

TEXT_SizewellC_ISH3_Session1_08072021

Thu, 7/8 12:01PM • 1:42:46

00:04

Good morning everyone. Welcome out time for me. Issues specific hearing being held in connection with an application made by an NB generation company SNC limited.

00:17

An order for development

00:18

consent duction and operation payments. Before I go further, everyone here my camera is Mr. Humphrey, I can't hear you very well. My apologies for a bad start forgot my headset. Yeah, I can confirm I can see in here. Thank you. Can I also confirm that with a case team the recording and a live stream of this event has commenced? Yes, both have started.

00:53

For those people watching your live stream, 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 the restarted live stream. I'll remind you again of this should we need to adjourn. Now let me introduce myself and my colleagues. My name is Neil Humphrey. I've 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 Moreland will now introduce themselves, starting with Wendy mokai.

01:35

Good morning, everyone. I'm Wendy in the chi and the Bachelor of law nonpracticing sister. I'm examine inspector and lead member of the panel. I'll now pass on to Mr. Brock.

01:51

Good morning, everybody. My name is David Brock. I to gain law degree once upon a time, and I also am a member of the examining what's Alrighty, I'll pass on to Mr. maund.

02:09

Good morning, everyone. My name is Edwin monde, I'm a chartered town planner. And I too have been appointed to be a member of the panel and are passed on to Mrs. Cassini.

02:23

Thank you. Good morning. My name is Helen Cassini. I'm a chartered town planner and I also have been appointed as a member of the panel. On that I'll hand back to Mr. Humphrey.

02:35

Thank you, Mr. Cassini. We are assisted at this hearing by the planning spectra case team. Do we have the planning inspector a deputy case manager such Sean Evans the other colleagues from the planning inspector to assist us today are Georgiana Hannigan and Jake Stevens. If you have any questions or queries about the examination or the technology we are using for virtual events, they should be our first point of contact. their contact details can be found at the top of any letter you received from us or on the project page of the national infrastructure planning website. Before I get onto 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.

03:21

As I explained in the examining authorities will 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 clauses. 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 blue light letter includes a link to the planning Inspectorate to 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 written form which can be redacted before being published. If you prefer not to have your image recorded, you can switch your camera off. I 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 out of fairness for all participants. Can it also remind everyone to wait until invited by the panel member to appear on screen or respond to a question or point made during a physical hearing we'd normally have breaks to avoid fatigue and we will do the same in this virtual hearing. Our intention is to take a 15 minute break at about 90 minute intervals as a longer break over the lunch time period are now hand over to Mr Marlin to outline the purpose and conduct of this issue specific hearing

05:00

Again, everyone. Issue specific hearing provides an opportunity for the issues raised by interested parties, and in particular differences between them to be explored further by the examining authority. The purpose of an issue specific hearing is set out in Section 191 of the Planning Act 2008. It is held if the examining authority decides it is necessary for the examination to hear oral representations to enable adequate examination of the issue, or to ensure that an interested party has a fair chance to put their case. As indicated in the agenda, questioning and hearing at the hearing will be led by a member of the panel supported by other panel members. That is for the zoning 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. Our aim is to use our powers of control over the conduct of hearings to ensure that they are carried out as efficiently as possible. Whilst remaining fair to all parties and thorough in our examination of evidence. We have identified the matters to be considered at this issue

specific hearing, and those on which we require further information. And these are set out in the agenda published in advance of this hearing. participants should know that written summaries of your oral submissions to this hearing should be provided to the planning Inspectorate by deadline five, which is Friday the 23rd of July 2021. 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 are not all remaining on screen throughout that we wish to minimise the demand on the IT systems to ensure the best quality of audio and video for participants. Now hand back to my colleague Mr. Humphrey, we will continue with the introductory matters.

07:05

Thank you Mr. Moreland. I'll now ask the applicant followed by IPS are named as invitees on the detailed agenda to introduce themselves. Can I start with the applicant, please? Yes, good morning, sir.

07:23

My name is here Flanagan. I'm a barrister instructors on behalf of the applicant and I'll be speaking on behalf of the applicant today. And like yesterday, I have with me a number of professionals. You I don't propose to go through now but I'll introduce them as in when matters arise relevant to their roles.

07:39

Thank you, Mr. Flanagan. Could I now go to Suffolk County Council please?

07:47

Good morning, sir. My name is Michael Bedford Queen's counsel. I'm instructed by sharp Pritchard. I'm acting for Suffolk County Council. I will be presenting matters today with the assistance primarily of Mr. Steve Mary, the transport policy and Development Manager at Suffolk County Council.

08:03

Thank you Mr. Bedford. Can I go to East Suffolk council now please?

08:10

Thank you, sir. Andrew Tate QC for East Suffolk Council. I will be the principal speaker because Suffolk County Council as before will be generally leading for us on transport matters.

08:23

Thank you, Mr. Tate. Could I now go to the highways agency please? highways England sorry.

08:30

Good morning. My name is Gary Cooper spatial planning manager at a quite rightly highways England. I'm also supported today with Chris Dawson propolis who is a route manager for Suffolk area.

08:43

Thank you, Mr. Cooper. Could I finally go to the police please?

08:51

Good morning, sir. My name is Ben Stansfield. I'm a solicitor at going wlg I'm joined by detective Chief Superintendent Cutler from the Constabulary, and on matters of technical detail by Mr. Adrian Neve, Director of transport at stantec.

09:07

Thank you very much. I also note there are other people attending today who have requested to speak at this hearing, but are not on a list of invitees set out a detailed agenda. They 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? I hope you haven't had a chance to read the detailed agenda for today's meeting. During the meeting today I have a number of technical questions for the applicant and the other invited parties. I'm also aware there are a number of interested parties who may wish to speak on some agenda items. Once I finish my direct questioning on the agenda item, I will ask if interested parties at that point would like to make any submission relating to the agenda item before moving on to the next agenda item 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. I understand that maybe 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 on the 23rd of July 2021. Thank you in advance for your cooperation but his approach in terms of the documents I'll be making reference to today, these are the following that are wrapped to dash 100 yet, which is a responses to the first written questions, read the fall four dash 005 which is a consolidated TA, rep two dash 054 which is a construction traffic management plan. Rep two dash 055 which is construction worker travel plan, rep two dash 053 which is traffic Incident Management Plan. Rep two dash 004 which is the implementation plan, rep three dash zero to four which is a deed of obligation, an app dash 198 which is chapter 10, the ies to assist participants, I will where possible refer to the relevant paragraph page numbers where they are available as we go along. The issues relating to noise, air quality and vibration we recognise are important topics that they may have suggested that these may form part of the discussion on Friday at is h four. This will not be the case is h four will focus on a wider community and socio economic impacts of the proposal. We acknowledge there are a number of concerns about these issues. And that discussions are ongoing between the applicant and the relevant authorities. We have reserved dates for hearings in both August and September. And we will decide near the time whether these matters will form part of those hearings. Having said that will now open the agenda now I did deal with what was yesterday's agenda item four, which is agenda item two on today's I think we completed that yesterday. So I will move on to what on today's agenda is agenda item three, which is monitoring and control mechanisms for traffic and transport. And I'd like to start with a discussion about the early years. Firstly, I note the early years is a modelling scenario for both the transport assessment and chapter 10 of the ies could the applicant explain to me where this term is defined and controlled in the context of the DCM.

12:51

Thank you. So yes, we can introduce Mr. Mullen yesterday to address the question of the definition control of the early years modelling scenario.

