

# TEXT\_OFH5\_Session2\_19052021

Wed, 5/19 5:17PM • 59:34

00:00

open floor hearing five has now resumed. I'd like to welcome those participants who have joined this session from the arrangements conference. Just before we hear from the first participant, I'd like to remind you that a second examiner will appear on the screen, when you have one minute of your allotted time left, do not have access to a camera, or have joined by phone a verbal key will be given instead. Could I ask Derek green to turn on his camera and microphone and introduce himself please? Mr. Grey, neither could the case team confirm whether Mr. Green is actually in the participating place?

00:55

Mr. Green is in the hearing. But I think there must be an issue

01:00

because he doesn't appear to be able to hear us or we can't hear him. Mr. Green, can you can you hear all CEUs? Please?

01:09

No, in that case, Mr. Green, if you can hear me and we will come back to you. Case team. I'm going to move on to the next person on the list. Maybe if you could make contact with Mr. Green and advise what's happened please. Could I ask Paul Santa to turn on his camera. And Mike chrome please if possible. Hello. Hello, if you could introduce yourself, please. And then you've got 15 minutes

01:43

going? Well, thank you panel. Firstly, my name is Paul Zanna and I'm a technical director and expert witness in relation to transportation and highway matters. working for a company called create consultant engineers. I'm here initially to represent a client family never gone family owned, sizable land holding holding which is within and adjacent to the sizable DTO and is going to be used for delivery of the sizewell link quote, as we know it must be SLR the family reside at 40 Hall, which is access directly over 40 Road at the junction with little more road junction and the farm is in constant use and is continuously farmed as as a going concern. I first initially would like to echo my concerns and share the same number of of matters raised by other parties, which I'm not intending to go into today. But I pacifically would reference for comments which have been made by Suffolk County Council in relation to the SLR in particular. And at the same time, our client is also wishing to seek a number of points of clarity on the SLR which run in tandem with what the Highway Authority is currently saying. It is acknowledged today we have been having some dialogue with the applicant. But we felt there was a requirement for us to come forward today and highlight three Pacific concerns which have a direct impact on my clients land holdings and residential property. With this in mind, I would urge you to look at vdslr plans and are referring to approve or part one and two. Alongside we're supporting technical material with those. Oh, can you hear me?

04:00

Sorry, Mr. Santa? Yes, please, please do continue.

04:03

I want to tell pacifically I would like to talk about the SLR and 40 Road. And I'd like to talk about the SLR and the junction with a b 1122 b 1125. As I've mentioned, my client has landholdings and resides adjacent to the 40 road. As part of the SMR proposal, the intention is for 40 road to the north would be closed under the SLR proposal, which will result in my clients dwelling alongside a number of other dwellings. And also some of the land holdings which are bisected by the SLR resulting in a lengthy diversion which would otherwise be necessary along the SLR and then rejoin and a B 1122. To access alternative areas of his land which are otherwise accessible with the new road alignment coming in place, we raise a concern over vs. I mean that's on threefold really one is fat as a going farm and a an interest, vermin movement of materials, farm plant machinery etc, we feel is wholly unacceptable to see the closure of Fort Lee road north and requiring our client therefore to for intensive purposes, access the SLR and then bypass and divert some distance to retain his his land holdings. We also highlight that the introduction of a link from the SLR to what would become 40 Road self appears to us to be creating some form of rather than linking back onto a 12 which seems to go wholly against the legacy proposal obvious a lot of remove traffic from the local highway network. And then really fundamentally, the bisection of this causes between local residents to the south of Hawley road 40 Road, unable to connect with the southern part, to the northern part and also to Middleton and other outlying villages in the area. We have had, as I've mentioned, some preliminary dialogue with with the applicant on this. And we pacifically would last that the panel take consideration of re establishing before the road link. We as a design team and because obviously you've examined this in some detail and feel that bear is wholly suitable and alternative which could retain 40 Road within the current decio redline boundary. And we move what we consider to be a surplus link from the SLR to 40 low self. And we would ask the panel to urge the applicant to engage with us perhaps more actively. To explore this option further. allied with them. I'd really like to focus on my client's dwelling and under media land interest which he commonly enjoys. forwardly Hall is within 650 metres do self of DSLR. As I say directly access via a little more road close to the junction with 40 word. We have done a series of preliminary investigations at that property. And it is confirmed essentially that that site enjoys extremely low noise values, no dust and no light pollution whatsoever. We haven't to date really seen any planned mitigation which we'll see. Our clients interests and dwellings maintain the current level of enjoyment which he commonly has at the existing farmland. And in particular, I prefer to be outside space, which my client enjoys. And potential for this to then create noise pollution and light impact in particular. And we're not convinced that the current environment or statement or the survey works which have been done as a result of them leading up to the SLR fully consider for direct relationship the SLR will have on the existing properties and dwellings about location.

