

TEXT_SizewellC_ISH5_Session3_13072021

Tue, 7/13 3:24PM • 1:24:54

00:07

Good afternoon and welcome back to issues specific hearing number five. Before we commence, Can I check with the case team that they can see and hear me. And that live stream and recording has become pleased

00:31

is that anybody can the case team that can confirm they can see and hear me?

00:37

I can confirm login here and see you. I'm just checking for the live stream. One second. Thank you.

01:00

Apologies slow internet. One second.

01:05

It's been confirmed that the live stream is working. So thank you very much. I'd like to move on to Agenda number item number five, please, which is regarding the outage carpark location and power export.

01:20

In respect to these two topic areas, I've noted the applicants comments made in document Rep. 3044, which is comments on Council's local impact report. That paragraph 6.1 point two, it stated that the power export solution and location of the outage car park at goose Hill are matters, which cannot be changed. And I understand that these issues are currently under discussion with Suffolk County Council. And that an update is going to be provided at deadline five. But I do have some areas I'd still like to discuss and I'm going to start with the location of the outage car park. And I'd like to turn to the applicant and I have some questions for you, please.

02:07

madami. Yes, I've got I've got someone who is

02:12

ready to deal with your questions. But before I turned to him if you wanted to explain what they are, and I'll just check that that is. Yeah, there's there's actually four of them, Mr. Phillpotts, and the first one is going to be dealing with

02:27

noting in respect of what the OMB partnership and Suffolk County Council have said about the location not being adequately justified in the context of additional damage to the OMB. I think the applicant then went on to say that if an alternative location was identified outside the OMB, this would require a park and ride facility, a bus Terminus on goose hill on car parking for staff that couldn't use the bus due to the need to bring specific equipment to site. And it's then stated that

03:03

this proposed development, although positive will be outside the air and B would actually be more harmful than that which is currently closed in the OMB. I just like to understand how that is, is it due to the level of equipment and infrastructure that is required?

03:25

Thank you very much. I think in terms of the relative impacts of

03:33

those alternatives, I might turn in the first and since to Mr. Richard Jones of quad if you want to go into

03:44

more detail on that. I may may ask Mr. kratt to comment on it. But I'll ask Mr. Excuse me, Mr. Jones to deal with that in the first instance. I'll repeat what I'm asking as well So

03:59

indeed, I'm very grateful.

04:21

Good afternoon. So picking up on outage car park first.

04:29

If I if I may. I suppose before we

04:35

get too far into into impacts on X the key key points is that we don't consider that there are indeed any alternatives to the outage carpark proposal that's that's this put forward effectively

04:54

where there's there's two outage car parks one site we'll see and one size will be

05:00

Then there are of course, three reactors in the in the size of a complex. And the risk of two of those reactors going into outage at the same time is is too great.

05:13

And so therefore it's it's operationally operationally necessary, the risk of a war three reactors going in to outage at the same time is is far less. And so given the the OMB context is, is not considered that

this there's exceptional circumstances for that. So that's that's kind of the first point that we think that there's the to outage car particle size will be in size we'll see they're absolutely necessary. And then in terms of its location for size we'll see adjacent to adjacent to the, to the main platform. We've got, we've got a colleague here, Mike Ravel on hand if if we need to go into any particular details on that. The point is, I suppose that there there's up to 1000 additional staff that's needed, forced outages, by their very nature, are unplanned. And so they happen without without notice. And they generally require all part of the plants be shut down to avoid safety risk, in order for that element of the power station to be to be fixed. And so in that scenario,

06:24

it's considered that it's inconceivable that there wouldn't be outage car parking available.

