

# TEXT\_SizewellC\_ISH4\_Session3\_09072021

Fri, 7/9 3:51PM • 1:26:35

00:03

Good afternoon, everyone. I just like to welcome you back to the resumed

00:09

issue specific hearing this afternoon.

00:12

Can I just check with the case team that you can see and hear me clearly? Yes, I can see and hear you. And the live stream and recording as recommenced. Yes, both have started. Thank you.

00:26

Ryan have come on to the next item on the agenda. That was

00:34

the issue in respect of rail services. Now I recognise that Network Rail are not in attendance this afternoon. And so it's going to be difficult for me to progress matters in the way that I'd hoped. So what I propose to do is to do some follow up questions at the next opportunity to everyone concerned, and then, obviously look to understand better the implications of the applicants proposals for their rail freight services, and the consequential impacts that that may or may not have, in terms of the council's policies for economic development over the next 12 to 15 years. So I hope that's okay with everybody. And so that means that the next item is really about mitigation, and monitoring. I'd like to see clarity from the council's please on their consideration of the mitigation and monitoring that is proposed within both the development consent order itself, but also the shedule within the obligations, and I think he's particularly shedule seven

02:02

in terms of the socio economic elements, so it can come first to Suffolk County Council, please.

02:16

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So obviously, you've heard already from Mr. Wheaton, the as it were, the general thrust of the concerns, if you would want us to, at this stage, provide some more detail of the specific measures that we want to see included in the monitoring, which would be added to shedule. Seven, rather than into the development consent order itself. I can ask Mr. Warmington to expand on that. And I don't know whether you want that level of detail this afternoon, which is able to give you or you want to leave that to the written follow up.

02:57

I'm quite happy. If you are, if you want to leave that to the written follow up, because we still have quite a bit to get through.

03:04

So that would be very helpful. Thank you.

03:07

Thank you, sir.

03:09

And east of the council, please. Is that approach, something you're content with?

03:15

Yes, sir. But Could I just mentioned a couple of additional points, if I may. So on shedule 15. Tourism, we've addressed the issue about the tourism fund. And I don't think there's anything to add now. On shedule. Seven,

03:35

we would want to see the supply chain strategy expanded. There are deficiencies at present. Governance and detail more widely is the subject of ongoing discussion with the applicant. In relation to the concerns mentioned by Mr. Wood this morning on local economy and employment impacts.

03:59

The Council is seeking commitment to an economic development fund to seek to address that commitment from the applicant,

04:07

which would encompass an economic business support service

04:12

with an associated fund. And in addition to have the contingency congestion fund flowing from the economic cost of congestion. So there are those specific issues that arise in relation to addressing the specific concerns. And those we would want to see in sheduled. Seven but we are in dialogue with the applicant about that. Thank you.

04:41

I just wonder whether any interested parties have any additional comments that they would wish to make?

04:48

on this point.

04:53

Okay, I'm not seeing any hands up so sorry, Mr. Galloway.

05:00

Thank you. It's just a very brief point in Cal cell comm culture and all we see are disadvantages. We see no mitigation and nothing to benefit our area whatsoever. I would just like to make that point we don't feel like we're being represented.

05:17

Okay, thank you.

05:20

So if I can turn to the applicant, please for the response. Thank you.

05:29

Thank you, sir.

05:31

I just want to say briefly in relation to a suffix, requested additions, as Mr. Tate has said, these are matters of ongoing discussion. My suggestion is acceptable to you is I can either open up the debate here or alternatively, which I think might be preferable. Is it given that we are discussing these things we carry on discussing until we think if there are differences which are crystallised in which we're not going to be able to resolve, then we can articulate those in writing? And that might be a more efficient and effective way of putting the matters before you because I'm not sure we're going to move that forward by just airing our differences at the moment? No, that's pretty helpful. I don't want to encourage ping pong.

06:19

So if we can, if you can continue a constructive dialogue, and then you can let me know in due course, where the differences are, if there are any

06:31

time we'll take it from there.

06:35

Okay, so

06:39

community issues, very consciousness, this is very broad. And

06:46

I don't want to get into sort of open floor hearing scenarios. So

06:52

I've got some detailed questions for the applicants and the council's To start with, and then I'll bring in interested parties. But I would just ask that

07:04

each of you do focus your comments on the specific points that we're discussing. Thank you. So the demographic modelling within the community impacts the Council on each rep. 1098 provided a review by a con. And it does seem to me that the

07:31

much of the concern over community safety comes from the quantity of the workforce and the proportion that would be non human based.

07:41

Just need to understand the assurances that you can provide the examining authority that the gravity model you've used, is sufficiently robust that it does represent the most conservative position. Because it does seem to me if the council are right, that a slight adjustment of inputs leads to a change in outcomes and does seem a reasonable proposition that this then might lead to a shortcoming in the mitigation offered with consequential effects of that. So perhaps if I can come to the council's first, followed by the police, and then the CCG. So if I come to should it be Suffolk first,

08:25

as far as the government who's leading on this?

08:30

So Good afternoon, my name is Isabella to four and I'm a barrister representing a Suffolk Council. And I think it's right that you turn to us first on this issue.

08:41

We have agreed with the applicant in statement of common ground, the approach that they've adopted to modelling the spatial distribution of the workforce. It's correct that we did instruct a quorum to review their assessment of a con prepared report which was submitted, which raised certain small queries, but didn't consider that they would have any impact on the output of the model. So that matter is now agreed and that's in the statement of Common Ground rec 2076 at entry SC seven.

09:20

Obviously, sir, you know, there are always limitations with a model and forecasting of impacts. And we think that that's appropriately addressed through a plan, monitor and manage approach to the mitigation which is secured or will be secured through the deed of obligation.

09:39

Okay, thank you. Thank you,

09:45

counsel. And please.

09:49

Thanks.

09:51

Thank you, sir. I'm Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council and we effect we take the same overall approach as East

10:00

counsel the a con

10:03

report or rather review, also, obviously was utilised by us to inform the robustness of the transport modelling because the gravity model obviously, fed in to that. But as you say, sir, it also has implications, particularly for the wider socio economic impacts. The only point that is perhaps just worth highlighting the acorn review did

10:30

note at its 4.4 and 4.5, as it were the sensitivity of the gravity model to the input assumptions. And it simply pose as we'll make the observation, there had been no sensitivity testing of as it were different potential impacts, if you were to make some changes to any of those assumptions, and the only instance question, which may be a matter for consideration by the applicant is whether more confidence could be given to the robustness of what has been done by potentially one or more sensitivity tests of key assumptions. That's the only point I think we would probably add. Okay, thank you. That's helpful.