08:58

And panel, I again, I would urge you to ask the applicant to engage actively on that particular point. For us to take things forward. I'd like to just turn briefly to b b 1125 22 junction and if I may just put this in context slightly. So b b 1122. Essentially is a local vote which links Blythe Baba to the north, former Yag 12 which essentially bisects a number of existing villages rejoining the B 1122. Just outside of

forgotten, this word is already heavily constrained. We have seen numerous accidents we have already have a 7.5 tonne load in stroke weight and restriction along this particular route. Albeit the bat is permitted for access for which size well are on one of those permitted parties are referring specifically to the junction with the SLR stroke b 1122, b 11 and 25. But works which are planned at this particular location, in essence encouraged traffic to travel along the B 1125. through life along this local road, where priority has been given over to a b 1125. To then join directly onto the SLR in essence creating a perhaps perhaps a more direct route for size work construction and operational traffic, which should otherwise be utilised in ba 12, down to the SLR and then along the SI LR in a more appropriate fashion. I'd also refer you to the transport assessment which has been produced by the applicant, which at times during the construction and operational phase of the sizewell C. Part activity sees more traffic on the B 1125. Fan we do actually on besides worldlink quote we've had in mind, we think that elements have been lost in terms of the opportunity here and we'll come back to legacy again here where we are seeking for really should be SLR comm forward for every effort should be made to make great use of this particular link load, remove in pressure remove in traffic which would otherwise be on the local road network. pacifically be a lever of a b 1125. I will be urging the panel to take the opportunity to request that the applicant removes this traffic. And while the van in COVID is traffic on to the SLR with a common junction improvement which is planned, we should be removing it altogether, or at least downgrading that junction and focuses in on the B 1125. As the link on its whole length for me a 12 in blind power to look at an intervention scheme which would otherwise really make fat link completely unattractive for constructions drug sizewell traffic, versus enabling them to use the SA Eliza, perhaps quicker, more convenient route. As it stands right now we expect we will see the size world traffic continue to use a b 1125 in a slightly more convenient route and quicker route with a planned junction. And ultimately, as a result of that lead to safety and risk within these local areas. Again, panel, I simply at this stage would urge you to request what the applicant engages with us more comprehensively over this particular matter. And I would ultimately suggest for Donald Duck could be had with the applicant and we are more than willing and able to participate in those dialogues going forward. And at this moment, or simply conclude and say that we would be looking to make a detailed representation at deadline to on these points which we have raised a site in alternative arrangements for both 40 Road and also for the B 1125. Thank you,

13:49

Mr. Sanders, for submitting your data, which you provide. As well as my last highlight of your concern.

14:00

Yes, I can absolutely find no problem at all.

14:02

Thank you very much. Mr. Humphreys. Did you have a Did you have a question as well?

14:10

No, it was it was a question you've just put the misters on it was about submitting details. A plan showing

14:16

their diversity you talked about at the beginning of your presentation.

14:20

Absolutely. I'll ensure they come forward as deadlines. Thank you. Thank you.

14:25

Thank you Mr. Sam. If you could turn off your camera and microphone please. Thank you Mr. Derek green. Are you are you available?

14:40

Yes. Can you hear me?

14:42

I can Mr. Green. I can hear but I can't see you but that

14:46

term camera on let me try that.

14:51

How's that?

14:53

No, I'm I'm not seeing anything if if you're happy you can proceed with Your camera off if that's

15:03

why I'm not.

15:09

I can.

15:10

Are you still there, Mr. Green? Mr. Green? I think we're having some technical problems. Oh, I think he Mr. Green Are you that case, Tim, I think we're still having some problems with Mr. Green. So what I'll do is I'll move on to the next speaker. And we'll need to contact Mr. Green again. Let's see is there Mr. Green? Are you there? No, I think we're going to have to move on Mr. Green, but we will come back to you if you can still hear me. Mr. hariyali. Oh, hello. Hello, Mr. Young. I'm sorry about that confusion. If you'd like to introduce yourself, and then please, you've got five minutes.

