

TEXT_OFH8_Session1_20052021

Thu, 5/20 3:58PM • 1:16:06

00:06

Good afternoon, everyone and welcome. It is now time for me to open this open floor hearing, which is being held in connection with an application made by nnb generation company said c limited for an order for development consent for the construction operation and maintenance of the size or C project. Before I go further, can I confirm that everyone can hear me and that my camera is working? Yes, I confirm. I can see and hear you. Thank you. Can I also confirm with the case team that the recording and live streaming of this event has begun? Yes, the live live stream started and as the recording has as well. Thank you. For those people watching the live stream. Let me explain that if the proceedings are adjourned at any point, we will have to stop the live stream in order to give us clear recording files. When the meeting is resumed. You need to refresh your browser page to view the restarted live stream. Our remind you again of this should we need to adjourn.

01:17

I'd also mentioned that feedback from open flow hearings held earlier in the week indicates that there have been some problems with the live stream. Apologies in advance should this occur today. But be reassured that this does not affect the recording of the hearing that will be made available as soon as possible after the event on the national infrastructure planning website. Now let me introduce myself and my colleagues. My name is Wendy mokai. I have been appointed by the Secretary of State as league member of the panel of examining inspectors that together comprise the examining authority for this application. The other members of the panel, Edwin mourned David Brock, Neil Humphrey, and Helen Cassini will now introduce themselves to you, Mr. maund.

02:16

Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Edwin monde. I'm a chartered town planner. And I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of this panel. I will now pass over to Mr. Brock. Thank you.

02:32

Good afternoon, everyone. My name is David Brock. I am a retired solicitor and I have been appointed by the Secretary stage to be a member of this examining authority.

02:44

Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Neil Humphrey. I'm a chartered civil engineer and I've been appointed to be a member of this panel or no pasta, Mrs. Cassini.

02:57

Good afternoon. My name is Helen Cassini. I'm a charter town planner, a member of the examining authority, and I'll pass back to my colleague Miss MCI.

03:10

Now, we are assisted at this hearing by the planning Inspectorate case team. Today, we have the planning Inspectorate deputy case manager, Sean Evans, the other colleagues from the planning Inspectorate who will assist us today are Georgianna, Hannigan, Jake Stevens, and Libro bins. If you have any questions or queries about the examination, or the technology we are using for virtual events, they should be your first point of contact. That contact details can be found at the top of any letter you have received from us or on the project page of the national infrastructure planning website. Now, before we get on to the main part of this hearing, I'll ask my colleague Mrs. Cassini to highlight a few housekeeping and background matters to note for today.

04:05

As explained in the examining authorities rule eight letter annex D, The open floor hearings will be live streamed and recorded. Recordings will be published on the project page of the national infrastructure planning website as soon as possible after each hearing closes. To assist viewers and listeners, anyone speaking should introduce them to cells each time they speak. As recordings returned and published, they form a public record that can contain personal information to which the general data protection regulation applies. The will eight letter includes a link to the planning and spectrum privacy notice, which provides further information on this topic. If there is a need to refer to information that participants would otherwise wish to be kept private and confidential, should be in written form which can be redacted before being published. If you prefer to have your image recorded. You can switch your camera on

05:01

I will repeat the requests made in the arrangements conference that in order to minimise background noise, please ensure your microphone or telephone is muted, and that you stay muted unless you're speaking.

05:13

During a physical hearing, we would normally have breaks to avoid fatigue. We'll do the same in this virtual hearing. Our intention is to take a 15 minute break at the end of each session, which will also allow participants for the following session to rejoin through the lobby five minutes before the next session begins. I'll now hand over to Mr. Moreland, who will outline the purpose and conduct of this open floor hearing.

05:40

Thank you,

05:42

for hearing provides an opportunity for interested parties to make oral submissions about the application to the examining authority. It also gives us an opportunity to ask speakers questions about the evidence that they've presented.

05:57

Today, we will hear first from interested party two who've notified us in advance of the hearing that they wish to speak and have completed the participation form.

06:08

They will be followed by non interested parties who will be heard at the discretion of the examining authority.

06:15

All speakers will be heard in accordance with the running order set out in the detailed agenda for this hearing.

06:23

To make best use of the available hearing time. The detailed agenda sets out the maximum speaking time that each speaker listed on the running order has been allocated.

06:34

One of my colleagues will be timekeeping and will indicate to you and you have one minute left of your allotted time by appearing on screen.

06:43

If you've not concluded all that you wish to say within that time, then you're invited to include the remainder within your written submit summary of your oral submission deadline to which is Wednesday the second of June 2021.

06:59

Once you spoken, the panel may wish to ask you questions that will not of course intrude upon your speaking time.

07:09

Finally, the applicant will be given an opportunity to briefly respond to any matters raised after all speakers have been heard either orally before the close of the hearing, or to submit a written response a deadline to Wednesday the second of June.

07:25

Can I check who will be speaking to the applicant this afternoon.

07:30

Good afternoon. I'm calling events and the chief planning officer for EDF energy and I'll be speaking on behalf of the applicant today. I'm also joined by my colleague Richard ball.

07:44

Good afternoon everybody. My name is Richard ball and leading on transport matters for the applicant. Thank you.

07:52

Tom McGarry.

07:58

Good afternoon,

08:00

everyone. My name is Bill McGarry. I lead the communications on the size of C project. And we'll be supporting Carly bins and the application teams today.

08:13

Thank you.

08:20

For clarity can all interested parties please notice second examiner will appear on screen at the point you have one minute remaining of your presentation. If you're joining verifone or we note your cameras switched off, we will give an oral warning of one minute remaining.

08:39

I would also like to reassure all of you that members of the panel

08:43

were all present and listening carefully to what you have to say. We are not however remaining on screen throughout, as we wish to minimise the demand on the IT systems, ensuring the best quality of audio and video for participants.

09:01

I'll now hand over to my colleague Mr. Humphrey, who will start inviting representations from the speakers in running audit before handing over to another panel member and so on.

09:12

Those listed to speak in session two of this hearing may now leave the hearing and rejoin as indicated in the detailed agenda before the start of session two. Thank you Mr. Humphrey. Thank you, Mr. maund. If I could first invite the first speaker Adam Rowling's on behalf of the RSPB and Suffolk Wildlife Trust to turn on his camera and microphone and say who he is and who he represents.

