

TEXT_PRELIM_Part2_SizeC_Session2_1404 2021

Wed, 4/14 2:51PM • 1:19:44

00:22

Right The preliminary meeting is now resumed the next topic to be considered under this item is the initial assessment of principle issues. I'll ask my colleague, Mr. Humphries to lead on this matter. I'm assuming that Mr. Phil part has nothing that he wants to come back on.

00:43

That's right, I've checked I don't have any further points to our quite happy that we carry on. Right. Thank you. So Mr. Humphreys.

00:55

Thank you Ms McKay, a number of representations have been made a deadline a additionally during part one of this meeting under deadline be about the initial list of principle issues, or we will take account of all of those submissions. On a point with respect to sustainability that was raised at the first part of this meeting, I would like to draw attention to annex C of the rule six letter in the final paragraph before the initial issues are set out. We say that the effect of the proposal on the achievement of sustainable development is not listed as a specific principle issue, as we will conduct all aspects of the examination with this objective in mind. I hope I have clarified our position on that we would now like to hear from interested parties if they want to raise any new issues not already made at either part one of this meeting, or submitted in writing a deadline A or B. Please raise your hands if you want to speak on this item. Following any comments made by interested parties. I will ask the applicant for any response they may wish to make. Have any issues raised. I would also like to say a pleased attempt to raise any issues you have in one go. And it is usual for the applicant to have the last say and

02:18

so does anyone wish to speak?

02:30

I'm not

02:33

Quite Alison Downes, please.

02:39

Good afternoon, Alison Downes, Stop Sizewell C.

02:42

With regard to the coastal defences question. We appreciate the explanation by Ms. McKay. At the start of today about the interaction with the applicants explanation of the use of the Rochdale envelope, I've been asked to convey that. You know, that explanation aside, I think it was the perception that it created for interested parties that the planning Inspectorate was examining authority. We're deferring to the applicant for this explanation that was concerning. So I do appreciate your explanation. They're also interested to see the environment agency's challenge to the applicants about the provision of key information about the hard and soft coastal defences. And they're urging that these be examined under coastal processes as a as a principal issue, and we would very much support that. And I've also been requested to raise an issue, which it's not clear whether it is included in the examination, but the impact of the applicants road proposals on use of the roads by individuals using mobility carriages. Thank you. Thank you,

04:00

sir. Anyone else want to make a point at this on this topic?

04:09

Councillor Marianne Fellowes

04:18

Good afternoon Mr. Humphrey. Ladies and gentlemen. Maryanne fellows representing over town council.

04:26

I think that the point I would make is your own guidance says the investing time ahead of the examination to identify issues and work out how best to consider them is vital to ensuring effective and efficient examination process. So in identifying the issues today that might need to be in that examination. The elephant in the room really is the changes to proposed changes. It's his chicken and egg isn't it? But if we if we don't know that the changes are going to be in the application.

05:00

Then we can't flag them to you as what the issue specifics might be. And I'm very conscious that interested parties related to the new mitigation land Pakenham.

05:14

And not even here within this process today. So I do still flag up the concern that there may be other specific issues that we do need to be examined in detail that may come out of your decision relating to whether the 17 changes are going to be included as material, or what timeframe is going to be allowed for those then to be consulted upon. So it I think it is still fluid. And again, this all plays into what we said earlier is we don't really feel we're ready right now to have a defined complete and total list. That won't be subject to some other things being added in. Thank you, sir. Thank you,

06:00

Paul Collins, please.

06:05

Yes, thank you. It's just to add one sort of slight point to that to what Maryann fellows has just said, and it's to do with this business between the changes and the original DCR. If I look at the original DCO, I find that actually on the hard and soft coastal defence, it's very difficult to find the information you require. And in fact, when I was looking at the changes on this subject, I found I found out more about the original DCO, when I did find out in the chat than I did in the original DTO. So it there is a there is a real difference of what what's going on here. So it is very difficult for me to actually assess what is going on when the dcl doesn't contain enough information. But strangely enough, there is more in the changes. So if you reject the changes, I can't use them. But if you accept them, then I find out a little bit more about where we're coming from. So it just goes to the whole issue about the information being there in an easily understandable and, and manner that you can actually get to it easily. And I'm sorry, in both situations, the DCO and the changes, I find that to be an extremely taxing thing to actually do.

07:22

Thank you. Thank you.

07:26

In that case, I didn't see any more hands. So I will ask the applicant if you want to respond on these points.

07:34

So not in terms of the identification of issues. Obviously, your identification at this stage is in any event subject to your views as the examination goes along. Do you want to add or change things? That I'm sure you and your colleagues will so I don't need to change.

07:52

Thank you Mr. Philpott. With that I'll hand back to miss McCoy.

08:03

Thank you, Mr. Humphrey. Now the next topic that people have raised under procedural deadline B that we will consider on this this agenda item is the applicants change request. Now I'll just remind you that the detailed agenda explains that no decision on the acceptance of the change request will be made at this meeting. That decision will be made as soon as possible. After the plenary meeting Part Two has ended. As I explained at part one of this preliminary meeting, the rule six letter annex B provides information about the scope of this topic, which is limited to a discussion of first whether the acceptance of the change requests separately or in combination would mean that the development now being proposed is not in substance that which was originally applied for. And secondly, how it changed application if accepted might be examined. We will not be discussing the merits or otherwise of the various change requests proposals as that will be a matter of the examination should the change request be accepted. Now part one of this preliminary meeting, the applicant was requested to submit additional information in relation to modelling of coastal processes in relation to the proposed changes to the temporary and permanent beach landing facilities, which would be sought by number of interested parties. That information was submitted by the applicant or procedural deadline beam and

we know the submissions made on that topic by others, including the East Suffolk Council, Environment Agency and the marine management organisation. We also note that further of modelling in relation to the proposed coastal defences remains to be completed and we will return to the timing of the submission of that later.