16:12

Thank you very much. Thank you. My name is Harry young and I chair the Suffolk coast dmo destination management organisation formed in 2012 to promote the Suffolk coast as a visitor destination. I only intend to speak briefly now as a very much hope that there'll be an issue specific hearing on the impacts of the proposed development on the tourism industry. The dmo has a volunteer board and a small team of part time employees that has a highly engaged in loyal membership of

approximately 220 businesses, the majority being in the accommodation sector. The dmo does not cover a fixed and formal geographical catchment, but it markets the tourism assets of what is broadly Suffolk. The value of tourism within the whole of East Africa is approximately 695 million pounds per annum with 14.6 1000 jobs, which equates to about 15% of all employment. Tourism within the Suffolk coast and Heath AONB area is worth 228 million pounds per annum with around 5000 tourism jobs. In 2019, shortly after inviting speakers from EDF energy and scottishpower renewables to join our annual conference, and responding to growing concern from our members. We commissioned leading consultants BVA BD RC to produce an independent survey to evaluate the impact that size will see. And the other nationally significant energy projects would have on visitor demand. BDA work with another consultant destination research to quantify the likely financial impact and job losses. EDF Energy Commission an equivalent report by Ipsos Mori, which produce startlingly similar results to the BVA reports in terms of the likely net reduction in visitor demand 16 17%. But EDF energy survey did not attempt to quantify the financial impacts or tourism job losses. BVA study suggests that the economic harm to the economy could be 24 to 40 million pounds per annum, equating to the loss of 400 to 600 jobs. Over the years, the Suffolk coast has engaged in numerous discussions with EDF energy about the size will see project and the creation of a promise tourism fund. At this stage, the focus of conversations has really been about governance of such a fund. The scale of the proposed fund is not yet known, nor is it clear how soon it could be made available to counter the perception shift. The Suffolk coast concerns include the following. So as we'll see on its own and cumulatively alongside the other nationally significant energy projects will cause damage to the way the air is perceived by visitors. Currently, and we know this because we survey visitors, it's viewed as a place of peace and tranquillity. This is a key strength and virtue. It's our major selling point. The environment was cited in the BVA study as one of the main reasons that tourists visit the area. The altered perception will be from one of peace and tranquillity to one of heavy construction and severe HGV lgv traffic congestion. This development will harm the brand of the sector that provides 15% of our jobs. The downturn in visitor numbers created by this change in perception could lead to the loss of hundreds of jobs in this key settled and long standing local industry. EDF energy has not yet attempted to measure the economic downturn in the visitor economy, whereas the Suffolk coast tiny organisation By comparison, has made that effort. To sum up, if the project does get ahead and there's, there is no doubt that the tourism sector will need very substantial support. Some businesses close to the construction site may never recover. But just to be clear, no business or sector ever wishes to suffer harm, but then be given support to rebuild itself. This report of tourism fund remains just a concept and therefore the dmo has no choice but to be gravely concerned about the dangers, the local tourism industry faces from this project and the other major projects nearby. I'm very much hopes that these issues will be explored issue specific hearings on tourism.

20:49

Thank you

20:50

very much, Mr. Young. If you could turn off your camera and microphone grateful. I'll now hand over to my colleague Mr. Moreland

21:04

during green

21:06

is now joining the case team and could let me know whether Mr. Green has been able to join us on the phone. Yes. Mr. Green Are you can you hear me?

21:17

Yes I

21:18

can. I'm sorry about the technology but I'm not responsible for that.

21:24

Don't worry, we can hear you so if you

21:27

see my decrypted face, but there you go.

21:31

Don't worry if you'd like to introduce yourself and let us know what you'd wish to say.

21:37

Okay, here we go. Firstly, as becomes clear, I've never done anything like this before but I'm here comes my appeal. Firstly, my name is Derrick cream, and I live in farnum. I'm making an appeal to people's homes and lives should matter. It's in the context of whether the alignment of the proposed to village bypass should go east or west and Foxborough would. I'm 76 years old, not in the best of health. I retired to suffolk with my wife to smell the roses. I think you understand what that would mean. We intended to wonder accommodate my 90 year old mother in law and our separate annex, which we will do one day But currently, it's providing a useful income as a holiday lead, which helps to pay the council taxes. I'm also a member of the phone association which is the Association of my neighbours. It's called it's an acronym for foreigners state residents and neighbours. It includes residents residents of what is farnum pole, barn and Manor, barn and bonds, farm and cottages and the businesses of the old Vicarage and Molly's farm. Sadly, this has often been lumped together as one home by EDS in the during the consultation period, calling it all farnum Hall, which obviously makes it sound like one home. I'll probably come back to that. My submission is that people's homes and lives should matter. my neighbours and I are not naming this. We're not trying to stop sighs well see. This is simply a plea for to believe by polar alignment to be routed to the east of Foxborough would, as is proposed in great detail by our local parish Council. This alignment better serves the greater good if you include the health of people's lives and livelihoods rather than just the ecological issues. Neither Ed, I'm going too fast. Sorry, my okay you hearing? Yes, that's okay. Okay, Islam, thought I better check in and carry on. But neither iidea nor the Suffolk County Council and their responses to the Paris Council's proposal of the alignment have get full and proper consideration to the well being of the residents of farming village, especially those of us that live in the 10 homes that have passed. They're often wrongly fertilisers, just farm home. But you see the construction in the use of the bypass will bring obviously noise, air light