11:19

I come to the police. Next please.

11:26

Thank you take up a second, please. So I think for us, it's the more I practice, important factors for us are the sort of the total number and the demographic of the workforce.

11:40

The gravity model is part of what we planned into our demand profile and mitigation. I guess if there was a significant deviation from that, then we want to review again, but in terms of how our policing model works in response,

11:58

I think from what we've seen so far, we have no, no huge concerns on the model being presented.

12:04

Thank you. And you, are you content with your involvement with the plan, monitor and manage approach the decrease of counsel have

12:16

indicated? Are you part of the governance structure involvement of those future plans? do you have?

12:26

I don't think we are at the moment.

12:29

But obviously, on the back of this is something for us to go and liaise with and and become involved in. Okay, thank you.

12:39

So if I can come to the CCG. Next, please.

12:44

Thank you, Elizabeth Maloney on behalf of the CCG. So this isn't specific to the gravity model, but we do have some overall statements around the demographic modelling that we'd like to share if that is okay.

12:56

So since the last deadline, the CCG has worked further with the applicant to understand the scope of data sources and depth of analysis completed to establish the baseline for the Health Impact Assessment. The CCG acknowledges the applicant has used a broad range of publicly available data that would be sensible,

13:18

comparative development to that proposed and that data and experience gleaned from Hinkley Point C has been used to forecast the potential impact of the proposed size we'll see development. Nevertheless, the examining authorities respectfully asked to endorse the following position held by the CCG and to ensure these replied by the applicant. Firstly, there are material differences between Somerset and Suffolk in relation to population health management needs, and the provision of health and wellbeing services. The data and resulting analysis produced by the applicant is therefore an informed basis upon which to forecast the potential impact of the development. Nevertheless, the analysis will need to be supplemented by further measures specific to the local area, population needs and demographic and health and well being services. Should the development be approved by the Secretary of State. And we are particularly keen to ensure that any action that is taken doesn't exacerbate the existing health inequalities that we know are within the community, and if anything helps to reduce those. Secondly, the development of health and well being measures including the quantity and type of additional health and well being resources must be adequate, effective and appropriate to the population health context of the proposed size we'll see project in Suffolk and that's particularly in light of the increasing demand that is currently on local provision.

14:42

Thirdly, the adequate contingency funding needs to be secured through the section 106 agreement to address additional and currently unforeseen population health and wellbeing risks. Fourthly, that the proposed health and well being group in context of the overall proposed project governance model

15:00

should agree the measures and ensure delivery oversight in support of the first point that I've made. This may include identification and additional mitigations to currently unforeseen risks that may require additional drawdown from the section 106 agreement. And finally, in the draft deed of obligation, the application, the applicant has defined a high level terms of reference for the health working group. The CCG does not believe that the terms of reference sufficiently captures the role responsibilities or membership that has that has been proposed, and therefore we have developed an alternative model. In particular, the CCG believes that it's important that that group should be chaired by health, and his remit should extend to health and well being rather than health alone. We ask that the examining authority to note the revised terms of reference has been shared with proposed members and feedback sought, and the CCG welcomes feedback from the applicant. And their acknowledgement that the proposed terms of reference has been well received by its proposed membership. The CCG and applicant have held constructive discussions since the last deadline. And we believe that the above points have been agreed by both parties. Thank you.

16:06

Thank you, can I just ask you a couple of points following on from what you've said, Have you

16:13

in terms of the

16:15

alternate model that you've presented?

16:20

When were you hoping for a response from the applicant to that, because I'm just mindful of the limited time we have for examination, and where this is heading, sort of further down the stream for the timing of this. So have you an agreed timetable between you about where this is heading. So in terms of the baseline data that's been used, we're comfortable with that. The alternative model is, is in relation to governance. So it's in relation to health and well being group. We had asked for feedback by last Friday. And we haven't yet received that. But we are working with the applicant to to gain that. And that's really to establish the governance that we need in order to agree the measures that will then form part of the 106 agreement.

17:08

Okay, thank you

17:13

for coming out. Are there

17:16

any additional comments from other interested parties on this particular point that they wish to raise?

17:28

not seeing any hands raised? The applicant can respond, please.

17:38

Thank you. So I think there are two matters to pick up. First, in relation to the

17:47

gravity model, specifically, which was discussed by the Suffolk County Council, there was a suggestion there

17:59

that we ought to do sensitivity tests. So I'm going to ask Mr. Hunt to deal with that. And then when he's finished, we'll be I'm going to ask Dr. Andrew Baroni, who deals with health impact issues, to just respond and what you've heard from the CCG. So first of all, I'll pass over to Mr. Ham.

18:39

Thank you, sir. Good afternoon.

18:42

So I think there were sort of two points raised by the

18:47

local authorities

18:50

around sensitivity testing, and then related to that kind of plan, monitor.

18:54

Planet monitor manage.

18:57

We did, of course, in the course of developing the gravity model, and those input assumptions, we worked with the local authorities to agree what those assumptions should be.

19:06

So those assumptions have changed over time. And we've gone through a process with the local authorities of

19:12

reviewing and agreeing those numbers. And, you know, as we've set out previously,

19:19

and at length, in



19:23

response to

19:27

global impact reports, the inherent conservatism that we've built in in terms of assumptions on the number of workers and that split between home based and non home based and about accommodation, and we did run various different assumptions, but we've arrived at this kind of as a central case.

19:45

And we've designed our monitoring, and some of our mitigation to be able to review where workers are actually living, and indeed will need to be able to be flexible in terms of bus routes, and

20:00

Things like that.

20:01

So we will monitor through the workforce survey where,

20:08

where workers are actually living.

20:11

And then within the proposed housing fund, there is specific elements about the resilience of the housing markets and stress and the ability to direct that fund to areas where it is most needed. So in terms of if there is a different outcome, the way we propose dealing with that is through monitoring it. And then through being able to adjust the mitigation in various forms

20:37

to ensure that it's, it's matched to where the workers

20:56

we've been quite good up until now avoiding feedback.

21:00

We will we're trying to avoid it. Now. I'm going to now pass over to Dr. Andrew Baroni to deal with the CCG. Thank you.

21:15

Yep, that should be passed over.

21:19

Yeah, just by way of introduction. My name is Dr. Andrew Browning. I've been working on Sizewell since 2014. Hinkley Point C before that as well as a

21:30

number of other nuclear power stations in relation to the points raised by Miss Maloney. Yes. We're working towards a green wording by September. But yes, we're collaboratively addressing it

21:45

likely to receive something by deadline five, at least an update, hopefully as to the progress.