06:30

In the in the instance that size one V is also undergoing either a plan goal or an unplanned outage. And so anything that would rely on a bus transfer connection, as noted by the county, in its responses to to date is is very cumbersome and very slow. And therefore to have something that's within walking distance of the of the main platform is is absolutely what's what's necessary. And

07:04

so yes, there will be enough to be an impact because of the development in in this location within the Airbnb. But there are exceptional circumstances to that. And I think it's important to recognise that the alternative put forward, which we say is not an alternative, also would still require an impact in the Airbnb as well. Because if there was to be an off site plus transfer connection, that would still require shelter plus dorms or bus Terminus area, and potentially a welfare building. If if we're expecting large numbers of people to wait in that location. Plus, there's also the practicality which is that a significant number of outage equipment, outage vehicles have tools and equipment in them that that need to be brought into site in a sense that they're not suitable to be put on a bus. So they would still need to be some form of development associated with with with any alternative. And so when you put that all together,

08:08

we consider that the the operational requirements of the power station and the need to minimise safety risk by putting it by servicing the outage as quickly as possible amount to exceptional circumstances. Okay, so it would be the totality of the infrastructure that would be required if there was a park and ride site that would lead to greater harm in the air and Bay than what is currently proposed. Is that correct me if I'm wrong? Is that what you're saying? In terms of impact on embedding?

08:45

I think maybe if so, it could be my misunderstanding, I thought.

08:53

I thought what you were saying was that

08:57

by having a park and ride site, the bus Terminus and some car parking for staff that would, as you said, would need to come into site.

09:08

That was what would be more harmful form of development on the AONB, then is proposed, or am I incorrect?

09:18

No, I think I think the point is that, because we say that it's not a reasonable alternative,

09:27

that that design of how that alternative proposal might look hasn't been physically drawn up. And therefore it hasn't, hasn't been assessed, because it's not a it's not a reasonable alternative because of the operational requirements and the increased safety risk from from doing it. So I don't think we're in a position to say whether it would be more or less harmful, but the point I'm making is that the the assumption that an offsite facility would would remove the need for outage related built development at goose Hill is

10:00

That is incorrect.

10:03

Okay, can you thank you for that? Can you help me then if I refer to I think it's document a pp. 190. And that's paragraph

10:15

point. 3.14. On page 33. You have the hand.

10:24

Just give me one. Fine. I can I can repeat the relevant paragraph numbers as well.

10:29

Thank you.

10:41

Okay, I have that in front of me now. Yeah. So it's it's, check it is the alternatives and design evolution chapter. And it's paragraph 6.3. point one.

11:03

Okay. I'm hoping that my paragraph numbering is correct. As I go on with this question, that it stated that an offsite parking ride site option was discounted due to increased logistics and costs that will be incurred around the critical outage period.

11:20

Can you help me understand where this site was? And where landscape and visual impacts assessed in this location? And can you explain what the additional costs would relate to?

11:35

So I may or may need to take some of that away, but certainly I can respond on the on the logistics point. The

11:43

the main point is,

11:47

is is the is the physical requirement to put on all of the of the buses and calibos arranged and planned as a

11:57

short notice and the logistics that would be would be required around that and the the additional length of time that that will create on the on the overall process. I think the best solution is probably for me to take that specific paragraph away and put it in a bit more detail.

12:15

Again, if you can help me understand, So would it be possible for the outage staff to use a mix of the main car park on site, the new car parking on site and part of the size will be?

12:29

Or are the numbers so great that those car parks together would not have enough plastic?

12:40

I was going to suggest we've got another speaker

12:45

who might be able to provide more

12:48

direct response to that. And we have Mike Lavelle, who's the Operations Director that sizewell C, and I suspect that he may be able to provide more assistance on the detail of what's involved in the outage and the logistics of that. So hopefully, he's listening. He's not here in the room with me, and will appear on screen and in due course. He has indeed appeared. I'll pass over to Mr. devalve. Thank you. Good afternoon, Mr. Mr. Lavelle? Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes,

13:24

outages by their nature can be planned or unplanned. So in the instance of size, we'll be having a planned or unplanned outage. At the same time as the sea station, having a planned or unplanned outage would would arise will give rise to a parking crisis.

13:45

Generally in an outage up to 1000 people extra arrive. And as we've mentioned, that includes

13:52

a lot of contractors that bring their site vehicles to the car park full of equipment and components that need to be trans shipped into the site and carried in.

