

# TEXT\_SizewellC\_ISH4\_Session4\_09072021

Fri, 7/9 6:02PM • 1:57:28

00:02

Small you're currently on mute. Can you hear me now? Okay. Yes. Super. Right. Sorry about that everyone resumed the issue specific hearing. Obviously the case teams confirmed they can now hear me. Presumably they can't see me. The livestream and the recording has re commenced. Yes, they have. Thank you. Unfortunately, judge my technical glitch, one wasn't certain whether the Constabulary had finished that point. Is there anything further you wish to say? or what have you got to the the end?

00:48

Well, I'm just a couple more areas to cover if that's okay with you, is please. Okay. So I, just before we broke, I talked about the sort of profile of demand and the differences between what we're modelling between Somerset and si as well. And the EVA Somerset memorial is, is very much structured around a single community team. And our assertion throughout our modelling with the applicant is that this, there's a need for a wider policing resource because of the amount of demand but also the nature of the demand, the complexity of it, and when it occurs, and a little bit of analysis of some of the incident data that we've seen from colleagues and even Somerset suggests that 50% of the recalls that are associated with Hinkley Point C, but what we would call of immediate nature requiring an immediate response. So the blue line response in Suffolk, and in most courses, visits outside of community teams, it sits in response teams 48% of the cats required police attendance. That's quite high, because when we look at what our figures are for overall Suffolk figures, only 39% of Suffolk calls would require an immediate police attendance. But in in the HPC data, it was 48. And we know that just under 50% of those incidents occurred outside of of the operating hours that beating so outside of that sort of 7am, two to 8pm. An 18% occurred at the weekends. Again, when the beatings are working through our engagement with colleagues in Somerset, much of that seems to be linked to nighttime economy issues. And again, you know, an assessment, we looked at how those incidents were broken down. So 31% linked sort of crime and nasb type issues 25% of those calls related to safety and welfare, and 21% related to transport, which goes back to some of those discussions yesterday. If we look again, at what our Suffolk figures would be for transport, generally it's about 13%. So a significant increase, I think is also worth saying that, you know, we probably all watched television programmes about sort of police investigations and when the single officer investigating a single crime and being successful, but but in reality, that's not the way it is. And we looked at some examples around the interface or policing units in even a sunset with with a single crime. So take a single crime, as soon as sexual offence. I counted 11 different teams interfacing with that single investigation name of Somerset, and again, with something as simple as a common assault, a very low level assault, still 1011 various teams interfacing, so not just that beat him, but a much wider implication across the wider Constabulary because policing isn't generalist, it's it's a series of specialists units that all come together to fulfil their parts and their duties to take people from the point of a call coming into the Constabulary through to the point of arrest and through the criminal justice system. And the second point I just wanted to cover was going to the mitigation. We've talked a little bit about that mitigation. And be aware the accommodation

strategy sort of fits into this but but to other areas of integration that we've been considering, had been talking to the applicant about have been the worker Code of Conduct And vetting and discussions. I guess the applicant is saying that these very much reduce the likelihood of crime being committed because their impact on behaviour of the workforce. We say there are some difficulties with that. If we look at the code of conduct it, it requires knowledge of employment, to be able to feedback through the system for transgressions in the community to be fed back into the system so

05:37

that the employer knows about them. That's very, that's all very well, if it happens outside the gates of the site, you know, it might be quite obvious, it's linked to the site itself. But the further away it gets further, though, the more difficult it becomes to associated to the side. We don't normally ask for employment status when we're dealing with what people's occupations are when we're dealing with crimes. And certainly, I would say that if you remember the workforce, and you asked if you were from the site, knowing that the word Code of Conduct might kick in as well. I guess you wouldn't necessarily offer up the fact that you were an employee and add to your woes. And then betting was the other sort of significant mitigating factor. And, and, again, you know, through our discussion with our colleagues, we're concerned around how effective fitting has been. There are different types of vetting for different types of purposes. And what we're seeing the vetting for site is very much linked to security around get sites as opposed to having a focus on safeguarding and community safety issues.

06:59

Thank you. Let's now come to less than town council, Mrs Corvett, please. Thank you, Mr. mahanta. Can you see me and hear me that I can thank you.

07:21

Much has been covered already in previous agenda items and also by our colleagues at Suffolk police. But licencing council would emphasise that 80% of the workforce will be based within our parish. And we do have major concerns about antisocial behaviour, front and centre. And also we have concerns about the emergency services, not just reaching the site but reaching our own residents. We live at least an hour away from the hospital. If there is any problems with ambulances or getting people to hospital due to heavy traffic or any problems of that description, then obviously that weighs heavily on our community and our ability to deliver the health and well being that our residents deserve. We're particularly concerned that the facilities on site might won't be ready at the beginning of construction. And therefore that will put pressure on what isn't very good and well performing GP surgery at the moment with a growing number of patients due to their their excellent care. And we have no dental practice in licen at the moment. I know this is a nationwide issue. But it's particularly pertinent for leisten because we have a large amount of people who are not mobile who don't have their own transport. And so health and well being dental care etc is very high on our agenda. I just like to go on if I make to sports facilities too. The Workforce access to sport and leisure facilities will put pressure on local provision adequate extra facilities must be provided as mitigation. These won't be ready in the early days neither a sports pitch with main use of the size of workers will not be enough. Sport is not the only recreational activity that most residents engage in should not be considered the recreational activity the size of contractors. Most and businesses need to compete with well paid employment and this always causes friction amongst the community. I'd also like to just mention briefly, that the term centre traffic

improvements that are in place going forward need to be completed before the beginning of construction. This This will prevent obviously potential traffic hazards and in particular air pollution without our town centre. We already have a very crowded town centre which is not particularly fit for purpose, even as it is and this will only exacerbate that problem. Housing provision has already been covered and is a major concern, as you already know. And there will be major competition within the market. And let's just add to the to the health provision to the concerns we have over mental health. The prospect of size we'll see is already affecting the mental health of some of our residents who might be impacted by the noise, the pollution and the anti social behaviour. And this needs to be recognised, too. I think, Mr. Moore that more or less covers the issues, I don't want to hold you up any longer than I have to. I think we have faith in in the agencies that are supporting us with delivery of all the things we need during the construction of size will see. And we will as a council continue to keep in touch with those agencies as we move forward. Thank you. Thank you very much.

10:52

I am mindful just at the point of a German to my technical difficulties that Mr. Belford did advise me of concerns about timing this afternoon. So I hope you can bear with me while I go to Mr. Bedford, because I do need to I would like to hear from him and his colleagues about the public health effects is obviously related to the community safety issues. But perhaps as they have quiet time on it, they could respond now.

11:28

Sir Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, so first, I'm very grateful for that and for taking that part of our contributions are out of turn. We do have separately some comments to make on both influx of non home based workers and the effects on emergency services, and also community safety, but I'll come back to those as separate matters. So in relation to public health, and

12:02

the

12:04

pre pre pre penultimate item on your agenda of the overall effect of the construction period on public health. I've got two members of the public health team. I've got Dr. Padmanabhan Badrinath, who is a consultant in public health. And then I've got the county Council's health protection manager chain halonen, both of whom have got matters they wish to raise on these issues. It's Miss Hallinan, who's got the time constraint in particular. So I start with Miss Holland, and then turn to Dr. Badrinath, if that's acceptable, yes, thank you.

12:55

Hi, there. So I think one of the issues that was raised was around the sexual health services. And there was an agreement that there would be plans in place from the beginning of the build and to be able to support them from the outset. And so I think that's the the major issue we have. The other issue that we have at the moment is just with regard to public health in general. And it's difficult to put specifics of general effect of public health overall. And to measure that from the outset. So the majority of the health issues will be addressed by the CCGs. And but specifically the ones within public health that we work to

open sexual health services. And I don't think we have any other specific issues there and they have been discussed already. Thank you. Mr. Bedford is yours?

14:02

Yes. My second speaker is available. And if I can then turn to Dr. Badrinath.

14:13

My apologies. I will just change the background My apologies. I grew up apologies for the background by just saying the background. So as Jane, as Jane said, the public health is much much overarching of this magnitude it will be quite difficult for us to estimate the impact at this point though my colleagues from the community safety will provide further information. And we have already stated that a large number of young fit men coming into the count date which is very welcome and the development but what we have got is there are some specific issues because the Public Health Commission the sexual health services, so those are the things with Jane was highlighting which have been covered as well in our submission. So these kinds of provision for these large number of men is one, which I just want to highlight. And also public health is quite difficult at this point, because we're quite into the future, the what both those impacts are some of them, it'll be very difficult for us to quantify. So those are the things I just wanted to add. Thank you, sir. Thank you.

