

SizewellC_ISH2_Session1_07072021_TEXT

00:05

Good morning everyone and welcome. It is now time for me to open this issue specific hearing which is being held in connection with an application made by nnb. Generation company s said c limited for an order for development concerned for the construction and operation maintenance of the sizewell c project. Before I go any further, can I confirm that everyone can hear me and my camera is working?

00:29

Yes, I confirm I can see and he

00:32

can also confirm with the case team that the recording and live streaming of this event has commenced.

00:38

Yes, the recording and live live stream have both started. Thank you. For those people watching the live feed. Let me explain that if proceedings are adjourned at any point, we will have to stop the live stream in order to give us a clear recording files. When the meeting is resumed, you will need to refresh your browser page to view that restarted live stream. I will remind you again of this should we need to adjourn. Now let me let me introduce myself and my colleagues. My name is Neil Humphrey. I'm a chartered civil engineer and I have been appointed by the Secretary of State as a member of the panel of examining inspectors that together comprise the examining authority for this application. The other members of the panel, Wendy MCI, David Brock, Helen Cassini and Edwin mourned will now introduce themselves.

01:33

Good morning, everyone. I'm Wendy MCI, Bachelor of law non practising solicitor, and an examining inspector and lead member of the panel. I'll now pass on to Mr. Brock.

01:48

Thank you, and good morning, everybody. My name is David Brock. I'm a retired solicitor,

01:53

and I'm a member of the examining authority.

02:01

Good morning, everybody. My name is Helen Cassini. I'm a charter town planner and I've been appointed as a member of the panel. I'll now hand over to Mr. Moreland.

02:13

Good morning, everyone. My name is Edwin monde. I'm a chartered town planner. I've been appointed to be a member of this panel, and I returned to miss Tom Ferry.

02:24

Thank you Mr. Moreland. We are assisted at this hearing by the planning Inspectorate case team. Today we have the planning inspector deputy case manager Sean Evans, the other colleagues from the planning Inspectorate who will assist us today are Dr. Deanna Hannigan, Jake Stevens, and Lily Robbins. If you have any questions or queries about the examination or the technology we are using for the virtual events, they should be your first point of contact. their contact details can be found at the top of any letter you receive from us or on the project page of the national infrastructure planning website. Before I go on to the main part of this hearing, I will ask my colleague Mrs. Cassini to highlight a few housekeeping and background matters to note for today.

03:10

Thank you, Mr. Humphrey. As explained in the examining authorities rule eight letter annex D, the issue specific 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 themselves each time they speak. As recordings are retained and published, they form a public record that can contain personal information to which the general data protection regulation applies. The rule eight letter includes a link to the planning inspector or its 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. It should be in a written form which can be redacted before being published. If you prefer not to have your image recorded, you can switch your camera off

04:06

or repeat the request 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 are speaking out of fairness for all participants. Can I also remind everyone until to wait until invited by the panel member to appear on screen or respond to a question or point being made.

04:29

During a physical hearing, we would normally have breaks to avoid fatigue. And we'll do the same in this virtual hearing. Our intention is to take a 15 minute break at about 90 minute intervals and a longer break over the lunch time period. I'll now hand over to Mr. Moreland, who will outline the purpose and conduct of this issue specific hearing.

04:51

Hello again, everyone.

04:53

The issue specific hearing provides an opportunity for the issues raised by interested parties and

05:00

Particular differences between them to be explored further by the examining authority.

05:06

The purpose of an issue specific hearing is set out in Section 91 of the Planning Act 2008 is held if the examining authority decides it is necessary, the examination to oral representations to enable an adequate examination of the issue, or to ensure that an interested party has a fair test case,

05:28

as indicated in the agenda, questioning at the hearing will be led by a member of the panel supported by other panel members

05:37

is the examining authority to determine how hearings are to be conducted, including the amount of time to be allowed at the hearing for the making of a person's representations.

05:48

Our aim is to use our powers of control over the conduct hearings to ensure they're carried out as efficiently as possible. Whilst remaining fair to all parties and thorough in our examination of evidence.

06:02

We have identified the matters to be considered in this issue specific hearing those on which we require further information. These are set out in the agenda published in advance of this hearing.

06:16

participants should note that written summaries of your all submissions to this hearing should be provided to the planning and spectra of pi deadline five, which is Friday the 23rd of July.

06:29

Finally, I would like to reassure you that all members of the panel are present and listening carefully to what you have to say at all times during the hearing. However, we're not all remaining on screen throughout through wish to minimise the demand on the IT systems to ensure best quality of audio and video for participants.

06:50

Allow that hand back to Mr. Perry.

07:02

Thank you, Mr. maund. I will now ask the applicant followed by the IPS were named on a detailed agenda to introduce themselves. Could I start with the applicant please?

07:15

Yes, good morning, sir. My name is Hugh Flanagan. I'm a barrister instructed by the applicants and I'll be speaking on behalf of the applicant today. I have with me a number of specialists who I don't

propose to go through now, but I'll introduce them when matters are raised relevant to their roles and that's acceptable. Thank you, Mr. Flanagan. And could I then go to Suffolk County Council please?

07:44

Morning, sir. My name is Michael Bedford Queen's counsel, I'm instructed by sharp pro Jared on behalf of Suffolk County Council. I have a number of members of the team dealing with transport matters. I'll introduce them at an appropriate time. But the main person you may be hearing from is Mr. Steve Mary, who is the council's lead on transport matters within the development team. Thank you Mr. Bedford. Could I hear from the representative East Suffolk council please?

08:21

Thank you, sir. Andrew Tate QC for a Suffolk Council. I will be the principal speaker. But I'm accompanied by Philip Ridley, who's the council's head of planning and coastal management if his contribution is required. Thank you, Mr. Tate. Could I hear now from the highways England. Representative please.

08:43

Good morning. My name is Eric Cooper. I'm

08:48

here on behalf of England. And I've got colleague also is joining us. I can hear you Mr. Cooper, but I can't see you. So

08:57

I do apologise. I thought again, my name is Eric. On behalf Hobbes, England. I've got also a colleague who's joining us today as well. Thank you, Mr. Cooper.

09:07

Now can you hear from Network Rail please?

09:14

Morning, everyone. My name is Sarah Hodge. I am the solicitor representing Network Rail. I do have a number of colleagues from Network Rail also here but again, I'll introduce them at the appropriate time. Thank you Miss Hodge. Could I hear finally from the Suffolk Constabulary representative please?

09:34

Good morning, sir. My name is Ben Stanfield. I'm a solicitor at Galang w/ G. I'm joined today by detective Chief Superintendent Cutler, the Suffolk Constabulary, who is the lead for the police. In relation to the size one seed project you will talk to resourcing and I'm also joined by Mr. Adrian Neve, Director of transport planning from stantec Consulting.

09:57

Thank you

10:00

I also note, there are people in attendance today who requested to speak at his hearing but are not in the list of invitees set out in a detailed agenda.

10:10

I won't ask you to introduce yourself now but the first time you're invited to speak please can you introduce yourself by giving your name and the name or names of the organisation or people that you represent?

10:23

I hope you've had a chance to read the detailed agenda for for this meeting. During the meeting today, I have a number of technical questions for the applicant and other invited parties. I'm also aware there are a number of interested parties, you may wish to speak on some of the agenda items. Once I finished my direct questioning on an agenda item, I will ask if interested parties at that point, if they would like to make any submission relating to the agenda item before moving on to the next agenda item.

10:53

I would remind you this is not an open floor hearing on transport and submissions made orally should relate to the agenda items we will be discussing.

11:01

I understand there may be other issues not on the agenda that parties may wish to raise, but submissions on these matters should be made in writing a deadline five, the 23rd of July 2021 Thank you in advance for your cooperation, but it's approach in terms of the documents I will be referring to today. The I will now list these they are the applicants responses to our first written questions, that is a wrap to 100.

11:33

And the appendices to those responses, which is rep 2108.

11:38

The freight management strategy, which is a s 280 the consolidated TA, which is rep 4005 the site selection report, app 591 workforce profile, which is app 196

11:59

implementation plan,

12:01

app 599 and a rep 2044. On the accommodation strategy app 614. To assist potential participants, I will where possible refer to relevant paragraph page numbers where they are available as we go along.

12:20

So starting with agenda item two,

12:26

our Could I speak to the applicant about rail provision.