13:03

Thank you. Morning, sir. Morning person on behalf of the applicant. So in terms of the early years, and it's defined in two separate documents, and so, if you go to the ctmp and the paragraph 4.4 point six and it has a trigger in there in terms of the the early years so the maximum daily limits of HTV movements from the wider network to and from the main development site will be as follows Monday to Friday during the early years, unless they unless and until the size will link rate and tubers bypass are available for use no more than 602 way HTV movements per day. And during the remainder of the construction phase no more than 700 to HTV movements per day. So from a HGV perspective, the earliest is defined is the period of time prior to the delivery of the site or link road and the teenage bypass and kept the HTV limits to 600 PCBs per day. At that time, in the in the construction workforce travel plan. It's defined as based on the based on the mode share targets. And so if you go to paragraph 3.4 point eight the early years Moshe targets are based on the early years transport strategy prior to the northern or southern Park and Ride facilities being operational, once the northern or southern part of my facilities become operational, the pink construction motor targets would apply. And therefore, it's safe in terms of the workforce and the the trigger or we have a commitment to, to monitor or getting so commitment to achieve the most shared targets set out in table 3.1. And that commitment changes from the early years to the peak construction once either of the northern or southern parking facilities are available.

15:43

Thank you just taking up first one about hgvs. Does it specifically mentioned in that target about the completion of the size while link road? Or is it? Is that the trigger point?

15:56

Yeah, so it's the sidebar link code. So in the first point, it says, join the IDS unless and until the size one link read into those bypass I'm available for use, they need to be available for use in order to go beyond that 600 daily threshold.

16:14

Okay, and the other one in the construction worker travel plan is relating to mood share targets. So it's directly related to number of vehicles, you could have any number of vehicles, as long as it's within the mood share targets, not direct.

16:30

And the commitment is to achieve the most airtight. That's That's correct. But the commitment is to achieve the motor targets. And it therefore takes you back to the implementation plans. If you look at the table 3.1 for example, we cannot we cannot achieve these Moshe targets without the infrastructure. And the purpose of the infrastructure is to manage the the trips to site, we have limits on parking spaces. And there's a setup elsewhere within the ctmp. And so there's a there's a cap, I suppose on number of parking spaces. And in addition, there's the requirement that there's the link with the implementation plan, that if we, if we don't have the infrastructure available that we've set out to deliver, then we won't be able to meet the commitment of the motor targets. And and the going forward from that the TRG has the ability to impose or to require the applicant to fund remedial measures in order to meet these targets. So it's a very strong commit the targets have a very strong commitment at the at the walk and cycle is a third of nearly a third of the of the workers are when we get to pay construction.

So as soon as the northern or southern parking mode available, our target then is to aim to achieve a high walk and cycle mode. Now there's walk and cycle improvements being proposed, by the way 19 diversion and also the delivery of the campus in order to achieve that motor target. The same applies for the park and ride, that there's a third of the workers in table 3.1 would be travelling by park and ride without the parking facilities. Obviously we can't achieve that commitment. So it's kind of a cyclical process.

18:37

Understand that completely. But in terms of the early in terms of what actually your assessments of impact in yes are based on our vehicles on the highway not mode share targets. So it comes back to how does the necessarily the mode share targets relate to control over vehicle numbers, which is a thing that he s and a TA have assessed.

19:02

I understand that but it then goes back to the need to control them and the tests and the planning policies. So if you look at in terms of paragraph 4.1 point eight, it clearly sets out what the tests are for controls. And so what we have sought to do is to control and provide controls where we consider there to be them to be necessary in order to protect from unnecessary, unnecessary also on unacceptable impacts. And when it comes to kind of cars now TVs, we're not seeking to have a hard cap on those in terms of if you go above the we're not we're not controlling the assessment per se. So we are we're saying that yes, we've done an assessment it's based on and we've set out the evidence that it's based on and and that we consider it to be reasonably robust But we're not saying that there may not be instances where there may be slightly more or less cars going in and out of those car parks. And and so then therefore, that the test is what would the would that result in an unacceptable impact? Sorry. Mr. Flanagan, do you want to add something here? Yeah. So

20:30

yeah. So just ask some volunteer, new Turkish. Thank you. Yes. If I, if I may, on this, this question of, of whether the controls controls everything that's been assessed. Opposition is this that I think it's quite clear and important position that neither law or policy requires the imposition of controls or monitoring on a project simply to ensure that your project conforms with the outputs of the assessments undertaken at the application stage, then an assessment, whether it's a transport assessment, or an environmental assessment, doesn't really say really doesn't should not translate into controls in that way. Then rather, as Martin says, the proper testing approach to imposition of controls or obligations is that contained in Paris 4.1 point seven and 4.1 point eight of the MPs and that means you have to ask not whether something's been assessed, but whether the control is necessary to make the development acceptable, implying terms controls, calls may be necessary to avoid harm, that that justification must be identified. And it's not enough to simply say, well, you assessed this cause, therefore, ergo, you must be capped at that number of cars. And there's, that is an approach which is correct, universally, we stay. But it's particularly important in this context, because the nature of the project, there is significant complexity and scale of it is that any such additional controls like that would already come on top of the significant challenges presented by the delivery of this very large and complex infrastructure project. And it's a project for which it's clearly established, there is an urgent need, and it's of national significance. So that concept further weighs heavily, we say against controls

other than those that can be robustly justified. And of course, the government has a general principle of not imposing unnecessary burdens on developers. And we say that applies with particular force in this context, so that's a position if assessment doesn't automatically translate to controls, and also you've got to particular regard to the context we see here.

22:50

Okay, well, before I come back on views of Suffolk County Council first,

23:03

sir, thank you, Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So this is a matter of significant concern to the county council. So as you will note, obviously, your bullet point. For agenda item three, first entry refers to the early years controls in the decio. The short point is there are no early years controls in the DTO. The only controls arise through these subordinate documents, which themselves are only secured through the deed of obligation. And therefore, it is absolutely critical, that there is clear definition and that the controls are effective. But that's our obviously overarching point. On the specific specifics, there is a general need to ensure that that which is consented falls within the scope of that which has been assessed in order that you can meet the requirements of the EIA regulations in relation to EIA matters. Obviously, I don't comment in this transport section on other regulatory requirements such as habitat regulations requirement, because that's a separate matter. And whilst certainly matters, which are not material, don't need them to be the subject of control. matters which are material do need to be the subject to control and so we are very much focused on the effectiveness of the controls that the applicant is putting forward. And we don't think at the moment that the present package of controls is adequate to adequately assess and regulate either the early years or in

25:01

Thank you, Mr. Bedford. And could I potentially hear the highways agencies view on this point as well? Please? We both leverage crystals.

25:26

Let me introduce myself. My name is Chris has gone up loose. I'm the manager for self org, we have we have engaged with the applicant, we have reviewed their incident management plans, the worker travel plan everything that is relevant with with their use of the strategic road network. We are in discussions regarding their controls. We are of the opinion that that the controls that are under discussion are adequate. However, we need more information as of yet. We're of the opinion that the management plans are incomplete. More details will need to be provided in order for us to have the confidence that the applicant will manage incidents of their traffic on the SRN appropriately.

26:26

Thank you. If I could return to Mr. Flanagan. Mr. Flanagan, having thought having heard those representations and thought about what you've said, to me that I can't quite see is how mood chair targets translates to effective control of vehicles. Now, the reason that's important is this, that I understand in the transport assessment, you've done all the transport modelling to make predictions of traffic flows in the early years and the early years is particularly important in my view, because it implications for the B 1122. Those numbers have been used to inform the assessment in the

environmental statement. So the environmental statement is based on those numbers. It's not based on mood shares that hasn't been done that way around. So if it exceeds, and it could exceed, and I'm not, I don't want to get into debate about how it might concede. But if any of your mitigation is delayed, or not delivered on time, potentially, the traffic numbers on a B one, one to two, can be much higher than those outside what was assessed in the EAS. Now, I think that's a legitimate form of control for us to consider.