15:24

Mr. metha. Do you have any other comments on the initial point on in terms of influx of on base work has an implication for community safety?

15:36

So yes, I'm afraid there are a number of incentives to two different aspects. to bear in mind, if I put it in overarching terms, first of all, and then I'll bring in the relevant personnel. Firstly, obviously, merely the non home base workers themselves, as it were, as a new addition to the residential population of the locality, for the period of the construction works, bring with them a whole range of what might be called Community problems or issues, whether that's in terms of children, safeguarding issues, whether that's in terms of vulnerabilities and behaviours. So there's, there's that aspect, which impacts on the delivery of county council services which relate to those matters. And then secondly, as it were, as a wider matter, that's not related only to the non home based workers. But the overall project itself as a significant addition, both to the local economy, and to the functioning of the local economy and the local network is the disruptive effect of that activity, again, on the delivery of county council services, you will appreciate that there is a incentive there is a distinction between clearly there are services that the county council by statute is mandated to provide. And clearly where the county council has legal duties, it clearly has legal duties to perform. And that is just as it is, but obviously, the way in which services are delivered. And the effect with the quality of service delivery is not in every case, circumscribed by statute, in terms of, for example, the frequency of appointments or the times that are allowed to be spent on appointments. So if it's homecare and things like that, what we are concerned about is the degradation of service delivery, not that obviously the county council is not talking about defaulting on its statutory obligations, because clearly it understands it has those statutory obligations. what it's talking about is the degradation in its ability to perform its functions that say the quality of service is maintained. So with that, by way of background context, could I bring in first of all gerbing Christine

Thiessen, who is the county Council's head of programmes, sorry, I apologise. He she is the county Council's assistant director communities who leads on community safety.

18:50

Thank you. Thank you. Good afternoon. Can you hear me? Yes. Thank you very much. So I can still see Mr. Bedford. Can you hear me sir? I can, I can hear you fine. Thank you. So the applicant acknowledges and agrees on a number of key areas that we've put forward in our written submission, not least about the influx of additional largely young males in the 20 to 49 age group coming in, who will be on relatively well paid salaries and and potentially have money in their pockets to burn. And there is also acknowledgement that there will be a significant risk that this will impact on the number of crime types that involve honourable people, including criminal exploitation, gangs, county lines, and domestic and sexual violence. So there is some agreed mitigations that we have that we've negotiated with the applicant and these include training and awareness around the impacts of these additional community safety risks, claims Criminal exploitation, domestic and sexual violence, etc. and working with the community and the applicant to to minimise the impact of these as much as possible. What I would say is that there are still some areas that we do not agree on. One of these is mainly the geographical spread of harm in Suffolk. So, there's very much a feeling from the applicant that the issues of the increase in crime and the community safety impacts will be felt mainly in the local area and will be minimised by the fact that there are the worker code of conduct and other mitigations in place. Our concerns are that actually in the local area to size Well, there's limited extracurricular activity or entertainment available and therefore, those that are employed in size will will travel to the nearest towns to find nighttime economy and places that they can go for for entertainment. And the impact of this can be seen in other areas where we have nighttime economies, and, you know, excess consumption of alcohol, which can lead to crime, antisocial behaviour, sexual violence, and unfortunately, domestic violence as well. So we would argue that the impact of this will be felt far more broadly than just in that local area. And the mitigations will certainly have have an effect while people are at work and in the workplace. But once they travel outside of those areas, I think is my colleague, and the police said it's much more difficult to attribute that necessarily to those people who are working at sighs well. The other the other thing that we felt would be important to mention on the worker code of conduct, and I think my police colleagues mentioned this as well, is that actually, we're not quite sure that that vetting will pick up those people who may have a predisposition for domestic violence, or other low level crime and antisocial behaviour in their past that's not necessarily going to be flagged through the worker code of conduct.

22:13

Thank you. And then finally, so if I can crave your indulgence, suffered Fire Rescue Service, and Mr. Ian Mallet, who is the Fire and Rescue Service Group manager to risk and resilience, and if he provided his contribution at this point.

22:34

Good afternoon, sir. My name is Ian Mallet as previously introduced. So a bit of background from Fire and Rescue Service perspective and without wishing to go over old ground, appreciate the times. Demographically that's been very well versed through previous hearings. What I will state is community safety is not only just how we contribute to safety needs in our communities, but it's also a blue light

response. Our makeup is that we are predominantly rural. The differences that we have compared to our counterparts in Devon Somerset, is we are predominantly rural in the area surrounding Sizewell being Laced and Orah and Saxmundham are what are known as on call stations. That means that we have a concern around the availability of personnel who work in mainstream jobs that remaining available for blue light response. So we have a concern with that we are working with the applicant in order to resolve this issue of management moving forward, but it remains a concern. It's been very well versed through my colleague Christine in the county council as to our concerns, which are replicated when it comes to community safety needs be a domestic violence, we do have active engagement in that area. And we also have involvement in the multi agency safety hub when it comes to any area of community safety impact. We are working with the applicant in order to realise these issues but they remains some differences in some areas that need to be resolved. That would provide you with an overview of where we're currently at. A little bit more on on the operational availability of the service itself if I was to do a direct comparison with Hinkley there near his hometown station is approximately 11 miles away. When in comparison for the size well project we are looking at Ipswich and Lowestoft with the two stations being Ipswich 52 minutes normal travel speed and last off South being 42 minutes. So there is some difference that we need to work on to ensure availability is robust moving forward. Thank you

25:03

Are there any more contributions? Mr. Bedford? Oh, is that?

25:08

No, thank you. So that was extremely helpful to have that as one suite of contributions. I'm grateful for taking that out. And apologies to everybody else who's been busy waiting for that.

25:20

Thank you. recognise we've got three speakers hand up. But I do also want to hear from the East of England ambulance service on this point. So I wonder if I can come to you now and then I'll come to the three speakers who raised hands.

25:41

Yes, thank you. Good afternoon, sir. I'm cranking I'm the resilience manager for the eastern run ambulance service. And we provide accident and emergency services and non emergency patient transport services across the East of England region, including the geographical catchment area associated with the proposed size we'll see project. We submitted the section 56 relevant representations and responded to the applicants proposed changes consultation in September and December 2020, respectively, and attended the preliminary examination meeting in March 2021, where we requested an extension to the procedural timeline, first draft 23rd July, to undertake impact modelling and review the statement of Common Ground due to the extenuating circumstances and unprecedented demand we're faced and continue to face as a result of the coronavirus pandemic. The trust continues to operate under severe pressure, with many staff and resources being redeployed to areas of critical functions with a focus on delivering frontline operations and patient care. East England Eastern dynamic service abbreviated East are in a unique position that intersects health, transport and community safety and have and as such have respectfully requested participation in health, transport,

and community safety working groups is have not been requested to attend the issue specific hearings in relation to transportation. And we would take this opportunity to reiterate our position that in that as a blue light emergency agency, we have the same transportation concerns as our blue light partner agencies in Suffolk Constabulary and Suffolk Fire Rescue Service. Due to the shared nature of our blue light responding duties. We will continue to work with both suffered considerably and suffered Fire and Rescue to address the areas of transportation and community safety. East would however, respectfully request that their position as a blue light agency is acknowledged and they were afforded the opportunity to present concerns or points of order to the transport review working groups as necessary. Whilst findings from Hinkley Point C and the impacts on blue light services are helpful, due to the demographic and geographical difference between Suffolk enabled and suffered Somerset mitigation secured by blue light services to reflect the impact of Hinkley Point C cannot simply be transposed across to size we'll see two suffers needs. With regard to the health impacts, Easter working closely with the Suffolk northeast Essex ICS, the lead Commissioner for the trust, annual funding agreements are made via our commissioners, and therefore any financial mitigation requests for East will be made by our commissioners is to undertake an impact modelling on the potential increase in 909 activity to the local area, excluding those to the construction site, and the assumed uplift in non annoying calls based on the DCR data. From our helpful conversations with the health working group, we understand that is we managed through our regular contract negotiations with our lead commissioners and system partners, which would negate the need for an in depth detailed technical model. with reference to the topic specific to today's hearing, he would like to formally state their concerns in the following areas, recruitment and retention of staff within the area, support for skills and education initiatives such as our community first responder schemes and public education and their initiatives. During peak tourism during the peak tourism period, there's an increase in demand and our services particularly around coastal areas, which require specific targeted planning, support in developing, developing and implementing monitoring mechanisms and clear lines of government, such as reporting to be appropriate working groups such as the transport review group, the impact of congestions on the traffic network remains a concern to ease due to the nature of our business and ability to achieve our ambulance response times. We support the position of Suffolk Constabulary and Suffolk Fire Rescue Service. In this regard. We will continue to work collaborative collaboratively with the applicant health system partners, and blue light partners to mitigate these risks. Thank you for your time. Thanks coming out to poll colleagues, please.