12:31

Firstly,

12:34

am I right in assuming of the potential rail options that you are pursuing in the early years rail provision of two trains a day to day industrial estate by January 24? What you call enhance rail provision of four trains a day to the green rail route by August 2024.

12:55

Does that right? I believe it is correct. And Mr. Bull. Here is the

13:01

DCI programme manager leading on Rails is going to ask him to come in to confirm that.

13:20

Hello, good morning, Richard Boyle on behalf of the applicant. I can confirm that to be the case. I would also add that we are working closely with Network Rail and our design team to try and promote a more aggressive date in advance of those those dates segment and mishap free but that is correct. Mr. Ball, is it one time you're talking about whether there could be a fifth chain of days that no longer the case?

13:48

That is correct. Okay, thank you. Well, I'd like to understand a bit more about the delivery of those two solutions. Starting with the two trains today, a dated industrial estate siding. Could you explain to me the practical barriers that may affect its delivery before January 2020. For

14:12

the day or two things that we're working on here, there are the decio proposals that you're you'll be aware of, which are the enhancements to the sizeable branch line, replacement of the track and

14:26

improved level crossings along that line. And additionally the the work to improve the functionality of the junction to the suffered line at Saxmundham.

14:39

Those are all currently going through the design stages with a derived design team we're having good engagement Network Rail has to go through the formal governance process that they have known as grip and we've just submitted our stage three

14:54

grip proposals for them to review and that is all on target for delivery within those timescales.

15:01

The second element is with regards to the suffer client. And we set out within our statement of common ground the position of those discussions. And there were some unresolved issues, particularly with regards to level crossings along the line.

15:16

And these relate to the

15:21

the fact that we are planning to run our services at a lower than current, the current permitted speed on the lines of 10 miles an hour freight services rather than 20. And there's an impact on the risk of some of those level crossings, particularly user work crossings where the use of those crossings need to contact the Saxmundham single signal box and

15:43

get permission to cross the line while running a slower service does increase the dwell times for those users of those crossings, and there's an implication on the risk of those crossings. So we've worked through those issues with Network Rail. And I think,

16:02

as we are now we've progressed to, I think, a conclusion where we know what's going to happen on those level crossings. There's some work required to enhance the functionality of the user work crossings, which would introduce miniature stoplights to those crossings. And we would need to work with Network Rail over over the coming months just to ensure those delivered in the proper way But currently, where, from what I'm seeing I see no issue,

16:32

unresolved issue in terms of the way forward to facilitate the trains in line with our aspired dates.

16:41

Thank you, Mr. Ball. Perhaps at this point, I could ask for views from Suffolk County Council on Network Rail ball start with Suffolk County Council if that's possible. Just before you do, can I just give you a what might be a helpful reference for those dates in the latest position in the implementation plan, which is wrapped to hyphen zero double for the recently submitted June 2020 version. The outdated position has movement to four trains per day from March 2024, March 2024. And you see that in plate 1.1 in the back of that plan.

17:24

Thank you, Mr. Flanagan.

17:29

So could I hear from I think,

17:33

Suffolk County Council first please.

17:37

Thank you. So Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So you will have seen in the representations we submitted after deadline, three, in rep, three, dash zero 84 comments on the applicants responses to your first written questions. And in those we have raised in responses to questions TT, I think in particular 1.3 1.5 and related, some concerns, seeking more information and clarification about how those proposals will be delivered in practical terms, particularly noting that there seem to be a limited amount of information in relation to the working with Network Rail, on the level of crossings on the Suffolk law in which at the moment, as we say, are not yet in the grip process. But we're not sure that they can be delivered outside of the grip process. And so what we've just obviously posed are questions and seeking clarification, and reassurance that actually what is being suggested, is achievable and deliverable. That's our kind of headline when we've asked for more information. Hopefully, in the response that comes in a deadline five, we will get that information if we don't get it today. Thank you, Mr. Bedford. Could I hear from Network Rail on their view of the deliverability of the rail proposals, please?

19:18

Sara Hodge for Network Rail. So that rails position is in alignment with promoters and the issues that they've already raised. So for they will also be a practical implication to be thought about with the wider network. So how the services will get from the origin point to the site. And I believe that is timetabled in and you know, that is an issue that will be addressed, but just to raise it for your attention. And then I'd also like to ask Mr. Fiske to speak in relation to the level crossing issues. He is health and safety manager. He's got 18 years experience, including seven years on the level crossings. Thank you.

20:02

Mr. Fisk?

20:04

Yes. Good morning.

20:07

Good morning, Daniel, first public and passenger health and safety manager for Network Rail.

20:12

And so so I do concur with with Mr. Balls statement. So we've got we've got some high level plans now for the crossings on the Suffolk line.

20:21

We do believe they are deliverable prior to January 2024. We do need to get things in motion to get this work started. They would be starting around the group group three, group four stage of our development processes, because we've already agreed what the single option is for through our risk assessment processes we've undertaken in alignment with EDF.

20:44

So your view then is that both sort of January 2024. For the two trains a day is a realistic and deliverable prospect?

20:55

Yes, as long as we can get it delivering to deliver the work. So we've got we've got some work we need to do and confirmation in place for funding and things. But yes, I'm confident that works will be deliverable to allow the two additional trains to run in January 2024. Thank you, Mr. Fisk

21:12

colour, then perhaps move on to the four trains a day and the green rail route by i think is now corrected is March 2024. Not as I suggested August 2024.

21:26

And how practical and deliverable is that date? Mr. Flanagan?

21:32

Yes, I can give you an answer. But just before I do, I noticed Mr. Tate's hands gone up. Perhaps I'm relating to the previous issue just before?

21:40

Yeah. Okay.

21:42

Mr. Tate. Thank you. So free Suffolk.

21:47

Opposition is very much in alignment with what Mr. Bedford has said for Suffolk County Council. But we would just want to add one point in relation to the rail aspects, which is that the delivery question includes the matter of

22:04

having addressed the noise issues from the

22:09

rail strategy. We're not going to talk about noise I appreciate today. But that's an important part of what is the acceptable what would otherwise be the acceptable or unacceptable delivery of the rail proposals. Yes, thank you, Mr. Tate, we do examining authority does understand that point and noise will form a part of a different hearing. But what we're talking about today is just the transport implications of the rail proposal.

22:37

Yeah, so I understand that. Thank you.

22:40

Thank you, Mr. Tate. Sir. Mr. Flanagan going back to you. Yes, thank you, sir. So just before going to the for train position, Mr. Bedford's concerned to me principally articulated as we'd like some more information, obviously, that can be provided in, as you've heard from Mr. Ball, things are progressing constantly. So the information has been constantly updated. But the current written position is perhaps best expressed in the Network Rail statements of common ground between the applicant and Network Rail, which is for your notes as rep 2074 which is suggest quite a quite a full document and does include a very full account of the various stages, both in terms of the grip stages and the various agreements and arrangements that needs to be put in place and are progressing indeed, as we speak. So that's position in terms of

23:37

tier four trains per day in March 2024. Again, it's best if I think I can ask the hand back to Mr. Ball to to talk about that please.

23:46

Thank you.

23:51

Hello, Richard ball on behalf of the applicant.

23:58

I think that the deliverability of the work to the branch line the green rail route are more straightforward in the branch line does not have any regular service now. So we can go through our design process and work with Network Rail on the approvals to ensure that we can actually replace the track bed and track and upgrade the level and upgrade the level crossings without having to take into account any running services along long the line and then the connecting the route into the main site with the green rail link again, needs to be undertaken in conjunction with the other early works, but it will be prioritised to ensure that we can get the trains to the main site

24:45

as quickly as possible. The

24:49

obviously this involves the level crossing at boxwood road and also the level crossing on the BLM 22 at Tabby road as well, but from a project perspective

25:00

Getting the materials to the point of use as soon as possible is significant priority for the project.

25:08

Thank you, just in terms of no running trains along the, the line, presumably the two trains a day going to

25:16

the industrial estate will be running along the line.

25:19

Indeed. So the the branch line works would be undertaken first, once they're completed, including the the link and connection to the software client, then the suffer client would be would be completed.

25:33

Following that in the months subsequent to the winning first train. Okay, thank you, Mr. Ball.

25:42

Okay, could I hear from Suffolk County Council on this point? And please?