27:45

So yeah, so responding to that in responding to Mr. Bedford, and the highways agency as well. So that in terms of whether something will exceed what's been assessed it, the proper test is it condition in possession of controls is whether the control is necessary. And in respect of, for instance, the HGV movements, there's no dispute that a control is necessary there because of the particular impacts created by HCV movements and the sensitivity of some of the routes, including the B 1122. It doesn't follow however, we say that that means that every vehicle movement assessed in the US must be controlled. In the same way, that's not the standard approach at all, you might be able to come in on this developments all over the country, and indeed just down the road at brightwell Lakes 2000 homes also plus significant amounts of employment space, create generating 1000s of car trips and so forth, no such caps imposed at all, of course, the TA would have assessed great numbers of car movements from that developments, all such developments, but it doesn't translate to a control like that. So So this response to Mr. Bedford as well, in terms of imposing controls, and how that relates to an assessment and environmental assessment, which you referred to, to two points, you control the parameters. And therefore you have parameter plans, and you control unacceptable effects. And that's what we say the HTV caps do. In this case. Mr. Bedford then went on to say well, respected words matters which are material need to be the subject of control matters which are material that is most certainly not with respect the test. There may be very many material matters, but MBs is carefully drafted 4.174 point 1.8 to say that what you control you control where it's necessary to do so that is not a materiality test that's obviously relevant to planning acceptability and harm. And that also in my submission, so it goes to your point about whether you need to control everything in the US and any material difference from the needs to be controlled. So it doesn't happen. Not so we say what you control are the parameters, and then you control the unacceptable effects. said, that's the position. And I've got one one further point of if I made my to be able to make it now, I talked about obviously the urgency of the project and the concept and the importance of not over controlling in that respect. I mean, it's important to think about the consequences of imposing controls to limit limits a project to precisely what's been assessed in that way. It would require essentially the applicant to come back to seek a change to the consented development, if there were to be any departure, potentially, as Mr. Potentially quite a minor departure from what's been assessed, even if it's not causing unacceptable harm. That's not the position we should set we say is right. And there are good reasons for that, given the delay to an urgent projects that a developer would like size, or ck would have to either stop the project, or seeking change, or more likely stop the project while seeking a change or alter the project in due course. And that's not right. It doesn't accord with the urgency. Projects need flexibility. The DCA provides a framework to control the project. But there's flexibility within that. But that's the position. I was wondering if I could come invite on this important topic two peoples come in. And Firstly, Mr. Rhodes, and secondly, Miss Malone to perhaps flesh out the points about bright Well, next, this interest you might have to make

31:40

a point to make but if you haven't assessed the unacceptable effects, how do you then say there is no harm?

31:49

So we have assess the effects that the environments

31:53

but I think my point was, if you're the Moshe, I cannot see how mood share actually relates to control the vehicle numbers and a B 1122. You're talking about how do you know what the harm is in the early years on that road if you haven't assessed those effects?

32:11

Thank you. On that point, can I invite Mr. Mr. Rhodes, perhaps to come in on that? And then I can come back if there's anything

32:19

but doesn't necessarily want to hear about transport system? I don't think that's necessarily relevant to this discussion, because I understand how transport assessments are done. What is unusual in this particular one is this this early year scenario with it with no trigger apart from the mood shared target, that's in my mind, something I've not come across before. So it the right way lakes might have a series of different controls in it, and I'd rather not discuss those here. Thank you. I'll ask Mr. Rhodes to comment on that. If I may. Thank you. Mr. Rhodes. Morning, Mr. Rhoades. Can you hear me? Yes, we can. Good morning. Mr. Rhodes. Good morning.

33:33

JOHN Rhodes for the applicant, can you can you hear me? I can't hear you. I can't. Thank you. So I've understood what you've just said. I think it's important that we're all clear that what we're proposing is a strict regime of control. There's nothing that we're trying to, to get away with. And I think our objectives are the same as everybody else's here. So I just wanted to say that. If one was to look at the ctmp, or the important, issues are controlled, they are limited. So if one's concerned about the impact of hgvs, for instance, there are absolute limits, not only on numbers, but on time, on routes and on peak hours as well. Similarly, in relation to other traffic work or related traffic, we have limits on the car parking, as you know. And then there are a number of measures set it in the workforce travel plan. And in the cgmp. The Workforce travel plan sets out multiple measures that will be necessary. Whether they're pedestrian and cycling printers, whether they're buses, whether they're Park and rides, all those issues and you know that we seek to commit to those within the implementation plan, but there are a myriad of measures which are set out there. It might be technically possible to find some form of ampion requirements in relation to every single one of them. But the way in which it's intended to operate, is through the mode share target. So we don't want anybody to underestimate the significance of that control to the table. Customer one has identified identifies numbers, by car numbers by bus numbers, parking numbers, walking and cycling, as well as percentage shares, both in the early years. And during the peak construction. And the way in which the DCR was set up is an absolutely uncapped requirement on us to meet those. And we report to them on them all the time, through the TRG, we

have to produce effectively what's a rolling action plan to demonstrate how we're going to meet them. And if and the deed of obligation identifies this as well as the travel plans, if there's any risk that we're not going to zaroni monitoring shows that we haven't, but if it appears likely that we're not going to the TRG can require us to take corrective action. And that's an uncapped liability. And we have to take the corrective action agreed by the TRG, in order to ensure that that performance is achieved. So that is an extremely tight regime of control. And we're very happy to discuss whether it's sufficient, but we don't want it in itself to be underestimated. And so as as close to one another said, we cannot meet the walking cycling requirement unless we provide the walking and cycling improvements. And unless we provide the campus accommodation and the caravan park, we cannot meet the bus share unless we provide the park and ride. And so may I just say one more thing, I want to repeat what we've been saying. There's an additional measure of control as well, within the global education and in the plans, which is the contingent impact funds. So the purposes of the contingent impact funds is that if monitoring identifies that we're having an impact, and this is the concern that Mr. bedframes expressed, that we're having an impact that we haven't already mitigated through measured in the DTO, to which we're committed, then there's a process to call upon contingent, constant monitoring effectively to ensure that we stay within not only the impacts has significant impacts, but the performance that we've identified within the moment share targets within the HTV limits. So there is a full regime of control. Obviously very happy with the precise wording of it. But that's the intention. And it's integrated regime of control than for instance is in place at Hinkley. What are the principal works while at Hinkley and the TRG works well at Hinkley. It's not been necessary to have any enforcement. And what the authorities haven't identified in this case is adverse impact arising at Hinkley from this similar regime. It works in practice. And it really describes what we need to do in order to build and operate the construction programme.

38:08

Thank you, Mr. Rhodes. But can I just go back to where it started this discussion about what is the early years in effect. Now as I understand it, the early years in HGV terms is in described in his ctmp. About, it's up to the point that the size of our link road is delivered. And in the CW dp, it's up to the point where to park and rides are delivered on either either one, either one in the parking rights. So if there's some delay in either of or any of those the early years, just understanding that the development is still proceeding, as you said, it's very difficult to stop it, it's still proceeding and you have found another way, the early years is in that sense, an unknown length of time. P one, one A B 1122 could be considerable, considerably more than now. And this is bearing in mind the discussion we had yesterday about the cap levels, which I know we'll hear submission from you.

39:17

The impacts wouldn't be greater. So you're right that they could last for longer. But the impacts are kept. So the impacts would not would not be greater in that in those circumstances. But I think one of the things that we thought after yesterday's discussion that we should do is try and share in more detail with you our construction programme, which identifies that we cannot build the project unless we have that infrastructure in place because those limits are so effective. That they require us to provide that infrastructure

39:47

budget just on the point about the limits would be longer and and bigger because if there's more people as the construction proceeds, there'll be more people working on the site, the percentage of those people driving would be greater than it was At the start of that period, we did not

40:02

well in those circumstances. In those circumstances, that would be an absolute breach of the of the decio. And enforcement can be taken against us through all of the measures set out in the decio. We can't that that's the point of the limits. We accept them as absolute limits.