09:39

Good afternoon sir. I'm Adam rowland's Suffolk area manager for the RSPB and representing RSPB and Suffolk Wildlife Trust today. I'd also like to acknowledge Ben McFarland from Suffolk Wildlife Trust was compiled this presentation with me. I've worked for the RSPB for 30 years and was the senior site manager at RSPB from today.

10:00

For for 14 years. Thank you for this opportunity to speak today. I will be briefly covering the history of RSPB and Wildlife Trust involvement in this area, the importance for protected sites and species, the wider ecological importance and visitor numbers and wider economic benefits. The RSPB has a long history of involvement with the Suffolk coast around Sizewell and owns two very significant reserves. Minster to the south, first published in 19, first purchased in 1939 and Minster to the north where RSPB management commenced in 1947 and land purchase began in 1977. The RSPB currently manages over 1600 hectares of land conservation and visitors between Orbera and Walberswick. Minster's various famous is the site where avocets returned to breathe in the UK after 100 year absence and was also the only site where bedded tits bred in the UK in 1947, and Marsh areas in 1971. As well as saving these species in a national context, Minster played an instrumental role in the successful Return of the Britain and Britain as a UK breeding species after becoming perilously close to extinction in the 1990s and also saving the stone curly on the Suffolk coast from a low point of a single breeding pair 25 years ago. Minster boasts a greater biodiversity than any of the other 220 RSPB reserves in the UK, with over 6000 species of plant and animal recorded. This is partly due to the great variety of habitats coastal lagoon shingle beaches and June's coastal grazing marshes reedbeds and fens, heathland, acid, grassland and woodland that cover such an extensive area. In recognition of this important Minster has been awarded the Council of Europe's Protected Area diploma awards since 1979, and is one of only five sites in the UK to achieve this designation. The most recent resolution to renew the award included the following condition. With regard to the project for Sizewell C, a proper strategic environmental assessment and an environmental impact assessment should be carried out according to international standards. The results of these assessments should ensure that the construction of the new reactor will not be to the detriment of the Minster nature reserve.

12:22

RSPB Minster is hydrology is contiguous to that of Sizewell Marsh is inextricably linked to the proposed development area. Any changes to the wetlands could result in impacts on the rare and sensitive species associated with this habitat. Minster shoreline is contiguous with the new development and the reserve abuts the northern boundary of the proposed new sea defences. The shoreline is home to flow communities that are important in an international context. Any changes to the shoreline processes could both affect these fragile flow communities and could also accelerate coastal erosion, increasing the potential risks of the brackish and freshwater habitats inland from the coastline. The water birds that inhabit Minster both for breeding and wintering and the foraging Marsh areas on the site are vulnerable to disturbance visually from noise and light associated with the neighbouring construction sites. The turns that breed in nationally important numbers are Minster the goons are dependent upon fish in the marine environment offshore to feed themselves and their offspring. And in addition, the marine environment supports an internationally important non breeding population of red throated divers that is sensitive to disturbance from boat movements and impacts on their fish food supply. Sensitive areas such as the wetlands the Flynn's and coastal dunes and shingles are also at risk from the displacement of visitors seeking recreation when public rights away and permissive paths are closed during the construction period. This could place ground nesting birds, which the RSPB and SWAT reserves are nationally important such as Nigel woodlark, and stone curly at particular risk, as well as threatening fragile habitats such as vegetated shingle. This threat extends

beyond minsmere to sites such as done achieve an ordering and walks. minsmere and donachie form part of the internationally important minsmere to Walberswick special protection area special area of conservation Rams our site and site have special scientific interest, ordering and walks is part of the sanderlings sbrrt the sights set within the Suffolk coast in his area of outstanding natural beauty. However, in addition to this threat of increased visitor numbers by public rights of access, visitors to the core of RSPB minsmere may be dissuaded from visiting due to the perceived or actual disruption caused by the construction period. disruption to access and transport and visual noise and other forms of disturbance may reduce people's propensity to visit or discourage them from making return visits or encouraging others to do so. In recent years, means

15:00

Nose attracted up to 125,000 visitors a year. The RSP B's economic analysis in 2017 identified that minsmere directly employed 33 full time equivalent jobs. Visitors to minsmere send 7.7 million pounds in the local economy and support 160 full time equivalent jobs. The income the RSPB generates at minsmere from retail and catering sales memberships and donations is vital to funding the RSP bees conservation work, but threatened by a potential reduction in visitor numbers. The potential loss of income to the RSPB as well as the loss of income and employment locally that which produce from a reduction in visitor numbers is of significant concern to the RSPB.

15:43

Suffolk Wildlife Trust has been managing sizewell marshes triple si for 27 years, covering 105 hectares. Size well marshes are important for their large area of lowland traditional wet Meadows which for outstanding assemblages of plants and invertebrates. The site occupies a low line basin of deep fen peat, where the water table is permanently high and it is the significant influence the water table with its high quality water with a unique mix of geology that results in its outstanding biodiversity. The size of our marshes triple si has three main habitats, species rich grazing Marsh, tall herb fen and wet waterpower woodland floristically. The grazing marshes and its network of dikes is one of the best examples is habitat remaining in East Anglia. Very species rich and containing a wide range of plants conservation interest including the nationally scarce Marsh dock and greater water parsnip. The extensive ditch systems supports a diverse aquatic Flora which includes the nationally scarce soft hornwort fen pondweed, and World watermilfoil. Even small changes in the balance between surface water and groundwater could result in significant impacts to the triple si plant community. The size of marshes site despite special scientific interest also has an outstanding nationally important invertebrate community. 2068 species have been identified within the study area with 120 considered to be nationally scarce. The ditches support 18 species of breeding dragonflies, including the rare Norfolk Hawker 236 species of moth have been recorded, including a number of national rarities. Many of the invertebrates have life stages, for example, as larva or adult that rely on the different habitat types found within the triple si. Consequently, the loss of or impact on one habitat type can indirectly influence another more widely the size of our marshes triple si plays an important functional role within the landscape of connectivity with minsmere to the north, an older woman walks in northward reserves to the south. The hydrology within the soil marshes triple si directly relates to and potentially impacts upon RSPB minsmere.