25:51

Thank you. So Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, we acknowledge that this may be a as it were more straightforward than the Suffolk line work. So in principle, but we do still have concerns in terms of obviously engaging properly with the level crossings. And we have a wider concern, which I don't think is for today, about the as it were the TIF, particularly the reference to the implementation plan that was discussed yesterday. And the the mechanism would be used for deliverability. But I don't think you'd really want to go into that. As part of today's discussion. I think you're more concerned with the as it were the the nuts and bolts. And there's a we can see that this is perhaps more straightforward than the subject line. But there are still some issues. And we've raised those in our responses to the deadline. Sorry, to the deadline, three comments. Thank you. Can I hear from Network Rail again, please.

26:52

So network rail's position, again, aligns with the promoters, just with the additional note that obviously, the wider system capability for the additional trains is something that would need to be addressed. And just as an aside, and again, I don't think it is really for today. But clearly, Network Rail will need to make sure that they have got all the appropriate agreements in place with the promoter to secure the relevant mitigation works. And we currently feel that that hasn't been done. But we are at sort of the final stages of an agreement that would

27:29

reassure network round that the relevant protected provisions will be added to the decio. And the appropriate agreements will be put in place to secure relevant mitigation.

27:40

Thank you, Miss Hodge?

27:43

I don't know Paul Collins, you have your hand up.

27:48

Mr. Collins? Yeah. Just just a very short question, actually. And that is, is the bridge that is proposed for the size link road part of the grip process as well. It was a question than anything else.

28:03

Okay. And,

28:06

Mr. Collins, I did say right at the beginning of this, I'll take that question now. But we, we would take questions at the end of the main agenda item, but

28:16

I will ask the applicant, if I could respond to that particular question. I wasn't expecting you to ask me at that point.

28:27

Yes, thank you. So again, this token was not a discrete issue. Thank you.

28:34

Hello, again, Richard ball on behalf of the African. Yes, I can confirm that is the case. Just as a way of an update the the actual bridge itself is undergoing design, we've progressed to reverse phase three preliminary design in conjunction with Suffolk County Council. good grip delivery process. Runs commenced in September 2020. And will run through to September this year, that's grip stage three to five. And then delivery of the of the actual bridge will be under grip six, six to eight, which would be June 23 to November 23. So hopefully that covers the question.

29:15

Thank you, Mr. Bull.

29:18

Moving on with my questions about the next one is about in your response to question TT or 1.6. And that's on page 76 of 183 of the traffic section of rep two 100. You set out a theoretical maximum capacity and nominal rail capacity. Could you explain in more detail why these two are different?

29:44

So yes, we can and I'm going to ask Mr. I think probably Mr. Oliver in the first instance, Mr.

29:52

B Mr. To introduce him so Mr. James Oliver of Lang, a rogue, Principal engineer dealing with delivery logistics and bolt material.

30:01

And I just wonder if it might assist this job, sir, because it's quite a detailed question. If you're able to pose your question again, and just before you do, if I might just say

30:14

from the previous topic, I've been some further information which just might assist to clarify matters we as to what you might be expecting next week, so by the 23rd of July, we have an updated agreed programme with Network Rail, which we intend to submit by the 23rd of July next week.

30:37

The original statement Network Rail state, we have common ground which are referred to as dated June it promised another one in July. And that information hopefully would form part of that. So that's, that's coming.

30:49

We also hopefully will provide the 23rd of July, formalising in writing the update you've heard on level crossings. And the think large measure agreement with Mr. Fisk. You heard about that. And 30. Just to note, just to give you a comfort so there is a

31:06

Network Rail meeting with a Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council as I understand every two weeks, so information does play through that way. So that's that's it. Your question was regarding one of the TT questions. Regarding volumes. I wonder if you might pose it again from its longest time. Certainly. Good morning, Mr. Oliver.

31:28

Good morning.

31:33

Right, my question was in your response

31:38

can offer feedback? In your response to question tt 1.6 you set out a theoretical maximum capacity and a nominal rail capacity. Can you explain in more detail why these two capacities are different?

31:53

Yes, certainly. So the the theoretical maximum is based on assuming that we use the maximum number of rail deliveries every day across the project duration. In reality, this wouldn't be the case because the material demand is not spread linearly over the project, there's a much greater demand for bond materials in the early years. So from year two, when the the to train, they become available and then laterally when the increased to four trains become available, that that period is the most sensitive to us. And when we require the the primary imports of the bulk material. Beyond year five and six, we start to reduce in the turret in terms of the amount of bulk materials we require in favour of more smaller deliveries for the mechanical, electrical plant systems and some of the other materials. And those aren't necessarily suited to rail transport because of their origin points, or the the manner in which they're conveyed.

32:54

Alright, thank you.

32:57

That that probably will suffice for the answer that question. Thank you.

33:01

Okay, well, that was basically my questioning for now. And we'll wait to see what happens what submitted a deadline five on the rail provision, so I ask any of the other interested parties if they would like to question on the rail provision. And I note, Andy Smith,

33:21

have a question.

33:23

Thank you, sir. Yes, I speak today on behalf of Felixstowe town council, also with prior knowledge previously, many discussions when I was a member of a soft Council on not the capacity of the line, from Ipswich to Sizewell, but the constantly unanswered question for many years about the capacity of the rail network, to beyond to the west and or south of it. I was very interested to hear Sarah Hodge also hinting at that issue.

33:54

I speak in part

33:57

from a Felixstowe perspective in particular, the port of Felixstowe is currently constrained in its ongoing drive and demand from its customers. For additional trains beyond the current I think it's 38. At the last count,

34:11

the branch line to Felixstowe was improved but cannot be used because there is apparently no spare rail capacity west or South switch currently available, or likely to be after the major improvements in early, which are scheduled for something like 2028. I heard the applicant in no document that I'm aware of including one of my earlier meetings. Memory I had with Mr. Ball has answered that I'd be interested to hear from both Mr. Ball and or Sarah Hodge as to how and where those trains are going to go. Without prejudicing the capacity from the port of Felixstowe, which uses that capacity in terms of piers far more intensively, with 20 miles with 60 mile an hour 750 metre trains, it would not be in our view

35:01

good use of national capacity to cut that to the much lower volumes that would be required by ISO as well. Thank you, Mr. Smith. Perhaps you could hear from the applicant first on that point.

35:15

Yes, thank you, sir. There's been a lot of work done on pathing of trains and the person to I'm going to pass straight over to Mr. Ball on that and can explain that both. I can say the works been done, go up the starting line and beyond, which is Mr. Smith points in the process. Mr. Ball. Thanks.

35:38

Hello, which is all on behalf of Africans. I know the points that Mr. Smith has raised, I have to say this is this is

35:46

we have done a lot of work on this. And we're currently working very closely with with Network Rail,

35:52

their support on it. We've got to the position now where

35:58

pathing within the angular region itself is well advanced and we have solutions identified.

36:04

Clearly, on the suffered line, when we're planning to run the majority of our services overnight, we need to formalise those paths and that's something we will do.

36:15

To stop your minute Mr. Bolten, Mr. Smith, could you mute your microphone while Mr. Bull is speaking, please? I beg, I beg your pardon. I was typing merrily.

36:25

Thank you.

36:28

Mr. Ball. Thank you. I think Mr. Smith's question was mainly directed at the wider

36:35

freight pathing strategy. In other words, ensuring that we can get materials from our origination points through the existing rail network and onto the suffered line to the main site.

36:48

So as I said, this, this is a this is something that we were doing a significant amount of work on now, working closely with with Network Rail, and also commencing discussions with the freight operating companies. The position is that for materials originating from the southwestern England

37:12

we stop.

37:23

And we understand

37:25

Mr. Bowden, no terrible feedback on your

37:36

thing, hopefully is resolved by house. Thank you.

37:41

Yeah, I was just talking about origination of materials from essentially origin through the rail network to ensure that they can arrive and the dispatch that the suffered line in in the required fashion. So we've got materials originating from the southwest of England, we've got materials in the northwest of England and North Wales,

38:04

as well. So what we're looking at is trying to establish what paths may be available to get those materials across country, I think it's fair to say the biggest challenges from the west of the country across on the Great Western line. We've established that there are four paths available, we think in an easterly direction and turn a westerly direction. But we continue to work on that with with Network Rail. We know also that there are parts that aren't 100% utilised, and we need to continue to work with the free to plank ating companies to understand what the potential is to free some of those up. There's also the opportunity for materials originating from the west of the country to take alternative routes if required, so they could go buy a pizza or Birmingham rather than via London. So there are solutions available for the materials originating from the west the country in terms of pathing from the northwest of England and North Wales. So far with the work we've done, it doesn't appear to be any major constraints to deliver those materials.