pollutions and stress all the time in life when we are less able to deal with it. Having the bypass in line to the east would lessen the impact on mental and physical health. Also, it would better provide continued to provide the immunity of the public right away that exists. It also have less impact on the value of our homes. There are these benefits to be had during the consultation period. At two explains that Farnum Hall is actually a collection of these 10 homes created which were created through the conversions of a main house and various outbuildings. Of the 10 homes. Of these 10 homeowners, only two of the owners have yet to retire. Five of the owners are widows. [REDACTED], you see, really a retirement group of living been living happily in our peaceful environment.

25:36

It seems when I think about this, it seems this nation just indebted itself probably for generations due to a COVID virus because they value the lives of its senior citizens. It's for the thinnest of reasons that both EDF and the Suffolk County Council seem determined that this bypass aligns closest to all of us in the farming village. We all benefit the bypass is further away, by which happens by aligning to the east of Foxborough wood, this would meaningfully mitigate the full impact that it will have on our health well being and our livelihoods. Clearly, the further away the bypass is must be better for further people's well being and should be an important part of the consideration. This is by the local parish council support it in the volumes of research and statements reported by EDF in the consultation period. There are very few references to the impacts on people. These impacts are simply swamped by EDF's efforts to persuade you that the greater good is served by the bypass and mining to the west. EDF isn't seem now to be right relying more on the fact that they believe West Trump's East Wing comparing ecological issues that is not as clear a truth as they presented to be it's simply unlovable, which others will do not me. So if you factor in the impact on people's lives, then East should and must be chosen. Personally, I think the ecological evaluation depends on which last expert you listen to. My guess is that there are pluses and minuses whether you go east or west depending on whether you prefer battle notes or whatever. It's but that argument is to be had and to be had fairly and we trust mistrust that you the the panel will be fair minded when listening. EDF originally in the console pipe consultation period gave three reasons to reject the local, our local parish councils detailed proposal for the alignment to go east. Their first reason was that they reported the number of homes and their distance from the from the proposed bypass, inaccurately this report from me from EDF was misleading. It showed for the show Farnum Hall has one home when it was made up of 10 homes. The homes distances from the past bypass will also reported inaccurately reported Jews to identify a walk bone farm as the one home badly affected by going to the east that was highlighted. That home however, is a modern sometimes rental property. It's not permanently occupied. It is actually actually it's owned by the person who EDF have reached agreement with for the bypass to go west through his field. Anyway, that was the first reason which we challenged, which we would challenge reason to, they gave up in the consultation was the if the alignment was ease, then vehicles were not not to use the bypass, as it was approximately 550 yards longer than West and would therefore take plus or minus 36 seconds longer to travel. This really is quite hard to take seriously. It's just encouraging us Is this really a reason not to mitigate the impact on people's lives. I mean, the western bypass comes to mind that hasn't caused people to continue to go through the village people used to bypass the reason the third reason that EDF gave to reject the local parish council proposal was the there was a tract of land between or a gap between planters Grove and Foxborough wood, which was ancient, quite simply, it is not naturally in England confirmed that it is neither ancient nor is it on inspection of any special Others will be making the

argument that it will be less damaging to the overall ecology for the past to go through this gap between pottsboro Woods and planters Grove, rather than removing the ancient head roads, hedge rows and the notable trees when aligning to the west.