14:05

With both stations, having an outage that will be even if we tried to share car parks, there wouldn't be enough space. And generally during an outage, both the what you would call a staff carpark and the outage carpark become full to almost overflowing.

14:20

Okay, so what what is I mean, you may not be able to answer this, but what is the likelihood of outages occurring at the same time? I think we'd all try to endeavour to keep up with us apart simply because of the demand on local labour. Was there's a lot of local level work on on outages, but inevitably outages either or the run

14:40

or are there are forced outages or unplanned outages where where the plant breaks down and has and staff have to be brought in rapidly to to repair whatever has broken and that often involves a prolonged shutdown.

14:53

That's, that's really useful. I have another question which may not be for you but I'll ask it to you anyway and then we can take it

15:00

So looking at the possibility of a double outage occurring, have the implications of that on accommodation needs and traffic impacts being considered within the environmental statement assessments.

15:14

It might be one back for Mr. Phil, part of like, it's one backhoe. Mr. Phil bought that one. Thank you. I think it has, but I'll pass it on.

15:24

Thank you, madam. Yes. I'm going to pass back to Mr. Jones on that. I think Mr. LaBelle is

15:33

on hand for the sort of operational aspects, but as you anticipated, he's not at the heart of the assessment of it. So I'll pass back to Mr. James.

15:53

So hello. So So yes, my understanding is that it has been taken into account. And what we'll do is in our, in our written submission will provide you with the references to that. That would be really useful. I don't have any more questions for yourselves at the moment. So I'd like to hand over to Suffolk County Council, if possible.

16:22

Thank you about a microwave at Suffolk County Council.

16:27

On that last point, Madam, we would certainly welcome seeing those references to where the environmental statement has addressed. The accommodation, the transport, and the socio economic implications of a double outage. You will note, no doubt, and this may have

16:54

been in part a source of your question that at paragraph 4.32 of our Rep. 2189. That's our written representation. We had raised specifically that point that we couldn't see where the matters had been addressed, have a double outage in the environmental statement. We didn't see any response to that point. In the applicants comments that deadline three to a written representation. They did make comments on a lot of what we said in the written representation, but they were silent on that particular point. So I say we would very much welcome being given the references to where that assessment has featured in the environmental statement, because at the moment we're not able to

17:47

see that. But that's

17:51

anything for an inflammation stroke evidence point. But going back to the the wide rescue.

17:58

And it's perhaps helpful Mr. Jones started by reminding you that there are three reactors in the world.

18:08

sizewell c consented world, but only two outage car parks. I won at sizewell C and one that size will be

18:19

as we understand it the outage car park Mike sighs well see is now exiting.

18:28

Well, I wish them well, whoever they were, wherever they've gone. The the outage car pocket size. We'll see. as we understand it is sized

18:40

to cope with one outage

18:44

for one reactor.

18:48

So it's inherent in what the applicant is saying that if there is a double outage,

18:57

then either

18:59

the size well see sorry, the size will be outage carpark will have to be utilised by size well

19:08

see, or they will have to make alternative arrangements on a temporary basis, such as a park and ride stroke bus arrangement, that that is something which is to say is inevitable in what the applicant is proposing. And the applicant presumably accepts that that is practicable and achievable because they haven't come to this examination asking for three outage carparks one per reactor. They say they have recognised that if there is a risk of a double outage

19:43

in terms of the size well see, then if sizewell

19:53

sees two

19:58

outages take place at the same time.

20:00

And then they will have to utilise sizewell B's carpark or if they make their own alternative arrangements.