18:00

Beyond the size of special scientific interest the wider size well estate hosts a nationally important population of Bob stone bat with multiple recites across much of the estates including within the development footprint. Bob stone, found only in southern England and Wales very few breeding sites are known in the UK with sizeable estate being one and the species are protected in the UK under the wildlife and countryside act 1981. It is also a priority species and the UK post 2010 biodiversity framework. Internationally, the rarity of Bob stone is recognised being listed as near threatened on the global IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. In addition to daytime roosts there is also a maternity roost somewhere within the estate which is yet to be located. The disturbance or destruction of a maternity roost would have a significant and deletes impact on the population as a whole. A species that is extremely vulnerable to disturbance generally the current low levels of light and noise neighbour of Bob stone to commute and forage widely across the state and link up with important habitat within minsmere.

19:08

On the estate very close to the development site, there is a small pond that contains a breeding population and natterjack toads. Given the rarity of the species, which is confined to a handful of coastal sites in the UK, the population of an estimated 12 individuals is considered to be nationally significant natterjack toads can live up to 15 years and are particularly vulnerable to disturbance especially when they only restricted to one or two ponds. We are grateful to EDF for having consulted with the RSPB and Suffolk Wildlife Trust regarding their plans for sysko. See for a decade. However, whilst we have been presented with reassurance that impacts will be understood where possible avoided, but otherwise appropriately mitigated or compensated. We are concerned that those reassurances have as yet not translated into designs and plans that satisfactory conveniences that might mask that minsmere. So

20:00

Mr. shears and the fantastic wildlife that these areas of the coast support are not significantly threatened by this proposed development. Although again, we've been repeatedly assured that there will be no significant direct impacts on our land holding at minsmere. The currently missing details within the application documents do not provide us with sufficient confidence that this will indeed be the case. And we have many supporters who share our concerns. In just over 12 weeks from last November 104,836 people signed the RSPB and suffer Wildlife Trust love minsmere II action, sharing our concern oversight of our seas impacts on nature. The number of people taking the loved minsmere action is eclipse the number of signatures and responses to all previous size or sea consultations and campaigns. It may also cast doubt over the claim support for the size received project. The campaign has seen support from a whole host of celebrities including Chris Packham. Anthony hora Vich, Julia Bradbury, Alison Steadman, Samuel West, Deborah Meaden, Bill Turnbull, Michaela Strack and Mike Delia YOLO Williams, Emma Kennedy, Miranda crest off Nick off, and Dr. Aamir Khan and more. We've worked closely with neighbouring landowners, communities, statutory bodies and NGOs and recognise that we and our supporters are not alone in airing these concerns as has been reflected in many other contributions the openflow hearing over the last few days, we welcome the opportunity to participate in the process and we are determined to ensure that minsmere and the Suffolk coast will remain where the UK is finest examples of wildlife habitat that people can enjoy. With thank you for your time to listen

to us today. Thank you very much, Mr. Rowland. I don't think we have any questions for you at the moment. So you could turn the microphone and camera off, please.

21:50

Could I now hear from Sally watts, please?

21:58

Can you hear me? Yes, I can. Thank You were called see you. Yeah, there we are. Could you introduce yourself and say who you're representing please, on your 15 minutes. Thank you. My name is Sally watts. And thank you for inviting me to speak at this open forum hearing. I'm speaking on behalf of Mr. table and Miss Hall who are the owners of 30 acres of beautiful water Meadows near the village of pregnant pregnant is just over six miles north of various Edmonds in West Suffolk and 45 miles or greater from the sides while development which is on the east coast of Suffolk. I'm also speaking on behalf of the farmers of the meadows, Steven childs, Jackie and any worked well. I hope that will be also given the opportunity to speak at the compulsory acquisition hearing in due course, and that your panel will find time to visit the meadows in a site inspection.

22:58

The Meadows have only recently just been identified by the applicant for compensator e mitigation land. This land along with some neighbouring land at Pakenham and three other sites in Suffolk coastal have been collectively identified as land upon which it is proposed to recreate thin Meadow to compensate for the loss of nought point seven Hector's of coastal fen line from the sizewell marshes sssi these 30 acres or 12 hectares of land are made up of three lovely summer grazing water meadows. The wettest field is called reclaimed meadow and can only be grazed in dry months of the year. Otherwise, the grass gets poached but too much by the cattle and they'll sink in the peat content of the soil. The gravel meadow and the long Meadow are the other two fields that provide the summer grazing for the cattle enterprise on the farm. The fields are bordered on one side by the blackboard river and by Woods and hedges on the other. And together they provide a wonderful wildlife haven in one of the driest parts of Suffolk we would like the panel to consider the following five points. The distance of this mitigation land from the development the amount of mitigation land that is required. The poor consultation information engagement time that the applicant has given to my clients to date, the cost benefits and feasibility of recreating Fenn Meadow in West Suffolk, perhaps some alternatives should be considered. And finally, the impact that this proposed compulsory acquisition will have on my clients livelihood and also on neighbouring land units users.

24:45

Like so many other representations given to date, we're concerned that EDF have not considered the environmental impact adequately enough in and around the actual development on the coast. And this lack of consideration is even more apparent with how they've chosen

25:00

approach our clients and their proposals for what is a very special habitat already in Pakenham.

25:06

Firstly, let us consider the distance. Of course it is understood that size well will need to mitigate for losses caused to the environment. But we don't believe it is appropriate to provide the mitigation on a site that bears no relation to the development over 40 miles distance from the coast takes at least an hour and a half to drive from the coast to Pakenham and

25:30

EDF should be made to replicate the loss of habitat within the proximity of the development. Ideally, they should be taking unimproved land and creating betterment. We believe that there are willing landowners who will be prepared to recreate fen Meadow on their land nearer to the coast that would be more adequately deliver the mitigation objectives. We understand the criteria that the ecologists have deployed find possible compensator II land AI they need enough land to deliver the mitigation. They need easy access for management and monitoring and they need to find a piece of land that is currently designated or in an environmental scheme, close to a river and close to an existing thin perhaps for connectivity of habitats. Our clients are still of the opinion that the mitigation should be delivered on land nearer to the development but we have made EDF aware of 4.8 hectares of their Meadow grassland that has recently just come on to the market adjacent to the river black boom just north of the Pakenham sssi this is on the market with Lacey Scott's