21:54

And if there are differences between you while they are

21:58

helpful, just to keep us

22:02

up to speed on it. Yet, we can provide a notes on the update to that as well as where the stable Common Ground is. Thank you.

22:15

Okay, so the next element on the agenda, I think, is the housing and accommodation strategy. We've obviously touched on this already in some detail this morning.

22:28

And clearly, the provision of the campus and its associated facilities is

22:36

a key principle part of the mitigation, I think it is identified as primary mitigation in your in the applicants environmental statement. So I don't know whether you're able to answer this for me, but I hope so, what point is the accommodation assessment identified, there is a need for additional accommodation beyond that, which could reasonably be supported by the local community.

23:03

So I'm going to hand over on this to Mr. Hunt? Who can answer that question. So

23:13

hope to understand.

23:21

Thank you.

23:25

The need for the compensation campus isn't driven entirely by what the local accommodation housing market can cope with. We have a project need and desire for the accommodation to aid the efficient and productive delivery of the project.

23:43

So the environmental assessment doesn't start from the principle of how much existing combination can we use? It starts from the point of

23:54

when should can the accommodation campus be delivered? And what is then the

24:02

the residual impact? So we've assumed that the campus is delivered by the end of year three in order to do the assessment. And what's the timing of the campus is driven by other matters is deliverability, in part, but also our desire to have it there. Because it's so important to us in terms of managing our workforce, having been close to sites and avoiding other impacts. So there isn't an answer within the s, which is

24:28

how much accommodation could you use, we have assessed the implications of the scale of the campus and that residual need for the peak of construction. And but we our starting point for the timing on campus is not

24:47

when is it needed for the housing market point of view. It's, it's about the project requirements as well.

24:57

It's interesting, interesting

25:02

It's referred to throughout the environment, state and environment assemblies, primary mitigation, rather than your explanation is that it's actually a sort of facilitator for the delivery of the project in an efficient manner. And

25:21

pose a question sort of in reverse. If if the At what point if the accommodation campus wasn't provided? There would be I think you'd agree adverse effects on the local community for in terms of housing supply?

25:41

Well, to the extent that we've identified local impacts, even with the campus that require mitigation, then yes, those impacts would be

25:50

bigger.

25:52

But to return to the point that the campus is both it is primary mitigation. But it's also essential for the effective and efficient delivery of the project. So it's,

26:03

it's not just that it is it is essential.

26:09

that

26:12

the reason I'm asking is that I'm trying to get a handle on the justification for the numbers that you're promoting, in the location that you're promoting them. And the timing of that delivery. Because each of those different factors is obviously having slightly different effects. And what I need to be confident of is that the numbers are appropriately reflective of

26:46

delivering appropriate mitigation for the local community, but not so large as to be having an undue adverse effect.

26:58

In the reverse, and if you like, and so

27:03

what I'm not really understanding is how you've quite extrapolated,

27:10

resolving those two sort of competing and conflicting issues.

27:15

And so can you assist me with that?

27:22

As

27:24

we make clear in the accommodation strategy, and in the essay itself, we are seeking a balanced approach. And we're seeking a combination of managed accommodation posted site and

27:37

slightly distant from the site. And the use of existing spare capacity of which I think it has gotten the ground that there is significant spare capacity, particularly in the tourism sector outside of the peak, and therefore delivering economic benefits and kind of matching that temporary demand with

27:57

the kind of temporary supplies. So

28:02

we've been sort of clear on,

28:07

on how we've tried to strike that balance. And through consultation, we've had very different representations on

28:16

the scale that that would be required, and what what is an acceptable residual level of demand and what can be effectively mitigated. And I think we've reached agreement with the local authorities that the scale of the campus and the scale of project providers accommodation, combined with the scale of the housing fund is appropriate to

28:41

delivering a level of mitigation that meets that kind of peak demand.

28:47

It's very difficult to say

28:50

precisely what the capacity of the housing market is, as I said, we've been very conservative in terms of our assumptions about housing supply, we haven't seen very much growth, being conservative about our assumptions about non home based workers.

29:06

But, you know, it would be difficult to arrive at, you know, a single answer that this is the amount of people that could be accommodated.

29:17

So, as I say, this is something that's, you know, we've discussed through consultation, we started with a wider range, you know, we've come down to

29:27

2400 on site and the six hundreds, the campus, as I say that's been informed by responses from consultation by project needs, it's also important mitigation of transport as well of course,

29:39

and taking care of vehicle journeys off the road.

29:43

And there are sort of physical sight constraints in terms of what we can achieve on that site. So really, it's been a balance of those issues. We the the campus technical report sets out how we've gone through the the sighting

30:01

And those issues. So, as I say, it really is a balance and a judgement that's been informed by engagement and consultation and to say that we now think we're in agreement with the local authorities that

30:14

the residual demand for housing at peak is capable of being mitigated

30:21

and that the campus is an appropriate size.

30:27

Right? Well, I'm going to come to the council's in a moment on that and recognise. So thank you for your response. So far. Also see that I've got a number of interested parties who would wish to comment. So if I can come to Mr. Collins first, please. And then I'll come to the council's before returning to the applicant. Mr. Collins.

30:49

Thank you Mr. Moreland. Paul Collins on behalf of seven nice bridge parish Council.

30:55

It's a very confusing picture, I think is the best way of putting this.

31:01

Mr. Hunt talked about the the number of bed spaces that the the cameras coming down to 2400. I think it was from 3000, that I'd be willing to be corrected on that number. But since that period of time, the maximum number of workers on site has gone from 5500 to 7900.

31:25

So the if the assessment was done based on 5500, how come we are now faced with the idea that we've got to find a further two thirds, well, some proportion of those 2400 additional workers are going to need extra accommodation somewhere around the area. Because many will be non home based workers, presumably

31:52

the idea

31:55

that this location is specifically a good one, there was plenty of other

32:01

there was a report by done for the county council, looking at some alternative sites, some of which are actually in the local area, they're not not far away. These were basically taken out of the of the assessment. And we were told that it wasn't the appropriate place that all of the people had to be close to the site.

32:27

The other thing is specific significant space capacity outside.

32:33

We can't go from 5500 works to 7900 workers with a static number of provisions locally, there isn't enough room also on the site to add to that, and I do understand that. But the the applicant just seems to think somehow the local area can can absorb this massive increase.