10:00

On when we get to the examination timetable. In addition, notwithstanding the consultation report addendum that states that the applicant has taken into account the feedback from that consultation, the applicant was asked to provide written submissions to explain exactly how that feedback from the consultation exercise had been taken into account. In other words, although non statutory, what regard did the applicants have to responses to the consultation exercise prior to formally submitting the change? Now, there is a further explanation of that in the applicants procedural deadline based submission, which also outlines its proposals for non statutory consultation in relation to additional information submitted and how it proposes to comply with the compulsory Acquisition Regulations should the change request be accepted. Now it also draw your attention to the environmental statement, signposting documents submitted by the applicant to procedural deadline be in response to requests made on behalf of the RSPB and Suffolk Wildlife Trust. Now, there have been a number of

11:17

points made a procedural deadline be we have wrote, read those, or if there are any points of expansion, or new points, you want to make our Ask some of those interested parties first to speak on this agenda item before asking the applicant to respond.

11:36

Now,

11:38

I know that Alison downs, you did make points under this topic. Is there anything else you would wish to add?

11:50

Good morning with some kind of awesome down some stop signs We'll see. And I think that the applicants and response to consultations, you know, it's something that's been problematic for us throughout. And, you know, we've had eight years of consultations. And really, you know, saying at this point that the changes made to the DCO were made because of feedback from consultations was really, it was something very difficult to swallow, especially as the changes and the new consultations came within the DCO period. And it related to feedback that we've been giving the applicant for many, many years, about unacceptable volumes of traffic, for example. So you know, individuals, you know, worked hard to submit relevant representations by the appropriate deadline. And we're now in a position of not knowing where those relevant representations are relevant any longer because we don't know which proposals are going to be considered going forward. And so, you know, I think our observations about EDS and claim to be responding to consultations are well, I won't expand on them here. But I think you get the gist from what I'm saying. And if, you know, obviously, you know, it's all contingent on the timing of the examination, as we've already discussed, and you know, our difficulties

of knowing which documents we should be investing time to look at. But one thing we would definitely say is, if the new proposals are accepted, then it would be absolutely essential that the applicant provide all the documentation and a fully integrated package because, as Mr. Collins pointed out, the accessibility of the information is already extremely challenging. And being able to search for the information that you need amongst all these different documents is, is just mind dizzying, especially when they're provided as separate sets as at present. Thank you.

13:52

And cats, the Marianne fellows.

14:03

Thank you Ms McKay, ladies and gentlemen, counsellor, Marianne Fellowes Aldeburgh town council. I wasn't asking to speak specifically at this point. I think I've covered everything I wanted to say in terms of material changes. When I spoke to you at part one, I gave you all the legislation back to you word for word in the pins guidance as to these changes being material. And in fact, the applicants counsel themselves said, Yes, they are individually material, but that doesn't mean that it is material to the whole application. That's not my understanding of the guidance. These are material changes because they affect new interested parties. They affect new compulsory acquisition of land, they have new order limits. And those are the three criteria that's in the legislation. So as material

15:00

changes, time needs to be allowed for new interested parties for revised relevant representations for all documentation to be provided, which is then we then need time to read all of that, and respond to all of that. So again, it's about whether that should happen within the examination. And yes, things overlap and things change. And there may be inadvertently new material coming forward. But we know this upfront. We're conscious now of this, all this new information. So this needs to be resolved before the examination starts. And it is material changes to the application overall in total. Thank you. Thank you.

15:49

Now Christopher Wilson, you were on my list anyway. But I see you have your hand up. So if I could hear from you.

15:57

Thank you very much. Ms McKay, critical lesson from task? Yes, I just really wanted to support what Allison Downes was just saying, in in all respects. Basically, I think we desperately need a consolidated DCO application, that if the changes are accepted, or incorporated into a set of documents, because they are a minefield it, try and find your way through. So it'd be great to have a decent starting point for the examination.

16:26

And relax you like to see that before the examination starts.

16:31

With I think they there's been talking about additional modelling that needs to be done. And I guess as one of the

16:39

unimportant interested parties feel like kind of left out on a limb about that. The applicant will speak obviously with the council's and sometimes the RSPB

16:51

but when that model is available to do not just be shared to all the interested parties, for their comments. And, and I just wanted to also to reach support, Matt and Dan said about the consultation, just the total inadequacy of how we feel, and that is have been consulted in the past and for the applicants say that these late changes were as a result of them listening. I mean, I just beggars belief I should even say that. Thank you. Thank you.

17:25

Now, right Rachel Fulcher, Suffolk coastal Friends of the Earth, is there anything that you would like to add?

17:39

Yeah, thank you very much. Yes. Rachel Fulcher have a personal friends and

17:45

family

17:46

to pick up on a point that little Phillpotts made in part ones, and it's in relation to the Pakenham home Meadow creations fight.

18:00

It seemed to us that he was attempting to minimise the amount of land needed, saying it was really only 4.9 Hectors rather than 32 hectares, which is the amount of land that EDF have asked for. In traffic, it's our understanding that the whole of the site will be necessary, because the entire hydrological regime would have to be changed in order for the smaller piece of Meadow creation to have a chance at all of working. And not only that, but water levels will then have to be maintained indefinitely at the appropriate levels. Now, this is why so much land is needed. And of course, the same applies to the other 210 Meadow creation sites. So as far as materiality is concerned, it's our view that the whole of the first two chapters should be taken into account and therefore it says a material change. Thank you.

19:08

Thank you. Good. Well, just one moment based on based on land area based on the extent of the land to be

19:17

yes.

19:18

Thank you.

19:25

Right, just to check that there's nobody else that wants to add anything on this topic.

19:35

Reagan sculpt.

19:41

Thank you.

19:43

Me.

19:49

unmute. Hello. Hello, I can hear you. Um, can I just take the opportunity just to raise a point about new modelling coming. It's a point I've made

20:00

In the submission, I've written submission for other reasons, but there is actually a zoning question about the whole of the transport strategy and the applicant to date, there's very, they've been very strict in assuming things about the impact of various aspects of the project.

20:22

In terms of prioritising the Enter zoning, which they designated, I think it's 1518 kilometres, something like that. And then there's an outer zone. And there has been a systematic refusal to disclose information about the strategic transport sourcing of materials for the site.