40:18

I think Mr. Brock wants to ask something at this point, Mr. Brock, thank you as to how great

40:26

Mr. Rhodes, when you just came back into the ishs discussion a few moments ago, you referred us to the implementation plan and invite us to take comp comfort from motors in there. And you said, if there's not what you said, it'd be constant monitoring, and the TRG can require you to take the corrective action. I was looking again, at the deed of obligation this morning. And recalling what you said to me on Tuesday, the implementation plan is only secured with an obligation to deliver it will take reasonable endeavours to deliver it. So I'm finding it difficult to take much comfort from what you said earlier. And I'd be I'd like to comment on that and and shaving Why should take comfort? And secondly, could you just help me because I haven't had time to check this up? Since you mentioned at the TRG can required take corrective action, the TRG is that is meeting quarterly. Could you just remind me please have a membership of the TRG. Core eight core numbers.

41:59

So in terms of comfort we had we had this discussion about the implementation plan. And we've committed to provide a document to the deadline five. To explain why we consider that effective. I won't go over that. But what I would say is that the limits to which we commit within the decio mean that we have to implement implementation plan, to the limits are the limits, we cannot build the project without that infrastructure. We've done our best to describe the programme for it, if you'd like it's a self serving programme, we that is our programme, we have to have that infrastructure in place by that time. If not, we can't build the project. And the DCR prevents us from building the project because those limits are binding on us and can be enforced against us. The membership of the TRG is set out in the ctmp. There's a transport coordinator appointed by site as well to other representatives from site as well. A representative from the county council prep Centre for highways England, and the representative from the Suffolk council those the voting representative, so the TRG is balanced if you'd like y'all to see it as sides or parties three, three. We don't see it as sides or parties. And that's not been our experience of Hinckley. It's been a very collaborative, cooperative, effective regime that arrives at the right answers based on real time information. It has the opportunity to invite other people to it but the voting is insofar as it needs to be voting, the voting is deliberately balanced. So to create a constructive forum. How do you break deadlocks? Well, you break deadlocks, hopefully in the way and in the spirit. That's happened at Hinkley. You break deadlocks on the basis of everybody trying to achieve the same thing. We've just been the practice. If you have a deadlock that you can't break, then the regime requires that to be escalated to the development steering group. Development steering group I think so.

44:10

Yeah, I think you can see our car concerns the document which you're producing for deadline five is really, really important. And you you need to explain very, very clearly what the white newsman says to alleviate our concerns if that's what you want to do. Thanks for Stan, for the time being. That's all I need to raise.

44:32

Thank you, Mr. Brock. Thank you, Mr. Rhodes. I mean, I think some of the things we touched on we'll deal with later in the agenda anyway, but because I've got some detail about the transport review mechanisms. I think for now, I think I think it's just a summary of what I am still struggling with, despite the comments is seeing how, given the first statement in your transport strategy in a consolidated transport assessment is about Protecting the impact of road traffic on communities that that the caps at such a level and the mode share targets being the controlling mechanisms necessarily do that in your years. And I think I need a lot of explanation exactly how that would work, and how they would be protected. Because I think on Tuesday, I think you were talking about Hinkley Point Did you not say you had to build an alternative park and ride because there's a problem delivering one of the parking rights? Yes. So that's a scenario in which the controls you suggest, though it's outside of that. And it has an unknown effect.

45:42

We would regard that as evidence that the process worked. Because of those limits, it was absolutely necessary to find a solution. And the solution ended up being a solution, which was in the controller, the local authorities because no application was made. But, you know, one could get the impression listing similar concerns that are expressed that we could just go off and do what we like we can't the limits require us to meet those absolute conditions.

46:10

But yeah, what we are sensitive to as well, I think we understand those, but what we are sensitive to is the communities who see that potentially, this is an unknown problem for an unknown length of time on an unsuitable road. That's, you know, and that's what we need to understand fully. In making a recommendation,

46:31

yes. We don't share that we will do our best to explain that to you. But one goes back to the Hinkley examination that is only useful in in part, but there was no precedent for how these things might operate within your proper living memory. And it put in place regimes which have turned out to work we have the additional comfort here of the experience of a parallel project. So it has worked in practice, you've not been presented with evidence in anything that I've seen that the hanky regime hasn't worked or is not accepted. audits are acceptable or unethical, unexpected impacts that should be offset and comfort.

47:12

Thank you, Mr. Rhodes. We'll await a few people now want to a few IPS want to comment Mr. Stansfield?

47:22

Hello. exalt the stealth field market, so we'll be affected by the system. Parker right. I'd like to pick up Mr. Flanagan's sort of legalistic statements

47:33

appear to be

47:34

avoiding control and monitoring, or the aim to avoid what he calls excessive control monitoring. I refer to the pledge one of techies to local community, which is to minimise disruption to local communities during the construction of sizable sea without adequate monitoring and control. That becomes a meaningless statement on war concerns for wicked market with a monitoring of cars to the park and ride an LG vs. the postal facility.

48:09

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Stansfield. Could I hear from Mr. cusec, please?

48:19

Yeah, thank you. I too, was concerned at what Mr. Flanagan behalf of the applicant was saying when he said that assessment should not necessarily translate into controls. And I'm the chair of the parish Council in Middleton, and through which to be one one to two runs. And residents of my parish are exceedingly concerned about the impact in the early years of traffic along a road, which is manifestly unsuitable for the volumes being projected. And now I think I'm hearing that although there may be an effective cap on HGV movements, there will be no effective cap on total traffic generated by sizewell C. And I just want to reiterate that this is a significant concern for the people living along that road. And I'd also like to comment on the composition of the TRG as expressed complete lack of confidence that people could be adequately represented on that group by the Suffolk Council. Thank you,

49:24

Mr. kusa. I think we'll discuss the TRG element in just just as the next part of what I want to discuss, but then, Mr. Flanagan, do you want to respond to those before I take Mr. Bedford in a number of others?

49:42

So both of those, I think, unless you want further information, I think we responded to by Mr. Graves has comments already. So I'm happy to leave it there for the moment on those two comments.

49:51

Okay, can I hear from Mr. Bedford, please?

50:01

Thank you. So Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. Sir, we are concerned to hear more than once from Mr. Rhodes references to there being absolute controls in relation to particularly HGV movements, which is what's being talked about in terms of the caps being secured through the decio is absolute

limits. We don't recognise that, because the deed itself does not impose any restrictions, or HGV movements, the only controls come through the deed of obligation, and then the subordinate documents which are secured through the deed of obligation. So I say we don't at the moment recognise the way that the applicant is characterising the situation. And we don't think it reflects the documentation that's thus far being provided into the examination. Sorry, so that's, that's the the general. That's not to say that the aspirations that the applicant is indicated it wants to be bound to, or not capable of being achieved through those subordinate documents, and we very much welcome the applicants recognition that they should be absolute limits, and that those absolute limits will then have to be adhered to. But I say we repeat the point that that is not what is present in the documentation. At the moment, then there is the more detailed point, and I don't want to take too much time on it. But at the moment, we remain of the view that the HGV cap as expressed in the construction traffic management plan ties itself only to HGV movements to and from the main development site. It doesn't, on the wording tie itself to all HGV movements, which is obviously not the same thing at all, particularly in relation to the B 1122. And we're also concerned particularly and I know you said you'll deal with that as a later matter for governance arrangements for the TRG. Yes, the TRG will have certain ability to require things to be done. But you then need to look at the breach mechanisms in both those documents that say the enforcement elements in section eight of the construction traffic management plan. And then what he said in the deed at the moment. They don't have the implications of that Mr. Rhodes has suggested to you for saying that effectively the development cannot happen. What happens is those enforcement mechanisms are triggered, but they don't actually lead to necessarily a prohibitive outcome as Mr. Rose was implying. I said, we're not saying that you can't get there. What we are saying is the documentation and so forth presented doesn't do that. Thank you, Mr. Bedford.

53:26

Mr. Feigin, do you want to respond to Mr. Bedford before I move on to some other interested parties?