30:10

Thank you, Mr. Moore. And before I start, I just like a little bit of guidance. Actually, we seem to straight into about four of these areas on your agenda. So what would you like me to cover? I can certainly start at the influx of home workers and then move on or what how would you like to play it?

30:30

I think bearing in mind the contributions that have already been made to try and save time if you can deal with the non home based workers emergency serious impacts and public health issues that have been covered by others, then hopefully the applicant will be able to group his responses together. Now that will be helpful in saving time and me going backwards and forward.

30:58

Certainly not a problem. Okay, so if I start with from this is from obviously from seventh Newbridge parish Council, and some of our counsellors, concerns that have been raised in these areas, influence of non home based workers, I think some of this has been covered, but just to say specifically, that the change that we are expecting in demographics of people who are going to be in there is becoming will become very, very different to what it is now, it's a very local community, close to particularly to the campus site where two and a half 1000 people or thereabout will be housed. The people in the community know each other, there's a very high level of safety implied in that our children can, when they get across the roads, walk on the lanes quite happily. The there are various other members of the community and the women are very safe to walk alone. And don't feel that this is an issue 24 seven, our pubs are very family friendly. And we are concerned a lot about the migration of this cohort of workers into the area, which will alter that level of risk of abuse and intimidation from quite what is very, very low risk to a high risk. If I move on now to emergency services impacts, there are significant concerns about delays not only of blue light services, for instance, with the ambulance trying to get to the elderly do have the older population as well as the younger population. We have a number of families in February in particular, with an increasing number of children in the area that looks like it's set to continue. And there is concern about ambulance services being able to get their Ipswich hospital is at least 30 to 45 minutes away. Right now, without any delays. We are concerned about that. We're also concerned about local midwives getting to appointments within 30 minutes and getting there when they're needed. So we find that there's a number of issues with emergency services that we're concerned about. We covered the other part of this yesterday to some extent, and that was the whole issue about the impact on any evacuation event of an incident at size will be or anywhere else in that area. We are concerned that the parents of children will have to go and find their children at various schools around the area in Middleton or otherwise, but actually getting there could be quite difficult in the situation where we have this massive increase in traffic on the roads. health effects now, can I have a perhaps you can give me a guidance here. We did talk about talking about noise and vibration. At this point. I don't know whether you want to go into that right now or not that it's it's been an item that has been pushed off from yesterday's, or the day before I can't remember I when I tried to raise this. There are big issues about noise and vibration in the area belong to B 1122. And due to the fact that the BLM 222 certainly in the early years is going to be very busy and the size will link road will be being built right behind Surbiton. So they'll be getting more from both directions. And the applicant seems to think that you can't add those two together and get a proper assessment of what the noise impact will be on on the residents of saboten and this is unacceptable. We'd like to find out how how this can be rectified We think it's well under represented in their assessments.

35:06

My guidance, but then you, I know, I'm sorry, fourth. I don't intend to go into the noise and vibration today, I am conscious that a number of people have raised it in writing. And that's something as an authority we are considering for future hearings. So the applicant may want to give a brief response in light of what you've said. Okay, I have

35:29

I do have more detail on that. So I will hold that back. And apologies for straying into yet another area that you didn't want to go into. Let's just see the effects of the effects of the strip freight strategy on health and well being of local communities. Being a largely rural communities, a lot of the local families



actually use deliveries from supermarkets around here from Amazon, everywhere else. I'm, I'm sure in the last two years, we've all been or 18 months, two years, we've all been using those services yet more. If those start to be impacted by the traffic in the Sizewell build time, then that's going to have a really difficult impact on families who depend on these deliveries, and on vulnerable people who also depend on these sorts of deliveries rather than actually going to the supermarkets in the round trip around here. What else? Yes. Again, I've sort of covered longer journey times to school in terms of emergency provision if there was an emergency at Sizewell B. But in general, getting children to and from school is going to be a more difficult situation here. Some of the children in Saboten have to cross the road and catch buses across the B 1122. And the safety of them actually getting across those roads, particularly in the early years is going to be significant. I know. We have yet to have discussions with the EDF and the applicant about mitigation on the B 1122. But it is a significant issue for our parish. And I will leave it at that for the moment. Okay, thank you. Mr. Collins

37:32

is about to fall for me suffer cancer, please.

37:37

Thank you, sir. I just like to introduce please, Richard Best who's the council's community's projects manager who'd like to address you on the influx of workers. And so I just asked him because I, I know a number of the points he wanted to cover have been covered by others. So I've just asked him not to not to repeat those points. Thank you.

38:06

Thank you, sir. I'll try my best not to not to regurgitate those points obviously. Firstly, in terms of the influx of non home based workers, at the peak construction, there will be some 7900 workers associated with Sizewell C 5880 will be non home based. At least there was a population of 370 workers in 2011. Peak construction, there will be 3689 Sizewell C workers living in Leiston, which are close to further 50% of the existing population. In that town, those workers will be overwhelmingly male, and between the ages of 20 and 49. This will mean a significant change in the local demographic, which goes via to risks both to community cohesion, and to community safety. Furthermore, police records indicate that men aged between 20 and 49 have a higher propensity to criminal antisocial behaviour, especially those living away from home. The Council has now collated and will submit at the appropriate deadline Community Safety evidence based on the previous seven years, which demonstrates across the Suffolk due to the demographic, there is a propensity for antisocial behaviour and criminal activity, with examples of all the likely risks and impacts destroyed by the community safety partnership, and Suffolk Constabulary. The communities are kept safe through a multi agency approach and enforcement by Suffolk and Stabling, which tackles the emerging issues in a timely manner and works to promote prevention and awareness phasing to safeguard our local communities. This will include reference to the latest reports from Hinkley Point C, which indicate that they are beginning to experience some of the issues which the council is concerned about in relation to crime and anti social behaviour. In terms of mitigation, the applicant has proposed a public services resilient fund to address impacts on community cohesion, and safety schedule five of the deed of obligation which is welcomed by the Council. That fund is subject of ongoing and positive discussions, and a Suffolk council considers that part of that fund should be directed to the east Suffolk Community Safety

Partnership, which operates a tried and tested programme of preventative and mitigation measures developed in conjunction with Suffolk Constabulary. In the local impact report, the Council also asked for additional requirements to be included within the draft decio, which obliges The Undertaker to produce a workers Code of Conduct to be signed by construction workers. We understand that the applicant objects to that but note that the Code of Conduct is treated as embedded mitigation in both the ies and the community safety management plan and see no reason why that embedded mitigation should not be secured through the DCA. The Council has also asked for funding to monitor community safety and creation impacts. We want to develop and produce our own monitoring mechanisms and to determine appropriate measures as and when issues arise. Thank you, sir. Thank you. Okay, turn now to Christopher Wilson.

41:50

Thank you, Mr. Jones. Chris Wilson on behalf of together against size we'll see and task would like to realise some of our concerns with regard to the impacts and emergency services and the community health implications. As Mr. Collinsville alluded to, we have concerns with God. In addition to his concerns, we have worries about the current emergency plan arrangements. Many observers already consider these to be inadequate to ensure the safety and swift evacuation of the current populations. In the emergency zones, we have housing developments planned for leister, which will increase the population density further, we'll have over 7000 workers on the size of C site, all operating next to a site that's already operating size will be. So basically we have a major increase in traffic using a road network to start design mainly for agricultural vehicles. The effect will be to put more lives at risk by making the implement implementation of an already imperfect emergency plan impossible by doubling the numbers of people and possibly grid lacking and inadequate road network around the plants. We also have concerns in terms of the general community. Insofar as it's been no specific specific community consultation on the federal side, as we'll see, will become a de facto spent fuel nuclear store waste stored until the middle of next next century. We believe there should be assist specific community consultation on that issue. Thank you. Thank you. Elizabeth Maloney from the CCG

43:44

Thank you, Elizabeth Maloney from the CCG. And so I just I won't reiterate the points made by my council colleagues or by emergency services, colleagues, colleagues, but just to reiterate that we do support the points that they have made. There are two points though that I would like to raise in addition that relate to non home base workers and their families, both of which have been discussed with the applicant and I believe that we are in a constructive concession discussions to resolve. So the first one relates to the impact assessment on the local health and wellbeing services. And we believe that that is too narrow based upon the population health management data that we have looked at. We believe that in addition to primary care, the impact is likely to extend to accident emergency inpatient and elective care, outpatient prescribing mental health and community services, dental and optometry. The impact of population growth on other health services across the integrated care system cannot be determined at this time. And based upon the CCGs constructive conversation with the applicant and Somerset CCG. We understand that data from Hinkley Point is not currently available. So that is something that we would look to monitor and measure as which I appreciate is a section that we're going to come on to the second area is around the primary mytek To health and well being concerns and relates to the workforce itself. And this is relating to the on site, occupational health provision. Our

request is, and as I say, I believe the applicant is supportive of this is that through the health and well being group that we're looking to establish, we do have, we would have a well informed basis of professionals there. That would be it would be advantageous if the applicant could agree to them being part of the process to both inform the design and potentially the procurement of that service. I think it would be an early and a very constructive opportunity for all parties to work together in mutual benefit. Thank you. Thank you.