20:45

I think I'm correct in saying that the freight management facility is outside the outer zone. And as a recently co opted parish Councillor and what the outer zone in great dealings,

21:01

our parish did raise an issue where there was a consultation in which we are excluded as being in the outer zone and therefore unlikely to be suffering any of relevant impact. So can I'm just raising the issue, candy, the question of zoning and the scope of impact, actually be looked at when that modelling is made available to you. Thank you. Thank you.

21:31

Right, I see that Christopher Wilson has his hand up. We've already heard from you, is that an error? That's an error. Apologies. I'll take that down. So All right, thank you just checking.

21:48

Right. If there's no one else on this, then if I could hear from the applicant?

21:55

Could I just say

21:58

it would be helpful, firstly, I think there was a procedural deadline B response on your lantech figure from a mike Taylor. And I just wanted if the applicant could confirm the area of land take again, I think he made it by way of a comparison with the N six land take. If you can't deal with that immediately, that's fine. Just make a note of that. And then, on the modelling, I don't really I've read the position, and I understand the position of what the various statutory consultees the counsellor and others are looking for. And what Mr. Rhodes explained, would be provided by way of further modelling. And I understand your position that it's not necessary to provide it. And I understand that that is the point of disagreement. But perhaps you could just confirm in terms of the further modelling to be undertaken for the coastal defences. What will that mean, which is said to be provided at two points. So we'll get onto the detail

23:12

of timing perhaps later on where my colleagues considers that what exactly will be provided? Is it mine that my understanding was that it was only going to be in relation to the this soft coastal defence? Is that is that correct? Madam, I've got Mr. Rhodes lined up to deal with this. And if I can pass over to him now, so you can deal with your question directly. And then if it's convenient After that, I'll come to pick up any other points that have been raised by interested parties. I think we'll have to come back to you on the first, right. Yes. I have to ask for instructions about that. Yeah. If I could just say and if Mr. Rose could make a note of what I said already, that I understand the differences between you. And I heard what you said last time, I don't need you to go over that at all.

24:11

Thank you. Thank you, Madam, that's fine. John Rhodes for the applicant. So taking that as,

24:19

as you say that, that that's been read,

24:23

to answer your question and also to give you a little bit of an update, if I may, in terms of timing, which I think maybe relevant to the modelling question. So the modelling is limited to the operation of the soft coastal defence. And the reason for that is because the hard coastal defence doesn't impact on coastal processes. It's protected by the soft coastal defence. It's what we call a terrestrial component or structure. It doesn't impact on that modelling. The modelling is concerned with the operation of the soft coastal defence system.

25:01

And as I explained, I try not to repeat myself

25:05

the degree to which and the degree to which and the frequency with which that needs to be replenished so that it maintains a continuous transport of sediment along the coast.

25:15

So, I think I said last time that that modelling was being undertaken to two levels of detail in order to inform the trigger point in the monitoring and management plan. And I said last time that those, I think would be late May and June. Now, we've checked with the consultants who are undertaking that work. And I can advise the examination that the first element of the modelling what we call one dimensional modelling, which will include an estimate of

25:44

the extent of erosion volumes from the soft coastal defence is do with a staggering APR.

25:53

And subject to your direction, our intention was to make that available to those stakeholders who are interested in that

26:02

during the month of April, effectively, as soon as we receive it,

26:07

there may be an opportunity for them to review and feedback on that in which case it may require some topic entailing but to submitted at the examination and deadline to but we would be directed by you about that. But we can certainly make that first stage of modelling available during April, two interested parties. The timescale for the second, which I think I said was late June, is still roughly late June, our latest estimate is around the 20th of June, when the bodies are modelling would be available for the operation of the soft coastal defence. And as you say, we think that's necessary to inform the next stage of the process. The approval of the monitoring management plan under requirement seven rather than to inform the examination but

26:58

yes.

27:00

Right. Thank you. Thank you. That's very help. I'm sure my colleague who is dealing with timings later on, we'll have we'll have made a note of that. Thank you for that. Right.

27:14

And this to feel part this, that concludes your response. Well, on that point, I'm just very briefly in terms of points raised by interested parties, and we haven't forgotten the other point you've raised and we will come back to that once I've got an answer. And so far as the signposting document that we've submitted is concerned, we say that, although that's not strictly necessary, we have responded

hopefully helpfully to the RSP B's request with that, and we think that that should provide interested parties with a useful way of navigating around the impact of the changes on the documents. But it's worth recalling that when the RSPB made that initial request, they did so making explicit that they weren't suggesting a whole new bs is produced. And that's why they asked for a signposting document. And that's a recognition that such an exercise would be highly disproportionate, and would, of course, lead to unnecessary delay. Now, some parties that may be seen as no bad thing, and maybe that's what they want. But that's not in the public interest. And we say it's not necessary. And secondly, so far as the Pakenham site is concerned. And all I would do is

28:42

say that we have dealt with that we say comprehensively in terms of the figures. And in terms of how much the site is actually expected, ultimately to become bed meadow. In the written submissions that we put in at deadline B. Those are the written submissions as opposed to some lists of oral submissions. But section 1.7. Beginning on page two, I don't need to repeat any of those matters. It's a comprehensive response.

29:15

Everything else that was what I wanted to say. Thank you very much, Mr. Phil part.

29:22

Right. If there's nothing else on that matter, the next topic to be considered is the examination timetable. And I'll ask my colleague, Mr. Brock to fill first with any new points in relation to the deadlines for written submissions, followed by Mr. Moreland, who will deal with hearings and then Mrs. Cassini who will cover the site inspections. So firstly, Mr. Brock

29:51

Thank you Ms McKay, excuse me.

29:57

So the timing of

30:00

submissions for responses to information on the coastal defence features is something we first heard a little bit about. And that's been raised, amongst others by the Environment Agency, natural England.

30:17

East Suffolk Council and Minsmere levels stakeholders.

30:23

What we want to clarify now is those dates and as a programme of what's going to be submitted when So, Mr. Rhodes, I may need to come back to you just to

30:39

be absolutely clear on what you said, I think was reasonable clarity, actually, to my colleague a few moments ago. But before I do that, may I ask

30:50

Mr. Rose either you or Mr. Philpott for the applicant.

