provides a level of flexibility for that flexibility has to be then reflected in the assessment that is undertaken of the impacts. So if you allow yourself a range of heights, for example, up to a set limit, you have to assess the impacts up to the top extent of that range. But that is then accompanied by a series of controls, generally in the form of requirements, where some details, for particular matters have to be submitted for subsequent approval and an examination of the schedules at the back of the DCO. We'll flesh that out. And I just invite those who are perhaps unfamiliar with these concepts to have a look at the helpful guidance, the pins is put out on the use of the Rochdale envelope, but it essentially then put some of the details matters for approval in due course. But in order to assess the acceptability of what is proposed, the exam the authority has to look at the assessments based on the parameters that have been set. Madam, that's a an off the cuff and rather brief overview of the approach, but I hope is helpful.

59:28

Thank you.

59:29

Thank you, obviously, if you do have further submissions on that, Paul, Please, could you put that to PDB?

59:41

Yes, but I will. But I do feel that I'm sorry to labour this, but, you know, it's meant to be a replica of Hinkley Point so there's lots of things that people have asked for, that should be readily available and in great detail. So thank you very much for listening.

1:00:02

All right, thank you. Thank you. Right if I could hear from Robert Hoggar

1:00:14

Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's interesting that I'm sorry I can't remember his qualification, Phillpot, introduced the Rochdale envelope. We've been talking about the Rochdale envelope now for years and into this so-called envelope, EDF have put over 300 items still unresolved. They have Hinkley point C running in parallel. We feel it's time they resolve some of these issues. And as Paul said, make them available for us to look at. Because the Rochdale envelope is a very convenient place to store information you don't want us to deal with. And I don't think they intend to let us know or get into the information that we're entitled to. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Hoggar.

1:01:08

Is there anyone else that wants to speak on this? Well, in that case, that does bring us to the end of proceedings for today. And many thanks to all those who have taken part. Now I'll now adjourn this

preliminary meeting. May I remind everyone of the date of procedural deadline be of Wednesday the seventh of April this year, which is the last day for receipt by the examining authority of written submissions in response to matters raised orally at this preliminary meeting part one, a request to be heard that preliminary meeting part two. In addition, as mentioned under agenda item two, we would welcome feedback on virtual and blended events to be submitted by that deadline. Now the date of Wednesday, 14th of April has been reserved for the resumption of the preliminary meeting part two, however, in the event that submissions to procedural deadline B do not justify the resumption of that meeting, the examining authority may decide to close the meeting in writing without Part Two taking place. However, given the submissions that we've heard over the last few days, two days, I think that that is it's very likely that we will be having that meeting. So thank you all very, very much for your contributions and your patience over these two days. And we look forward to seeing you again soon. The meeting is now adjourned