30:23

Having rebutted this, these three, EDF are now preferring to rely on arguments based on ecology and the s. Suffolk County Council seem to support that. In fact, Michael mould of Suffolk County Council wrote that, and I quote, the least worst option that West is the least worst option. Later theory due to reasons of ecology no detailed mentions of people's lives ecologist wrote admitting ecologist Sorry, I've got a lot I got a lot of myself. That's what I'm trying to say is Michael Pollan said was it the least worst option, but it was just about the questions of ecology, comparisons between going east or west, no mention was properly made of the impact on people's lives. And how much East would alleviate us from the worst of the impact. My point is, that the conclusion reached by the Council makes only one written reference to people who believe. Again, I quote that this is what Michael Michael Boyle of Suffolk County Council says in his letter, the council noted that local communities have proposed to alter the alignment. That's it. That's that's the importance he plays on people. Surely people's well being should be an important consideration. And not just noted. He also writes that the land between college Grove and prosper wood is considered to be contiguous, as this has now been shown to that, but it's now being shown to be neither ancient, nor certainly on inspection of any special merit. By the way, I looked up the word just before I spoke of word contiguous, and it has a variety of meanings very much depending on your context. I really don't what they mean, what they mean by it. But it's certainly the two woods are not connected by ancient land, and therefore the bypass could go through it. What I'm saying here is the one of the things here is surely the Suffolk County Council should read really reconsider, in light of the people and benefits they would get for the alignment to go east. The local parish councils very detailed proposal, I don't believe was properly considered. I can only guess that an alignment change might be the extra work effort and maybe cost for both the ADF and the council. But that's not enough of a reason. Unless they say so if at least be upfront. EDF do give an impression that a nice thin line was fully considered, but it's only an impression. The reality is that EDF dismissed the local parish council proposal without any real credible reason for their preference, as I refer to upon in the consultations. Through the consultations, I've not seen any mention of costing the issue to the side east or west. Could this be the reason? If it's money, surely they should say so. I mean, we should at least know what their real reasons are having to dismiss pretty much the reasons they put forward. Perhaps one, just as they say in the movies follow the money. I don't know. The reality is most of us will have no alternative now but to stay and suffer the devastating effect on our lives and livelihoods and the values of our homes. We can only fight for the most mitigation possible, which is an alignment east. Although the future enjoyment of our Homes and Gardens is to be compromised. These would meaningfully mitigate our suffering. Please. I finished with some big rebuttals trying to get ready for this which EDF saying in quotes on ministers how much respect they give it. in quotes. EDF say the alternative alignment put forward by the parish Council was review taking into account impact. So woodland environment and nearby receptors, as well as operational matters. But it was not to be considered to be a better solution. Again, no mention of people lives livelihoods or will be.

35:15



My local parish council provided a detailed well thought out reasonable alternative alignment proposal. And it has not been given the respect it deserves, please review, please plan and review and rule that it should be adopted as a mitigation of the bypass and its impact on the lives of people have fallen. And it's, it's a heartfelt plea. Sorry, with the personality, I have no choice but to put it as I feel it. And that concludes what I had to say if anybody has been on I hope someone's been listening. Yes. Okay, thank you for letting me know. Yeah. I'm sorry, I couldn't call you by name or whatever or see you because it's not been available, but I've done the best I can, with my claim that and I just really hope that you take a real good, the document and the effort that went into the council put, and it's very rare that one would so wholeheartedly support the local parish Council, there are no losers if it's adopted. And they haven't ended, in fact, or finished with the font. There was a follow up letter in response to EDS response by the Council, which I recall seeing back in February. And that one identifies everything that comes

36:42

to mind your time is your time as

36:46

well. Then I am finished. Okay. And I'm sorry for not being able to see you, though. But I'm My my, my words are done. Okay, thank you. All.

36:56

Thank you very much, Mr. Green,

36:58

liquid reports provide.

37:02

Okay, during green, I invite you to come through and perhaps put your camera on.

37:14

So I hope your permission. My wife is Sally Island, and she's had to leave to attend with a vet on an animal of hers which is ill so with your permission. I'd like to say what she has to say on her behalf, please.

37:33

That's fine. That's fine. If you want to introduce yourself and then see what you wish to say.

37:40

Thank you, sir. My name is Simon eyelid and I'm speaking on behalf of Sally eyelid who wishes to make representation of herself her family and her business mode our backers. We have been breeding alpacas at Merck farm for about 10 years selling animals and fleece products. We have a small farm shop a members of the public visit the farm see our animals and purchase products. We currently have 25 our Packers but this number can rise to around 40 after birthing. We are always that mode farm out road to the west of the village and some of our animals are grazed on land in eastbridge. This is an integral part of our business as the land is free draining and means alpacas are kept clean through the