30:55

In your covering letter for the deadline beat submissions, you have hinted at some amendments, which you think would be helpful to the information which we require at deadlines one and deadline two and the aim seems to be to help mesh with the East Anglia one and two, timetable. It's part seven of the covering letter. And whilst attend, and I'll just read out the sentence so that everybody knows what we're talking about. I'm going to ask you if you give a bit more detail of what you're proposing because it's just a bit Delphic at the moment. You say this.

31:40

Size we'll see currently considers that the additional time for the EA one and two examination can be programmed to have a guard to draft examination programme for size we'll see so as to minimise impact on interested parties resources. However, we suggest this could be further aided by some small amendments to the information to be provided, including statements of common ground at the earlier deadline. So I just want to concentrate on that last point that further amendments to the information we provided. Can you tell us? What's your driving out there, please?

32:16

Yeah, my understanding is that was in relation to,

32:22

for example, the statement of common ground with the East Suffolk Council. I will ask in a moment, Carly Vince to speak to that

32:38

kind of events. So you'll notice the chief planning officer and the author of the letter so perhaps is the person best place to explain what lay behind the words. But that's my understanding. But I'll ask Miss Vince to.

32:54

Very good. Thank you.

32:56

Good morning. Yes, you'll be aware that we've been engaging with East Suffolk. And we're very mindful of the officer resourcing, particularly their need to focus on the local impact report. So not wishing to speak on their behalf. But we just think that affording them a little bit more time to work with us on the statement of Common Ground may be very helpful to them, but also the examining authority to make sure that we give you something that's very robust and thorough.

33:27

So what do you suggest that we push back the date for statements of common ground? So I think you might come meet?

33:34

No, I'm not. I'm here.

33:39

Well, I'll mute

33:41

myself and see if you can hear me now. Yeah. Yes.

33:46

We've got the feedback going on. Have you got more? I've only got one. I'm here on my

33:53

How many? How many laptops you got open in your rents? Are we okay, now the feedback seems to have gone. So what are you suggesting that we push back the dates for students a common ground?

34:06

Yes. With the with the councils to deadline to with the two councils. Okay.

34:14

I hear that. That that's the only adjustment which you are proposing? Yes. Very good. Okay. Thank you. I would just ask the council's to standby from record to come back to them and ask them what they feel about that.

34:33

So yeah, this Suffolk Council and is the county here as well. Can I start please submit counsel, what

34:44

would you like to say in relation to that proposal?

34:48

Thank you, sir. Andrew, take you see you suffer console. Thank you. So we are keenly aware of the strain that the

35:00

Overlap now between the two examinations VA one and year two and potentially, sides, we'll see we'll impose on participants in all three of the examinations. And we have in mind, not just us, but of course, individuals and community groups.

35:19

And so

35:21

to ease the pressure on, particularly in May, where there is the seems to us to be the greatest degree of overlap, because the end of May there's potentially a week of hearings on

35:37

one north and EA two,

35:40

we would suggest that consideration be given to some easing of the list of requirements under at deadline one.

35:51

First of all, initial statements of Common Ground perhaps to be moved to the deadline to and also the first item under deadline when comments on any updated application documents. And the penultimate one, which is similar comments on any additional information submissions received,

36:12

being shifted to that lab work just to reduce the that otherwise is imposed on participants in the three

36:22

examinations. There may be other scopes.

36:26

But we would ask that consideration be given to that.

36:31

Ad also, conversely, that I appreciate that that the first preliminary meeting, there was some suggestions, perhaps some of these dates can be brought forward, that we would certainly be very anxious about that. That doesn't resolve any problems. That potentially may still work you. I'm not I may have got this wrong tape. I'm not conscious that anybody has asked to do anything earlier.

36:56

I think there were some suggestions but

37:01

not a deadline, because I think

37:05

there was some suggestions that very good.

37:08

If that is a shadow that we're boxing

37:12

all about. I think I think we hear your point strongly. Let me just put it that way.

37:18

So the points the things which the candidates from your point of view, to move from deadline B, deadline one rather, are your SOCGs and the comments on

37:33

the update application documents, and also the penultimate entry, which has comments on any additional information submissions received, which is something about capsule which is rather similar to item one. Yeah, yeah. Yeah. That loads of stuff which came in in January, doesn't it? Yes. Yes. They came.

37:52

Thank you for that.

37:56

Thank you, Mr. Tate. And who is representing Suffolk County Council today.

38:05

Thank you, sir. Mike.

38:09

microbead for queens council acting on behalf of Suffolk County Council.

38:15

So yes, we would endorse the points that Mr. Tate has just made to you.

38:23

Obviously, we hadn't raised that in our deadline be submissions. But we had flagged up in those submissions that we were alive to the fact that there were a number of parties who had raised this us about the overlap, as it were of the extended EA one and EA two examinations. And we were alive to the fact that he suffered counsel had raised that. And certainly we note from your draft

38:54

annex D list of subject matters for the statement of common ground with the rule six letter, the topics there. We were intending to work closely on statement Common Ground matters both with the applicant and with the Suffolk Council. So clearly makes sense that if they have a difficulty, that we should have a single, single deadline. So we would endorse that we would also endorse the issue in relation to the two other items in deadline one that Mr. Tate highlighted the first and the last bullet point. Again, we can see the merit in pushing those back and Could I just perhaps while I've got the opportunity, it's a point that we think is clear enough from what you have already provided by way of written material, but

it may just be helpful to have it clarified and confirmed that we have taken it that the first bullet point under deadline one comma

40:00

And on any updated application documents was not intended to include any reference to any of the materials submitted as part of the changes application on which obviously you've not yet made a decision.

40:17

Yes, that must be right. We had not made a decision. And we have still not made a decision in relation to the change. Yes, no, I say we that's the way we interpreted it. But it's just as well that everybody can sort of understand that clearly is the case that would it were you to make that decision that will be subject to his own separate deadlines and timetable? Well, I think at the time at the time at which that that timetable was put out, I was right.

40:41

It may be that

40:44

at the time, the timetable ceases to be draft and becomes finalised.

40:49

That there is a different position we don't

40:53

go for nothing further to add thank you for Thank you very much.