53:32

Yes, thank you, sir. Say on the absolute control question. And Mr. Bedford's concerns there, this really comes down to the discussion that was had about the the choice as to whether something is in the DCM when the duty obligation because obviously, the canvas quite extensively on Tuesday, but in this context, it is important to note the date of obligation requires us to implement the cgmp and the other plans that is enforceable there. There is an absolute obligation in that respect. So it's not right to say that this is this is not a not a proper control. As to the question of where the control should be, we say it is why that is in the in the deed of obligation in, it's in sheduled 16. If you want reference which we have to implement the cgmp. The controls you've you've heard about are in those plans, they are set out as enforceable strict controls, for instance, the HTV movements and the merger targets and the language is carefully used in that respect. They sit there partly because they are closely related to the TRG. And the enforcement mechanisms. The TRG has, for instance, if there is any issue, the TRG can require remedial measures. And therefore, we think that's the right place to put those controls because they're bound up with the TRG and the TRG mechanisms also sit there. So we don't recognise this characterization is some Less than tight control. As to the second point, Mr. Bedford made about separate points about restricting movements to the main development side, and what does that encompass in particular the B 1122. So, Mr. Man can speak on this If required, but the main development site is obviously a wide area, and the the connect their obligation within the plans is to cap

movements to the main development site, what the, what can be done, what was discussed by explained by Miss Mullen yesterday was that in respect of the B 1122, it depends as to where you draw the line in terms of the he moves, he made HGV movements, which the TRG would consider. And in particular, it would be done electronically through what's called a geo fence. And if the HTV goes part through that geo fence, then it's counted and counted within the cap. So you protect the V 1122 by making sure that the geo fence includes the sensitive parts of the V 1122. And that addresses Mr. bedfords concern. So that can be done. The third point is the third and final point is the Bedford mind was suggesting that, Mr. Rhodes his comments about the not not having the the protective effect, that is the rate that the controls don't have the protective effect that's required, and particularly suggesting that the project would not stop, the point being made, and Mr. Rosen speak about it If required, but the point he made was that this infrastructure needs to be in place for the project to happen, the accommodation campus and so forth. That was the point he made, and that from headquarters and the applicants experience is right. We are applying for this infrastructure because it's necessary to build the project. And it's plainly right when you look at the documents that it is needed to to do what we want to do and build the project. So those are the three points. I'm just going to pause there on the third point because it was more of Mr. Rhodes point to see if I know whether Mr. Rhodes has got any further note, you're shaking her head. So thank you. That's my response.

57:07

Thank you, Mr. Flanagan. At this point, I think I'd like to hear from Mr. Collins, please. Oh, sorry. Just before you do, Mr. Collins. I see Mr. Brock has done his camera on again. Thank you.

57:23

Thank you very much, Mr. Humphrey. So it's question to follow up to Mr. Flanagan. So it's fine. You just said to us on the absolute controls issue. Are you there? Yeah. You just said to us on the absolute controls issue, that the deed of obligation says that the recommend that you have to implement the ctmp. I just explained to me what you think would be the enforcement action, which the local authorities would take or could take at that at that point.

58:02

So if we did not implement the cgmp, an injunction could be applied for or against us, in short, which is a draconian and serious bit of enforcement, which would ensure that what is what we've committed to is enforceable, and that we need what we set out to say when in chapter 16, when talk about implementing the ccmp. And everything that goes with it, the strict controls that Mr. Rhodes referred to.

58:30

So use a positive injunction get on with this implement ctmp.

58:34

Yes, the precise terms of that injunction, obviously, would be the metaphor that was applying for it and the court but that is a positive injunction is within the scope of an injunction. So yes, that would be an option

58:47

and not put to five was it positive injunctions are really really difficult to make them work on a

58:55

positive injunctions are some sometimes a last resort, that that must be right forcing, forcing someone to do something. There's also negative injunctions forcing someone to stop doing something pending, but

59:04

you aren't. But you have made it very, very clear. And Mr. Rhodes has made it very clear. So it is vital for you that the project is not stopped.

59:15

That that is that certainly our position, sir. And we would say that that would be taken into account by anyone who's applying for an injunction in a court in deciding whether to on a warden attempt to make an injunction that that enforcement mechanism is there, and certainly has teeth. And can I just say something else on this schedule 16 point that it's important to you draw attention rightly to obviously the obligation to implement the plans. It's also important, we say to look beyond that in the rest of sheduled 16. Where in what is make sure I get the right version of the rep three version. Which is zero 24 rep three zero 24 para 3.5. That gives the TRG the power to review the transport management plans and mitigation.

1:00:19

I don't want to delay Mr. Mr. Humphries examination of these points or the next point. So he's going to move to. But you will see that that I think that that Mr. Bedford raised a very, very good valid point. And it's one which I am interested in as well, which is about the enforcement mechanisms, what happens in the case of breach, and how we can be sure that your that the provisions of, for example, your ctmp are in actual fact remedies, and it needs to be remedied quickly, it seems to Mr. flow, you've got the moment, you've got your TRG meeting quarterly, it makes a recommendation, it says something, I don't know how you break a deadlock on that thing. Mr. Rhodes says, Oh, we keep talking. And and this could take a great deal a great deal of time. Meanwhile, there is a real environmental effect of rapidly neutral terms, which is affecting a lot of people, and which is probably not one which has been predicted in your environmental statement. Yes. So. So I'm just just going to leave it there. I say that the explanation which which is being prepared as a result, what we said on on it on Tuesday, really must drill down and deal with these issues. And if you find there are gaps in what you're proposing at the moment, then you please leave make sure that you show us how you're going to deal with it.

1:01:48

Yes. Okay. Can I just respond on a couple of points. Now taking into account when we say about responding writing is important. In the in the shooting schedule. 63.8 says SSC coach shall implant any proposed mitigation approved, so that has teeth. And so the TRG says something we have to do it. So that's the first point. The second point says obviously you say well, what if there's a deadlock, or if there's a deadlock, we are stuck with we have to comply with what's currently in the in the management plan those those caps and the mode share target. So we are those can be enforced against us. And that's the third point. They can be enforced against this, they can be enforced against a junction and

obviously there's other mechanisms as well, but said that that that is enforceable, and action can be taken quickly if it's required. Urgent injunctions happen if necessary, but there is a suite of mechanisms, both within sheduled 16. And outside it, I threw an injunction and so forth, which which holds us to what we say in what we've committed to that. That's in shorter, or Alton.

1:02:59

Okay, we're looking forward to receive your T five submission. Thanks very much, Mr. Humphries.

1:03:06

Thank you, Mr. Brockman. Thank you, Mr. Flanagan. No, no take. Mr. Collins, please.

1:03:14

Yeah, thank you very much. Paul Collins from seven Knightsbridge parish council stop size we'll see in the B 1122. Group. I was very glad to hear what Mr. Brock actually brought up there, because it was something I was going to raise. Also. Also, on the note of urgency, we had a long discussion about urgency yesterday. So I'm not going to talk about that. And he and one and everything else, again, because we've been through this and the changes that are involved in that. Going back to this business about the TRG and three monthly meetings to potentially review and look at these issues, particularly back in these early years. Let's face it, the early years only last for roughly two years, all things being equal. So it's a very, very blunt instrument to get anything done when when Mr. Brock quite rightly says there could be a real issue on the ground that day, that week or whatever else it is, and waiting for three months for the next meeting to come around or for some action to be taken is highly is not going to be very good. And for those who are living alongside the B 1122. And all of that implies, the other thing that did occur to me was this definition of the main site and perhaps the applicant can state something here and that is is the less than Eastern east, the land east of India Eastlands industrial estate part of the main site or is it an associated development site? And so therefore, when they have this geo fence for stuff coming down to be 1122, does it then get reconciled or Oh, that one actually went in the main site? And this one went to the the associated development site. So I'd like that answer. I'm not clear on that. The other thing that occurs to me about the comparison here between what's happening at sizewell and Hinkley Point, as you both as I'm sure all the inspectors are well aware when you go to the Hinkley Point site, there is nothing beyond it. It is the Hinkley Point site for A, B and C. There is nothing else there. So the only traffic that goes right out there is Hinkley Point traffic. The only traffic that comes back is Hinkley Point traffic on the whole. That is not the case with the D 1122. It is a through road that goes down to our oberer and all sorts of other places. It's also the road that's going to take all of the cumulative impacts from the scottishpower proposals should that be approved and I noted that the the examination finished the other day, whilst we were all having a long chat. So I think these issues are real issues. It's not easy to say that Hinkley Point and sizewell C are the same thing. The other thing that I noticed in this mode share assessment target. And perhaps this, the applicant can explain this as well is that we have 600 people on Park and Ride bus in this but as I understood it, the early years will have no Park and Ride bus. Unless it is the small one that goes from less than the land east of Eastlands industrial estate into the site. So perhaps those 600 people on there, you can explain that one too, because there is also a direct bus of 600 people and I sort of assumed that was what was coming from the the site where the the caravan site will be. Thank you.