45:44

I've consciously been quite a lot covered there, because I will come now to the applicant, Mr. Phil.

45:55

Thank you. So can you hear me and hopefully soon see me? Yes, I think I'm now appearing on your screen. I can't hear you. And I can now see you give thanks. So I've got a number of broad areas, to invite people to speak on. And before I do so just two short points, if I may, hopefully to clear two things out of the way. First, taking a point that Esther raised was raised through or a Suffolk Council. And it was Mr. Best. Going into my note was about securing the worker code of conduct. And just to say that we are willing to discuss with a soft Council, and how secure and compliance of the work Code of Conduct might best be achieved, were not opposed to the idea in principle, though, we think that probably the DCR is not the best way to do it. But rather than air those points now, just to indicate that we are open to that, and we'll discuss and hopefully be able to present either an agreed position, or if not, at least how we propose to go about it. And then the council can respond to that. Point, sir, that sort of want to watch. The second point, one of the issues that has been raised is in relation to journey times and impact on emergency services. Although I wasn't involved in the transport session, my understanding is that this isn't a modern, bespoke on behalf of the applicant in that session, did discuss the question of delay and whether there will be significant delay on the network. And my understanding of what she said was that there will be no perceptible impact on journey times on the road of roads. And my understanding is the applicants position is there would be no perceptible impact on emergency services response times. And but I wouldn't propose to go back into those questions of transport, modelling and journey times now unless you particularly wish for that to be done. That can be picked up in a post the post hearing note to make sure it covers emergency services as well. So having cleared those points out of the way, I get to deal with with the remaining three broad areas. In this way, I've got a collection of points that relate to police and worker conduct, from the perspective of things that might involve the police will give rise to home community safety issues. And I'm going to have two people speak to that, first of all, Mr. Hunt you've heard for from already. And then another speaker that you haven't heard from so far. And that's Laura Robinson Brown is a security manager for sizewell C, will be able to say a bit more about the code of conduct and how that works in practice. Then I'm going to ask Mr. Mike Humphrey to deal with delivery of public services, issues. And then we're going to come to Dr. Bahraini to deal with the various health matters that have been articulated. So I deal with things in that order. But that's just to give you a flavour of how I'm proposing to greet things. So, first hand over to Mr. Hunt, and then I'll ask him if he wouldn't mind where he's finished. coming over to Mr. Johnson Brown.

49:47

Thank you. Thank you, sir. Quite a lot of comments and questions, and I will endeavour to deal with them. Sort of sequentially. And thematically, I'd start by saying, with respect to the policing point, and that we have engaged with police over a very long time on very intensively. And I would absolutely support Mr. Carter said, we've made significant progress. And we have reached agreement, as he said, on the certainly the non crime incidents and the mitigation required on the nature of the resourcing that's required I it is not simply the the beats team or the or the neighbourhood team model. But there remains a difference between us on the scale of resourcing required, which goes back to the point, which has been much discussed about the importance or otherwise of demographics, and what lessons we can learn. From Hinkley Point C, we acknowledge that, you know, there will be an increase in population, and that that will lead to an increase in incidence. And we will put in place measures to seek to minimise those and to mitigate them. I'll say a little bit more about that at the moment in a moment. But there needs to be a recognition that these are hard working men and women, there's an element of sort of othering that somehow these people when they arrive in this community will behave in ways which are utterly unacceptable, bull and unprecedented. And we do think that the evidence from Hinkley Point C is particularly relevant. And these are people who are in many cases, highly specialised, highly skilled workers, very experienced, working away from home, working long shifts, at the end of the shift, want to get something to eat, get some rest, and then go again, and then go home when they can to visit their families. So they are have a mindset, which is focused on on their work. And they will be supported through a variety of mitigation that we're putting in place. There's assumption that sort of age and gender are the only things that matter and that all 30 year old men are therefore the same. And I think we will challenge that we would challenge that to 30 year old policemen is an equivalent likelihood to commit crimes does anybody else and that we would say that of our workers, that the circumstances such that the likelihood of committing crime isn't properly reflected in the police's model, because it simply reports on the age and gender of those into with whom they have contact, there is no account of the frequency with which any given the individual comes into contact with them. And this is why we think the evidence from hankley is so important because the police's model and focusing only on age and gender and in taking no account of the factors or indeed, are very extensive. mitigation is effectively missing. Really important, relevant factors, we understand that the background demographics in Suffolk are different to those in Somerset, but the violent crime rates in Suffolk are actually lower. And the assumption of a number of speakers seems to be that the workforce and they will be it's the same as the non home based workforce. And that in many cases, the same people,

54:07

literally identically in those individuals, they will arrive 250 miles east. And the assumption is that somehow in that journey, they become three and a half times more criminal than they've been at point C. And, you know, we understand that there are differences in how that is mitigating it. And as I say, we're closing in on that with the police. But we think that, you know, people are under estimating and missing the very significant nature of the mitigation measures and the characteristics of that workforce. And, you know, things like the accommodation campus means that people are not living in the community, they will walk to work and they will go home from work and they'll get something to eat and they'll go to bed. That's an important mitigate nation. We've got occupational health which will deal with mental health and other issues and reduce the burden on on public services. We've got other things CIT development that will have secure Park and Ride freight management, which will again reduce opportunities, crime, we've got the code of conduct, we've got drug and alcohol testing, we've got

vetting. We're not claiming that any of those things will completely eliminate any incidents and Robinson brambles a little bit more about that in a moment. What we are saying is collectively, that the security team, the onsite security team, as well as Collectively, these mitigations will lead to a reduction in crime. And it can be seen at Hinkley Point C, that the levels of crime attributed to property projects are below the average rate for for the populations. So we we understand the concerns, and we understand that there will be incidents and there will be an increase. And as Mr. Cutler said, We are agreed that there is a need for support for sort of community beat team and for additional resourcing for things that happen outside of that time period. And I think, you know, the police have, as Mr. Carter acknowledged, already made some changes to their modelling. And we've also moved in terms of the additional support for those out of hours issues, and we're confident that through further dialogue, we will actually close that gap. But I think I want to reassure people who are listening and raising these concerns that actually our evidence from increase suggests that the behaviour of these individuals and society, they will be to a large extent, very similar. And in some cases, the individual is on the whole, better than the average. So the other point, obviously, to make, and there's been a number of references to work as bringing families. And we've done the modelling of that. And there's a little bit more about that at the moment. Of course, you know, these people are paying their taxes, and they're in houses, and they'll be paying their council tax and making a contribution in entirely the normal way that people do. And and it's important that that that isn't forgotten as well, that these will all intents purposes be ordinary members of the community with their families settling and playing an important part in community life, that the families aren't simply a burden on the provision of services that contributors to the tax base and also to that sort of wider community life. I think I've addressed most importance, as I say, I think, you know, we recognise that there are concerns and risks, and there will be impacts. And we're very close to agreeing the negation I think in most of those cases, and partisan probably points hand over to Robinson Brown, who can say a little bit more about the the code of conduct and the vetting management of

57:58

the workforce. Thank you. Hello, sir, can you hear me? Sorry. Don't worry, as long as I can hear you clearly. That's fine.