39:10

Once we've gone through this initial

39:13

work to identify capacity, it's very important that this feeds in to the

39:22

formalisation, the timetable bidding process to secure train paths with regards to the May 2022, timetable change. So the aim will be to submit an electronic timetable file in quarter four of this year, which summarises the past that we've identified and those will then be formalised within the subsequent work in the timetable bidding process, but I have to say we're getting a significant help and support from Network Rail on this, which we thank them for. Just just I think Mr. Smith might have mentioned the the Westfield junction capacity with

40:00

Got the Felixstowe operations? No. Okay, fine. So I'll leave it there.

40:06

Thank you. Maybe I could hear from Network Rail on this issue as well, please.

40:13

Thank you. So my understanding is that the branch line is actually the sort of main concern at the moment in terms of opening up capacity. And once the level crossings, for example, have been upgraded, and any risk associated with them have been resolved, you then sort of can look at the wider network and how then additional capability on that on those lines will be possible. However, it is still being assessed. So although there are solutions and as promoters, Network Rail are working very closely with promoter to sort of find relevant solutions and make sure it's all going to be feasible, that hasn't actually been secured yet. still a work in process. And I'll hand over to Mr. Newman, who is the senior free route freight manager who will be able to give some time. Thank you.

41:09

Good morning, everyone. I'm Kevin Newman. I work for Network Rail is the senior route freight manager on the eastern region which this project is on. Yeah, I agree with with what Sarah said, our main constraint on this on the Felixstowe branch is actually one particular level crossing. And that would then free up some more parts for that the wider network does have just have some constraints on it. That is true, as has been alluded to by the applicant,

41:38

especially from the West Country and getting across the the north of London. Works ongoing, we're gonna have to have a look and see what that's what that does to the train paths and to the freight plan. We usually find a way around issues to do with capacity. And again, it's been alluded to by by Mr. Ball, where we can look at underutilised wt parts are working timetable paths are easy to slip into jargon, and see if we can free those up for for this particular traffic. So lots of work to be done. But it's we do find solutions. So you're confident are you Mr. Newman, then that the work for sizewell would not compromise necessarily the operation of Felixstowe the port?

42:23

It's a mixed mixed picture, I would say. It's different operations. So heavy haulage of

42:32

material trains is a bit different to the fast parts that are needed for intermodal services out of Felixstowe, they generally can be fitted in much better than a heavier train. So we may have to operate for instance on night to move our our heavier freight trains rather than the intermodal is out of Felixstowe. It's so I think, until we know the complete picture of where things are coming from how we will operate. The train plan itself, it's a bit difficult to exactly quantify what we're going to do. Thank you, Mr. Newman.

43:06

Mr. Smith.

43:09

I have to say, you shaking your head down. I don't want this to be a debate about fit the operation of Felixstowe. So I would say, if you have any further comments about what you've heard, perhaps you could put that in writing for me at the next deadline.

43:25

Okay, I will attempt that.

43:28

The core picture is if piles cannot be made available for the poor and how can I be made available for

43:35

size? Well, I will do as you ask. Thank you, Mr. Smith. Thank you for your assistance. Thank you. Mr. Lovelock. Can I hear you from you please?

43:49

Good morning. I'm Clive Lovelock. today. I'm talking on behalf of just one moment, Mr. Lovelock, Mr. Smith, could you come off and put your hand down, please? Thank you.

44:03

Carry on Mr. Lovelock. Yeah, I'm Clive Lovelock. I'm appearing on behalf of the task today. But I am a retired where we signal engineer with experience of managing rail infrastructure projects, including decap power station, coal supply,

44:22

upgrade, while in fact, reopening the line to port free dock. So I'm a little bit concerned with what I'm hearing at the moment. We're now MD, we're now only months away from a decision on this planning application. And I don't think we have the details of how the rates were or freight service will actually be delivered. And I don't think it's unreasonable at this stage.

44:47

to expect that we have a final list of materials to be delivered by rail.

44:53

I look at the documents I see that reinforcing steel and tunnel segments are mentioned, but there's no mention

45:00

To know where they're going to be sourced from. There was an aspiration to bring containerized goods in by rail. Where that's gone, I don't know.

45:10

I've looked at the draft timetables for the rail movements that have just been issued as part of the consolidated transport assessment. That's that's section 11.

45:26

It's got a very comprehensive timetable between Sizewell and Leiston to Westerfield. Now as your previous contributor has said, the section between Westerfield and Bess Hall junction is probably the busiest section of railway in the whole of Suffolk. There are 133 train movements a day. So

45:50

can we have can we have some draft timetables?

45:55

I'm concerned, the mention there's a mention of stock up of materials coming from the southwest from what the quarry in Somerset. Now

46:07

that route involves coming up the box and hands line to Reading. And then on the Great Western main line to Acton and then from Acton finding a path across to Stratford. And then Stratford to Ipswich.

46:24

I hear what's been said it seems to it seems there seems to be a suggestion that there is there are paths

46:31

between Stratford and Ipswich. But there are there are constraints on movements from the southwest. And I don't know whether anybody has mentioned this, but the Great Western main line a little that the trains will run on the relief lines on the Great Western main line, the Great Western Main Line,

46:55

what we used to be called Crosswell, Cross Rail, but is now the Elizabeth line.

47:00

All things being equal will will open up next year. And I think that that's going to have an impact on capacity.

47:12

The

47:14

I just I just think that at this stage, we ought to be seeing from Network Rail from indicative some indicative train paths for all these movements. They're coming they're coming from.

47:26

They're coming from even mouth, they're coming from Shark Quarry in the Lake District. They're coming from Mountsorrel in Leicestershire. At this stage, I think we ought to be able to see some train pass. The other thing that I'm concerned about is I think,

47:45

to make this work,

47:48

the trains have got to be at Ipswich in the Ipswich area in good time to make the paths that are shown in the in the document between Ipswich and and less than or sighs well see. And I've asked, it's a simple question. Are there any proposals to have some holding arrangements for windows up to up to four 339 metre long trains? Where are they going to be held to work this service? So

48:23

I think i think that's that's that's the buy capacity issues. I, I think we also ought to ask for measure of the reliability of the rail movement. So you know, something, something that says, you know, there's a 90% probability of all three train paths per night being delivered

48:45

to you, but this is about a specific point about whether it's deliverable these four trains a day, I understand what you're saying. And I think we've already heard that there will be some more information coming in a deadline five.

49:00

So I think we will hopefully get nearer the answers that you seek.

49:05

At this stage, I'd like just an initial response from

49:09

the applicant in Network Rail. And perhaps if you have other concerns, beyond that, you will be able to put them yourself in to deadline five chance. All right.

49:20

Thank you. Can I can I just before I just before I finish, though.

49:25

It's a it's a question probably to Network Rail, about the two train parts, the initial to train paths to leisten. And it's about how how that will be safely operated between sizewell and laced and there's this idea of parking up two trains on the branch at least and I'd like some information about how they, how they think they will safely operate those two things. Thank you, Mr. Lovelock. Mr. Flanagan.

49:56

Thank you, sir. A number of issues raised there. That's as you say, from my

50:00

initial response sources and materials.

50:05

Mr. Lovell wants more information on that so that there is already information within the freight management strategy both on overall quantities and breakdown concrete, steel bitumen, etc. And there's also information in that freight management strategy. The reference reference benefit is as heightened to 801 sources, where these materials are coming from Somerset was mentioned by Mr. Lovelock. There are others. That is one areas where we will we intend to supplement that information at deadline five, as you said, so I think I might have said next week lax and I meant deadline five to 23rd of July. So I don't propose to say anything more on that, that sources of materials, train paths beyond the Suffolk line and Mr. Lovelock's concerns about capacity, going through act and and so forth. You've already heard from Mr. Ball and I think Network Rail on those wider parking issues. I don't propose to say more now. But in light of what's been said, I think we will aim to supplement that information at deadline five as well. And this

51:07

one of the issues raised I think, not Mr. Lovelock, but Mr. Before that was the issue of not compromising Felixstowe and said, discretised, I'm just going to ask Mr. Ball to say a few words about that, if he words, and perhaps at the same time, Mr. Vaughn could wrap up on our initial responses on Mr. Lovelock's other points, for instance, where will the long freight trains be held anything?