winter months. In order for us to maintain herd health, we have to regularly Hoover up the manure. And we do this using a quad bike and a paddock cleaner and travelled to the field from mote road crossing the bay 1122 and down on his lane. In addition, we had to transport hay and feed them on a daily basis should the proposed link road be constructed, we would be the opposite side of the road to East bridge, as there currently is no vehicle or crossing of the link road with mote road. We must join it and would be forced to turn right onto the link road across heavy traffic travel along toward less than and then turn off to come back towards honours lane and in reverse on the return back to the palm. This with a small slow moving agricultural vehicle carrying a machine with a large volume of heavy goods vehicles, buses, vans and cars that are expected this manoeuvre would be a danger to us and to other road users and would mean that we could not serve as this field in this way. The eastbridge land is important to us and without it we would not be able to maintain the number of animals to keep the business viable. We have an annual open day to raise money for the village church and this is a very popular event. feedback from our visitors tell us how they relish the peace and tranquillity of this area and that is why they come here. Should the size or C project proceed. We will be on the edge of what has been described as the largest bill Inside in Europe, and we'll keep people away as a reason they visit will be destroyed. We are also concerned for the colony of great crested newts inhabiting our moat and pond and the impact the link road will have on their migratory routes to surrounding ponds and habitats. The link road like the power station is in the wrong place. It follows a b 1122 for many miles, and there will be little need for it once the build is completed. East Anglia is known as the breadbasket of England. The fertile agricultural land is well suited for growing wheat, barley, onions, peas, and other crops. The road will take great swathes of prime agricultural land out of production, not only on the footprint of the road, but also the fields that are carved up by the road and will have marginal plots left behind either side that cannot be farmed with modern agricultural machinery. When visiting the proposed route of the link road, with the examining authority, please take note of the quality and diverse crops that are grown to feed our nation. In addition, we would urge that the authority to insist on the removal of the road to return to agriculture. After all, there is a precedence for this. During the national emergency of the Second World War. One hundreds, hundreds of miles of concrete runways were laid over many 1000s of acres of East Anglian farmland in the construction of airfields so that the nation could be better protected. Since that time, much of this concrete has been lifted, and the land has been successfully returned to agriculture. Thank you.

41:40

Thank you. Before you depart, I wonder if I might ask when you submit your written submission or your wife submits her written submission, you could provide a plan so that we can more readily understand the relationship between the two parcels of land and the accesses you're currently using.

41:58

Yes, thank you. I'll make sure that she does that,

42:00

sir. Thank you very much. I think I'm good to come back to you. So you're obviously speaking on behalf of your company, I

42:13

guess? Well, it's, it's a joint company. Yes.

42:17

So I'll again, you have five minutes if you'd like to when you're ready.

42:21

Thank you, sir. So I'm Simon eyelid and I'm speaking on behalf of Cypher crystal. And our main concern is employment matters. Cyber crystal is a small business that has been run from moat farm for nearly 20 years. We specialise in the supply and engraving of corporate awards to businesses and individuals throughout the UK. We employ three people and I had engraver who has worked for us for 15 years, he lives near Ipswich and engraves the majority of our wards presently it takes about 45 minutes to travel to work daily. The routing includes joining the B 107 at ash baulking onto the a 12. Or we can mark it and then travelling North coming through Saxmundham and onto that button along clay hills. All these roads will be severely impacted by 1000s of lorries, buses, vans and cars travelling to the construction site every day. shirt size we'll see construction begin, then the travel time along this route will be much longer and may well make her decide that it is no longer worth making a difficult drive to travel to work. And so to continue to work for us. Her role is skilled and we take time to train a replacement. However, more concern is recruiting that replacement from a pool of potential candidates that will be sucked dry by the power station build far from creating new jobs for the local population. The project will simply take jobs away from existing businesses like ours, either directly or indirectly, making these businesses are able to continue. We have recently been negotiating our electricity contract. And three years ago we were paying somewhere around 11 pence per kilowatt hour. We are now looking at paying upwards of 18 pence per kilowatt hour and when I questioned the broker who was acting for us, He said it was due in no part to the nuclear power generation costs and that when Hinkley Point came on stream it would only go up and with the possibility of Ra B funding for this project driving costs higher it will unfairly impact on those already in fuel poverty. Thank you sir.

44:44

Can I now come on to Regan Scott, please, if you can switch your camera.

44:51

Oh, camera up. Sorry.

44:55

Okay, hello.

44:57

Hi. I can hear you, Mr. Scott. But at the moment moment. I can't see you. If you wish you can present to us just orally if that's preferred. I can't now hear you Mr. Scott, I think you might be muted.

45:20

I've been having lots of difficult afternoon. So that's camera on and mic on.

45:26

I can hear you now, but I can't see you. But as I say, if you wish to present orally that that would be absolutely fine.

45:34

I'd like to like the camera on but

45:38

it's showing on for me. Yes. And it's showing off for me. I'm afraid. So, and I can't see you, but I can't hear you very clearly.