32:56

The other thing Mr. Hunt was talking about is significant space capacity outside of peak? Well, I'm not sure which peak is talking about, if it's the peak from what what we expect in the tourism space. In other words, perhaps winter use utilisation is lower than the rest of the year. We might accept that. But one of the things that this area has been very, very successful at is making tourism a 12 month.

33:27

phenomenon. Yes, it made it but times of the year, but it doesn't dip to the extent that these sorts of numbers would indicate plus the fact even if it does dip, how are you going to actually then provide the extra spaces during the months when there is no dip. So it seems to me that this assessment is not really fit for purpose. And I don't think that the applicant has really provided a credible explanation of how they're going to accommodate all these workers without significantly affecting local housing stocks, low rent, low, low cost, rental accommodation, etc, etc. in the air. There will be huge impacts on this and they will be very difficult to mitigate. These are not big areas. This is not like Bridgewater, Bridgewater is a place of 35,000 people. It's it's a much larger space than the five and a half 1000 people we have in less than and the smaller areas in in places like South Laurel and Ober, which To be frank are not the sort of areas I suspect that sighs what workers are able to be what transit workers will be able to afford or go to. So I find the entire explanation of how this is going to work.

34:47

Not really, not really credible. Thank you.

34:51

Alison downs, please.

34:56

Good afternoon, Alison. Don't stop sighs we'll say Mr. Collins.

35:00

This has made a number of the points I intended to make. But I just wanted to observe it's refreshing to have people like Andy hunt, giving evidence in this hearing, because we had different answers to what we were told throughout the consultations that the campus was for mitigation purposes. And you've heard him say that its primary purpose is for the delivery of the project. So, you know, we don't feel that the applicant has been very open with us throughout the consultation period. And, and it may be that there's agreement with the local authorities about the size of the campus, but I just want to make sure it's on record, that the local communities totally oppose this number of people in that location.

35:44

I certainly understood that from representations I've read.

35:48

Jenny Kirkley, please.

35:57

Hello, thank you. Sorry, we're trying to turn something off here.

36:05

Johnny Curtly, on behalf of together coincides, we'll see.

36:09

Just a point I want to make on housing stock in the area at the moment on Rightmove within a five mile radius and including Leiston. There are currently two properties available. One two bedroom house plus a two bedroom flat in Leiston. Within 15 miles radius of Leiston. There are 14 properties available, mainly two bedroom houses or flats. Where the how we're locals especially the bonds chemigation. And in fact the home in the area. Exact properties for sale. Miss currently offer rent. No, they're for rent. Okay. That's what's available on the rental market on right. Okay.

36:54

Mrs. COVID, please.

36:58

Thank you. The applicant has led us to believe that having a contract is in accommodation good accommodation within the red line, the construction site is highly beneficial to the local local people.

37:14

It will protect the student from unscrupulous landlords creating HMOs for contractors who will be reticent to move I would imagine once they are settled in accommodation.

37:28

Leiston always did suffer from poor housing prices because of the effect of the size will be construction and is likely to suffer in the same way unless the campus is there providing accommodation for the contractors in the main. And I'd like to just say that I would totally agree with everybody else has said the housing stock is currently under pressure. And I don't understand where these figures are coming



from that there is somehow within the community, the ability to house all these extra contractors in the early years of the construction period. Thank you Mr. Moon. Thank you.

38:08

Good evening Galloway, I think is Next please.

38:13

Hello again. Edwina Galloway on behalf kill Cellcom Calvin parish Council.

38:19

exhibition brief point. In our submission at two, we referred to a document produced by hardest read Jones several years ago that referred to eight to 9000 people associated with the development which is somewhat higher than the seven nine, I understand from Hinkley that that number is being approached. Now. The reason given at the time was the pandemic but actually how just re Jones estimated that will be the figure before the pandemic. As all of these figures are based on the estimated number of workers. We're very concerned about the impact on the population. Thank you. Thank you.

39:08

Come now to the use of the council is about to fall, please.

39:13

Thanks, Isabella. For that you suffer counsel. As you know, sir, our concerns relate to the potential displacement of tourists and residents as a result of the significant number of construction workers of whom Some 5880 are expected to be non home based at peak construction. And the applicant recognises that there will be

39:39

adverse impacts between minor to major on tourist accommodation at the local level. And they also recognise major impacts on the private rental sector particularly in laced in all respects. mundum and Oxford.

39:55

And in some of those areas, there's a particular concern but

40:00

Because of the high levels of vulnerable people in housing need, who will have to compete with the size will see workers. So the provision of the accommodation campus and the caravan site seek to address those concerns. Even with them in place, there'll be adverse residual impacts, which the tourism fund is directed towards.

40:21

As to the principle and scale of the accommodation campus and the caravan site, the council agrees with the applicant. As to the location, the council's position is that the proposed locations adequately balance the needs of the project, and the environmental and community effects. And are the point at

which we differ with the applicant is the timing for their delivery. And you'll have seen in our comments on the decio, which is rep 3064. Point 16. The Council's raised concerns that the campus in the caravan site should come forward in a timely manner. And it has suggested some amendments to the decio. In particular, identifying the campus and the caravan site as separate works. And then including a requirement on the decio. Firstly, that the campus should be completed by the peak construction year, which is either suggested by the Council to be 2028, or what by the time 7000 people are employed in construction activity. And the second requirement suggested by the Council is that the caravan site should be provided before the authorised development can commence. And the reason for those concerns for those concerns really relate to the point that you were raising with the applicant earlier. And it's the fact that the provision and delivery of those the campus in the caravan site have been treated as embedded mitigation. And there's been no, there's been no assessment of the impact on the housing sector, absent the provision of those facilities. And we've heard Mr. Hunt to explain earlier that the assumption in the US was that the campus should be delivered would be delivered by year three.

42:21

And

42:24

our current currently, there's a requirement for the applicant to use reasonable endeavours to deliver the campus by year three. And we have asked that the campus there should be a long stop to that effectively, which requires the campus to be completed by what would be year six, so 2028 or by the time of 7000 construction workers, which is close to the peak of 7900.

42:50

And it's it's it's not as Mr. Rhodes mentioned, I think yesterday that the counsellor seeking the delivery of the accommodation campus right at the outset, far from it, we've allowed a longer period than the applicants themselves have assumed. But we do think it's

43:14

I'm sorry, Mr.