26:40

We now turn to the question of quantity natural England have submitted a very robust representation objecting to the loss of the valuable habitat sssi habitat at the marshes and hence they are requiring nine times the amount of lost land. The exact amount of loss fen Meadow has yet to be defined is it naught point five Hector's or naught point seven Hector's

27:07

because this will have a

27:10

relevance on how much needs to be mitigated. In the original application two sites at Bernal and one at Halesworth were identified and if they had been converted into thin meadow, they would have delivered 15 times the amount of loss then there must be some concern that the mitigation will not be a success and so, EDF have had to target additional land and hence the pagan umbrella and

27:38

from my experience the more land that is farmed does not always mean better farming. Often management is spread too thinly and therefore becomes failure. We believe the applicant should concentrate on providing compensating mitigation on their own land at all test which is near Laced and and also on the Bendall and Halesworth lands. All these areas of land are in the sub coastal area. As opposed to West Suffolk

28:08

we're just like to outline a little bit concerning the lack of consultation and engagement. As you know the land at Pakenham was only added to the planning application this spring. The first engagement my clients had with the applicant was via a letter in September 2020 and December 2020, a section 170

notice was served on this table in this hall so that EDF agents could start their survey work in January 21. The owners are asked for a warrant, but the agents refused to obtain this and proceeded to take access in early January, as my clients didn't feel comfortable with the prospect of standing in the fields with their pitchforks. surveying is currently taking place, and three bore holes have been drilled and more to engage boards installed in the ditches. To date my clients have not heard any further information or data as to what will be done to the land how they envisage creating a fan, and how it will be managed in the future. We would like it recorded that the above communication that our clients has experienced does not meet with the method statement as to how a foreign national infrastructure project should be conducted. We have asked for the following information, how much of the land will they need to acquire? What will they do with it? How will the management affect the adjacent land and also land further up and downstream? And will the Fat Fat family be able to farm the land? The appicate applicant to date has not answered these questions. Our client is as a result, unable to plan their own business. Looking forward, and I'll go into that a bit later on.

29:57

I'd like to then address the type of compensation

30:00

During mitigation in the detailed representation made by natural England dated the 30th of September. It is stated that recreating fen Meadow is extremely difficult, if not impossible. We are aware that EDF have already mitigated and created a significant wetland habitat on their farm that they purchased in 2015. And we wonder whether EDF attempted to recreate Finland there, knowing how difficult it is to recreate then meadow and with the understanding for various published documents that m 22. Ven Meadow habitat is disappearing at a very high rate in the UK. We would respectfully propose that mitigation should be delivered by the applicant in a more effective way, such as perhaps improving the management within existing m 22. Then Meadow habitats near the coast. We're all aware that the subject coast is under constant threat of erosion. And so any enhanced management in preserving valuable grassland habitats along the coast would deliver two crucial public benefits, present ration of the habitat and stabilising of the coast. We recommend the Panama panel listens to the radio for costing the earth programme broadcast on the 20th of April 2021, where it was highlighted that old landfill sites on the Essex coast are now leaking their contents into the sea. The protection of our coastline and the sea must surely be a greater public benefit than the destruction of some beautiful grassland Meadows in Pakenham, which already have their own unique valuable habitat and are distant and irrelevant to the size well, marshes.

31:47

We'd like the panel to consider the practicalities and feasibility of recreating fen Meadow at Pakenham.

31:54

As we've heard, it is increasingly extremely difficult to create create fun, but with any environment, it is the long term management that is crucial to get it right. Any new water management will inevitably have implications on neighbouring land. Natural England have requested surveys on the potential impacts of the actions at the peak and meadows sssi, which is nearby. We assume that these surveys that are

currently being carried out on our clients land are also being carried out at patronum. But on the sssi meadows, but we've not seen any evidence of that to date.

32:36

And

32:38

when there's rumours obviously, our clients have been talking to the people working on the fan motors, and it has been suggested that they plan to dig up the peat under the meadows and spreader on the surface. If that is done, the peat would in time disappear like the levels in the arable fields around the eally fan. At a time when we informed that Pete was not be used on gardens and that areas of peat in the UK need to be preserved at any cost. This proposal is certainly cause for extremely alarm, and contrary to environmental guidance. In March, the surveyors got their vehicles stuck in the peat quiet while they were driving around in the field at this time of the year I question. The resulting damaged sward of the meadow has had to be fenced off for the rest of this grazing season, and possibly next, as well as it will take at least two years for the damage Pete swards to reenact we've also been told that all the land drains will be removed from the land. This will not only disturb the soil structure, but also release valuable carbon stores which have developed over many years in these meadows.

33:50

The Meadows have a unique and highly interesting water management system where all the water drains into a central soap ditch. This then travels along parallel with the blackboard river and is piped under the Pakenham water mill and cat joins the blackboard after the Mill Pond. This complex water management system has worked well for over 50 years and created the unique wet environment providing the summer grazing. As we've already explained, we believe the proposals to make the land even wetter by holding back more water is going to be meat there will be less opportunity to graze the land if not none. And it is not known what ramifications there will be for the rest of my clients land or the neighbouring land users including Peyton and watermill.

34:42

The lack of details for the proposals on the future management of the meadows of pregnant is of course great concern to my clients, and we have no overall confidence that any public benefits will be achieved overall.

34:55

Finally, I wish to talk on how these proposals are going to affect

35:00

the livelihood of my clients cattle enterprise. My client has dedicated his farming career to managing a 40 head cattle business with the summer grazing of these cattle provided by the meadows at Pakenham. Putting the cattle out into the meadows in May after a long winter in the shed is, of course a special time for the cows and calves. If the meadows are turned into a wet fan, the number of cattle that can graze this land will be drastically reduced. If not, there'll be no grazing at all possible. With the loss of the cattle enterprise. There'll be a knock on loss to my clients livelihood, his well being and self

respect. So not only will employment and well being lost, but they'll also be the destruction of this existing valuable habitat.

35:48

The panel will also be aware of the significant changes being imposed on the agricultural industry over the next few years. We're currently preparing a mid to countryside stewardship application, which will have to be submitted by the 30th of June this year. Within this application, any applicants have to confirm that they have the management of the land within their abilities for five years. Can we do this? As you can imagine, this proposal has come at a period of much help people and change and have the threat of losing a significant part of the farm is extremely distressing. To summarise this proposed mitigation is too far away from the size world development, EDF have not provided evidence to demonstrate the feasibility or success of the proposed mitigation. we question the amount of land required for mitigation. There is no compelling case that the land in West suffered is required for the development in East Africa. We asked if the cost benefit mitigations could be in some more beneficial way. And we would ask the panel to recognise the impact that these proposals are going to have on our own as well being livelihood and employment together with the loss of an existing valuable habitat. Thank you. Thank you very much.