51:35

Thank you.

51:39

Hello, would you call on behalf of the applicant just happen to provide some additional information on that

51:45

topic again, this terrible feedback coming from wherever you are, is there other people who've got their microphones on or

51:54

there's an awful lot of background noise from wherever you are. I think I do apologise. I think we've corrected that this. Apologies.

52:03

Just to take those two points very briefly. The the point made on Felixstowe, we have done some modelling on this and

52:13

done some additional work with Network Rail. Our understanding is that Westfield junction where the fieldsets Felixstowe trains come on to the Suffolk line.

52:24

There are 11 potential paths to utilise. There. We understand obviously, Felixstowe has an aspiration to increase the number of services they have, but they have an existing constraint

52:37

due to the completion of infrastructure work at Ailey, and that isn't due to

52:44

be finalised until towards the end of Network Rail, CP seven, which is around about 2029. So our understanding and I think we have agreement in Network Rail on this is that there are paths available for the sizable trains to

52:59

go through Westfield junction without having any detrimental impact on the existing services from the port of Felixstowe.

53:09

The second point made by Mr. Lovelock is a good good question. And clearly, we have very, we will have very specific timings of train paths to go up the suffered line after the passenger services have been completed for each day. And those trains will need to be timed to match those parts. And clearly, if those trains are moving from considerable distance away, whether it be the West Country or the Northwest, we need to ensure that those trains hit those parts at the appropriate time. So as part of a prudent strategy, we would look to have appropriate holding points for those trains to ensure that they can be dispatched in a way to meet the times of those overnight paths. So we're having discussions for example with the with the porter heritage, that there's a rail link in there and that that could be a very good solution for us to hold those trains and then route them up the Suffolk line in an efficient way overnight. So I hope that's helpful, sir. Thank you.

54:18

Okay.

54:21

counsellor Robin Saunders. Please.

54:28

Can you hear me? Yes. Good morning, Mr. Sanders morning his two questions in relation to the timetabling environment. What Mr. Ball just raised actually, in report for our EP 405 which is the deadline for report. There are illustrative timetables in in tables 11.2 and table 11.4. The 11.2 on relates to the to two trains day movement

54:59

and that shows up

55:00

Are the train driving Saxmundham junction at 2200? And Robert westville 2355? If that is correct, that means that the last passenger train going down line towards Saxmundham is being axed. Is that correct? Secondly, with regard to table 11.4, which is the for train movement, that shows the first train going up line from Saxmundham freight train that is

55:27

going through literally within a minute or two of the last day in train passenger train from Ipswich. Does that mean therefore, that the intention is that that last down train from its rich will have to leave on time and will not has normally wait for any late arriving? Liverpool Street train?

55:51

Thank you, Councillor Sanders.

55:54

Can I hear from the applicant on those two specific issues please? Yes, thank you, sir. Again, Mr. Hall deal with them passenger train interaction.

56:07

And I wish you well on behalf of the applicant, just just to say categorically, there will be no impact on passenger services on the suffered line. So as a principle, we feel very strongly that that should be the case, we do not want to impact any passenger services at all.

56:22

With regards to the discussion about the timing of a trains on the Suffolk line overnight, we have undertaken the capacity analysis in conjunction with Network Rail that suggests that it is theoretically possible to actually have four trains up to the construction site and back out again overnight, it leaves very little contingency for

56:45

any delay

56:48

with regards to the passenger service, so as from

56:53

in order to be prudent, we think it's much more sensible to build some contingency into that, that timetable and only run seven of those services overnight, utilising the one existing freight path during the day to complete the four trains in and out movement. So I note the comment made about impacting the passenger services, there would be enough time from the completion of the last service out of size well,

57:24

and also emphasise or to not impact the train that was mentioned in terms of holding that passenger train service to to to to wait for the arrival of the liberal street service. So

57:36

that will be our position on that.

57:40

Thank you.

57:43

Could I just say Councillor Sanders could take your hand down possibly and Mr. Lovelock.

57:51

And could I hear from Josie bassinet, please?

57:56

Yes. Hi. Thank you very much on representing the Walberswick parish Council. I just had a couple of questions, if I may.

58:07

Girl. Okay. So I just wanted to ask, having listened this morning, and this has been the constant refrain of parish councils through all the consultations is what is going to be the impact on the local community on our access to roads and passenger rail. All this work is ongoing. Hello, could it Yes, Miss Mussina? I mean, at this particular point we're talking about specifically about the rail provision. So a question about that we will talk about the the other transport effects and roads etc at different parts of the agenda. But are we allowed to ask you about the impact that this rail provision is going to have on us locally because it's never been addressed? So level crossings and things how Where is that addressed? I think that the community impact issues are a subject of a different a different hearing.

59:05

This particular one is just about the transport networks and how they operate.

59:11

Okay. All right, so I'll hold those. Yeah.

59:16

Okay. So can I then ask, again, a specific question, which is related to the conversation that was just ongoing is why we are not hearing from Greater Anglia, which provides the passenger service on what impact

59:34

that current late running freight trains have on the services that we have. I would ask that the planning Inspectorate get this information directly from Greater Anglia, because again, we're hearing from the applicant And particularly, that in theory, this shouldn't be interrupting the services, but we can tell

1:00:00

from people who use this services now that it is not uncommon for, for example, the first train in the morning that goes down from Lowestoft to Ipswich and then on to Liverpool Street to be cancelled because of late running freight trains. And that's without these additional services and I think we're missing this part of the story for the planning Inspectorate. Thank you, Miss Pearson. Well, what we can do is ask the applicant now to respond about the involvement of Greater Anglia in the process.

1:00:35

So Mr. Flanagan, yes, I can just for I do pass for Miss Massenet's comfort and information if she's not aware already, on Friday's agenda under community community issues, there is an agenda item of the the impacts on the local community have the right strategy, so that might be relevant to her concerns on Greater Anglia. So can't speak for Greater Anglia. But I've been asked Mr. Paul, in scholarly information you can relay

1:01:07

Hello, which one on behalf of the applicant? I understand the point being raised. I mean, obviously, greater Angular is a key stakeholder and we engage with them on a regular basis. And I just to reiterate, our our aim is that no, no passenger services should be threatened at all by the running of freight services. I would just like to mention one other key point really. And it's an important one that the key sensitivity on on that stretchy line is the single track section of the Suffolk line, which is alumna half miles long, and it takes

1:01:42

a freight train one of our freight trains to take about 45 minutes to go across that along that single track. And that's the key risk to

1:01:52

any passenger service that would be running as well. The point I would like to make is that the proximity of that track is very, very close to our construction site. So it will be the end of the journey for incoming trains, which would be after the passenger services has been completed for the day and

1:02:14

the departing trains,

1:02:18

departing trains would

1:02:21

would be dispatched down the line. One in advance of the passage, the passive services that will be do due to run I think the important point is that if there is any today on site, the trains would be held. And the part of the path in the morning, the freight path, existing trade paths will be used to to allow any any train to move down the line. So the proximity of the construction site to the single track on the suffered line would give us a high degree of control to those trains to avoid any disruption to passenger services. If that's helpful. Thank you most of all.

1:03:01

Good. Could I hear from Paul Collins, please?

1:03:06

Yes, I think Paul Collins stop sighs we'll see the 1122. Seven nice, which parish council

1:03:14

it's back to this number of trains. And when they started the two train paths that want to go in early on in the early years, when they will start and what the impact is going to be on the roads, should those be delayed in any particular way. And obviously, that also travels on into when they want four trains in and out per day.

1:03:37

And I sort of it was it's interesting that

1:03:41

Mr. Ball just said that the seventh or the path during the day, which is currently a pattern, an old path that was used by size relay, and size, or size relay in particular, is that to help out if anything gets delayed, but I also understood he said, That's why that was there. They were going to do three out if you like and then the last one during that particular period. That is part of the plan. So it's either part of the plan or it's a contingency it can't be both. It's actually got to work properly. So I hope that the deadline five will give us more on on those details. But I am concerned that any disruption to those dates and timings is just going to come back to more hgvs on the road. Thank you Mr. Collins.