43:17

Frozen? Sorry, sir. I hope I'm back now. You're back. Now I lost you for a moment. So Sure. What I was saying was that given that the ies assumes that at the time of peak construction, the campus will be fully occupied. We think it's perfectly reasonable to impose a requirement that it should be completed and available for occupation. By the time 7000 construction workers are engaged. There's then a discrete issue in relation to the caravan site. And you'll have seen the council's request that that should be delivered. Prior to construction works commencing that is the subject of some discussion between the council and the applicant. And it may be that there's some scope for further flexibility on that front. But the reason for the request for early delivery is

44:14

that there's been some experience Hinkley Point C with unauthorised stationing of caravans which has led to enforcement action by the local authority. Now that's recognised in the applicants accommodation strategy. And it's 10s or certainly the experience at Hinckley was that that unauthorised site in caravans related to the early civils workers and it's for that reason that the council want to see the early delivery either before construction commences or perhaps current discussions or within six months of construction commencing and there's some scope if if that is delayed to six months which is currently being discussed whether some adjustment would have

45:00

To my to the tourism fund to reflect that later delivery. Thank you, sir. Thank you. whilst you're still there, can I just ask you in terms of the

45:11

proposed adjustment to the requirement that you're presenting to the applicant?

45:21

How does that actually resolve the problem that you're potentially identifying? It's in terms of the timeframe, you're suggesting? It appears quite late.

45:34

Just in terms of my thinking off the top of my head at the moment, if you're looking at peak delivery being available? Are you talking about the whole thing being available at that point? Or are you looking at a phased delivery so that you already have

45:51

a proportion online and ready and usable? Because it goes on to the concern that has been raised by others about once people get settled in one place, they probably will wish to stay rather than move around several times. So I'm just

46:12

interested know what your view is on that. Thank you, sir.

46:16

As I say, we've heard the applicants operational reasons for wanting to deliver that campus at an early stage. And we have no reason to doubt that they will use their reasonable endeavours to establish it within those three years. What we say is that all of the assessments in the Yes, assume certainly that by the time of peak construction, they're in place and available. And so that's what we seek to secure. Hopefully, it will be earlier, but absent any assessment of the impacts of peak construction, without that, it's we say, wouldn't be appropriate to allow a situation whereby peak construction activity is reached without the campus being in place.

47:04

Okay.

47:08

Right, I just need to think about that outcome. I'll come back to the Mr. Ashton, I think, the Oxford parish councils next.

47:18

I it is actually following on from that point, and I think your confusion, I'm similarly extremely confused. And it seems to imply that, say a few months before peak construction, there wouldn't be an impact that required the campus to be there, but at the absolute peak of construction, it would need to be there. And surely, that makes no sense in them. There would be massive risks that needed to be mitigated a few months before peak construction by the presence of the campus. So surely it has to be there. Well before peak construction.

47:52

Okay.

47:55

Mr. Bedford, from Suffolk County Council.

48:02

Thank you. So Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So in terms of the issues about the the size of the accommodation campus, Karen seitzer, we don't take any issue with that. And we don't take any issue with the location. We do endorse the concerns expressed by the Suffolk council as to the timing and deliverability of that important part of the project, which obviously is required as mitigation, as well as it may have a role for the constructability of the project.

48:42

As to whether requirements or something tighter in the deed of obligation is the most appropriate mechanism where perhaps more agnostic, but that's a matter for further discussions rather, for this afternoon. So I think probably the only point that I would want to bring in

49:01

one of the counter counsels offices is obviously it's the knock on consequences in relation to the non home based workers accommodation provision, the campus is obviously an important part of that. And in numerical terms, the largest part, as well as the site accommodation, but clearly there are the other non home based workers who are, as it were.

49:29

quite sure they're the right word populated across other areas of the normal housing market, whether that's in private rented sector, or in an occupation or other forms. And it's the knock on consequences of that, for the particularly the delivery of those services of the County Council, which are residentially based. And for that purpose, I don't think I need to

49:56

deal further with the issue about vulnerable or disadvantaged

50:00

Because Mr. Ferrara has already covered that in her comments. But there is, I think, a particular comment in terms of adult service provision and residential care. And if I could bring in Gavin multitud, who is the Assistant Director, strategic planning and resources, Adult and Community Services, just to express our concerns on that aspect and therefore wanting to ensure that adequately addressed and mitigated? Thank you. Thank you, sir.

50:31

The Adult Social Care market in terms of residential and nursing care in Suffolk, as in the rest of the country is quite fragile.

50:41

The financial returns are low.

50:45

And many of the businesses are struggling to remain sustainable. We would worry that an increased demand for accommodation from workers at sizewell c could lead the owners of some of the residential or nursing home or supported housing businesses in the size well area to actually see greater returns in closing their business and use property asset for housing for workers, thus reducing the access of local people vulnerable local people to Social Care Services.

51:32

Okay, I understand that concern. Thank you.

51:37

Mr. Wilson.

51:43

Thank you, Mr. moaned. Chris Watson on behalf of together again. So as we'll see, I think Miss tougher just said that the SF work we're looking for the caravan site, perhaps to be up and running before the works commence. But forgive me if I miss her yesterday, but I thought this McCallum for the applicant yesterday said they might be using the caravan site as like a mini Park and Ride before they actually constructed the main Park and Ride sites to thinking about it can't be both if I if I did recall that correctly.

52:18

I don't think you have I think on the land, the Li the land east of eastland Industrial Estate, there are two elements on either side of the proposed rail spur. The

52:32

park and ride is on the one side, forgetting Forgive me the name of the road at the moment. And the caravan campus is proposed on the Valley Road side. So they're quite distinct. But

52:47

hopefully that's assisted you. Come now to the applicant.

52:53

Mr. forepart? Before you respond, one of the issues that does concern me and it has been mentioned in some of these responses is

53:05

the ongoing pressure that could arise on

53:11

private rented sector and existing housing stock and how that filters down to more vulnerable groups in society, and how that has been properly addressed and to avoid concerns as if they were to arise. So hopefully you'll be able to in your response, allay my fears they're

53:36

sort of racist from it. Yes. I've got quite a list of points. We've been listening to a number of speakers

53:46

as we going along, and I've got a note of your concerns. And if I might deal with them in order, because I think Mr. Ham having heard that will we'll be able to respond to it. But can I suggest to do so that I am able to pick everything up? Did I take the points in the order that they arose? And so

54:14

deal first with an issue that Mr. Collins raised, which was in about the relationship of the change in predicted worker numbers to the number of bed spaces on campus. And so I'm going to ask Mr. Hunt to deal with that first and when he has I'll come back and deal with pick up the next point. Okay.

54:52

Thank you, sir.