1:06:48

Thank you, Mr. Collings. On the first point about the responsiveness of the transport review group. I think that's one of the things I want to talk about in the next part of the agenda. So, but I'll ask the applicant to respond to the other points you've made. Mr. Flanagan,

1:07:05

thank you. So thank you at a number of points that the transport view time in this point, I've got hold back on, as you say until the relevant point, just wanted a contextual point there. And I think it goes to timeliness and takes a slightly back to the point before but it's worth mentioning now. It's suggested Well, the TRG and which sits within the deed of obligation is not quick enough. And the alternative pitfall by Mr. Bedford is well, let's bring it into a requirement in the DCA, which you could, in theory, you could have a prosecution for breach of well, that begs the question was would that be any quicker prosecution for breach of a requirement rather than for instance, talks about Mr. Brock an injunction for breach of the deed obligation? And the realistic answer is no. Subject to that, I'll come back to the TRG in a moment. The the point about the 600 workers on park and ride and Mr. Collins says Well, what park and ride and he talked about the park and ride at the Landis' the reasons I can confirm it is that that's the one that's being talked about in the early years. So obviously, the the other two Park and rides come later. Still at an early stage, but later that the 600 that's a reference to those ones that landed Eastern Eastern park and ride. The reference to the third point was the the geo fence. I think I've said what I can on the geo fence, I'm just getting to it.

1:08:35

There was the point about whether the land Eastern industrial estate was actually the main development site or not. Okay, well,

1:08:43

can I can I turn to that I'm going to, if I may ask this man to address that question.

1:08:51

Thank you. case, you all seem to be having the same problems as yesterday.

1:09:09

We think we've learned by now apologies, and cursed him out Mullins on behalf of the applicant. And so with regard to the land database, and we do when we talk about the the main development site, it is included within that. And but the there's two aspects of that in terms of the strategy. So in the Mossad targets, there's a park and ride for search there, but there's also caravan accommodation there. So there's the direct buses shuttling between the caravan park and the main development site. So the two parts of the Workforce Strategy in that respect. And the other aspect was with regard to the geo fence on the 1122. Now the the difficulty about monitoring and we recognise we may need to clarify this within the cgmp so And we will take this on board in the next version. That the difficulty with monitoring in the early years is that the main development site roundabout will be being constructed and therefore the access strategy for the MDS is is more complicated than it is once. Once you get to the peak construction, where everything's going to the main development site roundabout, and therefore, that we will be using both the secondary site access on another slide and also using site as well be access, it's

quite difficult to then determine what's going in and out of sizable Bay and what's associated with sysvol. Say. There's also a lot of activities that fall under the banner of an MDS work, which as I've just said, includes activities that Landis' defacement in terms of movements movements there. There's this construction works being undertaken at lovers lane, there's also the development of size one link code. And we're conscious of ensuring that the impacts on the 1122 is kept to a minimum and therefore the proposal is that the 600 cap is actually monitored via all hgvs would be tracked. At the moment, the commitment in the ctmp is that the it's hcvs tracks to the main development site. And from speaking to the team, we can extend that to to the ad construction as well. Therefore, it means that in terms of that geo fence, it would capture any size. Well HTV is effectively tooling a cordon around the kind of the B 1122. And in particular, the communities of saboten. And Middleton more to ensure that we have that monitoring data of the total number per day of sizewell HCV, going through those communities.

1:12:02

Thank you for just two points. I mean, we'll all face us have GPS, even local suppliers, because I think that was a point made by

1:12:13

that is a point. I mean, you're right. So if you go to my cover this later, more detail is in terms of more detail on the GPS system, which I think is maybe of interest to yourself and others on the call. But the what we've set out is that in just get the references polities. So in paragraph 4.4, point four of the ctmp there is a commitment there it says all hgvs will be tracked using GPS technology to monitor compliance with the proposed HTV routes. So this is with regards to Section four is an ACV management of HCV to the main development site. The specifications of GPS tracking system is set out later in this section. And then if you then refer to paragraph 4.4, point two eight that sets out the objectives of the DMS tracker says delivery management system is split into two parts, a booking system, which we've referred to as the DMS Booker, and the DMS tracker, which is tracking the the HTML in terms of their route. And the umbrella of that is effectively the delivery management system. So the paragraph 4.4 point two eight sets out the objectives that that need that tracker needs to meet. And then below that 4.4 point two, four sets out, can in order to meet those objectives, what the specification of that GPS system needs to be. So that is something that we are committed in terms of the specification and the requirements of anything, any GPS system that's procured will then get set out in paragraph 4.4. Point three two is that the system hasn't been procured yet. But we are having detailed discussions with potential suppliers. And and that there are and we can, can provide more detail on this at the hearing. And but effectively hgvs already have GPS and majority of them already have GPS and will be tapping into their feed in order to track them via the DMS tracker. But there may be some, as we say in the second bullet point of 4.4 point three to that and the smaller supply chain that don't have that now, I think there's been questions about the word could in that sentence. So there's the saying that a smartphone app could be developed to allow integration now, this is from discussions with potential suppliers that that say a solution. It's not necessarily the only solution but we're setting out that there is a solution that's available in order to meet the commitments that we've set out. In paragraph 4.4 point four that all HD phase will be tracked. So I think there's the certainty in the commitment. It's the procurement of how and the specification of that ecosystem is the procurement on that, that we would like some flexibility. But we can keep continuing to discuss that and provide further information to the authorities.

1:15:17

Thank you. Or just one thing that maybe for you or one of your colleagues, one of my one of my colleagues has reminded me, in answer to our question, written questions. The main development side has different meanings in the DTO. And he s is the land east of the Industrial Estate, in the main development side in both, whichever meaning whichever version he has underneath you.

1:15:44

I will need to take that away and confirm I don't have misleading information, sir, but I will take that away to confirm. Okay, thank you. Can I just say one other thing, just in terms of kind of what's come up about kind of the end, it may come up later, but in terms of a breach, and if there was a breach of the HTV caps, and actually, Mr. Brock saying, well, that could happen, it wouldn't be notified TRG wouldn't be notified for another quarter. And then they made a resolution. But if you look at and this is the same that applies at Hinkley, if you look at paragraph 8.2, point three server ctmp, it talks about TRG notification. So yes, they'll be meeting at quarterly basis. But actually, they it's up to the TRG to decide how frequently they meet. But the paragraph 8.3 2.3 says that sighs we'll see we'll monitor the DMS on a daily basis gets requirements at the ctmp and the TRG will be notified of any breaches as and when they occur. And so I think that's an important point to note that is kind of reactive on the day.

1:16:51

It is something that I said previously, we're discussing on the next point of the agenda, but but thank you for that. Mr. beech. Can I hear from you, please?