37:12

We don't thank you. You don't have any questions at the moment. So you turn your microphone and camera off, please.

37:19

I'd like to hear now from

37:24

Alex Johnston. Please.

37:32

Johnston Are you there?

37:43

Okay, well, maybe we'll move on to Andrew blowers. Please.

37:51

Come back to Mr. Johnston. Mr. blowers. Are you there?

37:55

Yes, Amy, I can hear your can't see you as yet. All right, coming up.

38:04

You can call me. I can hear answer you. That's great. For the purpose of the recording. Could you introduce yourself, please? Mr. Blows? Yes, I'm Andrew blow is professor of Social Sciences at the

Open University. Formerly I have been a county Councillor for 30 years, a government advisor on radioactive waste matters. And I'm currently

38:29

the chair co chair of a government NGO forum, and also chairman of the Black Water against new nuclear group whom I'm representing today, and that is the black that the brand will the power station. So in Essex,

38:48

what I want, what I want to say first is that, it seems to me

38:54

necessary to look at this project as a whole and not just in component. Yes. Apologies. Can you hear me? I'm sorry.

39:04

Hello. Hello.

39:11

Mr. Humphrey, I think you're on mute.

39:18

You can continue now. Mr. Blows, thank you. Thank you. The the the application should be judged on in as a whole as to whether the site is potentially suitable. That's that's what the judgement is supposed to be made upon.

39:38

Unfortunately, it's assumed that the site is already a given and much of the discussion and the application seems to be concerned with various issues, which are obviously contingent, but don't address the question of whether this is a satisfactory site

39:58

for the whole concept

40:01

So we have to ask ourselves whether this site is viable, whether it's viable in the medium term and long term. And I want to focus particularly on radioactive waste management in the context of climate change, going into the next century, because that timescale is very important. And it is necessary. There is the argument, and it's embedded in many of the papers that have come before you that this power station is not necessary. And certainly by the time it would come into being would make only a marginal contribution. And might well displace other more more benign approaches to climate change. So there's that problem. But there are two particular aspects of climate change I want to focus on. One is the period up to the end of the century, which would be the period of operation for the power station.

41:05

The predictions are that, that climate change, global warming, they're trying to keep it at two degrees C, however, it's very unlikely on current performance, that we should be able to do that. And the likelihood is it would go to three or even four degrees C, at which point, the sea level rise globally, would be of the order of one to two metres. Now the Environment Agency are claiming that it is reasonable to conclude that a nuclear power station within the site could potentially be protected against flood risks throughout his lifetime, including potential effects of climate change, I would ask you to challenge that assertion.

41:55

And that was made 10 years ago, the situation is far worse now in terms of our knowledge of climate change. And the whole idea that a policy of managed adaptation would be sufficient, seems to me dubious, and one that I very much hope that will be severely tested during the course of this, this application. The idea is that there's a raised platform and the hard standing and soft standing to try and protect this station does look incredible, when you think of this situation on a on a crumbling coastline. In in, in, in increasingly worse conditions. But more than that is a situation beyond 2100 that I think we should look at. And that will be the period of decommissioning and radioactive waste management because there'll be onsite storage of spent fuel on the calculations given in the papers, at least until 2165 by which time is expected to put the stuff in a in a GDF which which we know means of knowing would be available or even constructed. And therefore, when the government said it satisfied that effective arrangements will exist to deal with this radioactive waste, it cannot be so in the future, because

43:20

we simply do not know the conditions they are unknowable. And with that, there are more alarming situations coming in now, in terms of global warming, with the collapse of the ice sheets and so on, and there are even predictions of sea level rises as high as seven metres. I think you do have to take into consideration this and that the situation is far worse than is being assumed in the applications. And my my final point is that this particular project should not indeed cannot go ahead because of the burdens on the future. Because when you go into the next century, certainly if not before, the site will be unsustainable, unmanageable, unacceptable, and also unsuitable. It is not just potentially unsuitable is totally unsuitable. Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. blowers. You can turn your microphone and camera off now. I'm going to now try to speak to Alex Johnson again, please.

44:28

Yes, can you hear me now? I can hear just one moment. Could you Mr. Blow? Thank you.

44:36

Yes, I can hear you. Mr. Johnson. Can you introduce yourself, please? Yeah.

44:41

My name is Alex Johnson. I am a property owner in between leisten and Saks munden. And I'm not going to sort of be as eloquent or as articulate as those speaking about the environmental issues

44:58

about the economic issues.

45:01

But I do want to pick up on an issue that was raised earlier about consultation. So

45:07

I've received several letters from the applicants regarding compulsory purchase of land.

45:14

I have tried on several occasions to get in contact with them.

45:20

The very best I've got is being referred to long detailed planning letters, which are, frankly, incomprehensible to the lay person, which I include myself.

45:30

And despite several emails asking for a simple explanation, I've been unable to, I've been unable to get any response whatsoever. So putting the discourtesy of it to one side, it's obviously left me living in a property with this cloud of compulsory purchase above it, and seemingly no recourse at all to get any clarity about what might be involved in terms of my property. That's all I have to say.

46:01

Thank you very much. Mr. Johnson.

46:04

I don't think I've got a question for you at this time. So thank you.

46:09

Could I now move on to

46:13

a Adrian lock beam? Please?

46:26

Can you see me I can see and hear you mister not being so your five minutes to start now once you've introduced yourself. Hi, my name is Adrian not being I'm not an artist, engineer, semi retired.

46:40

And my concern is principally to do with first and first of all the the selection process that has been put in place by ADF.

46:56

Regarding the available alternative sites around the country, and the reason I'm making this point is not because it reflects particularly strongly on the matters of the moment as regards the local environment

just here that has been, as the previous speaker was saying very eloquently dealt with by the environmental people that have already spoken and I'm very grateful to their presence here today.

47:29

I've been resident in a Suffolk since 1979. That's location four miles from the proposed site for the new two two reactor power station.