58:17

Lovely. Thank you. So I think probably the first point I should start off with is that we really are in a sort of post 911 environment now. So the security controls and the regime that are tied to sizeable series of projects are not the same as sizeable B, and they are higher. And that's clearly because of the special security significance that a nuclear project has. And although with construction, it is a graded approach, ie the security controls increase as sensitive material, which includes information and assets arrives on site. That doesn't mean that appropriate controls are not in place at the start, because of the opportunity to pre place things which could affect the project. So in terms of the security regime, it really is an integrated interlocking beast of personnel, physical information and supply chain security, which is underpinned by a robust UK security culture. Now that project culture, both fully organisational and an individual perspective, is a real sort of fundamental piece of the security architecture for the project. I sort of mentioned the robust security culture because that's where it links quite closely with the workers code of conduct. And in terms of the personnel security regime and the aftercare arrangements. That document is absolutely critical in allowing us to manage caveat management. So we use the office

negative regulation, guidance and direction in terms of caveat management, which is also supplemented by sizeable sea caveat requirements as well which mirrors what currently takes place at Hinkley Point C. In terms of pre employment checks and betting, and sometimes those terms have not been used quite correctly, they're not interchangeable. So pre employment checks is the right to work proof of rather residents and the Id check. So all of our employees have those pre employment checks. And in addition, we also as a minimum require a criminal records declaration, and that is a statement of the offences, previous offences that you have or have not committed. Now, those are submitted to an assurance process, and so a number are checked and confirmed. And our experience from Hinkley tells us that in majority of cases, people don't lie that they're very honest and upfront about it. When we move on to the next level of pre employment checks, that is bpss, which is a baseline personal security standard. And that is where a criminal records DBS enabled check takes place. And again, from our experience with Hinckley in 8000 applicant cases taken over five years, only one was ever refused access to the site on the grounds of criminal records check. Okay. So obviously, other roles require a national security vetting, and those are where people have access to provision information and more secure assets. So our view is that the pre employment checks, and the vetting checks that we have in place are proportionate to the project. And if we were to employ additional bpss checks, ie the DBS criminal records declaration chip, that doesn't actually confer a community safety benefit. So that's also a position in regards to that. In terms of the security risk profile, the size of LCA as a project, we have developed a security risk profile, which is based off of operational experience from HPC. And also threat intelligence that we've received from HMG. Because of obviously, the size of the team at the moment, we haven't extended the outside the Constabulary yet, because we have no resource to do so. But if we were to get to fit that would be the point at which we received further intelligence, local intelligence for the police to fill that out security risk profile, which allows us to adapt our security regime to fit the requirement. Suffolk Constabulary mentioned concerns about not being able to pull in information from incidents that are happening off site into that picture to make decisions about whether workers should continue or not continue to be employed on the project. And that is something which is still being addressed HPC and the difficulties of around data sharing between the police and HPC. And part of those difficulties are not having a clear policing purpose for sharing what amounts to intelligence with the project, which is unable to protect, then do something with that information. So from a size policy perspective, we'll be willing to explore what can be done with data sharing with the police. But at the moment, I believe it sits in the space where we can share information where it relates to the investigation, prosecution of serious crime. When you start to look at things like antisocial behaviour, and drink driving, it becomes more difficult, but it's certainly something we can look at to explore in the future.

1:03:24

Thank you. Thank you. Sorry about that, sir. We did so well. So I'm now going to turn to Mr. Mike Humphrey is going to deal with the public services matters that have been raised. So I'll pass over to him now.

1:04:12

Thank you. I just briefly like to take a few minutes just to talk to the issues that have been raised in terms of our assessment on demand for mitigation of public services, and particularly in the context of lased. And in the context of the the influx of the non home based workforce. So we have worked with

service providers, including the local authorities and others, and are proposing a package of measures across the date of obligation. The support healthcare, social care, education, early years, leisure and community safety services, both in terms of the council services and other relevant interested parties. They're focused on leisten but are available across a much wider area. Whether Non homebase workers are expected to live. As we've mentioned earlier, in today's sessions, we have committed to monitor where those workers choose to live on a very regular basis. And report on that through our governance processes set out in the deed of obligation. So our support for public services and other aspects of our mitigation can be directed to the areas where their effects or the risk of effect might be most keenly felt. As an initial statement of common ground, we've broadly reached an agreement on the principle of most of this with service providers. draw your attention to sc 42 and sc 43, in the statement of common ground, which talks to the public services, resilience fund and community safety measures. And on that were broadly agreed on the principle and the largely autonomous role of those experts, service providers in the area to deliver those funds to the issues and locations where we think the and where we agree through discussion through the working groups that those risks might mostly be felt. And that includes the community safety Working Group, upon which all of the emergency services and the council's would be members, as well as the housing combination working group. And it's it's important to have a clear line of sight between those groups. Think, as we've heard today, and as we've set out in the governance structure under the social review group, through the date of obligation is clear that there is overlap, and the ability to respond on a multi agency basis to some of those issues, is something that I think all parties involved in this examination are keen to promote. So just to move on to the specific issues of public services and community infrastructure in lased. And we were comfortable that we've covered most of this in terms of setting out our approach to mitigation in response to examination questions AR point 1.29, AR, point 1.33 and C II point 111. In that regard, we are very grateful for the support and collaboration that we've had with both the town council and the county council in particular for those local measures that we're setting out in Easton. That's worth referring to our approach to responsive mitigation which applies to schedules 345 714 and 15. of the deed of obligation. For example, the approach to delivery of funds through the housing fund each year, the public services resilience Fund, the skills Fund and the community Fund, and the community fund under sheduled. 14 is something we haven't touched on today yet, but I think it's probably worth drawing interested parties attention towards HPC funds coda UK, which sets out some some clear examples of how the community fund that we've employed Hinkley Point can support small and large local projects and investments that have significant legacy effects and can be accessed by the communities and managed by the communities that need the most and would benefit most from support for those residual intangible impacts that might not be mitigated elsewhere. Just to raise a point that would that was that was raised by less than town council and Mr. Corbett on the demand for sports facilities. We'd like to just point the panel towards appendix 90 to the environmental statement, which is 196, where we've undertaken a formal assessment on the demand for formal sports and leisure facilities, and concluded that the demand as a result from our workforce is not significant.

1:09:05

We just we may cover this later in the in this sports and recreation section of the agenda, but we wanted to make clear that the provision of sports facilities in less than as part of a suite of public services and community infrastructure is about pricing community integration and cohesion, as much as it is a report on more than it is in terms of mitigating an actual observed effect through the years. And

then finally, I just wanted to clarify some of the numbers that have been discussed in terms of influx of workers and particularly the workforce living in less than Mr Best is correct when he identifies 3689 workers at the peak in less than 3000 of those workers will be living in the project accommodation, the onsite accommodation campus and the caravan site. So that leaves 700 workers, of which half would be an unoccupied accommodation or tourist accommodation. So probably wouldn't represent an additional effect on the population of less than the remainder in the private rented sector. Some of them may be considered to be additional if they live in an accommodation that's been brought forward through the housing fund. But even at that level that represents less than 5% of the total population have placed in as estimated by the RNs in 2019. And it's worth saying that that's the very peak. So that is a few months in the peak here. And on average, those numbers would be 44% lower than that. And we can set that out in writing. But we could also just provide the the application reps where those those numbers are lifted from. Thank you. If you do,

1:10:49

and you're in response to today, make specific reference to the key paragraphs within those documents that you're relying on. That'll be helpful. Thank you very much.

1:11:07

Thank you. So then, finally, I was going to turn to Dr. Bahraini who will deal with the points about public health, including those matters raised by the CCG. So I'll pass over to him now.

1:11:28

You can hear me can then listening to the points raised, I mean that there's there's four key items that come out of it. And concern is local healthcare is sensitive to change. And that's the point that we're making as we consider all local health care provision, highly valuable and highly sensitive to any change. So at that point, we're in agreement with I think, Mrs. Corbett's point about the dentistry not being any sufficient provision locally. And her concern for local GP care is important. And that leads him to the next point, which is the need to dress to address or internalise the health needs of the incoming non home based workforce. Again, that's the point where we agree with and it's been addressed within the the approach to that is to completely internalise it to the point that we have our own occupational health service provision as proven effective at Hinkley Point C. This, this actually overlaps with one of the points that I think you raised right at the beginning about when it kicks in. It kicks in from the onset, it's not done by programme, it's done by actual headcount. So as part of induction, people are screened. And the reason for the screening is, as a number of people pointed out the age demographic, the sex demographic of the worker is very specific, that there will be some deviation in that. But with that demographic, Men of a Certain Age come a range of health conditions and risks that you can screen for. And that's not to prevent work, it's actually to address existing burdens of poor health, and proactively address them, such that you actually prevent the need for treatment or loss work that's open to the entire workforce, not just non home base, but home based itself. So for the home base staff, they're socially complimentary health screening over and above what they would get from any other employer. Then there is a GP led health clinic on site, and that ramps up with the workforce. In there, you have a GP, in there, you have a pharmacy, which is aligned with the image services for written instructions for medication, handover. There's also treatment in terms of physio, and it's also linked into wider health campaigns. And this is again open to the entire workforce. So it would



mean that home based or non home based you turn up to work, any health concern that you have you book an appointment on site, while still on the clock, access your GP have any sort of treatment that is required. And we're seeing referral rates for non home based staff being insignificant, and this is the purpose of the overall service provision is to remove any material impact upon local healthcare. Following that, we need to address any residual impact upon local healthcare. And there will there will be but what it is is minimal. What we've predicted for sizewell is in the region of 47 non home based GP referrals over the entire construction period, that's less than you will see in seasonal variation alone. And that doesn't take into account that the homebase staff will actually have access to GP throughout that entire period. So actually, we're reduces that demand a local healthcare. We have seen that the more screening you do, the more health The promotion you do, you can actually identify issues which could mean referral to hospital where there's any incidence of cardiovascular respiratory distress that the precautionary approach and that that goes on. But again, that is modelled in our assessments and health care planning contribution for any local referral is offered.