40:59

Now just I'm just really focusing on this point which the applicant has made asking for some small amendments, the information you provided deal, which they've elaborated is in relation to deadline one moving some stuff back.

41:14

Are there any other interested parties who wanted to

41:18

make a comment on that, and I see an MRI Rob that your hand has been up for a few minutes, so I'll turn to you. Hi, Mr. Brock, Amery, Rob, president of Eastbridge. And I think you yourself have just earlier in the piece we've been talking about now, and noted an issue, which again, is due to the timeline is disadvantaged in our communities, which is a point I made earlier. And Carly had a significant problem with an echo which is because she is in a room of EDF staff who are all able to work together due to business laws versus PR laws for individual people during lockdown, which enables EDF to work in a much more fluid manner than our communities are able to do to oppose this application at this point.

42:01

We are here talking about a timeline. That timeline clearly is subject to what's going on illegally at the moment with

42:09

lockdown. And I would like to reiterate again, that if the timeline continues in its current form, it is disadvantaging community communities against the applicant. And whilst Mr. Philpott clearly would like to have a fluid and efficient and timely process, and he may be on his own in a room today. And the rest of us also want to make sure this is a thorough process, because we have lived with this for a very, very long time. And want to make sure that it is heard. It is fair, it is balanced. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

42:44

Very good.

42:47

I guess turn now to the coastal processes modelling issue. Oh, just I see. Mr. Wilson's hand is up. Mr. Wilson?

42:58

Yes, thank you. Mr. Rock. Yes. Chris Wilson from tasks. You're just question on the statements of common ground, I noticed the council are so agreeable to delay, would it not make sense if all the statements of Common Ground would work to the same timetable? That was just a suggestion, because we're all struggling to, to deal with all these things at the same time? And any, any additional time when will obviously be of assistance? Okay, thank you. I've noted that. Thank you.

43:28

So turning to the position on the coastal process modelling, I think we may have code all of these points already, but

43:35

bearing in mind that the examiner authority has yet to decide whether or not we can accept your the change request, but if we do we need to look at this as well.

43:47

So dealing with the submission of modelling for the beach Landing Facility, which amongst others Environment Agency, naturally, the mesa Council have asked for the others in support. My understanding is that the applicant has as they promised in part one meeting submitted the BLF modelling.

44:07

Can I just check with the Environment Agency

44:11

and natural England and East Suffolk council? That is their understanding? Let's start with these other counsellors see you've already Mr. Tate

44:28

mistake.

44:31

So yes, we have received that and that's on the dependence website. We have made some we're currently assessing

44:42

the adequacy of that. We've made some preliminary comments that deadline be

44:54

but after an initial review, it appears to fall short of what we do.

45:00

candidates will need to see to allay our concerns

45:04

on beach morphology. But that is a process that is

45:10

subject to dialogue, which will no doubt continue. Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you.

45:17

For the environmental agency. I see we've got Mr. Barlow, Mr. Scared and Miss bolt here. Which of you would like to speak on this?

45:29

It's kind of a bolo. Excuse me clear my throat. First time I spoken today. Simon Barlow from the environmental agency, project manager at the size was for the size we'll see project.

45:39

Yes, I thought I would respond to you on this one. Mr. Brock. So yes, we did receive the modelling information that they say that the applicant said would be provided for the changes to the marine infrastructure that is the beach facility in the jetty proposal on the 29th of March. So not quite as was

46:05

suggested to you at the previous part of the of this preliminary meeting at the marine technical forum, but subsequently on 29th of March, which we are now in a commenced position of reviewing, which obviously is now going to be going to be an ongoing process for a while.

46:21

Very good, thank you very much. That's helpful.

46:25

Do we have natural England here today? It looks not from my list.

46:33

They can chime in if they if I've missed them or put their hand up.

46:38

Williamson, I see your hand is up.

46:42

Yes, good afternoon. Just wanted to note their national and aren't at the meeting today. However, they have made comments regarding this at an MB memory management organisation have also put forward our comments regarding the beach planning facilities as they are very important to our remit. And I defer to Simon Barlow's comment from the EIA as we mimic what he said there. Thank you. Thank you, Miss Williams. That's very helpful. Thank you. Okay.

47:09

And in relation to the hard and soft coastal defence features,

47:14

if I deal first with soft coastal defence,

47:18

Mr. Rhodes, you've been telling us about this.

47:23

In your clients deadlines, the documents you state the further mean modelling is still being carried out. The change request document you maintain wasn't is complete without that, as you pointed to requirement seven A of the latest draft DCO, which requires details of coastal processes monitoring and mitigation plan to be submitted.

47:49

Prior to commencement of construction of either soft or the hard coastal defence feature.

47:58

in passing, I just want to note that the coastal process monitoring mitigation plan is as you've currently drafted requirement seven a for the approval of the marine management organisation rather than political planning authority, we might come to pick that up not today, but later on if it is relevant.

48:15

Nonetheless, you've submitted this draft, coastal appraisers monitoring and mitigation patent examination were submitted as part of your plan to do so. Although you say it's unnecessary to do so at this stage, you say it's complete except for the trigger point, which is the trigger point for replenishment of the soft coastal defences feet feature.

48:39

And the further modelling which are carrying out is being is necessary to set that trigger point

48:46

that

48:48

you now hope will be coming through before the end of the month of April. And

48:56

you are able to share that with what you've described as stakeholders

49:04

at that point, and we would need to find a point in the examination timetable for that to be submitted if that becomes relevant.

49:18

And in relation to the hardcase and defence feature as Lana state your position is that you're not submitting anything further. Now have I got that right.

49:30

So that was all right, as you stated it, thank you. But perhaps I can say one more thing which may be relevant to that which is in relation to modelling it's certainly not our intention to do or submit further information relating to the hard coastal defence feature. But we have been asked by stakeholders about the design of the hard coastal defence feature.

49:55

As you know, we say that the parameter approach said

50:00

And the application is appropriate. And we've explained the reason for that. But nevertheless, we have been continuing with work on the design development of the hard coastal defence feature. And I'm advised that we are due to receive drawings relating to the next stage of the design of hard coastal defence feature during April. And in very similar timescale to the modelling timescale I've just identified, we'd be happy to share that with stakeholders that your direction into submitted at your direction at an appropriate time during the examination, although of course, that detail is reserved, again by requirement. But if it's if it's helpful, we don't think it's necessary for the coastal processes monitoring. But it is certainly a matter of curiosity for a number of stakeholders, and we've been working on it, and then we're happy to share that information.