1:04:29

Can I hear from Richard Smith now please?

1:04:34

Good morning.

1:04:36

I'm the county Councillor for the Bing division, which covers Saxmundham saboten and other villages up to world was weakened blys bruh.

1:04:47

I'm also the county council cabinet member for transport strategy.

1:04:52

But I really want to concentrate on Saxmundham where I live and where I've lived for 29

1:05:00

Yours and more than that, I live within about 30 metres of the railway line. So you will understand that I'm concerned about nighttime movements. You mentioned earlier that noise will be looked at at a

future hearing. May I please ask that vibration of the effects of vibration are also looked at at that future meeting. But my question is not that

1:05:26

there will be pressure on the east Suffolk line for the from these extra freight movements. And why is it that we have never be able to persuade the applicant to put in a passing loop in the kempsey ash area that is a route near to wicker market station, because that would solve so many of the problems and alleviate the necessity to have so many trains coming through in at night, which will disturb all of the people who live along the East Suffolk line between Westfield and Saxmundham.

1:06:05

Thank you, Mr. Smith. I'll ask the applicant for a brief response to that.

1:06:12

Yes, thank you, sir. I'll ask Mr. Bull to give a brief response. If you did want a full response or Councillor Smith wanted a fuller response in the network rails statement of common ground there is quite a detailed explanation of the investigation of passing and passing leave and the issues that might arise. But perhaps Mr. Gould could just provide a brief response on that issue.

1:06:34

Yesterday, Richard Boyle on behalf the applicant.

1:06:38

And counsel Smith, we're aware that this proposal for passing leap was part of our proposed road rail lead strategy at three stage free consultation.

1:06:54

The points to be made to refer to the statement of common ground when Network Rail which does set out the reasons why this wasn't taken forward.

1:07:01

But the main reasons are that the passing loop itself doesn't deliver the the intervention required, the freight services would have to run at 40 miles an hour to ensure that they would dovetail effectively to the passenger services. And that triggered a level crossing intervention at 45 of the level crossings on the Suffolk line. So it'd be 33 upgrades and 12 closures. And having worked through these issues through consultation and working closely with Network Rail, as set out in the statement common ground. We didn't feel that that was a deliverable solution based on the timescales required for the project. So it wasn't taken forward.

1:07:42

Thank you, Mr. Both.

1:07:45

Right, I think that there's no other hands up. So in terms of rail, I'll now move on to that.

1:07:53

I have one question about marine provision.

1:07:59

That is in terms of when

1:08:04

what the use of the temporary BLF.

1:08:08

Originally that was specified as bulk materials only in the conveyor belt we'll be carrying it but on the site visit the accompanied site inspection and our visit to Hinkley Point we were told that the temporary jetty at Tingley point as it is,

1:08:26

would be used for delivery of some things like tunnel segments that I just want to clarify exactly the use of the temporary BLF proposed.

1:08:39

Could I hear from the applicant on that point, please?

1:08:43

Yes, on this issue, I'm going to hand over to Mr. JOHN Davis introducing for Mr. JOHN Davies, who did his site operations and logistics programme leads. And just in case it's useful in terms of terminology, temporary BLF, I think is the term that obviously you find in the some of the application documents, you may also see reference to MMBIF, which is marine bulk import facility, which is I think it's more technical term but has like a hand over to Mr. Davies to deal with the issue as to what it's been used for.

1:09:22

Good morning. Yes, your initial observation is absolutely right in respect of the temporary BLF or or mo Marion bulk import facility being used for bulk materials only. We will however, look at opportunities to identify or identify further opportunities to bring materials in by sea but the principal use is for bulk materials only. So, in therefore in the responses you've made to date about the capacity of it, it's just considered bulk materials using the conveyor belt, not other

1:09:59

items.

1:10:00

Free think of it that way. Correct? Correct.

1:10:04

Thank you.

1:10:07

That's Thank you very much.

1:10:10

I think I have I think Paul Collins has a question, I think on marine freight. Thank you, Mr. Davis. You can,

1:10:20

Mr. Collins. Yeah. Thank you. I have one short question too about marine deliveries. Is there anywhere where we get the proportion of AI ELLs and special deliveries that will be brought through the BLF, the permanent beach Landing Facility? And when will there start? And will any of those AI ELLs etc be actually required by road before the BLF and before the size will link road is in place and funnily enough, so.

1:10:54

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Collins. I will ask the applicant to respond to that question.

1:11:01

Yes, sir. on that aspect of

1:11:05

AOL moving by pg&e facility I think it's going to be is Kirsty Marlin, another member of the team transport planner at KMC. Planning limited start with a volatile transport works if I can hand over to custom Marlin please.

1:11:31

You see and hear me

1:11:34

it's got the same noise problems that Mr. ball has, I think

1:11:39

Jays

1:11:41

joy, right. We also are YT problems. And I can't actually see myself so I'm just checking that other people can see me. Yes, I can see and hear you. Okay, that's fine. Thank you. And so most amount Marlin and EDF technically done on transport acting on behalf of the applicant. And so with regard to the question, the question was about what would come by road and Okafor to the MC TMP? Which is the questions Could I just interrupt you, Miss McMillan? And the question was about how many AI ELLs would use a beach Landing Facility permanent beach Landing Facility? And would any of those come by road?

1:12:23

Close it. And so we've answered this in the questions to the exempt first examination questions. And in that the there is capacity for up to 400 kind of landings

1:12:41

over the over the course of the

1:12:44

of the construction period, which would equate to circa 600, abnormal loads, and it depends on how many we could get on each on each landing, and the seasonality constraints. So there were two types of, of abnormal loads, there's the permanent equipment that is needed to be brought in to serve the power station itself. And then there is the temporary construction equipment, cranes, excavators, etc, that would come in temporarily and be removed, temporary and then be removed again. So the the the beach Landing Facility has been designed to cater for the heaviest largest ones of those and the programme would be scheduled so that the based on the facilities in place ahead of the the need for those to come in. But there may still be a need for some deliveries of those kind of heavy deliveries by boat ahead of the beach and acidity and being in place. So at the moment, this there is some spare capacity within the beach family facility. But that the

1:13:54

the

1:13:56

would seek to reduce that where it was appropriate. And in order to take the the abnormal loads off the road.

1:14:04

Yeah, so I think what I guess what Mr. Collins wanted to hear was, Would any of the

1:14:14

larger abnormal AI ELLs use the B 1122.

1:14:21

In advance of the cyber link road being constructed, and potentially and so in terms of the in terms of the permanent equipment that's needed for the for the power station there'll be scheduled to be or that they're needed later in the project. Once the baseline facilities in place, there may be a need and this is where I've referred to the ctmp which is data from Hinkley set. There have been occasions where there have been some special order and CR one loads. They're the kind of the largest loads that and they're the temporary construction ones that that were needed to be brought in

1:15:00

by road.

1:15:03

And so we have,

1:15:05

we have assessed that situation. So we've looked at the Hinkley data, which is the best data we've got available. And and and we've assessed there being a potential need for some and be a small amount. If you look at table

1:15:21

3.1 of the ccmp, it gives you a breakdown of the abnormal loads coming in by road based on the Hinkley data. And so shows in terms of special order and field one, which are the largest loads, and they amounted to kind of one to 4%. So they're over there over five metres all of those base of five metres to table 3.2 sets out that it's 1.5. So nought to 2% of the total loads over the course of a year would be there. So there's a very small limited number that may need to be need to be moved by road either via the BLF in 2005, the size of a link