1:15:24

In terms of sexual health, I think it was brought up by Miss Hammond. Yes, not only is it managing the health needs of our workforce, but it's also managing any risk between sync and source between the host population and the workforce. And a sexual health provision is included within that the other health initiatives that we are looking to actually align, because public health isn't static. One thing that we've learned over the last two years is anything can happen. And the need for a robust, resilient, flexible service provision that does align with local health priorities as they may change, what's important now might not be necessarily be the health of the public health priority in five or 10 years time. So that's the purpose of ongoing engagement with the health working group. And as Miss Maloney pointed out, it's not just managing the risks, it's also maximising the opportunities to promote health to align with those health promotion activities, which is why we're happy to change the names the group of health and well being. And the wording of the stigma Common Ground is still being agreed, largely because we need to agree on the quantum of the residual impacts and the healthcare funding contribution that goes with it, not from the home base, the non home base workforce, but for dependents that may come in, because while we can internalise pretty much all of the health needs of that the non homebase workforce such an impact on local healthcare is insignificant. It's harder to do so for dependents. And that's even though anybody who does bring their family with them would only be able to offset existing households, you know, this project doesn't build new homes for residents. So if a if someone does bring a dependent, they would move into a home that has been vacated. So that the net additionality is is less of an impact. That being the case, we're still exploring what the dependent impact upon local healthcare will be. Largely because there is a delay in the way the NHS budget is allocated, It normally takes three years before for for population to be recognised and the NHS budget allocation to catch up. We all pay into the NHS, it's done through general tax largely and to a lesser extent, National Insurance. So it's not that there's the absence of that budget, it's just the delay in which it can be brought forward and allocated. So that is also being addressed. And, yeah, that that's the final point, I think and yeah. And largely links into miscellaneous last points, an earlier point, actually, that we are really moving towards agreeing the final terms of the step of common ground, we recognise the issues and opportunities to be had and can collaboratively collaboratively work that way. And this has proven it's not just it was harder to demonstrate this for Hinkley Point C, because Hinkley Point C's occupational health provision was pretty much the first of its kind. It did build on the experience that we

did on the Olympics. But this was, again, far more comprehensive service provision. And we are tailoring that to both the what we know about the demographic of the workforce, but also the host community and the sensitivity that we know, there is for local healthcare. So I think that's the segment common ground which should be agreed between us about August and then submitted in September.

1:18:59

Thank you. I just asked you one point, Doctor, only your reference to the provision of health services offensively starting on the stream as the workforce arrives. And where is that set out within the documents such that the examining authority can rely on its provision within that timeframe?

1:19:30

It will be in the deed of obligation.

1:19:35

Okay, well, hopefully in your written response, you can make that clear to me which part of the deed of obligation it is and how it links to the workforce as it as it grows? Yes, sir. Thank you. Thank you. So

1:19:58

that cost of Here's our response to the points that have just been raised. Thank you. Note raised. Mr. Biggers.

1:20:15

And Sam is more just more just a question. Are you intending to have a session on mitigation following this or what? Because I wish to talk about the applicant's response to property blight.

1:20:31

hoping to get to monitoring and mitigation that's the final point on the agenda.

1:20:36

Thank you. I will. I'll wait for that and thank you. Awesome dance, please. Thank you, Mr. Moreland. Allison down, stop. sighs We'll see.

1:20:50

I just, I their hearing Mr. Hunt's evidence. I'm sure this has not been lost on you. But I just feel there's been so much contradictory information given today, this morning compared to this afternoon. And clearly the police didn't invent those statistics. I'm looking at [crime rate.co.uk](http://crime rate.co.uk). And seeing that, you know, crime and violent and sexual offences, crime in Bridgewater is getting worse. You know, the crime rate there is is well above the average on Sunset as a whole. But honestly, Mr. Han cannot have it both ways. I think you can predict people's behaviour. And he asserted this morning, you couldn't predict the behaviour of tourists. But apparently you can predict the behaviour of workers. And either the campus, the workers are living in the campus, they're having a bite to eat in the canteen and going straight to bed, or they're out spending money in the local economy. Either they'll be living in the community or they'll be living in the campus, but the campus won't be ready for for a certain amount of time. And obviously, the caravan site is in very close proximity to leston. Although the 2400 back

campuses is technically part of leisten. Parish, it is geographically much closer to Well, it's right on adjacent to East bridge and very close to the village of saboten as well. And so I just wanted to highlight what I feel or, you know, contradictions. And depending on the topic, you know, these statements are adjusted to suit the applicant.

1:22:26

Thank you. Mr. Philippon, do you wish to respond to any of those issues? No, thank you. So

1:22:36

I'm not sure what's going to assist you chasing down all of those points that you've heard what we've said, and I didn't I wish to add her to the stage. Okay, thank you. Right, I

1:22:51

think then need to just touch on the sports and recreation provision now at least in town council did raise it. And we've had several people already talk about this. The applicant has referred me to the appendix nine, which nynaeve application 196 and how they believe they've assessed that. Is there any additional point that the applicant wish wish to raise on this? My broad concern was very similar to what glazman town council had raised was that the seem to be a significant focus towards the football pitch provision. And not a lot beyond that. And I couldn't quite see how it all tied together, so that those who weren't interested in sport, which could be a reasonable number, how they could have their leisure time, appropriately accommodated, so that the local community weren't having problems created as a consequence. Out. Can you help me with that?

1:24:00

Sir? Yes, I'm going to ask Mr. Humphrey, to deal with that, as you say he's he's explained how we came to the provision of the particular sports facility. He's, he's heard your point about those who might want to do other things, and I'll pass over to him now.

1:24:32

Thank you for raising that point. Obviously, our formal assessment has we anticipated and set out through the scoping report covered the assessment of formal sport and recreation activities. So we think that appendix nine a is accurate to the scoping report. So in AIA terms, we've assessed what we said we're going to assess The extent to which other leisure activities may be undertaken by workers. We need a bit more advice on exactly what what you mean by that. Obviously, sport and recreation is something that is assessed, and it's a statute to requirement of the local authority to provide it, we have provided a statement in pap 195, which is the socio economic, he s chapter on our position with regard to other statutory services such as libraries and other cultural activities, which workers might undertake. Aside from that, the leisure activities of workers would either be informal, so might be covered through a session on public rights of way, or it might be related to the commercial provision of, of, of leisure activities, cinemas and restaurants and other activities, which are essentially driven by economic demand and supply for those activities. So if there's any further guidance, you can give us on how you think our assessment should consider those with regards to what we set out in the scope and report and what we received from the scoping opinion we'd be we'd be grateful for that. But otherwise, we're comfortable that we've assessed any likely significant effects on those who are in recreation.

1:26:31

to undertake your assessment, I just want to be confident that the impact of your workforce is being appropriately assessed in terms of the consequences of behaviour that arises from this workforce. And it just seems to me that he's not just going to be sporting activities that they're going to be interested in. And Lacey is obviously a relatively small community eastbridge even more modest. And then we always have sighs well over and so on. And I just wanted to try and understand from you

1:27:16

where

1:27:18

those effects of this workforce, in their leisure time are being covered so that the local community are safeguarded from any of those knock on effects. It goes on also, I think, because this is a common theme to the timing of the provision of your sports pitch. Because at the moment, that seems to be linked to the provision of the accommodation, which, again, seems to potentially be somewhere between three years into the programme and six years in the programme. And so, again, it's about that timing of that delivery, because it until it's there, it doesn't provide any mitigation and the staff from the construction project. What will they be doing in the meantime? And what are the consequences?

1:28:25

Understood. Okay, so if that question goes to delivery of facilities, then I think we would probably be able to respond to that when we've we've, we've responded on the question of delivery of the campus. If it speaks to what the pre peak effect is, then that is assessed in the appendix 92 environmental statement. But I take on board, your, your, your query about other leisure activities, and we can we can respond in writing on those.