50:58

When we cue prepares to put that in, in that case. So it happens to coincide with the same timescale. So during we don't have it yet, but during April, we're told it to be received by us, we want to see it, obviously, but anticipate being able to share it during a call with interested parties and submitted at an appropriate time to the examination.

51:21

So I guess your proposal would be to put it in at the deadline following the more informal sharing was State Fair, that's what we thought may be appropriate.

51:35

And just to be clear, that would be detailed drawings for the hard coastal defence and a technical note explaining that detailed design.

51:43

And that's what we've commissioned, and were due to receive shortly.

51:48

Thank you. Okay, I understand that.

51:51

And going back to the soft coastal defence modelling, some of that coming through in April, so the same timescales that we've just been talking about.

52:00

And further modelling, which, from your deadline be submission? you hoped to be coming through before the end of June?

52:13

Do you have anything? Did I hear you say to miss Makai? You have a firmer date on that.

52:19

So I asked the question yesterday, and was told that the expected delivery date is 20th of June.

52:26

So is that the time at which you'd expect to share it? Yes, sir.

52:34

Thank you.

52:46

Very good. In that case, I just want to ask the Environment Agency if they have anything they want to say about that. Can I turn it back to you? It was Mr. Scared, wasn't it? No, it wasn't it was Mr. Mr. Barlow?

53:04

That's right, sir. Yes, we're back online.

53:07

Obviously, we've made it clear that it is our view, that the work to support the proposed mitigation measures associated with a soft coastal defence feature are fundamental to our understanding of how coastal processes will work in our part of the world.

53:31

For the future, significant length of time, this power station will be on our coastline, if it's given permission. And we contend that that is something that should not be left to a pure requirement of DCO, but instead should be properly examined in an issue specific hearing. We therefore, welcome the submission information necessary to support those proposals and those claims. What we are absolutely

54:02

paramount, what is of paramount interest to us is that the claims being made on the maintainability of that soft coastal fence feature are indeed viable and sustainable. And that is what we are looking for, by way of this process. And so we hope and trust that that is what will be provided, and that we will have sufficient time to review it.

54:29

And I think probably that's, that's all I need to say at this moment in time.

54:35

Very good. Thank you very much. Thank you.

54:39

naturing they don't have

54:42

the marine management organisation, Miss Williamson, anything you would like to add or comment on that. staff in the Williamson marine management organisation, know nothing further to add from us on that point. Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Tate.

55:00

See, you've got your hand up.

55:04

Like so undertake for his support council who of course, also the case Protection Authority. And environment agency's position is very much the position that we are also following. We're not expecting modelling for the park host. defence. But we are expecting an engineering report, I think what was the root cause of detailed drawings and the technical note?

55:31

And we noted the expected timescale. Thank you. Very good, thank you.

55:44

Just check my notes.

55:54

What I'm going to do, because we've got some, some dates, and

56:02

matters which are proposed by the applicant, I'm just going to

56:08

produce my own separate note on that. So I know that I've got the right dates and the right things against it. And before we finish today,

56:16

I will read that out so that we're clear what the applicant is proposing, by way of the dates and material.

56:27

Mr. Collins, I see that you have your hand up.

56:33

Yes, thank you. It's just whilst I understand what EDF are saying about delivering any information about the hard coastal defence, and yes, we would be very happy to see exactly what it is. And in engineering terms, they're actually

56:51

proposing.

56:53

The issue of the soft coastal defence and maintenance of it is that we all know on this coast, that actually maintenance of such a structure is can be very, very difficult and very, very sporadically changed. In other words, the coast does funny things at odd times, where large amounts of soft coastal defence or whatever it happens to be on sand dunes just get washed away. And they can do it metres at a time. And once that happens, we end up with a hard coastal defence sitting behind it, which is only it ordinance data, and that becomes exposed and becomes actually susceptible to undermining. So this the fact that they're actually saying here, that it is only the soft coastal defence that they're going to actually deal with, was really quite a dangerous idea. Because actually, if that were ever to fail during

the lifetime of the operation of the station, or indeed, beyond that, when there are still radioactive substances on site, this you know, the ability of the hard coastal defence is actually a very important thing. And so it's a combination of the sustainability of the soft coastal defence, as well as the design of the hard coastal defence, we're still sitting behind it. And they EDF do admit themselves. But if nothing was to be done for the soft coastal defence in terms of maintenance, they expected to be exposed in the year 2050 to 2080 something or other I can't remember it's about a 34 year period, which is half the lifetime of the entire station. So there's not exactly it's not a matter of exact science, but fortunately. So I caution. I caution in this case, because this is not something which is easily predictable. And even EDF's own consultants will say this when you ask them, the coast is very unpredictable here. And despite it being

58:57

being said by EDF to be a very quiescent part of the coast, it is anything Scott. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

59:10

Councillor Saunders, I see your hand.

59:15

Thank you. For a kangaroo. It's actually in in myself as an interested party in this aspect of the application. Because I did put a relevant representation in myself. I happened to be consulted retired consulting engineer and have dealt with a lot of coastal defence, particularly along the coast. And I already heard Ron Paul said, I've actually been engaged in trying to save terrestrial defences when the beach was dropped, and the in the Suffolk area, and in both instances, it was impossible to save it. We were brought in literally overnight, and we put in every effort to try and save the trust of the defence and it wasn't the same had to

1:00:00

rebuilt. So these things happen very unexpectedly, the beaches dropped, certainly at Phoenix, they weren't washed when we had dropped over five metres overnight. So it is very unpredictable. It's very important there for the hard defence as low as a high level of

1:00:22

trying to find the right word of the man. But, but basically, it's a safeguard against these very large events that do periodically occur and occur on our collective basis. And that's why I would be interested in not perhaps just stakeholders, which is a term that's come in here for documents that interested parties don't seem to be going to be allowed to see some of these documents. I certainly would.