1:16:11

is is there somewhere where that early years scenario before the size where link code is it set out somewhere where the number of AI ELLs, how many there would be on the B 1122. So that the best kind of proxy for that we are using is the 2017 data from from Hinkley. And so I refer to table 3.1 and 3.2. As the ccmp. I just want to carry out that we're having kind of detailed discussions with the with Suffolk Constabulary at the moment about abnormal loads and the management on the road. And then then in the next version of ctmp, there will be some minor changes to those tables based on the kind of interrogation of the Hinkley data. But effectively, the conclusion stayed the same, that there would be a kind of very small number of special donvale one lies when zeta chain to be needed to be moved ahead of the head of the size one being, quote being operational, and that those would be escorted by the police. So the other thing to point out in terms of the discussions for having this Suffolk Constabulary is the police escort requirement, both before the size onelink, quaden tivos bypass of operational and once they've been placed as well. And so normally, and the police would not based on their current guidance, there's effectively no legal obligation for police to escort an abnormal load. Their current guidance says that they wouldn't, they don't normally escort abnormal loads under five metres in width. And what where we are seeking to create a matrix that would be included within the next version of the ctmp. That looks at kind of police escort requirements and recognising the constraints of the B 1122. In terms of abnormal leg movements, whereby you will see the vast majority of those movements, ie anything over from 2.9 metres wide being escorted by the police. So there will be heavy management on either place and by the applicant of Apple amazed by raid. Thank you. I think we definitely stray down the agenda a bit now about how we're going to manage AI ELLs on roads. But I mean, thank you. I mean, I think in terms of I think Mr. Collins's original question was about how many

1:18:42

I mean, it would be useful to have quantified at some point, the number of AI ELLs on the B 1122. In what we know is the early years. I know you're saying it's a comparator in a table about Hinkley Point but I'm not sure it's as specific as the question just asked. It could be set out for us that would be really helpful. That's fine. We can take that away as an action to provide a note on kind of pre and post an

SLR in terms of AP normalised by write and write down if that. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Can I hear from Michael Bedford please?

1:19:24

Thank you, sir. Like Bedford Suffolk County Council.

1:19:28

Two

1:19:29

points. Going back to what you were saying about the beach landing facilities, which is a thing where we have started before we jumped into AI ELLs.

1:19:41

Obviously you will see in a game we raised in our Rep. Three or 84 comments on applicant responses that we were seeking some more information in relation to the utilisation of both the temporary and the permanent beach landings.

1:20:00

solidity is essentially laws we understand, in a sense, the conservative assumptions that have been used in the assessment thus far. And we can understand the reasons why some of those assumptions are conservative, particularly where they're weather dependent or tidal dependent. We are anxious to see that the facilities are maximised in terms of their utilisation. And we don't understand as it were, why they should be any other way, in principle, objection to

1:20:30

binding into the particularly the

1:20:35

freight management strategy, and then its subordinate documents, a commitment to maximise wherever it is possible to do so the use of those facilities when they have been provided. So that's as it were a general point. The second point I just wanted to raise if this is the appropriate point to do it.

1:20:55

Miss Mullen did then provide quite a lot of detail about the Ai L. implications. I know that Mr. Mary from the county council will want to comment on that matter. Either I can bring him in, in now, whilst that is fresh, or we can leave it until it actually arises on your agenda, which I know is later on. I mean, yeah.

1:21:19

I think I'd rather leave it till it arises in the agenda a bit later on. If it's that.

1:21:24

That's fine. I just wanted I didn't want to miss the boat, if that's the right phrase. No, no, no, no. That was that was probably my fault for straying into the road. I'll preserve the back of a question about the

beach Landing Facility. I'm concerned. Well, we'll park that for the moment. Thank you, sir. Okay, thank you. Can I hear from the applicant? dawn? Mr. Bedford? First point, please. Yes. on this issue of has been raised in writing, as Mr. Bedford says, on maximising the marine form of transport, I'm gonna ask two people if they made a contribution on this the first one you haven't heard from yet? Sarah Williamson, sighs we'll see civil programme director who I think can provide a high level, more high level answer on the work that's been done, the significant level of work has been done to

1:22:11

maximise sustainable modes of transport in the modal split. And then perhaps, if Mr. Oliver could perhaps provide a bit more detail on why the suggestion that we're doing anything other than using the maximum reasonable capacity at the moment is misconceived. So firstly, Miss Williams and then Mr. Oliver, please.

1:22:52

Good afternoon. I'm Sarah Williams, and on behalf of the applicant, just responding to the question on maximising the use of the beach London facility.

1:23:02

However, the numbers are interpreted that is, in fact, what we've been working to do as a team. So if I go back a little bit to the work that started probably in March or April of this year, when we started to look at minimising Our objective is basically to minimise road transport of materials to the project. And the options that we've got for that are to utilise rail or sea import the rail important and we've discussed at some length and from a construction and delivery perspective, we will actually maximising real import

1:23:39

for the materials that James is described and are going through in a little bit more detail. And then when it comes to the C import of aggregates, we take in a lot of our learning from HPC, you referred to the OS module referred to the jetty there earlier, and what we discovered with our experience, there was the theoretical the theoretical capacity was not achieved for a number of reasons, being the sea conditions are the actual ability to achieve the theoretical discharge rates. So the 50% capacity that you see is actually 50% of the theoretical capacity, we believe it's more likely to be close to the practical actual capacity of the of the bulk import facility. There are a couple of other factors also that come into play in our planning.

1:24:29

The the rail, we can use 100% of the year the road we can use 100% of the year the the bulk import facility we limited it's seasonal. And although it seems like a fairly commodity activity, we do have quite a lot of work to do to plan stock levels on the site. So anyone who went to visit Hinkley has probably heard about the aggregate management and the amount of material that we need to have in storage 14 days worth at any one time and we know the team they're not certain do have issues

1:25:00

Because of the heavy reliance on the jetty so in terms of a James can talk in a minute if if we require in more detail about the materials but in terms of a commitment, you're we're really clear that we commit

into minimise the amount of materials coming by road. But we do need to get this thing operational to confirm that what we've written down is actually achievable.

1:25:49

Should be having problems for the applicants and here.

1:25:57

Mr. Oliver. Yes, hopefully that's, that's okay. Now.

1:26:02

Yes, thank you. I think as Mr. Bedford alluded to the the weather and the title constraints of the bulk of the main bulk import facility do give us concerns as Mrs. Williamson said, that the two predominant material types that will be imported father, rail and the marine are concrete aggregates, which are required consistently and constantly throughout the project lifecycle, the needs to be able to import a steady supply of those materials throughout, not just within the marine campaign season is critical to the delivery. And therefore the rail focuses on predominately on the imports of those concrete aggregates.

1:26:40

There is a residual capacity that is then used to supplement marine imports, the marine import has to be considered against the stock levels, as mentioned earlier, that the marine provides a very high volume of input over a relatively short period.

1:26:58

And that would supply materials at a much greater level than we actually would need to consume on site. And therefore, we've had to look at balancing the ability to stockpile material on site whilst maintaining our commitments within the parameter plan heights and the levels of stockpile within the site. If we were to increase our marine import, much more, that would give us a requirement to hold greater material on site and therefore potentially exceed the commitments within the material, the procurement and the parameter plan height. And it's a balance between the rail therefore and the marine to make sure that we manage those aspects, and are able to control the site logistics and supply into the project. Thank you, Mr. lebryk. Thank you one simple question about tunnel segments. If the tunnel segments come in, by see what what what is the mode of travel, it's that replaces? How would it How would it be brought in if it wasn't by See? Summer? tingri? Yes. So at the moment, our assessment assumes that the tail segments are bought in by road as the most onerous condition and that's what is incorporated in, in the revised plate 4.2 of the HTV profile in the freight management strategy. The ability to potentially divert those away from roads to other means that obviously improve the HTV profile by reducing that, but because I think we've mentioned at the moment that they, the procurement and manufacturing facility location of that will depend and impact the means of transport to the project. Thank you, Mr. Oliver.

1:28:37

I see a hand up from Andy Smith. So just before I'm sorry, sorry, Mr. Barney and carry on.

1:28:43

So just before you move on, there was one point Mr. Bear for grades that wasn't really covered. Williamson or Mr. Oliver, perhaps it's easy to buy, if I deal with it. a suggestion I think from the county that why can't we have some commitment binding, I think suggested commitment to maximising the use of the beach Landing Facility marine works of that sort. So we don't see that as justified that sort of intrusion into the operational flexibility of the project is not justified. We you heard quite a bit on it yesterday. And so in terms of imposing controls, I think it applies here as well. We have controls in the DCA to control against harm HDV limits being a principal exam relevant example, in this case, if further controls are to be imposed, they would need to pass the tests. And therefore it needs to be asked whether this suggestion of a binding commitment to maximise a particular form of transport passes those tests. And we say it doesn't and indeed, it could be positive. It does two things. It removes the flexibility of the rail and marine flexibility and the resilience that provides for such a complex project and it also

1:30:00

cuts down on procurement options on the basis that procurement options may depend may be dependent on rail and marine. And for those reasons we don't consider that that intrusion almost micromanagement, I think is what's going on into the project is justified. And we say that the controls that have been imposed is the right framework as Mr. Rose put it yesterday.