1:28:59

Thank you. And I'll have another look at appendix 90. If I need to prepare some additional questions.

1:29:06

Thank you very much. Sir, I just a pad that I made briefly, just looking at sheduled 10. To the deed of obligation to the way that the delivery of the lace and sports facilities is structured, you'll see. And it's up to you if you want to turn it up or just take a note and look at it in due course, but it's red 3024 and this starts on page 56. There's provision for the design of the latest in sports facilities, followed by provision for construction and then management and maintenance and the trigger for the first stage design of the licence. sports facilities, which is to one one, so the applicant has to pay what's called the sports facilities design payment to he suffered Council on or before commencement. So that that's the first trigger. And then he suffered Council and prepares or procures the design. So it comes up with the design, the detailed drawings that will frame what is ultimately to be delivered. But that also includes a timetable demonstrating the completion of the sports facilities worth shall take place in an appropriate timescale. Having regard to the planned occupation of the accommodation campus as set out in the implementation plan, to ease Suffolk Council has to come up with a timetable that has to be appropriate having regard to occupation of the campus, but ultimately, it's for the council the proposal the timetable

should be now you then get into construction. And in to to that there is the moment there are blanks in terms of the actual timeframes in terms of how many weeks but within a certain number of weeks to be agreed of approval of the proposal, Bice by size? Well, those have to be the details have to be submitted to the council in accordance to requirement 12 A of sheduled, two to the decio. So we have to then send the details in order to discharge the requirement. Once that's been approved, within again, a number of weeks to be determined we have to pay the Suffolk Council of sports facilities works payment. And then it's for he suffered council to provide and make available the sports facilities in accordance with the timetable in the proposal unless otherwise agreed. And then they notifies of completion. And then there's provision for management. And there is provision for maintenance. So although there is a relationship in terms of the timetable and finding an appropriate period, there is considerable degree of council involvement in the process of determining when it should be built. And then ultimately, they are the people who will deliver it with funds to be provided by the applicant. And so in terms of how that phases with the campus, I think is quite important to see that it's not just a matter of us having complete control over that it's dealt with in I suggest quite intelligent and structured way in schedule.

1:32:51

Now, I do understand that but I guess it really comes back to the assessment of the what is regarded as appropriate in terms of the time of delivery, and probably don't need to say any more than that.

1:33:08

No. So we've talked about the mechanisms that exist within the agreement for dealing with differences. But it's important to understand that this is ultimately something that we pay for. But that is procured and delivered by the Council in accordance with the terms of our schedule. Okay, thank you.

1:33:35

Just know that chose you better next quarter and race because I hear from you. Yes, thank

1:33:43

you very much. I just want to quickly support the statement. I'm sorry to see basnet Walberswick parish Council, I would just like to support the statement that was just made by Alison downs. And now further substantiated, actually, by the applicants answer to us, sir, we hear that the concerns of the police and the ambulance and the firefighters and local community are not justified, because the workforce is staying home and going to bed. They're not bothering the community. They're not driving, they're not adding to congestion. They're not creating any potential anti social behaviour. And then we find that the applicant doesn't need to do anything to think about the provision of leisure activities for their workers. And I believe I've just heard that all the mitigation seems related to nothing more than passing money to East Suffolk Council, none of which mitigates the impact on the local community. And this is just exactly why we don't believe that this project is feasible to be delivered as discussed. Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity. Mr. Phillips, do you want to make any further response

1:34:59

so I'll look to my right to see if any of the other speakers want to respond. But I'm not sure that there's anything there that we haven't already covered. And I've explained the position as best I can. And I'm not sure I didn't improve matters by going over it again.

1:35:14

Okay, thank you. If I can move on, I'm just looking at the time it's half past five. Not sure we're going to get through everything. So what I wanted to I'm probably going to have to come back to some issues later on. I just can I just take a quick sounding from two or three parties about what would be a suitable time to finish? I propose about quarter to six is that going to suit and just thinking, we still do our two major topics there, but I can't say that we will get through them. And perhaps the best use of time, we'll be looking at the modern monitoring and mitigation measures. And just hear from the applicant first on that proposal.

1:36:15

And so we are completely in your hands, whatever would assist you. Most we will work with that. Okay, can I just hear from the counsellors and please Suffolk County first.

1:36:30

Thank you, sir, like Bedford Suffolk County Council. So I wasn't proposing to say a great deal about either of the two outstanding items you've got already in our rep 383 comments on the draft D the sheduled detailed comments on matters of the mitigation clauses in the deed as it was at that point. Obviously, we talked through the underlying issues through the earlier discussions, and I wasn't sure that we were really likely to help you too much by just reiterating those points. And in relation to the effects of the freight strategy on health and well being Obviously, we've, again, rehearsed the kind of the general issues, we've also had a long session over the previous two days on how that strategy worked. So, so we didn't have a great deal. But obviously, if you had specific topics that you wanted to hear from us all in relation to those, we'd be very happy if we brought the personnel still here to assist you on that. Okay, and Isa counsel,

1:37:39

Isabella tuffle, for a Suffolk Council. So on health effects, our our main concerns are noise and air quality. And we understand that you don't want to hear about those today. So we didn't have anything to add under that topic. On monitoring and mitigation. We've really, I think, picked up the points we wanted to make when Mr. Best addressed you about what had been secured and the additional measures that we were hoping for, which is effectively the securing their code of conduct which Mr. Phil has helpfully responded on, and some funding to enable monitoring to take place of community cohesion and community safety impacts. And other other than that, I think that the monitoring and mitigation, it's addressed in the statement of common ground, the principles are largely agreed and some issues of governance and detail remain subject to positive discussion between the council and the applicant.

1:38:42

Okay, thank you. The Suffolk Constabulary agency, you've raised your hand.

1:38:48

Thank you. So Ben Stansfield for the Constabulary. So we don't have anything to say on the freight strategy. But we do have a few comments on monitoring and mitigation in a deed of obligation. And I have, as you know, two senior officers with me, and it would be grand if we could cover that which we wanted to today so that the next week they can be released to operational things. Thank you.

1:39:13

Okay, well, I think it's probably sensible. Then if I can hear from you straight away about the monitoring and mitigation. I'll have a further consideration about the other two topics that were on the agenda. And we will consider where we go too, into course. So if I can hear from you now.

1:39:34

Thank you. Thank you, sir. So, so you've heard from the subject matter specialist on crime and policing about some of the impacts of the project, and Mr. COVID clearly explained his concerns that there are inevitably a number of unknown number of crimes committed by Hinkley Point C workers that cannot properly be tagged. Hinkley tagged by his colleagues, and so the applicant can't really know the number of untagged crime And quite simply, the police can't compel a suspect to tell them who they work for. And the Constabulary has also made clear that the bulk of those working at the size will see site will be in a category of people most likely to commit, but also most likely to be victims of crime. And I think that distinction was captured last a little earlier. But turning to the mitigation paid from the deed of obligation, sir, in the consumers view, that's, that is not currently adequate. And I'll, I'll briefly summarise these and we'll make sure these are put in our written summaries. In relation to the emergency services, financial contribution, we don't currently have any detail on the federal contributions which are proposed by the applicant, and we hope that that will follow shortly. It's critical and it's currently missing. The deed of obligation proposes an emergency services contingency contribution. This is also problematic for Constabulary. The contingency contribution is akin to a locked safe, containing a specific, albeit currently unknown sum of money within it. And that sum of money is to be used for very narrowly defined matters, that being public safety initiatives, that's safe to continue, the analogy cannot be opened by the Constabulary, but the council's and only the council's can request the safe to be opened. The applicant holds the only key to the safe, and the applicant alone decides if the safe should be unlocked. And we say, sir, that none of the above is in any way adequate in relation to the community safety Working Group, that is to be established from the commencement of the development and is not proposed to sit or existed during preparatory works, which we think is a weakness. The Constabulary will have two seats on the working group. But the group may only meet between two and four times a year, and it will receive Reports of committee safety matters. That will then report to the social review group on the evidence that is received. As we read the deed of obligation. The Community Safety Working Group has no ability to recommend actions to the social review group, let alone address those impacts as it becomes aware of itself. And if sizewell seen if the applicant does not attend the community safety working group meetings, the group will not be caught. As to the social review groups, without wishing to revisit some of the weaknesses highlighted in previous days. Regarding the transport review group. We do note that 50% of the social review group voting sits within sizewell C. And we question therefore, the likelihood of meaningful reactions issues raised. We also note that the SRP itself may only meet every six months. And it is unclear actually from the deed of obligation whether even the SRT has power to fund unforeseen mitigation. In short, as

currently structured, the work the community safety working group and srg are wholly inadequate as a governance and mitigation mechanism. The Community Safety working group is an occasional talking shop for subject matter experts and reactions to community safety issues brought to it will be glacial if indeed there are any reactions onto review and monitoring. The modelling undertaken by the Constabulary has been extremely thorough. However, if there are additional impacts arising in the community, these will need to be policed impacting the police's resources. And similarly, if there are fluctuations in workforce numbers, for example, changes to the applicants model if additional work workforce members are brought in earlier, or indeed changes to the location of where the workforce is staying there will need to be flexible and responsive mitigation. And the deidra obligation clearly needs therefore robust monitoring provisions to track worker numbers amongst other things, and that's currently absent.