20:09

So that that's again part of the context. What what we say is, first of all noting from E n one paragraph 5.9 point 10

20:23

that where there are detrimental effects, the obligation is to see to what extent they can be moderated. And where there is clearly a detrimental effect by taking land, which is presently part of the AONB and turning it over to car parking, which has no natural beauty attributes to it. The question is, can you moderate that, either by making the car park smaller, or by utilising other land, which is already being utilised for car parking, that's a form of moderation of what is a detrimental impact. So we say that the owner of the factory is on the applicant to persuade the examining authority, that for sound operational reasons, as it were utilisation of the size Well, the outage carpark is not going to be sufficient to cater

for all of the outages that can be expected. Now, as far as the planned outages are concerned, we know that if they're all plans, they can be planned and sequenced so that they don't overlap, and therefore only one outage crop up would be needed for the three reactors. So far as the unplanned scenario is concerned. The question really is the degree of

21:47

risk, the degree of likelihood, we've not been given any analytical information or any as it were mathematical model to show the different degrees of probability of two as opposed to three simultaneous outages. We're told by the applicant that the risk of three is so unlikely that no arrangements need to be made for that. But we're told that the risk of two is so likely that arrangements do have to be made for that, but we see no analysis that that demonstrates why the probability of one is any more or materially different to the probability of the other.

22:35

If we're right, that the applicant hasn't actually assessed the environmental implications of a double outage that might tell you something about the likelihood of that scenario of coming to pass.

22:50

But if one then moves on from that, and then want to ask yourself the question of well, if there is the

23:02

an outage, which coincides with a planned outage at sizewell B, or an unplanned outage at sizewell B, and they don't have the size, we'll see outage carpark. What then happens, we accept that there would be an inconvenience, and there would be clearly

23:25

a need to make alternative arrangements. But we don't accept that it's not realistic and practicable. For those arrangements to be made on a contingency basis. There is we acknowledge that there may be a small proportion of staff who would need equipment who would be needed to be accommodated by parking close to the site. But we've given being given no quantification to show that small proportion could not be accommodated

24:03

within the capacity of the main car park. Bear in mind that during an outage there will be some operations for the normal operations of the power stations which will not be taking place.

24:18

And equally, we've been given no indication that that proportion of our parking could not be accommodated either at sizewell

24:26

b. so far is the issue about the question of what if there was a bus and then there might need to be some facilities for the bus? Well, I think we might be talking about potentially a turnaround area for a bus and possibly catering for inclement weather, some form of waiting location in form of some kind of

bus shelter. But that that doesn't really seem to us to in any way equate to the impact of a 600 space car park in the AONB.

25:00

So we don't accept that there's any kind of measure of equivalence between an offside arrangement outside of the OMB and what is proposed within the AONB. And then so far as

25:13

the

25:15

CV, implications for the efficiency of the operation really comes down to,

25:23

there will be a degree of inconvenience to staff because shifts will no doubt runs whatever the shifts run to. And people's journey time to and from the site will be somewhat longer if they have to be busted as opposed to if they have the privilege of driving in. But we say that these are all things which are capable of sound logistical management, particularly when we're only dealing with a say the the scenario of the unplanned outage, because the plan ones can take place on the existing proposed carpark. And so we say that the case just has not been adequately justified to demonstrate that there really is a need to take AONB land and utilise it for the outage carpark bearing in mind that the size will be outed carpark will exist and will be available for all planned operations. So far as one knows, it may well be available for any unplanned operations as well.

26:20

Thank you for that. Can I just ask you in terms of your written representation, which is document Rep. 2189. I think that's page 31. For me, or paragraph 4.41?

26:36

Yep. Yeah, it talks about

26:39

the suffolk county councils. Can you consider that there are alternatives outside of the AONB? They exist? I'm just trying to understand whether any conversations or dialogue with the applicant has taken place regarding these just noting

26:57

what Mr. Jones said that no alternatives exist?

27:04

Could you just give me a moment? Because I always take instructions that my understanding is that there have been no specific conversations about particular locations. But hopefully, I'm going to get a

27:21

message in the moment that will tell me whether I'm right or wrong about that we're certainly happy to discuss. Yes, I'm close that there has been no such conversation. But we're certainly happy to discuss that issue with the applicant. I think this from a

27:37

matter of fairness, if one party is saying, you know, it's not been adequately justified, but perhaps is aware of an alternative, it would seem logical to me that a discussion could take place as to the suitability of alternatives. And that's obviously something for yourselves to take, you know,

27:58

to take away and you know, do with it as you wish, but from a logical point of view, that would seem reasonable. Sorry, ma'am. We're very happy to take that away and to have that dialogue with the applicant and to explore with them whether we can come to any kind of agreement as to that matter. We understood from previous dialogue that affects the applicants position was closed on this topic. So we hadn't engaged in that. But with obviously, your your comments we're certainly prepared to do and that may well be the situation. But I think that we'll just close off like a discussion point. If somebody is saying that there are alternatives, and they haven't been discussed. I think that would be a logical step to take. But thank you. I don't have any further questions. Thank you very much. If I could turn to East sipoc cancel, because I am aware. Sorry, I'll just wait for you to come on the screen.