1:00:57

Thank you. Thank you, Councillor Sanders. I don't think that the applicant is suggesting that they are only sharing with the stakeholders. It's just that when the documentation comes in, they can share it with, for example, East Suffolk Council, and then in answer to my questions they propose to put into the examination at the next

1:01:20

deadline. So I hope that helps you, Councillor Sanders. Glad to just say that the mayor was me looking at the question of, of the dates and what material the applicant has proposed to put in. So it's a procedural point rather than substantive point. Mr. Wilson, I see your hand is up.

1:01:44

Yeah, sorry. Thanks very much. Sorry, you just sort of made that point. But can I just, I was just wanting to pick up from what Mr. Collins had said. You've just sort of really for clarification, because I was very surprised, surprised. surprised when Mr. Rhodes said that they were working on the south coast defences as the sort of the main protection and kind of lifetime of the site, how does one get clarity on what the lifetime of the site is deemed to be as far as the applicants concerned? Because in the climate change resilience section, they talk about 12 years of construction and 60 years of operation, which is a long enough period on that east coast in terms of erosion. But then when you've got another sort of 80 years beyond that, with radioactive waste stored on site, are they looking at that soft curve feature? And actually, they're actually saying that it will be there till 2160 or, or just the end of this century?

1:02:43

Well, thank you, Mr. Wilson. If the applicant wants to answer that before the end of the day, then that's fine. Otherwise, it may be something which you can validly raise as a starting point when we get into examination if the point is still relevant at that time.

1:03:02

Mr. Phillips, I haven't come back to you.

1:03:05

Whilst I've been having a discussion and hearing points from other interested parties, I'm about to move on to another aspect of the timetable. But before I do that, unless you want to respond to nice, as you would have been aware, from what was said earlier, in response to your query about the letter, we were alive to the point that was being raised by the council's about the state of common ground. And we don't oppose the suggestions that they've made, we do think that there may be advantage of a statement of Common Ground does come in at that later deadline, and that it's likely to be Fuller, and more robust. If it comes in then. And so we see the advantage of that we don't oppose the other points in the race, so I don't have anything further to add.

1:03:59

Thank you very much. Thank you.

1:04:02

In that case, I'll move on to the other things which I want to deal with in relation to timetable before we pass on to

1:04:12

the open floor hearings.

1:04:16

It's a convenient time for you just to raise a couple of matters in relation to statements of common ground.

1:04:21

The examining authority is asked for statements of common ground with several bodies and what about says of particular relevance to the marine managers marine management organisation to natural England and to East Suffolk Council. The MMO in their relevant representation raised some issues in relation to the harbour and the harbour that night 64 where they have told us that the Department for Transport are normally involved. And so we will be asking for a state of common ground between the applicant please and the Department for Transport on those issues.

1:05:02

We have also asked for quite wide ranging statements of common ground with natural England, the MMO and East Suffolk. And if I can give you something of a heads up, the examining authorities questions

1:05:17

do contain some requests for specific points to be dealt with in statements of common ground. You probably there are there already. But please do make sure that you address those specific points when you receive the examining authorities questions, which won't be well, there's a timetable for that. Lastly, Mr. Saunders,

1:05:43

for Woodbridge town council, might I ask a question of you please? Are you there? Mr. Saunders? Yes, I am. Thank you very much indeed. I'm grateful to you. I'm hoping you can help me on something. in your, in your counsels, deadline be submission? Yes, you say this to us. You say statements of common ground and section 101 agreements are being sought via the examination process between the Africans and East Suffolk District Council. And I think that at part one of the meeting, I also had Councillor fellows from Ober refer to Section 101. I've looked at the legislation or reasonably convenient with most

1:06:28

familiar with most of it on handsets and DCs, but I'm really not quite sure what you're referring to as a section 101 agreement. Let me explain. At the meeting at the part one meeting, it was actually referred to as section 101 at one stations probably why both of us have come with that comment. I suddenly realised when we put in that I thought no, it's really section 106 which I'm sure is what.

1:06:53

Thank you. That's exactly what I thought. I'm grateful to you. Very good.

1:06:59

So in relation to the deadlines, then Are there any other interested parties who wish to make submissions to us now? I think New submissions rather than ones which would be made before on the deadlines. Councillor Fellowes?

1:07:15

Good afternoon now.

1:07:21

Hello, counsellor fellows. Good afternoon, Mr. Brock. And we've got the beautiful afternoon sunshine here in Suffolk NASA. So I see adjusting my camera. Thank you, sir. Marianne Fellowes representing Aldeburgh town council.

1:07:38

I think it was section 111. And section 106 as part of the Scottish power renewable's DCOs, the East Suffolk Council have agreed section 111 with the applicants in terms of how

1:07:55

funds may be set up to mitigate and how those funds might be used and managed. Okay. If the process continues in the same approach here, where he Suffolk is going to do that, without consultation to local parish and town councils or affected parties, then I believe more interested parties may feel that they need their own statements, common grounds or protective provisions.

1:08:27

So I think it's quite difficult at the moment to understand how matters that are still outstanding might be resolved, and what may remain on agreed, which is obviously statements of common ground are really good to identify where parties agree, but also, as I'm sure you agree, where parties may, where there may be a divergence between opinions or aspects of of an agreement. So I think it is something that might become quite daunting, but quite necessary for parties to take out.

1:09:05

The thing I would say today, it feels I feel a bit strange sitting here today because I thought we were going to receive perhaps your decision on whether proceedings were going to be delayed or whether there's going to be a part three to the preliminary meeting. Before we went on to talk about specifics, because it's hard to talk about key dates or key things that are difficult for us.

1:09:31

If you said, How many weeks into an examination post the start of it, do you want this or that discussed or, you know, in terms of you know, when would the statements Common Ground calm? I would say they need to be further into the process, especially if we start that process tomorrow, because things are still evolving at this stage. So I do think yes to summarise, there may be lots more parties that need statements of Common Ground even if they're quite busy.