45:47

Okay, well, fine. Um, I want to talk about policy and need. And raise two questions. These are Why does EDF claim there are no change circumstances since the national energy policy statements of 2011? And how can they claim a tilted balance in planning for these out of date policies? We've discovered these arguments in the statement of needs. And in the planning statement. Consideration of change circumstances was first required in a ministerial statement in December 2017. EDF deny in the statement, so there are there are any changed circumstances and I can give the references and so on. On this basis, they are also claiming a tilted balance in the examination. And that's what I want to question. This policy interpretation is, we think substantially out of keeping with the realities of government policy, especially on climate change, and renewable energy development. The policy facts are pretty clear. Excuse me, a strategic new direction for UK energy policy was first announced in fact, in November 2015, it involved a review of nuclear citing policy and need and that's the mpfc and six, based on changes in policy and law, and to be freestanding of the main energy policy statement in MPs one today as of late last year. Under the urgent imperative of climate change, a comprehensive cluster of energy policies has come into operation. It's shown in a long awaited energy white paper, the Prime Minister has 10 points of green transition, the adoption of the six climate climate change committee's carbon budget. A strong emphasis on energy price controls there are very detailed ones and a role for new nuclear testing. This turns out to be funding for nuclear the small and medium reactors nuclear research, alongside natural gas as a transition technology and expanded offshore wind developments instead sees big European pressurised reactors can be seen in this context as old, not new nuclear. In the real world, there are profoundly changed circumstances characterised by a triple revolution of market liberalisation going on for a long time, decarbonisation and renewables development and finally digitalization. The EPR, in contrast, are expensive, inflexible, slow to build and have a disputed carbon footprint and other problems. They are not well designed for the new world. Our recent Sage briefing which will send you in our written representation is about these new developments in energy policy. And we have previous interest. A long time ago, I contributed to the Brussels investigation about the subsidies to Hinkley Point C. That was in 2014. To understand the evolution of policy we've been looking at the statutory authority for NPS is in the 2008 Planning Act. In chapter two on the NPS is we give the clause there is a very strong last duty on the government to contribute to sustainable development in two designated areas. These are climate change mitigation and good design for infrastructure projects. They look in principle to be drafted as equals and connected duties, but the design must be fit for climate change purposes. We've been exploring both issues. The good design duty can be applied to many essential features of the project. Economic and financing issues, we believe are obvious. EDF state that these issues are already dealt with by d o n Are we rejecting the

view, EDF have chosen on the invitation of government. The Rab regulated asset based consumer levy model to pay for the construction of size rolls See, this affects all of us. It's being consulted on in public. And secondly, EDF have raised what is surely an area of public interest they have agreed with the government a massive 20% cut in their construction costs. They've contracted Atkins engineering company to advise on how s said C's 20 pounds 20 billion cost can be cut in comparison to Hinkley Point C.

50:38

Good design test look necessary for also for energy markets. And for life after Brexit, the EIA alternatives and obviously for many physical design matters. As we've noted, they were in the wilfer examination. The new site size requirements in the EM six reviews specify approximately 30 hectares for one unit. So just

51:02

just to say Your time is up, if you could draw to a close and just to say that we can see you so we're very glad that your cameras Come on.

51:12

Okay. But the end of this process, I've written it out and I'll give you all the references we've got two asks, one is that you will actually hold the highest h on policy needs and design. And secondly, that the Atkins Report is made available as soon as possible to the examination. Thank you.

51:34

Thank you very much, Mr. Scott. Now, move on. Mr. Scott, if you can switch your camera off. I'd appreciate it. Thank you very much. can now go on to Jennifer Wilson, please. Hello. Hello. Hello. I can see and hear you if you want to introduce yourself and let us know what you wish to say.

52:06

Thank you, Jennifer Wilson, Oregon counsel. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak. After five consultations over nine years. I believe the applicants 56,000 page DCR application exposes at the size we'll see project is still a little more than a concept evidenced by lack of detail repetition with conflicting information. appalling maps with no God red lines and impossible to read keys. Many of the major concerns either sea defences water supply transport strategy presented at this late stage are still only possibilities or options with the applicants hopes of using the Rochdale envelope to avoid proper scrutiny. I've wasted months of my life poring through this documentation tried to fully understand the impact on a Suffolk and the amb and can honestly say it's brought me to tears on many occasions. I'm at a loss to understand what is left for the little people to defend such a precious air with its many national and international designations. A quick google search reveals that French government owned EDF has huge financial debt with a French public auditor saying in October 2020. The EPR flam reveal the same design is proposed for size which is a failure with huge financial consequences and implications for the French nuclear industry and beyond. So no surprise EDF a demanding UK taxpayers and Bill payers pay up front and take the risk for the size we'll see beyond if you are a person that believes such destruction can be mitigated or compensated which I am not. What is often overlooked especially by our elected representatives is all the compensation and mitigation on offer by