1:17:05

Yes, thank you, sir. Timber Ridge, Snake parish Council. And I'm also here to represent someone. And I've got a brief for milesplit as well. I just wanted to make a short point, if I could, that the concerns identified by yourself and Mr. Brock and Mr. Bedford are those that we as a parish, and I'm sure various other parishes have raised about the control mechanisms, we were reassured and actual reassurance that they those control mechanisms would be in place, and that there would be some form of policing and being able to enforce them. Some of what I heard Mr. Flanagan say and start, that his presentation appeared to counsel that Mr. Rhodes then wrote back as well, partly on that kind of thing. I'd just like to support your request, I'm sure many other parishes and communities would that there is real detail and real means in the document that they say they are going to submit to you at the next deadline. So all of us can see that and all of us can be reassured. Thank you, Mr. beech. Mr. Fortman. Sorry,

1:18:16

Good morning class for Manning Camp crpc. Also in part representing miles food and other neighbouring parishes, I would like to make a couple of points and the first of which I would like to pick up on highways Coleman's about half an hour ago, were on the subject of controls in the state of the adequate only for the gentleman then later to say, well, it's not complete. So how can something be adequate and judged to be adequate with regards to controls? If complete picture hasn't been established, so I just wanted to really query highways. Secondly, I mean, we're hearing a lot about the B 11 to two and controls etc, which we you know, we fully support and understand that that is a really important issue. But the issues start much further north and much further south IE around with the

weaker market. area which obviously comes out as part of and we as a weaker market join parish traffic meetings with EDF on the metal of control. And we we do feel it is yes, it is not really resolved especially what's on the HGTV site, delivering directly to to the site. You know, we sit we I think we can say we are happy of happiness, what will be in place but the whole LGB issue the smaller vehicle issue, it's not really addressed. And that comes into the things we discussed yesterday in terms of traffic modelling etc. You know where everyone agrees we're facing a problem on the side routes in terms of traffic trying to bait the a 12 corridor. And our our point is and Mr. stands for from weaker market will, I believe is listening in you know, he had ideas of geo fencing, getting geo fencing into place in a wider arena, we would like the examining authority to when you close out that

1:20:41

Thank you. Thank you. Jenny curtly. Please. Can you see me and hear me? I can hear you. I can see you. Thank you. I just like to talk about traffic on on a trip to Hinkley in May 2019. Five months into the build. I was caught in a horrendous traffic jam on a return on the return trip from Hinkley to Bridgewater. I took

1:21:14

I had dashcam on and which I've sent into pins, which I hope you've seen. It seemed to me that although those that Hinkley in charge of traffic management, they did not stop the HDS hgvs and EDF buses, some empty from joining the congestion, hence making the situation much worse. How would the developer ensure this wouldn't happen and gridlock the whole area? I believe this was caused by an accident on the M five so it could well happen if there was an accident on the a 12. If the B 1122. gets shot, it is the main route to doctors, and indeed a bank in leisten. So

1:21:54

this could cause complete chaos

1:21:56

if there's any kind of accident. Thank you.

1:21:59

Thank you. Could I at this point, Mr. Flanagan, do you ever respond to those before I move on to the next ones?

1:22:10

Yes, thank you, sir. Are Mr. Beaches point and concern that we might be rolling back from commitments I can't confirm. Don't want to be misunderstood. We are certainly not rolling back as Mr. Rhodes has said we consider this as a strict regime. We've signed up to it and we're committed to it. Mr. Fortman had one point about highways England. I won't address that. But he made a further point about side rail is in use of side roads? Well, two points. Firstly, reiterate that, obviously, the hgvs are on prescribed routes which will be monitored and is enforceable, not side raids, and Mr. Mullin spoke yesterday about rerouting the traffic and I'm not going to repeat that transport evidence. But you'd have evidence on that. That front there. So so that's why I want to respond to on those issues.

1:22:55

Thank you, Mr. Flanagan. Could I hear from Mr. Galloway now please?

1:23:04

Good morning, sir. Thank you very much for letting me talk in Galloway. I private resident of Cal Cellcom calm.

1:23:12

Good morning. I just like to roll back just quickly to a comment made by Mr. Rhodes during his response to an earlier question, where he said that or in a piece is sort of implied that we should gain some solace from the fact that parking was strictly limited. And that that is defined Well, I find that difficult to actually comprehend. As far as I can see, in shedule, one part one of the decio there is some defined parking, and that amounts to in excess of 5000 parking spaces on the main development site. And those 5000 parking spaces on the main development site equate to as much as both park and ride together. In addition, on the schedule one, part two, there is then what seems to be blanket approval sought for unquantified temporary vehicle parking, vacant bicycle parking and parking areas on site, work numbers one through 217. So I have gained very little solace, or, for that matter, any happiness, that there is any strict control over main development, site parking, and for that matter, other development side. Thank you.

1:24:37

Thank you, Mr. Galloway. Mr. Scott.

1:24:45

Thank you. Can I just ask a question about Mr. Flanagan's contribution about the problem with injunctions? I'm well retired, but I'm quite familiar with interim injunctions role in employment law And I wonder whether if the appropriate conditions were in the decio, it would strengthen the case for that as an instrument

1:25:12

i think is something that Mr. Brock will be looking at, you know, in the submissions that the applicant is going to make. Mr. Scottie, Stiller. Thank you. Yes. Okay. Thank you. Could I hear from Nigel brown and please?

1:25:43

Yes. And Nigel brown from Melton parish Council. I don't know if my cameras Yes, Mr. Brown. I can see and hear you.

1:25:51

Yeah. Okay, good. Yes. Melton is on the outskirts of Woodbridge, close to 12. And the road the a 1152 runs through the centre of Melton, and there's an alternative possible route to site. Well,

1:26:09

just following up on some point that Mr. Flanagan made a moment ago where he said that side roads wouldn't be used

1:26:17

by HGV traffic, what is the position that will pertain if there is an accident on the a 12? And the a 12 is blocked? Can they guarantee that they will not

1:26:28

be routing any traffic onto the a 1152 in those circumstances?

1:26:34

Thank you, Mr. Brown. Mr. Flanagan, take the two points from Mr. Galloway. Mr. Brown? And I think I have

1:26:45

say yes. in reverse order Mr. Brown's point of actions on a 12 if it's satisfactory for you, so that seems to ask the point which relates to the timp part of the agenda. Yeah, it means can say I'm not relegating it. Perhaps we could leave that to them, if that's okay. And then the second Mr. Galloway's point was about quantum of parking, we're going to ask volunteers to do that in a moment. Mr. Scott's point about interim injunction. So as you said, that is something that we will intend to cover a bit more in writing. I said something about it already. But anything further, I'll put in writing. But if I could hand over to Marlon to deal with constant parking. Thank you.

1:27:38

So Kirsten, on behalf of the applicant, and just with regard to the parking question, we believe that we submitted this in writing, but we're just kind of confirming the where the what the references of that submission that would set this out. But just to clarify that the individual kind of parking is at the 1000 parking space at the main site. And 12 150, the northern and southern Park and Ride facilities, which equates to 3500 parking spaces. Just to note that, obviously, the purpose of the park and ride facilities is actually a demand management measure to intercept trips on the on the a 12. So that we don't have all of the workforce and can travelling through to through to site. So it's, yes, it's parking, but it's parking. For Purpose. Obviously, there are parking facilities that Suffolk have on the agewell for exactly the same reasons.

1:28:41

In terms of what Mr. Galloway asked, could you provide us in response?

1:28:45

We can provide that? Yep, I think we already have, we'll just clarify where to find that. That's fine.

1:28:51

Thank you. I know. Still not there's quite a few hands up. Can I say this? This is the first point of the agenda about early years traffic modelling, about early years controls in the in the dcl, or the deed of obligation. So providing the remaining hands up are all on that topic. I don't want to get into a

conversation about what the applicant said before and a response. It's not a it's not a dialogue. It's it's a hearing where we listen to evidence. So with that in mind, Mr. Collins

1:29:28

Thank you, my, my, my question was actually generated by a response from a current member who wasn't from EDF, but there seem to be an implication that in in, in their geo monitoring of hgvs, they couldn't tell the difference between something that's going to size well be for size or B purposes versus what's going to sighs well see, I'm slightly puzzled by that, just like clarification on that and nothing else.