1:10:00

And protective provisions. Thank you, sir. Okay. Thank you don't go in. So

1:10:07

sexual Memorial, I think you mean section 111 of the local governments act 1970 something. Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

1:10:15

And your point about whether or not the parish councils are consulted in relation to what the

1:10:23

District Council and maybe the county council do own isn't there's, there's limits to what the examining authority can do in relation to that. I think that's, I, if I can help you a little bit, I think that's largely going to be something where you need to try to influence those councils. And we will receive whatever we receive.

1:10:44

Yes, thank you. Okay, thanks. I'm the same. The same applies to statements of local impact as well, doesn't it? Really? Thank you. Thank you. Yeah.

1:10:56

Mr. Scared for the Environment Agency, I see your hands up.

1:11:01

Hello, Mr. Brock, Cameron stead

1:11:04

of the Environment Agency. It was just a brief observation in terms of information still to come. There's been a lot of discussion today about further information to be submitted for hard and soft coastal defences. It was really an observation that, as we understand it, there are a number of other areas where further information is still to be provided. So an example might be a water supply strategy, as well as

1:11:36

a strategy for non potable water supply. So within our response, we did highlight that it may be useful to obtain a programme for all of the other areas of information that still to come. So I just want to sort of capture that

1:11:58

further information that's still to come. Okay. And beyond the hard, hard and soft coastal defence information. Thank you.

1:12:07

Just took away all those points, which will be made in your Thank you. Yes, stay with all those points, which you've made in your deadlines be written. We highlighted it in our

1:12:22

response to our written response preliminary meeting one, where we highlighted where there was further inflammation to come. And we suggested

1:12:36

a timetable for that information in our recent response. Yes. And was it that you list Have you the things that you've just mentioned to me?

1:12:47

Yes, they're all listed in your deadline, because I've read your deadline be response, and I thought I saw your suggestion that there should be a timetable programme for putting those things on, I just wanted to make sure that everything what you just mentioned, is already in there, there isn't a comprehensive list within that response, it was more the request for a timetable from the applicant to understand what further information will be submitted in terms of reports and, and studies to support. Okay, to support the application and enter timetables? Well, the Afghan will have heard what you have just said. And

1:13:27

that's very helpful. Thank you. Thank you.

1:13:32

Mr. Barlow, who's also impure for your organisation is I see. God is good his hand up at the moment. Did you want to say something, Mr. Barney? I miss solid. I see. I see your hand.

1:13:46

Yes, sorry.

1:13:47

Just to very quickly reiterate what you were just discussing there, we certainly provided you with a list of those areas in which we felt there was substantial information still required is our deadline, a response. And then in our deadline be response, we recommended that perhaps the examining authority themselves may seek from the applicant, a programme for the submission of that outstanding information to help everybody not just the Environment Agency, but everybody come to terms with that when that information will arrive. And when we will therefore be able to embark upon the process of reviewing it. So I just thought I would just

1:14:22

boost my colleagues comments there. But the question I wanted to ask, and I know it was touched on earlier by the local authority, and I think you gave us some an answer, but I'm still a little confused. And I just want to get some clarity on it. Is that in the initial timetable, and now it's potentially subject to change? There is a deadline, one where it talks about comment on updates to application documents. And I'm, I'm of the view that I think you've confirmed that that doesn't necessary at this point in time, refer to the changes documents because you've yet to make a decision as to whether

1:15:00

To accept them. And that's helpful because we've been, we've been trying to get our head around whether indeed that was the case. And of course until such time if you make a decision as to whether to accept changes, then why would we be embarking on the process of coming up with a set of specific comments about those documents. But if you were minded to accept the change application is it you're thinking that you might seek a separate deadline for comments on those specifically, because it's the environment agency's position that we were planning if you accepted them, to simply consider them as part and parcel of the of the application as submitted, and to prepare our written representations of this specific hearing on the basis of that new information, and not to have to apply ourselves to a whole extra deadline interim deadline for those bits independently. So it was a question of clarity, and a sort of a plea, if we may, to suggest that if you do accept the changes that we simply embed our position on those into our written representations proper, and not be held to yet another deadline for comment on them in their own right.

1:16:09

Thank you very much. That's helpful. I think that's the decision which we need to make as an examining authority as a whole on the points which you've made. Both I've heard your representations about that. So thank you very much. Thank you very much.

1:16:23

Rosie Sullivan, and

1:16:29

thank you so much, sir. Rosie Southern representing the RSPB and separate Wildlife Trust. Just a couple of quick points, if I may 1 of all just to support what the environmental agency, both points that they've helpfully made. So on the first to do with the deadline one, first request, if you'd like the first submission, again, just to support whether it's whether it's changed application information, or whether it's any other information, we certainly would welcome and be appreciative of all of that being dealt with by way of written reps, rather than sorry, written representations rather than have this this extra deadline to comply with. So thank you for considering that. And then secondly,

1:17:13

just quickly, again, wanted to fully support the helpful submissions made both by the Environment Agency in their procedural be response, but also orally just now.

1:17:26

And would be incredibly grateful if there was some kind of timetable, list of new information, deadlines, set, etc. I didn't want to mess up the ordering of things too much earlier. But hopefully, you have already covered three new pieces of information to do with the hard and soft coastal defences.

1:17:45

And it's an obvious point that we that we've we all know, but obviously that information is coming in either after the written reps or any just before. So very hard to kind of take account of that. But also going forward. And of course, we do understand that things move and changes and new information

might need to be made. But just we would be very grateful if there could be a timetable. And I just wanted to add, we've got our own lists. So the Environment Agency has helpfully mentioned a few things today. There's also a few things in the procedure. Be response. We have also got a list if it's helpful to send that in just to give an indication. We'd be very happy to do that.

1:18:28

Thank you, Mr. Sutherland.

1:18:33

Yeah, you'd need to find a point in the deadlines, I think which you can send it in. There may be other informal routes, I'm not sure.

1:18:44

Well, maybe do it over before the end of the day, as I help you on that. Thank you very much.

1:18:54

Thank you. So it is now by my watch almost one o'clock. I am therefore getting in a second to adjourn us for lunch. I'm just checking with my colleagues as to what length of a gym they think would be most appropriate.

1:19:26

Very good. Thank you. We will adjourn for lunch for one hour. So there's an applet for seeing you at two o'clock promptly. Thank you very much.