1:30:22

Thank you, Mr. Flanagan. I think the controls that we'd like to talk in great idea to detail about tomorrow. So I think we'll leave that for for the moment. Mr. Smith.

1:30:33

Thank you, sir. Yes.

1:30:36

interesting discussion the past through two or three points all about in quote, maximising the BLF there was, of course, an absolutely fundamental as opposed to an incremental change of seeing there with EDS changes that we first hollow in December 20. When the BLF went from 100 metres or something to 400 metres or something, and into a water of significant depth six metres, I'm

1:31:02

pretty sure town council did suggest tentatively in our first response to PDF and then in more and more detail culminating in our written representation, there has been no consideration given that you have a jetty extending into

1:31:16

significant depth of water, could there not be a significant proportion of

1:31:23

other the many, many classes of other goods from rode by containerization to the jetty?

1:31:31

That would be a big change. But of course, it only became a question to ask, When the jetty extended from 100 metres to four, that we have made that submission. I've not heard that mentioned by anybody.

1:31:44

It is quite a significant one in terms of change of ways of working, but could be massively significant in change of road traffic. I wonder whether the EDF have given any significant consideration to that. And all whether use the examination authority may be inclined to ask them to do just that, given the potential huge benefits in reduction of road traffic. And, of course, the tremendous logistical infrastructure that exists in and around these to England and Australia Katrina, in particular in support of the port.

1:32:20

You know, it's a very, very efficient industry and container handling. Why not to the jetty, we did suggest you know that, you know, we covered in our top in our topic, the obvious questions about weather and number of vessels, and so on and so forth. We do think that is, in principle feasible. Is anybody going to look at it seriously, or is it to be ignored? Thank you, Mr. Smith. Just before I get the applicant to respond to that, I'm aware of the time and the need to have a break soon.

1:32:50

Can I hear from Mr. Collins, so the applicant can respond to both these points, potentially.

1:32:58

Mr. Collins?

1:33:00

Yes. Thanks very much. Again, from stop signs we'll see the 1122. Seven nice, which parish council

1:33:08

the the fact that the temporary beach Landing Facility is going to be used for aggregate. When this was actually first proposed. They also noted that we have some additional stockpiles that have been added into the site plan. But at the moment, admittedly, at the moment, they're at perhaps a lower level than the original stockpiles, which go up to I think, 35 metres. I think the the height of the new ones were something like 25 or something below. But I presume that's because they intend to bring in so much dark material during the summer months when this campaign is going on. And that they will over over stuff, if you like beyond the 14 days, presumably that the previous one on the previous EDF speakers was talking about? And I just wonder if you know that, if is that then factored into the fact that it takes longer to then deplete those stocks? On the other hand, does it also mean that they might actually raise the limits on those if they have a particularly successful campaign, and therefore end up with the farmer materials on site and change some of the parameters that are currently set?

1:34:21

Thank you, Mr. Collins. Right, just for here for the applicant. Mr. Smith, could you turn the camera off and take your hand down and say

1:34:30

thank you. So could the applicant respond to those two things, please?

1:34:36

Yes, thank you, Mr. Save is to John Davies is going to respond. Firstly, on the containerization issue and then Mr. Oliver will respond on the stop position. So firstly, Mr. Davies, please.

1:34:54

Yeah, thank you.

1:34:56

As Mr. Smith points out, I believe that there was some QA

1:35:00

communication between the project and himself back in January this year in respect of the containerization option. So, this has been considered

1:35:10

as we as I said earlier, the primary purpose for the marine bulk import facility is to receive bulk materials.

1:35:20

And the type of structure that would be required to receive container goods would need to be

1:35:28

considerably more robust than that structure. And I think the project has reviewed the ability to build a more significant structure in the sea before and that's been ruled out on environmental grounds.

1:35:44

Alongside that, I think the the other important points are that the the nature of the goods that that remain

1:35:53

are not bulking in, in quantity, or characteristics, and therefore the ability to

1:36:01

do so they don't particularly suit containers, containers. containerization sorry.

1:36:08

And I think the other point worth mentioning is that that's actually our preference would be to try and avoid Felixstowe. Felixstowe is a you know, the UK is largest intermodal port, and actually, any operation we would have to conduct there would be insignificant in comparison.

1:36:26

And, and we we would prefer to be

1:36:30

not impacted by having an operation down down at Felixstowe port. So, you know, containerization and consolidation are very valid points. But our preference is to, and the nature of the goods means that that's

1:36:48

not particularly deliverable in this particular context.

1:36:53

Thank you, Mr. Davis.

1:37:01

And just picking up the specific issue that Mr. Collins raised on stockpiles, you are correct to state that the arrangement of stockpiles has developed since the initial proposals. And we've done a lot of work to look at reusing as much of the site one materials as we possibly can. And that has required segregation of certain tools for reuse and non reuse or lower quality reuse. Therefore, whereas Originally, we had a quite a large area dedicated to stockpile handling and holding of a single material currency. And that generated a very high stockpile by segregating that into two different stockpiles of high grade reuse the material and a lower grade reusing material that the plan areas have reduced. And that has what's that's that's impacted the heights that can be

1:37:52

achieved in those stockpiles. The that is just a snapshot in time. And obviously, throughout the project, the two proportions of the grades of material do fluctuate. And we will potentially still encroach up to the set limits and think 35 metres was mentioned. And that is correct. However, that will be a relatively short period on the project, at peak a peak time when we have a certain material stockpile. And as we reuse that material as backfill, obviously, that those stockpiles will be depleted in in lieu of other materials.

1:38:34

I mean, Mr. Collins made a point about whether or not during the summer campaign on a beach Landing Facility, you would actually be increasing the stockpile is that, you know, if you feel you need to get as much as possible in the summer campaign, is that likely to lead to an increase in the stockpile heights? Is that

1:38:55

possible? So the assessments we've done are based on the interior demand demand profiles from the programme, and that provides us a buffer of a sufficient

1:39:07

quantity of material on site at all times. For the express purpose of seeing through any disruption in any of our material imports, we are looking to import as much as we can during the marine campaign, up to

the limit that we have within our stockpile capacities. The split between rail and marine is what gives us the flexibility to have a replenish the stock piles to their university to their maximum during the summer period. Draw down from those throughout the year and keep a gradual restocking Via Rail throughout the year years period. So the assessment looks at balancing those material imports to ensure that we have the required quantity material on site at all times with a buffer.

1:39:55

Thank you Mr. Oliver, right. So I'm aware at a time at

1:40:00

I see Mr. Collins, your hands has gone up again. Could I ask is this a separate question or no, no, it was actually following up on

1:40:08

on that point. And I, I'm well aware that the Ddf are learning from Hinkley Point. And one of the things that sort of crossed my mind was the fact that they had to increase their stockpiles and boil heaps from 35 metres to 45 metres in the recent past, an actual an actual fact it does sound like they do intend to increase their amount of materials or usable materials, whatever you want to say, high grade usable materials beyond the 14 days that was previously referred to so that the whole issue about how high these stockpiles are going to get seems to be variable. Okay, thank you, Mr. Collins. Mr. Oliver, do you want to respond to that briefly before it, if I can? Certainly, yeah, the mention of the 14 days of stockpile material that was specifically for concrete aggregates and the production of concrete details for the main plant, the stockpiles, the open stockpiles are for backfill material so that the two are separate commodities that will be used sort of individually throughout the programme, so that they will be dealt with separately.

1:41:18

Thank you, Mr. Oliver.

1:41:20

Okay, the time is now 11. Oh, sorry, Mr. Flanagan. Do you want to make a point?

1:41:26

Only only, of course, that the

1:41:29

stockpiles are also governed by the parameter plans as well. So there's that obvious control in that respect?

1:41:36

Thank you, Mr. Flanagan.

1:41:38

Okay, if there's no other contribution, the time is 1141. So we'll adjourn for a break and we'll resume at 1156.

1:41:49

Thanks. Thank you.