29:00

Good afternoon, Mr. Tate.

29:03

I'm aware that use of a counsellor has a different position on this matter to that of Suffolk County Council. Insofar as with appropriate mitigation in place it's considered the location of the outage car park is generally acceptable. Can you a confirm that I'm be if there is anything else you'd like to add at this at this point? I can a confirm it be that we accept the operational and security need for the applicant to have outage car parking located close to the power station operational platform.

29:41

And in those circumstances, were accepted to an appropriate site.

29:46

Thank you very much, Mr. Tate. In terms of people with their hands up, can I turn to the SMB partnership, please?

29:57

Thank you, Simon. I'm sorry.

30:00

For custom DS IO MB partnership, I'll be very brief.

30:04

Just a reminder that IO and B's have the highest level of protection and major

30:12

infrastructure such as a car park should be seen in exceptional circumstances, or should only be delivered in exceptional circumstances. And if there are known outages, and also outages that aren't planned, but we are still aware that there will be outages of that nature, I would suggest that that might be stretching the term exceptional.

30:40

As agreed with what much of Michael Bedford said around carparks not contributing to a and b purpose. And I think they will be partnership very much like to see an assessment of the impacts on the AONB from Ay, ay, ay

31:01

ay Park and Ride facility or some sort of bus facility versus the car park in in the OMB. And perhaps leave you on our question of my own if we're struggling to get this sort of facility into the into the development? Is the development of this scale appropriate for this location? Thank you

31:27

could attend to Paul Collins. Next please?

31:32

Yes, hello, thank you, again, Cassini for bringing me back in, I think we have to remember and sort of go back, we're talking about the necessity of putting this car back in the place that it is. But part of the issue that we're faced with here is the fact that actually this development outside placed on goose Hill, as part of this development is partly due to the fact that the applicant has decided to build two reactors on this site. It is a small site, it's very, very constrained, and therefore there is no room for any car parks. It's so you know, goes back to, as you say, strategic decision making right at the beginning, that, whilst it might be appropriate, or it might have been reasonable to consider a two reactor site, but actually isn't really a big enough site to fit all of the requirements onto it. And I would echo what Mr. Bedford has said regarding the fact that, you know, there are just certain things you can't plan for, and one of them is to have both the sides while c reactors offline at the same time. The other is that you might just find yourself in a position where a planned reactor outage conflicts with service or to plan react, and reactor it conflicts with other unplanned reactor outages, or the plan reactor outage gets extended, like the one size won't be right at this moment, due to what they find when they open it up. So the whole idea that these two car parts can manage is not necessarily going to be the case, there may be the case, when there will be three outages at the same time for whatever reason, and that sort of planning needs to happen. It also occurs to me that as time goes on, if there was to be an offsite park and ride for the operational staff while an outage is going on, there is a point at which size will be will no longer be operating. And its car parks will probably become less well used because it's in decommissioning. And that's a place where they can actually also stop using that offside carpark. So there's a whole bunch of things that are going to happen here over time. But the fact of the matter is, the basic problem with this site is that trying to put too much into two smaller space. And the amb is the casualty on this and it shouldn't be the casualty.

34:05

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Collins. Can I turn to an Westover, please?

34:20

Thank you. Just a very quick point I'd like to raise Can you hear me okay. I can see. I have raised it in personal submissions as well. But I understand the proposal to build an outage carpark on the pillbox field was removed at an earlier stage. But I would like to point out that the alleged landscape mitigation plan to provide some element of replacement woodland for coronation wood which was felled and you will now realise realise that size while a is very prominent when approaching the coastal landscape.