EDF will be paid by us to as EDF have no funds. With regard to mitigation such as new roads and roundabouts. I think it's time we all recognise this is in fact more environmental damage spreading the size we'll see project throughout East Anglia. My main concern is the applicant's cavalier attitude to the environment and the climate crisis. Last December, we witnessed EDS destruction of 100 year old coronation wood, ie during the hibernation period and before obtaining the necessary bat mitigation licence. Ignoring the many consultation responses that reasonably requested this decision should be part of the decio planning process. As the size was the project might not gain approval, and that would be destroyed unnecessarily. Many local residents suggested that there are alternatives to sites and facilities outside the OMB eg the visitor centre Training Centre and car parks avoiding the disrupt disruption of the word which provides a screening and a noise barrier for the nuclear complex and home to meet flora and fauna. EDF ignored these requests. My cottage is two miles from the size one side and like part of the size was site is in flood zone three. It was impacted in the 1953 floods. So I have grave concerns as to whether the size of site can be protected for its lifetime. I enter all the radioactive waste is removed or possibly indefinitely, as GD F is still a government unkl climate change predictions are unknown for this period. Yet the applicant wishes to proceed with the programme of managed adaptation with a seawall has increased in height during the decio planning process. I've also found that the 1953 floods have not been included in more of the app and surveys in decio document 6.12 in which there is an assessment of extreme flood risks, and I quote, part of the conclusion, the period extending beyond 2100 2185 a level of protection equivalent to a platform level 7.5 metres will be required to safeguard digital and more localised hazards such as those that might be associated with the spent fuel store. The additional effective ways also need to be considered in the design of these sea defences. It should be noted that these assessments are based only on data for the period 1964 to 2014, and do not include the high magnitude 1953 event. modelling has shown that the inclusion of this and other high magnitude events early in the 20th century leads to even higher estimates for the one in 10,000 year water level. My understanding is that the platform hike in the triple si processing would be 7.3 metres. With my limited knowledge a question whether this will be high enough. I'm also yet to find anything in the decio documentation that reassures me that my project will not be put at risk by the endeavours of the applicant to protect its own site. I fear for future generations of East Anglia and the legacy EDF will lead them to deal with I'm hoping Zerrin thority will heat the 2019 wise words of environment he chair Mr. Howe board, we need to move away from talking about flood defences, we cannot win a war against water, we cannot expect to build our way out of future client risks with infinitely high walls and barriers. For these reasons, and many others I've already heard in the open floor hearings. I believe the applicants proposed site of C project, if it is ever allowed to go ahead will be an environmental and financial disaster for the UK and future generations. I feel we have I think we all have a moral duty to ensure that cs sizewell c never happens and I hope this will be the conclusion of the exam the authority at the end of the DCI crisis, feel

57:12

converter.

57:16

Okay, if I can now turn to the applicant, please see whether you have any comments you would wish to respond to what you've heard this afternoon.

57:27

Thank you. Good afternoon, I'm Callie vents on the chief planning officer for EDF energy and representing the applicant today. And we're very much in listening mode. And I believe all of the matters raised today will be covering in our written submissions that deadline to including those in relation to questions around the slice for link road alternatives, the to village bypass alternatives, carbon tourism, as well as the progress made on section 106 and progress with stakeholders in terms of statements of common ground. So I'm very happy to take questions, but I think we could better use a time man responding and writing for you.

58:06

Thank you, that would be appreciated. I just got one question. Mr. Scott, in his submission made reference to a report by Atkins, I believe, is that going to be something that you're intending to submit that deadline to?

58:20

I did take an action myself to find out what that report is specifically? So once I get to the bottom of it, and we will, we will confirm? I just need to understand what it is.

58:33

Okay, well, perhaps in your note, you'll be able to explain for us. Thank you. Thank you very much. now hand over to this MCI to close this session.

58:54

Thank you, Mr. Moreland. Now, just before I close the hearing, let me remind you that any case hearing submissions, including written summaries of the cases you've made orally at this hearing, should be submitted a deadline to Wednesday, the second of June. If there are no other matters that anyone wishes to raise. Then I'll now close the hearing. Thank you all for your attendance and participation.