47:42

Named sites we'll see under the aegis of EDF

47:49

in November 2009 the government of Britain identified 10 nuclear sites which could accommodate future reactors and they are profitable in Essex greystones in Cumbria, Koch stands in in Cumbria, Sellafield in Cumbria, Hartley Pauling County Durham heisha in Lancashire Hinkley Point in Somerset, Aubrey in Gloucestershire and size will in Suffolk. So, the question I would put to the investigating authorities concerning themselves with the planning aspect of this entire matter

48:28

is

48:30

why

48:31

better, should I say more comprehensive information about choice and the possibility of these other stations bearing in mind that there are already two power stations standing on the site at at a Suffolk

48:51

lay stone. And one of them of course, is is now

48:58

no longer operating. The other one is, but the point is that to

49:05

the point I'm making is that to come to this particular location with a double

49:12

nuclear power station project, which has such a tremendous environmental impact and re dimensioning effects from the point of view of the natural environment and also the addition of a huge amount of infrastructure which is planned to be put in place over a period of 10 to 12 years from the start date whenever that is

49:42

there to my knowledge nine nuclear power stations currently operating in Britain, one of which is the now 25 year old size will be p wr type Jason to the news. So the now retired Magnox station commissioned in 1967

49:59

one

50:00

The Nine stations currently operational.

50:04

Five sorry, of the nine stations currently operational five are listed as possible sites for the development of new nuclear generating capacity, while only three of the 10 shutdown locations are listed as possible sites for new build reactivation. why this is the case has, to my knowledge not been formally adequately made clear over the timespan of the past 10 to 20 years. And I would have thought that if the nuclear power industry or the nuclear base power industry

50:41

were doing their homework thoroughly, over this period of time, they would have

50:49

evolved a more balanced approach to the potential sites that they're looking at rather than this extremely delicate and fragile environment. They've decided to challenge in a way as far as the the engineering capability is concerned. And I think that quite possibly, if they look back into the files of the previous construction site there in the 1990s, with these sizable base station being built, they'd come across some very interesting information. They may already have done this. I'm not suggesting for a moment that they haven't, but if they haven't, I suggest that the planning authority directs them to that.

51:41

In some, in place of some of the official study considered information flow regarding the fate of the front

51:49

page, just to say that you have reached your maximum speaking time, could you sum up in a in a sentence and then submit your remaining comments in writing that you haven't been able to make? Okay, so I must turn off my, my microphone now. If you just if you have a last sentence to say please say that, and then the remainder of what you have to say, please put that in writing to our deadline to

52:20

Okay.

52:21

Well, all I was going to all I can say now is the following paragraph him in place for some form of officials study considered information flow regarding the fate of the fragile and beautiful coastal landscape of this locality. What the permanent residents of this past suffered, have experienced a

random hints in the local press word of mouth from local people, and widespread bytes of information from informed nuclear energy employees and temporary maintenance crews passing through over the timespan of the several different nuclear energy administrations. This is not exactly a trust generating situation to the local population.

53:06

Thank you. Thank you very much. Mr. Naqvi could you know turn the camera and microphone off, please? Very well.

53:14

And now let's get to hear from Arthur Stansfield, please.

53:22

Hello, can you hear me? Just one? Yes. I can hear and see you Mr. Stanfield? Mr. Not being Could you turn your camera off, please. And your microphone.

53:35

That's fine. But if you could introduce yourself, and then you've got five minutes. Hello. My name is Arthur Stansfield. Until recently, I worked one of the leading GPS technology companies. I live in wicker market. Like to make a few comments about the application in general, frequently walk along the coast between obrah and Walberswick, particularly around eastbridge don't chase. So I will be a lot I will lose a lot of the pleasurable walking environment as I use. For the application to build size will see to be approved the benefits of producing electricity from nuclear power over other forms of green electricity production have to weigh the negative impacts on the population, landscape and environment of the Suffolk these comments on the environment have been well made by other parties.

54:32

Were renewables on electricity storage are rapidly developing technologies with advances every year. The design of size we'll see will be 30 years or more old by the time it is complete. Nuclear efficient reactors are fundamentally a moribund technology.

54:51

For example, southern Australia has moved from coal powered electricity production to predominantly renewable electricity production over the last 20 years.

55:00

And now has the cheapest electricity in Australia.

55:05

I as I said I live in wicker market. I have been involved with discussing mitigation measures for the extra 1000 vehicles per day EDF forecast. I personally expect there will be additional local traffic as locals avoid the inevitable increased bottlenecks at Woodbridge and the B 1078 can be used as a route into Ipswich as well as to the west.

55:29

The discussions concerning mitigation started in December 2019. In November 2020 EDF employee consultants look at street improvement in wicker market. It's important that the minimum amount of EDF f traffic comes through the village.

55:47

I have expertise in vehicle tracking, nothing is my expertise to find methods to monitor worker traffic as opposed to hgvs etc.

55:57

EDF are relying on the goodwill of workers to avoid driving along the B 1078. And through weaker market and to use the preferred route of a 14 and a 12 to the park and ride. EDF need to monitor these journeys to ensure that these travel policies are complied with.

56:17

I presented a paper to EDF that described the use of mobile phone technology, GPS and geo fences. A geo fence is a virtual fence around a geographic area.

56:31

Sorry, I've lost my place. And that would allow the monitoring of weather workers passed through weaker markets on the way to the citizen park and ride. The system would only monitor whereas the geographic area was entered not track the workers journey entirely. other technologies also exist such as smart cameras with number plate recognition that could be used to monitor whether workers journey is passed along particular roads. The cameras would only monitor vehicle registrations which have been downloaded to them by EDF in West London this technology is used to prevent rat running along residential routes. This could be used by EDF to ensure that policies on worker journeys are complied with. I've also suggested steps that can be employed to make the B 10 cent gh for less attractive route for travelling from the a 14 a 140 to the a 12 North American market. In conclusion, technologies exist that could be used to ensure that the minimum amount of traffic pass through work and market. But so far, EDF has not indicated any of these approaches will be further considered.

57:44

EDS offered with a market road furniture modifications that will probably improve pedestrian safety and probably slow traffic down. In my opinion as a cyclist, little if any account has been made to the safety of cyclists in these proposals. And the proposals may even make the roads less safe for them. Finished. Thank you. Mr. Stansfield. Could I just ask you one thing will you be submitting in writing your details of what you've just been talking about? representation? Thank you. Michael invited me personally all through wicker markets, parish Council. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you turn the camera off and your microphone off now please.