1:44:01

The Constabulary's concerns are about cost of responding to impact which may be foreseen but which are incapable of being modelled. For example, impacts arising from organised crime or county lines, and those were also identified by Christine giesen. Suffolk County Council addressing impacts such as these in future will require additional police resources, the cost of which either falls to the Constabulary either suffered taxpayer or to the applicant, and we say further those costs should fall to the applicant, and that the deed of obligation must have a secure and robust mechanism for funding mitigation of these issues. And that will allow mitigation to be delivered by the Constabulary fully failing and fast. We have explained to so why the community say the the working group and the contingency contribution are not appropriate vehicles for that mitigation. And then finally, just to say that discussions with the applicants orange He's ongoing. But given the significant differences between the parties, which are outlined by Mr. Cutler, the Constabulary remains keen to see quicker progress and for those discussions to be increasingly productive, and to that end, so we would welcome a timetable from the applicant to ensure their aspirations for reaching agreements are met. And as Mr. Cocoa advisor, we think that a further issue specific hearing may usefully be scheduled. And there's my comments. Thank you, sir. Thank you.

1:45:35

Notice we've moved about a bit on the agenda. So I think, is there anyone else present who would wish to make comment on monitoring mitigation measures? I know that I think it was Mr. Vickers who had raised issues previously and I cut him off. So perhaps I can hear from Mr. Baker's first. Hello, Mr. Baker's. Hello,

1:46:03

Mr. Modi's counsel Greg because from fair Britain and East beach parish Council. As the applicant is aware, the cumulative impact on our community will be significant with all elements of the development being closed in close proximity to eastbridge and saboten. With pollution in light dust noise, and also a spoil heap of 35 metres high, within 400 metres of the neighbor's property in eastbridge. At present, the applicant has identified a very small area around development that they believe will be affected by blight. However, interestingly, the property included in this area is in the main of these properties appear to be owned by NDF. Within our meetings with the applicant on areas of common ground, we asked them to accept property blighting as an issue. My understanding is the applicant



failed to recognise property blighting in its truest sense. I would ask the applicant, what exactly is the difference between Hinckley and sizeable as we have evidenced that they have purchased, they've purchased properties and paid compensation within the Hinckley area. So surely, they have accepted blighting at Hinckley by their actions in compensating and purchasing of many properties, which were in excess of one mile of the development. So the present stance by the applicant gives our community significant concerns in that if illegal, in that if a legal requirement is not placed within the overall framework, the applicant will merely treat us as collateral damage. Therefore, indirectly they will be asking us to financially support their project as a community investing 1000s of pounds of our lost equity within our properties. I'm sure you agree Mr. mod I personally along with others have no wish to become an investor in size will see project when I don't even receive a share. So can we have a positive response from the applicant, please? Thank you.

1:48:32

Thank you, Mr. Vickers. And just ask Mrs Corvett. Next from licen Town Council.

1:48:36

Thank you, Mr. mod. It's just sort of a if you like reaffirming that lesson tank has the seeking to ensure there is clear, transparent and independent monitoring the far reaching effects of the construction on licence throughout the build. We will expect elected representation on the various fora that will be tasked to monitor these effects being so closely allied to the belt. And we support the county and district councils and the Iran hazing establishing robust standards to maintain good air quality, water quality, and acceptable noise and vibration levels. We of course have a rail route which Hinckley Point doesn't have, through our Victorian buildings in licence, particularly in the early years. There must be a clear and transparent route for people living in Leiston to raise any issues that arise during construction and ways for recurring problems to be identified and dealt with as quickly as possible. So it's really just affirming that licenced and counsel needs to be front and centre of the monitoring groups and have have a way if you like to, to air any issues for our community, who will be hosting sighs We'll see. Thank you, Mr. Bond. Thank you. Edwina Galloway, please.

1:50:07

Hello, Edwina Galloway from castle consulting parish Council, we also share the issue in respect of compensation in respect of properties. Again, this was an issue that we raised that hasn't been responded to by EDF in our comment on to representation. But we have properties very close to the size of our link road that have not been offered any form of compensation or dialogue. Thank you.

1:50:38

And just before I go back to the application, can I just check with everyone else precedent that there's nothing further they would wish to raise on the monitoring and mitigation? No, okay, then can I company applicant, please, on these final issues?

1:51:01

Thank you, sir, again, to try and find a suitably economical, but also hopefully helpful way of dealing with these bearing in mind the time and so far as the police are concerned. And, obviously, I want to preface any response to this by saying that, as I hope is clear, already, there have been an ongoing,

very productive discussions and negotiations with the police. And we are working with the police productively on the scale of effect, which will then quickly lead to the identification of sums of money, which ultimately, I think is going to be a key matter. And I don't want to trespass too much into those discussions, because I anticipate from what I've heard that they're likely to narrow or indeed resolve those issues fairly soon. And we've indicated when we anticipate supplying a deed of obligation with fees to the examination in September, but we anticipate that the discussions with the police in terms of identifying the scale of effect, and therefore moving on to money will will happen, hopefully, well in advance of that. And so, so far as the various points made about governance are concerned, those seem to me insofar as they're not resolved to be preminent, the the sort of points that are best dealt with in writing. So for example, the arrangements that exist over the availability of funds for proactive campaigns in terms of the sort that were addressed a moment ago, by the by the police. So your recall, so and if you don't just to provide the context for this, in shedule, for to the the deed of obligation, reference that was being made a moment to go to the emergency services, contingency contribution. There are multiple elements to it so far as the police Fire and Rescue Service and Eastern England Ambulance Service trusts are concerned. And this is dealt with in paragraph 4.3. This is concerned with public safety initiatives that either suffer Constabulary or the Fire and Rescue Service or the East of England ambulance service, and decide to conduct which where the need is directly attributable to the project. And so, this is something which is initiated by those bodies. And therefore the governance arrangements that sit with that in terms of the extent to which those funds are simply either available to be spent without any control, or to which they are controlled as they are at the moment in order to ensure they're properly incurred and properly spent, needs to be understood by reference to the subject matter of the contingency obligation now, at this hour on a Friday, I don't propose to go into the the drafting and how that works and why we said right, but just so that you understand that there are good reasons why it's structured as it is but we are discussing those matters with the police. If we can't resolve them, we'll come back to you with a written explanation of the differences.

1:54:47

So far as the points were made about blight, you'll be aware so there is a property price support scheme and that is set From any obligations that exists in relation to statutory blight, but rather than seeking to explain the difference between those things, and how they're catered for, and why it may be in individual cases, that people are not getting what they would like. And I think that's best done in writing, because I think that will be the clearest explanation for those who are affected by it. But also, I suspect, so that you might help might help you to see that. And then if you've got further questions, that those can be picked, those can be picked up. And then so far as community involvement in governance groups concerned, again, it's quite a one has to go through the schedules to see the way in which that works. And I suggest that we come back and writing on that rather than taking a lot of time to try and provide an explanation on the hoof now. And so I'm looking to my right, I don't think we've got anything substantive we'd want to add to that. So I hope that provides a sufficient response for moments.

1:56:06

That's helpful. Can I just when you're preparing that response, one of the issues that seems to be raised both today, but also previously in the week is the what makes the group's chord. And it does seem to me to be potentially a significant problem, if that relies on the attendance of the undertaker, the

applicant, because last, I think they should be there. If they choose not to be there, it causes a problem. So if you can consider that,

1:56:43

we certainly will have a note at that point. And I'll raise it with my team immediately after the end of this call.

1:56:51

Thank you, I'm grateful. So if there's no Mrs Corvett, your hand is raised. Is there anything further or is it just from previously? Many apologies is just from previously? No worries, it's not not an issue at all. But I think on that basis, then I just like to thank everyone for their perseverance and their patience today. Thank you very much for your contributions and I will close the hearing. Thank you.