54:54

So click two points to make about that. One is

54:58

as I set up previously, this guy

55:00

Campus is based on that kind of Balanced View. And some of that is about site constraints. So point to make is that we did introduce the additional capacity of the caravan site,

55:12

at the same time as we set out the new hire workforce. So we are making more project provided accommodation available. And the third thing to say, obviously, is to kind of circle back round, we recognise that that leaves a residual demand in the wider market that needs mitigation.

55:34

And, you know, we've been discussing the scale of that mitigation, we're agreed about the nature of that mitigation with the local authorities that those impacts are capable of being mitigated. So

55:46

there was an increase

55:48

in body provided accommodation at same time as the workforce increased. And we agreed with the council the nature of that package of mitigation. And we're confident that we'll reach agreement on the scale as well.

56:09

Thank you. So the related point, which I'm going to ask Mr. Hunt to pick up was raised by other speakers, and it related to the local

56:24

market and the conditions that prevail, and the extent to which it was likely that the funds, the mechanisms that we propose to include within the deed of obligation are going to produce additional bed spaces, particular concern raised about that. And so again, that's, that's a matter I get to ask Mr. Hunt, to deal with, and then we'll come on to the the timing of the campus.

57:02

Thank you. So

57:05

the detail on this is set out in Section 31.2.

57:10

of our AP three data 044, where we set out a range of details on the reasons why our approach has been very conservative, starting with the relatively low proportion of home based workers, certainly compared to what we've seen in clay,

57:28

and what is being seen in England. And then secondly, we've also, we've done the assessment and you know, the work we've been doing with local authorities has been effectively based on more or less static markets, we haven't taken account of the growth of the combination supply in private rented sector or tourism tourism sector, we do know both have grown.

57:52

We're taking no account of latent accommodation, that is people, you know, renting out spare rooms, or excuse me, again, bringing forward

58:03

sometimes, perhaps what sometimes referred to as unconventional all the other times, in other cases, we're just purely new supply that's converting outbuildings and things like that. So,

58:13

Hinkley Point C we've seen it's varied over time, but between sort of 11 and 13% of the workers have been in that kind of

58:20

latent accommodation. And we've taken we've made no assumptions about the extent to which that will happen here. We expect it to and in particular, we expected to because of the housing fund.

58:32

And housing fund contains quick and easy measures that can be deployed very early on.

58:42

In key points, see,

58:46

there's some housing from the delivery of our 1000 bed spaces in the private rented sector. It's actually already done about two and a half 1000. That's about one and a half times the demand from workers that's arisen in the 1500 of those in the early years. So we have a high degree of confidence

59:05

that

59:07

the assumptions in our work and underpin the housing fund itself are quite conservative and the market can and will respond in particular because of the support that will be provided by the housing fund. But I think we're in broad agreement with the authorities about that.

59:27

Closing in on what the scale of that fund should be.

59:36

Thank you, sir. Can you hear me now? Okay.

59:40

Thank you to start getting some slight delay on my microphone coming on and off. So I just wanted to make sure. And so we then come on to the question that Mr. Ferber raised, which is the issue of the appropriate way in which to encapsulate the



1:00:00

commitment to the delivery of the campus accommodation. And the suggestion that that might be dealt with through the decio. By I think it was put by reference to a long stop, which might include worker numbers. Now, I'm keen not to rehearse all of the points that we dealt with on Tuesday, particularly in light of the fact that we have said, we're going to put in a note that deadline, five, but there are just two points, which I'll raise so that you can be

1:00:36

you and your colleagues can have them in mind in the meantime, and I think are helpful in this. The first is to just consider what are the implications

1:00:49

of such a mechanism? in circumstances where as Mr. Rhodes explained, and I don't think is disputed, in terms of the construction sequencing, we have to get the campus up and running at a particular point. So we have every incentive, as Mr. Rose explained to deliver it when we say we will, because we we need it.

1:01:12

But also, if for any reason, despite the fact that we have a strong incentive to deliver it, and if we have used as the obligation has it are reasonable endeavours to do so. Nevertheless, there has been some delay.

1:01:29

What is the anticipated enforcement? What measure is it anticipated will be taken if the workforce was approaching those numbers without it in place. And I think that's important in terms of the likely efficacy and therefore the choice between different means of securing, because unless it is anticipated that you would say, Stop, or that you would actually it would be in the public interest in those circumstances to slow things down.

1:02:05

Then it becomes a question of what are you gaining by means of having it in a requirement if in fact, the nature of the issue you're dealing with doesn't lend itself to that? So I just I raised that point, we'll deal with it in the note that I raise it. So that was a surprise that the second point,

1:02:27

again, helpful context in this regard, you'll recall during the transport session related to this question of delivery, and in the context of the urgency project, and therefore, what approach should be taken to control measures requirements?

1:02:49

Wait to you.

1:02:50

Yeah, already.

1:02:56

Right. Hopefully, that was.

1:02:59

Actually that's it?

1:03:01

Yeah, yes. And you're recalling context of that discussion, which is how much significance what weight does one apply to the question of urgency and potential impact on the construction sequence, and the overall construction timetable to the 2035 date. And Mr. Rhodes made points about how that was his understanding of the way that

1:03:28

government policy worked, and particularly your recall the way that the pathways to 2050 were dealt with. So there is a if I can give you a reference to references in the planning statement. So this is the original planning statement, which is ap 590,

1:03:50

which are helpful in that respect and provide is quite an important framework to when we're considering this issue overall. The first reference is paragraph 3.3 point six, and this deals with the ministerial state

1:04:10

in 2017, December 2017, on NFV infrastructure, you'll recall that there's a 2017 statement then the consultation that 2018 response, and the ministerial statement in 2017, talked about the new MPs. And it said the new MPs once designated will have effect for the purposes of Section 104 of the act for development, which forms part of the product able to demonstrate expected deployment after 2025 and before the end of 2035.

1:04:47

So just pausing there that's anticipating that the new NPS is going to cover projects that can demonstrate deployment before the end of 2035. So

1:05:00

If you can't demonstrate, you can deploy in that time, you would fall outside the scope of the MPs, which is as clear an indication as one could expect of the significance of the 2035 date, in terms of the government's thinking about urgency, that if you slip beyond that you would slip outside the scope of the MPs. That's the first reference, we'll have to see what

1:05:26

is in any draft mpss and when it comes out, but the second related reference, which is at the end of paragraph 3.3, point seven, and this relates to the July 2018 response to consultation.