58:31

And I will pass to

58:35

Mr. Brock now.

58:39

Thank you, Mr. Humphrey. Thank you. We'll carry on now and the next person

58:45

to give evidence is Mr. Bill Parker. Mr. Parker, we'd like to switch on your camera and your microphone. Hello. Good afternoon, Mr. Brock. Thank you very much. I see you again. Thank you. My name is Bill Parker. I've lived in New Suffolk for more than 20 years. And I was head of coastal management to do Suffolk Council for seven years until 2019. In my view, the bariga size we'll see what causing character or damage. I firmly believe that no form of mitigation is capable of compensating for the momentous adverse impacts of this proposal. The areas I'd like to particularly comment on, or the failure of EDF to be precautionary flaws in the proposed coast defence solution questions on the use of science or the long term legacy to future generations to meet the government's 2018 objective to reduce the cost of nuclear new build eebo EDF aims to replicate the thinky point C design and sizewell the 20% lower cost. However, the two sites are very different size what is a constrained inside Hinkley Point is after all 40% bigger and is severely compromised by being sandwiched between the CTD used and the triple si of size or masters the West

1:00:00

EDF, EDF recognise the importance of avoiding exposure of the hard coast defences to direct wave energy as they highlight this in the coastal mitigation objectives. They also met this may happen as soon as 2050 through the consequences for the coast of North and South, and ongoing liabilities for sighs let's see, are unspecified but undoubtedly significant. The only way to reduce this risk is to move the entire proposed development language on the east west axis. However, this was destroyed even more particular by land the 12 Hector's already Mr. EDF have calculated the take the long term precautionary approach and increase the loss of triple si and they can remove planning permission or planning approval even more difficult, and therefore, they're potentially taking the easier but ultimately much riskier option of placing size we'll see close to the sea. In short, the site is too compromised and too small for this design, and therefore it should be abandoned. EDF have yet to submit submit detailed design to the coast defences and therefore have avoided critical examination by others. But our proposal does identify the use of soft defences. This will require the deposition of huge amounts of dredge marine material to act as a sacrificial beach. This approach is the base of the Dutch zand Mota, which is barely 10 years old. Yet these defences are expected to defend the site and the nuclear waste for perhaps 140 years. It's a novel solution. But there's no evidence that this dislocation is suitable for this approach. No experience on how to deal with rapid sea level rise, no clarity of who would fund its maintenance, no assessment of the impact on adjacent coastlines, and no proposals for Plan B, it doesn't work. The recognition

1:01:50

for the need of soft defence so Sue, is effectively with non judgement. This is a flawed design. Coastal engineers today are dealing with the consequences of failing Victorian sea defences. What would future engineers think of us was grappling with the unimaginable challenges defending two nuclear reactors when we've allowed the construction despite already knowing about the likely catastrophic impacts of

climate change. I endorsed the comments of David Rob last night in questioning the integrity of the applicant. After all, we are all urged to follow the science. The attitude of a significant concern that the advisors to EDF have a best being selective or may have even misinterpreted the scientific evidence to ensure they meet the requirements of their client.

1:02:34

Evidence will be presented for deadline to highlight some of these concerns. We know that future generations will have to deal with the consequences of a changing climate and the need to rapidly decarbonize over the next decade. But sighs we'll see is not the solution, EDF have declined to publish the true lifetime carbon costs of the proposal, but admit that will take at least six years to pay back the carbon generated in its construction. But where does the raw material procurement, they are decommissioning the protection of nuclear waste for 100 years. feature in that calculation, as I'm afraid is typical radio the detail is not available at work and scrutiny. All claims EDF make about low carbon emissions and green energy must therefore be treated with extreme scepticism. This year the UK will be hosting Cop 26 and it's inconceivable to sanction such a huge unnecessary emission of CO2 head of the key target x 2030. In addition, this is the first COP to focus on biodiversity. So the willful destruction of such a protected environment is beyond comprehension. Finally, we all have a responsibility for future generations who will be living in a much more uncertain world, they will have to deal with our legacy. It is critical to examine very carefully the applicant's claim this being a safe location. We absolutely must not bequeath to future generations avoidable problems, and that they may not have the resources nor the expertise to resolve this application should be rejected. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Parker. Can I just ask you one question, please do

1:04:08

you said that the coastal engineering design was based upon a Dutch design or concept which is relatively new. Yeah. Is there some suggestion coming from you that that is that the Dutch work is flawed? No, not at all. The

1:04:26

the Dutch sand motor is a deposition of a huge amount of material has actually also been replicated back to the north Norfolk but it's a solution whereby effectively you create a beach which then allows the silt to naturally erode

1:04:41

has a lifetime to it. The problem with it is that it is a new concept. And there's not been challenged in many different ways in terms of a long period of time. The other thing of course, is that not every bit of coastline is therefore suitable. They have that form of defence

1:05:00

And we have looked at other locations on the eroded coastline, which there are big challenges to be able to do such a similar response. So my question is, is, as you know, we haven't seen the details and the proposals of the soft defence that EDF want to put forward. But actually, is this really the true? Is this really an effective mechanism to use? Will it last for a significant period of time? And if it doesn't do? What are the options?

1:05:30

Okay, if you can make sure that you explain that when you put in your post hearing submission, that'd be very helpful. Of course, many thanks. Thank you very much. Indeed. You can switch off your camera and your microphone now. Mr. Jackson Brown, are you

1:05:47

in the room? And if you are, Please, could you switch on your camera? And your microphone? Is not Mr. Jackson.