1:29:57

Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Just on that. Point alone. Could the applicant respond? Yes, thank you. We will say Miss Malone again on that. Thank you.

1:30:18

On behalf of the applicants, just to clarify as any Rh TVs that would be tracked, obviously there are other HTV is not just sizewell B. But elsewhere on the network and maybe travelling on the V 1122. They will not form part of that geo fence, the geo fence picks up the ones that the DMS tracker is there to track, so it was only the size well see the size, well see vehicle hgvs that would be picked up by that, that GPS, they are completely isolated. And that system. Thank you.

1:30:47

Thank you, Mr. Southern, please.

1:30:54

Thank you, Mr. Humphries, John Sutherland from Oxford also speaking on behalf of Ashton and parish Council.

1:31:04

This is preliminary to a point which is later on. But I just want to make the point that we understand totally why the emphasis is on the BLM 22. And we support

1:31:13

our colleagues

1:31:14

on that. But I think it's worth highlighting in the early years, the traffic on the A 12 is also going to be much increased by the project. And of course, including in that is the work generated by various Park and rides, the bypass and the rest of it. And that's going to have implications for your Oxford and I'll come on to that later on. The other point on ATVs. And Marlin sort of refer to this just now that only the size we'll see hgvs will be tracked. And of course, there are lots of other hgvs that use this area, as we will know, including coming through Oxford, which will not be tracked. And of course, the reference to saying well, the HGV is not going to use the rat runs all the other hgvs will. But that's the only point I want to make at this point. Thank you very much.

1:32:09

Thank you very much. And I've got Josie be on is the list I've got and that would be jc vasana Sorry,

1:32:25

sorry about that. Thank you, Mr. Humphreys. I will be brief. Just to add my voice to several other of the colleagues who represent parish councils. I represent the Walberswick parish Council. And to say that there is the B 1125, which runs by our village and many other villages and to say that the controls particularly in the early years, where I believe I've heard from the applicant that they will not be monitoring or controlling workers will be coming down that route. They use that route now for sizewell B. And this is a big concern. So again, not to minimise the other issues on the other roadways. But this is a big concern. Thank you.

1:33:11

Thank you Miss bassinet. Could I hear from Peter Wilkinson now, please? Yes, thank you, Mr. Humphries. I hope you can hear me. I can hear you can't see yet. On tried to turn my camera off. Excuse me. Come on. Not having much luck. It's okay. I can hear you. Clearly. If you want to carry on.

1:33:33

I'd like to be. My name is P. Wilkinson. I'm chairman of together again. sighs We'll see. I'd like to address the issue very briefly of emergency planning. And the question I have for the applicant is

1:33:46

take into consideration the increased traffic that there'll be in the early years of the development, the increased number of people that will be on the site working next to an operational site size will

1:33:56

be in the event of an off site emergency and what the implications would be for the ability for people to be evacuated with the extra 1000s of people that will be on the size of Merseyside. Thank you, Mr. Humphrey.

1:34:11

Thank you, I think you'll find that the traffic incident management plan might be the area that would be a discussion and that's a bit later on the agenda. Thank you, Mister. Thank you. Mr. kousaka. Please.

1:34:27

And thank you during cusec Middleton parish Council, my point at this point is is more a point of order. I just like to understand

1:34:35

if I may, when it will be appropriate to raise issues to do with the severance of Middleton comm forwardly by the SLR and those kinds of impacts on this agenda.

1:34:47

I think that would be in the consideration of local traffic impacts, which is agenda item Ford, we somewhere in there. Appreciate it. I've got 10 closes Gordon mustard, Woodbridge town council, please.

1:35:07

Thank you. I've just got a question about the GPS tracking and Mrs. McManus quite right. The most lorries nowadays are GPS tracked that she's failed to explain how the ones working on behalf of size will see will be tracked separately from those not working for sizewell C, and issuing the to provide some form of evidence to support that claim. And will it be a condition of contract with HTV and suppliers, that the this particular GPS is fitted to their vehicles?

1:35:46

Thank you. I'll, Mr. Flanagan. Here whether you have any response to the previous submissions, and then potentially Miss McMillan can answer that last point.

1:36:01

Yes, thank you. So leave that one to miss Malone. The emergency planning once you say so leave the session. The Mr. Southern will make two points. Firstly, about areas traffic on the a 12 will be much increased, including generated by the park and rides and I haven't vacation. So we say we've assessed, obviously the traffic on the agewell. Both existing and our contribution to that. And we say that the accessibility of that is shown in the consolidated transport assessment. The second point Mr. Southern made was that there are of course ATVs other than sizewell c hgvs which will be on the network, and those non sizewell CAC these won't be tracked, we say that. That's right where we're mitigating end and star development, and Rh GDS will be tracked. This bassinet made a point about the B 1125. And the potential impacts there again. So my answer is similar to Mr. Sutherland, in respect of the a 12. The consolidated transport assessment provides a comprehensive assessment of network impacts. And we say that that therefore covers and shows the acceptability of those impacts with of course, any necessary mitigation. So that's that, that's where that I can then hand over to the final, Marlon is actually going to be I'm told Mr. JOHN Davies. Introducing. Yesterday, Mr. JOHN Davies, site operations and logistics programme lead to deal with the final point about GPS. Thank you. Good morning,

1:37:55

john Davis, speaking on behalf of the applicant, in terms of the GPS tracking system, a couple of points were raised. So one in terms of distinguishing between other non size related TVs and size related TVs, it's important to say that the system is bespoke to the project. It's not looking generically at tracking on every vehicle. So we will have a bespoke feed from the vehicles directly into our DMS delivery management system that will ensure that we're only reporting and monitoring those HIV specific to the project. how that is done is through an API for taking an API feed Application Programming Interface feed from the tracking system on the size well vehicles into the delivery management system. So that feed isn't in existence for vehicles, not on the sidewalk project. I think that was the question if there was a I don't think there was that one. But if there were there wasn't happy to answer. Your Thank you, Mr. Davis. Mr. Mustard.

1:39:29

Thank you. So it's just then that this this would seem to imply that every HGV operator attending the site has to have this particular piece of software within their vehicles on that day when they attend the site. And I know from experience that HGV operators often substitute vehicles and it remains still remains unclear. And given that this is the only way that The applicant is demonstrating that the cap on lorry movements is not exceeded. It remains a bit vague as to whether or not lorries can still go to Sizewell C. And without having their GPS reported.

1:40:16

Thank you. Mr. Davis, could you perhaps come back on that point? Or? No, I'm aware that it is 20 to 12 and ready to take a break. So after Mr. Davis has spoken, potentially, I think we'll take a break. But Mr. Davis?

1:40:40

Yes. JOHN Davis on behalf of the applicant? I think I think the answer to the question is,

1:40:50

it's not the case that you know, I get back to my previous point, that the the fee that the system we are creating is bespoke to the project. Any any vehicle working for the project, will suppliers will be contractually obliged to provide us with that API feed from their system into our delivery management system?

1:41:16

Yeah, so as the as the question, Put simply, that you wouldn't get on the site, if you didn't have that different delivery management slot? Would that be correct?

1:41:29

Sorry, could you repeat?

1:41:31

Well, if if everything is tracked by the delivery management system, and an ACV turned up without GPS, and consequently not plugged into delivery management system, they wouldn't get on the site? Is that correct? Alright, just got some speaking problems. Can you hear me now? Yes, sorry. Can you repeat that question? Yeah. Sorry. Just put simply, that if an HDTV turned up, that wasn't in the delivery management system. Would they wouldn't get on the site. Is that correct? Correct. Right. Okay. That that's the thing, the point that Mr. Mosley was trying to make, I think. Thank you. Right. Okay. I'm aware the time is 1142. So I suggest we take a break before moving on to the next item about construction traffic management plans. So I think we will come back at 12 o'clock. So thank you very much.