1:05:41

And at the end of that paragraph, and the pain statement points out that annex two of the response confirmed and then this is the quote from paragraph,

1:05:53

Roman two for government's view is that those sites listed in en six continue to be those sites which can deploy the soonest and are likely to be the only sites capable of deploying a nuclear power station by 2035. So you may recall yesterday that there was some debate as to whether or not 2035 has significance in terms of government's thinking and government's policy. I say it really does based on what the government has said so far. And therefore that's an important framework. If one is contemplating a requirement, the effect of which would be to push completion and deployment further out to the right and further towards that deadline. It's a very important public interest consideration, and needs, therefore, to be fully taken into account when we're considering these alternative ways of securing the campus. So I'm keen that we that we don't go too far into this. But I'd just like, if I could, to ask Mr. Rhodes very briefly, just to supplement that.

1:07:02

In terms of the factual context here. Okay. Let's hope it's brief.

1:07:14

Afternoon, Mr. Road.

1:07:17

Sorry, I can't hear yet.

1:07:21

Still still can't hear you. I'm afraid.

1:07:56

So apologies. If you can hear me now.

1:08:05

Once it will be enough, sir. I'm sure.

1:08:09

So I just wanted to say clearly, there are practical issues here about how we do this. And also, in some sense, my, I think we're all very much saying the same thing. Here, we've all got the same intention to get the campus delivered, as soon as it needs to be delivered, and it needs to be delivered early. We all recognise that. And we have no more interest in causing housing stress in the local market than anybody else does, for several reasons. So I just wanted to say that we're taking away or may we take away from this discussion, the thought that we need to try and find a way of generating comfort around the fact that whilst we have a shared objective, how can we ensure that others are comfortable that it will be delivered when it needs to be delivered, we'll look at different mechanisms. And we're discussing with the delivery team issues relating to that there are practical issues as to how quickly the campus

can be produced, we can't go straight onto the campus site and build it the access works and necessary, those sorts of things, apps, the reason it's placed where it is in the implementation plan, but we want to examine those. We want to examine ways of generating comfort for everybody that our shared objective is something that will come to pass. So we'd like to do that between now and decline five in discussion with the council. I think that would be extremely helpful. Now, I think you have made reference already in the written submission was about the possibility of phasing the introduction. And so that may also help in terms of assisting the comfort and, you know, I look forward to seeing the comments that deadline five, thank you. Okay, thank you.

1:09:59

Thank you. I know

1:10:00

The house from Dallas.

1:10:08

You're coming, please. Thank you Mr. Moreland and Dan, stop sighs We'll see. I'm I just have to respond to Mr. footbox lengthy explanation about urgency, and about how they seem to be using the extension of NPS replicability and the government's deadline of 2035 as justification to resist being held to account for the deliberate mitigation. And I'm reminded that the saying your failure to plan is not my emergency. Because if you compare the consultation times for Hinkley Point, they started in November 2009. And the DCI was submitted just less than two years later in October 2011. Whereas here consultation started in November 2012. And the decio wasn't submitted until May 2020. So there have been many years that EDF could have got a wriggle on and

1:10:58

develop these proposals more quickly.

1:11:01

Thank you. I

1:11:06

don't know whether I particularly want to

1:11:10

Mr. Wilkinson, you've raised your hand this point on the accommodation strategy?

1:11:17

Well, it is indirectly on guest service, the Hmong deaths if I could be permitted just

1:11:24

to report Alison Daltrey, what she just said, it seems that the applicant uses the justification for all speed on government policy, if you actually look at the policy, it doesn't talk about how we should reach net zero. There are lots of quicker ways of getting to net zero than the 12 to 15 years it's going to take

to build size We'll see. And I think it's unfair to keep justifying the need for the lack of early mitigation in an area down to one one, double two, which will be pure hell, for the first few years unless mitigation is put in first. And I think those things have to be taken into account, that it's not, in fact, sighs we'll see was conspicuously not mentioned in the opportunities as the government had to mention that we've got to get to net zero by 2050. We know that and there are way points along the way. But it's not necessarily because we have to build size, we'll see that we've got to get to net zero by the date that's now enshrined in law. And I think we should get move away from this constant harping back to the speed at which we'd have to build something received, not necessarily building. So see, the speed is in getting to the net zero. Thank you.

1:12:37

Thank you, Mr. Wilson. We'll come back to there. But

1:12:42

obviously, the question of need is different topic for a different day. So

1:12:51

don't really wish to rehearse the whole of that. But clearly the applicant does need the opportunity to respond to those points.

1:13:02

Thank you, sir. I don't propose to address you on need, because for reasons you set out in writing that settle. And so I don't need to take time on that. I'm very conscious that we came in on this point, with a series of responses to points that have been raised in particular point that you had raised, and I'm keen to complete that exercise so that we can give you the information that you particularly want. So that there are

1:13:32

I think two points that arise that are related. One came from the County Council, which was a concern about Adult Social Care. And then there's a particular issue that you raised about ongoing pressure on the private rented sector and how that might affect vulnerable groups. I that's my inexact encapsulation at the point, but I'm going to ask Mr. Hunter respond on both of these. Thank you.

1:14:10

Thank you, sir.

1:14:15

Taking your question. First, in terms of vulnerable people, a lot of fact, both of these issues are sort of partially addressed through our post hearing submission, which is wrapped to dash 130.

1:14:30

And in there, we've set out some evidence from Hinkley Point C. Around around impacts on homelessness.

1:14:42

And you'll also see from figure four and this picks up one of the points somebody else made was that the area around Hinkley Point C is very different from the area around Sizewell C in actual fact, as we show in figure four there, the housing market within 45 minutes, which is where the vast majority of

1:15:00

The non home based workers are expected to resign. And the size of the housing markets in the two areas within 45 minutes are actually very, very similar, both in terms of size and tenure. So the performance of the of the housing market around Hinkley, we think, shed some light on

1:15:19

the likely effects. Nevertheless,

1:15:23

we do recognise that there is a risk of homelessness increasing and so within the housing fund. And we have specifically included a resilience element to deal with housing market stress that arises, in particular for vulnerable people and presentations of homelessness. So we fully anticipate that the mitigation measures to boost supply will be effective, and they'll be an aggregate increase in supply. We hope to avoid any increase in homelessness, we're not seeing that, to any extent, include points T. But nevertheless, we recognise that there may need to be provision in place should it occur,

1:16:07

and sort of it slightly relates to that, but to the county Council's concern, we are, of course continuing to discuss this with them. And, again, it's kind of it's a question of evidence, you know, what, what, what's the evidence that

1:16:23

care homes would close as a result of demand from Sizewell C workers. The aim is that the housing fund will

1:16:33

provide a big boost

1:16:35

and increase the supply of housing.