1:05:59

Right. All right. Please tell us who you are and who you represent. And then we would love to hear from you. Okay, so my name is Jacqueline Brown. I'm represent I totally represent myself, although I think I speak for a lot of other people in many of the things I'm going to say. And thank you very much for letting me speak. Anyway. Thank you for coming to speak. Okay. So I'll start. So first and foremost, I have to say that I totally post sizewell C, and all related infrastructure work to during the decio size was quite obviously the wrong place for any large infrastructure project, especially a potentially lethal one for many reasons, including, because the 3.2 gigawatt energy that it may or may not ever generate, maybe produce faster be safer. The cost far less money by using a combination of alternative technologies and battery storage. Because this fast eroding and size we'll see will exacerbate flooding and erosion to the north and south. putting more people's homes and businesses at risk. The sea will always when, regardless of the height of the surrounding walls, and no amount of reinforced concrete will prevent that the seas rising faster than predicted and the poles are melting at an unprecedented rate which adds to extreme weather events, storm surges, higher waves and tides. And the ramifications of storing lethal radioactive waste on the shore here with the sea coming in for over a century and possibly much longer, really doesn't they're thinking about will not only lose a large part of our supposedly protected AONB, but will effectively lose the whole of he suffered, which will in a very few years, be transformed from a rural to an industrialised area. Our history and heritage will be lost to a French company billions of euros in debt that has no sense of or feeling for the area. So they propose to trash it along with our lives. The energy we won't get until the late 2030s by which time it won't be needed. It's shameful i think but such an idea in this era of climate emergency, environmental protection and net gain should even be suggested. I own a grade two listed Methodist chapel in Oxford High Street. I've lived here for 25 years and was brought up in a village seven miles away. Over time, traffic has increased dramatically on the a level 20 and the Oxford's grown in size with many new houses built in many families with more than one car per household. Da 1120 became a designated tourist route running from the a 14 near Stowmarket do end in locks, which added greatly to traffic use. And now several local estates have become upmarket tourist accommodation and traffic through the village grows year on year to this add farm vehicle some of which are gigantic visitors coming to the music festivals like latitude Maui Wally Snape Maltings concert hall, regular tourism to our popular coastal towns to the coast itself and to RSPB minsmere. In all, we already have lots of traffic on this road, something the inspectors could easily have missed if they visited Oxford on a chilly winter day in the middle of COVID lockdown. I'm going to enlarge on the subject of the a 12 a 1120 in my written Rep. But I fear for the integrity of my chapel which has a large rose window front and 12 windows down the side. All original leaded stained glass. They're fragile, very unlike today's tight fitting double glazed windows. I've no

doubt that they will be damaged by emissions from the endless stream of vehicles that will be directly outside all of nine feet from the frontage is soon so deeply damaging to health will inevitably get inside the

1:10:00

The building itself may have suffered white bricks. These two will suffer degradation I mean, how much longer will they stay pale, I wonder. But the problem is not just emissions, it's also noise and vibration. vibrations will exacerbate the ingress of emissions as glass within the leaded lights is shaking and loose and day after day, and the noise will be constant even at night. All categories of vehicles can use this road currently, and is only hgvs bound for size We'll see. We'll be forbidden, let's use the numbers of every other size of vehicle will grow exponentially. It's supposed to be my duty to care for this building, but obviously is completely impossible under these circumstances. I'm full of sadness and anger that I am therefore being forced to sell off and move from a place I love and plan to live in for the rest of my life. I'm using a local estate agent who told me that in his view, loxford would be the village most severely impacted by sizewell c because the VA 12 a 1120 Junction. I bitterly regret that the footpaths fields for his hips ensure that I've known almost all my life will no longer be there for me or anyone else to enjoy. Actually, it's an absolute tragedy and further proof that government is good at talking the green talk but has absolutely no intention of implementing it. And then and to finish I just want to say I fully support together against sysvol see stop sighs I'll see RSPB minsmere Friends of the Earth and everyone else who's speaking against this hopefully ruinous project.

1:11:38

Thank you very much indeed.

1:11:43

I now let's move to Mr. Robert Lindell.

1:11:50

Sir, can you can you hear me loud and clear as defendable. Please, for the record, identify yourself and

1:11:58

then please address us. You have five minutes. Thank you, sir. My name is Robert splendour. I live in East bridge with my family. And we're just 500 metres from the proposed construction site. We feel very strongly that the development would should not be permitted. sizewell c would be a development in the right and the wrong place in the wrong time. We believe that the development of this scale and longevity will be totally inappropriate in its very sensitive landscape. And a precious rural environment will be severely damaged the decades its flourishing visitor economy would also be harmed. Government policy for new nuclear is out of date and will not address the climate emergency.

1:12:43

sighs boss see energy production will not be carbon neutral until the sixth six years after its completion, which could be as late as 2035 or beyond. We have no idea what the UK energy strategy will be by that time including how much we are likely to be already reliant on renewables. Today, you start will see remains a very real threat to the environment that we suffered not just to local communities of less than

saboten a nice bridge, but also those towns and villages alongside the a 12 and several B roads that will be directly impacted by the applicants in an inadequate transport strategy. Our written representations will cover the impact of the proposed accommodation campus. The proposed borrow pits, the applicant store management plans, their transport plans, impacts on the built and natural heritage harm to the visitor economy, social impacts and the cumulative impacts of the Sizemore c project alongside other energy infrastructure currently planned in East Suffolk a number of questions that the examining authority ought to be asking the applicant Firstly, do you believe that the proper proposed campus would not result in unacceptable harm to local communities and residential amenity?

1:14:01

Do you believe that the proposed borrow pits and spa management plans would not result in unacceptable harm to local communities? Have you carried out a thorough examination of all link road options and believe that your favourite option route zayde is the best in terms of its community impact and legacy value? Do you believe that the proposed development would not result in extensive and irreparable long term damage to the southern landscape and the southern coast and peace AONB? Do you believe that the proposed developments would not result in unacceptable damage to the east suffered built heritage? Do you believe that the proposed development would not result in extensive and irreparable long term damage to suffer natural environments? Do you believe that proposed development and the influx of 1000s of construction workers for a period of at least 10 years into an otherwise quiet rural locality will not have harmful social impacts on communities in the Suffolk

1:15:00

Do you believe that government energy infrastructure policy needs to urgently address the cumulative impact of proposed energy infrastructure projects in East Suffolk? Do you believe that your draft decio provides sufficient protection for local communities for the period of construction and beyond? And if the answer is no to any of these questions, then please show evidence. Why not? I conclude that the disk benefits of the proposed developments hugely outweigh any benefits that the DC owes and the decio should be rejected. Thank you, sir. Thank you very much, Mr. Fennell.

1:15:40

We

1:15:42

have now reached the point where we will do take a break and we will break now until 4pm.

1:15:50

So please come back in through the lobby in time to do that, if you want to speak is listed for the last part of this afternoon. Thank you.