1:16:40

You would need the value of residential property to increase on a permanent basis because developers consider this on a on a long term capitalised basis. And you would need the demand from Sizewell C to chain that relationship between the current value of the property and its existing use versus the future value

1:17:03

on an ongoing basis for that incentive to play through. We see no no sort of evidence of that. And certainly the evidence, and again, there's some information in that submission that we've given you that that impact on rambles around Hinkley points is is not that significant. So we're not seeing it feed through into house price pressure would create the incentive of the sort that the county was raised over above the existing demand for for housing

1:17:34

records that that sort of effect, but we continue to discuss it with them to understand better where the evidence on that leads us.

1:17:44

But, yeah, that's our kind of current understanding and information that we've put we've put before you, sir, as I say is in that to 130 chapter four.

1:17:54

Thank you.

1:17:57

I'm going to move on to the next topic on the agenda. But I've just seen Mr. Collins is have you

1:18:07

got something else to add on this point?

1:18:11

I have. I know you don't want to end up in a debating circle here.

1:18:15

But I find it quite difficult to understand the demographics of Hinkley Point being certainly the housing stock around Hinkley Point being anything like what it is here they have the M five literally 10 miles from their site, which opens up a much larger swathe of populated areas. I mean, if you don't take you cannot get to Ipswich in 45 minutes, you cannot get to Norwich in 35 minutes. The only places around here that are within 45 minutes are Southwold just halesworth obrah Saxmundham

1:18:52

Woodbridge just about that's half an hour. But you know, it's a massive difference. And I cannot accept that what they're telling me is is the correct

1:19:03

amount here this is you can get to Bristol in 45 minutes, pretty much you can't do you can't approach anywhere that size from here in 45 minutes.

1:19:16

Thank you, Mr. Collins. Mr. Biggers, have you got an additional point?

1:19:24

Yes.

1:19:26

So I have just to add to Mr. Collins and to the gentleman spoke on behalf of the applicant. I would contest what he's saying in regards to the housing situation in the Hinkley area, the areas section of housing regarding rental sector, as increased sex potentially in terms of value. So if the same was to arise in this area, it will have an impact on the sort of houses that would be rented in this area. So I'd like them to confirm that in an evidential way. Please

1:20:01

Thank you

1:20:05

go back to the applicant just to hopefully close off on this point, and then we can move on to the next item on the agenda. Mr. Phil.

1:20:14

Yes, thank you, sir. I think we're quite content. We've set out our position on this in writing and what we've said already, so we don't need to respond any further.

1:20:22

Thank you.

1:20:25

The next element is the concern about the potential influx of non home based workers. And we've obviously touched on this to quite a degree already today. But what I would like to hear from is laced in town council and the police and CCGs, particularly with regard to their concerns that they've identified about possible implications on sort of community impacts and the emergency service impact. So if I can first come to the Constabulary, please, Miss Philpott, would you mind switching your camera off?

1:21:10

I think just pros.

1:21:14

Thank you, sir. So I'll introduce chief superintendent, Retief to take the superintendent Cutler from the Constabulary Constabulary as the subject matter experts on climate policing and Mr. Cutler will address the extent of the discussions with the applicant, but also, particularly the model impacts. Both Constabulary Thank you. Can I just pause for a second? on my screen at the moment, Mr. Phil potties frozen? Is that the same for everyone?

1:21:43

No, I can see Suffolk Constabulary on the screen. Okay, well, I suspect this is the prelude to crashing. But let's carry on as long as I can hear you and



1:21:53

we'll see how we go.

1:21:56

Thank you, daikon, that sort of place.

1:21:59

So we've been we've been working for many years, planning for size We'll see. And we've been actively engaging

1:22:11

with EDF on the socio economic matters

1:22:15

over for over five years and very intensively for the last two years.

1:22:20

I guess due to what we consider weaknesses and gaps in in the assessment by the applicant. And the acknowledgments of our professional expertise in this area, we undertook and provided the applicant with what we believe is a detailed assessment of the policing impacts. We certainly have areas of agreement,

1:22:40

the need for our locally based neighbourhood style team, what even a Somerset referred to as that beating

1:22:48

the need for that team to be embedded in the local community.

1:22:53

And that also that is demand on policing that sits outside of that beating.

1:23:00

And this is what, as I said, was that engagement has on the whole being very positive. There are still significant disagreement

1:23:10

that remain on sort of key areas that remain of concern myself principally,

1:23:16

what that demand profile looks like the continent mitigation that's required to address that demand.

1:23:24

We continue to work

1:23:27

on a weekly basis to understand and develop these issues.

1:23:32

But I'd probably say now that

1:23:35

I further folk focused on SSH made required

1:23:40

and just wants to bring that to the attention of examining authority this time.

1:23:45

As part of our planning, we've engaged continuously with colleagues at Hinkley Point amongst my team and visit visited on a number of occasions to understand and we even visited pre construction starting to make sure that we were as ahead of the game as repeatedly.

1:24:06

We've also, as I said on Tuesday engage with colleagues from North Wales Police to undertake a similar process, you know, we're comfortable with with confidence in our modelling. We know there are differences between what we modelled and what the applicant has modelled.

1:24:25

But this comes back to I think we've heard on it on a number of occasions from a number of parties throughout the course of the last few days. The context of Hinkley Point is very different to the context of of sizeable

1:24:39

the demands, the demographics, communities are very different. And and to pick up on model

1:24:48

based purely on what's observed from Hinkley Point doesn't necessitate that it'll be fit or that we're applicable to the context of what what we see in the licences for that

1:25:02

Thank you.

1:25:05

Thank you.

1:25:07

What I'm going to do because I am having some technical issues, and I can't see what's going on, because I'm just going to adjourn is probably sensible time in any event, and then I resumed with the other interested parties before returning back to the applicant. So it's 22 four. And if we can return at five to four, I think that would be sensible. So, again, those watching the live stream, already need to

1:25:38

restart your browser. But we'll adjourn now until five to four. Thank you, sir. I suspect you can't see me because of your technical difficulties. So it's Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, could I just invite you during this adjournment to just think on the timetable of one point, which is just public health, was some of my personnel have a five o'clock, as it were difficulty. And so if there's any possibility of terms of the remaining items of the agenda, rejigging things so that we can be reasonably happy that public health is dealt with before five o'clock? Some of my team would be extremely grateful. But can I just leave us think about that? Yeah, no, thank you for that. I will

1:26:22

reconvene at five to four. And I'll look at the agenda in the meantime. Thank you. I'm grateful. Thank you, sir.