35:00

I'd also like to point out that that landscape plan, and you may have seen it. In reality, the planting looks very sad and neglected already. But the landscape plan still reflects the former shape and location of the of the outage carpark when it was proposed on the pillbox field. And I want to point that out because I am concerned that there may still be pressure in future if more parking is required to locate it in that location. Thank you. Thank you very much. Mr. Phelps, if I could turn to you for comment.

35:40

Thank you, madam.

35:42

Just taking a step back.

35:45

As I understand it, the county Council's position is that notwithstanding what is said by the promoter with its experience

35:58

of operating nuclear power stations, and the requirements for outage carparks it considers that one outage carpark will be sufficient for three reactors in circumstances where it has been accepted as necessary for the base station alone. One reactor to have an outage carpark. Now, you've heard from Mr. Laval about what is required, the question has been raised by suffered as to the relative likelihood of two as opposed to three outages and we will take that away and respond in writing that seemed a better use of time and trying to deal with that already now.

36:49

But it is important just to understand the position of the county council in context, that this is effectively an alternative that is being promoted by the county council to the proposal, which is in front of you proposal, which is in front of you includes an outage carpark. And it's very clear that if you are being asked to consider an alternative without an outage carpark, but reliance instead, on some alternative arrangement, the burden falls squarely on the county council to do two things. First of all, to establish with you the relevance of the alternative for your decision making, in other words, what are they asking you to do? Are they asking you as the examining authority to recommend that development consent

should not be granted for the decio which includes all of the development as a package on the basis that there is an outage carpark provided

37:56

and on the basis that there is an alternative, which would not require an outage carpark. If that is the case, then it is necessary for them to do one further thing, which is to demonstrate that that alternative is not only preferable in terms of impact, but also that it is workable,

38:19

that it is achievable. And that when one has regard to the policy on alternatives in any one, that it meets those policy requirements. At present, there is no specific alternative before you we can't look at a plan and see the county Council's alternative and test it. So when one looks at paragraph 443 of e and one, which tells us that alternative proposals which are vague or or incomplete, can be excluded on the grounds that are not important and relevant to the ipcs decision. At the moment.

39:02

We have something which is clearly vague and incorrect. We can't point to it on a plan. It's said by a learned friend, that while we might be looking at a bunch of that you've heard that we're talking about 1000 additional people on site to provide adequate shelter for 1000 additional workers is not simply a bus shelter, the sort one might see along the side of Tottenham Court Road with four seats on it. We have to know what it is they have in mind. But of course, although you hear my learned friend saying well, reasonable logistical expertise could make this work or worse that affect the county council does not have any expertise that it is deploying or any experts that it is putting forward to explain how this would work to counter the expert evidence that

40:00

was put forward by the applicant to explain that it would not that it is simply not a workable alternative.

40:07

So although we will take away the point about likelihood so that you have the information on that, and I do say before one gets too carried away about the council's alternative and how this ought to feature in the decision making, it is important to take that step back and ask oneself, where are they going with this point? And have they actually got the material to make it something which is important and relevant, as opposed to something they would like to discuss what for reasons which aren't immediately apparent? So that's what I want to say at the moment. We'll come back to you on the likelihood point. Thank you very much. Mr. Scott. I can see you've got your hand up.

40:50

Thank you,

40:51

guys, just a small intervention. But it may be quite important. I gather from the

40:58

scrutinising to the extent I've got the

41:01

professional background to do it. The Eleanor's requirement is that there has to be an independent access for each station, which is why there is the big embankment road. So I just and I also note that there's going to be a difference in the height of the sea walls between the sides. So I just wonder whether the you know, this debate about the capacity for outage isn't assuming there is actually an interconnection between the new site and the B site. And that was the only point I wanted to make. Thank you. Mr. fell apart. Sorry, if I cut you off there.

41:36

No, madam, you didn't cut me off. It's simply that when I went off screen, Mr. kratt, indicated to me that he would like to comment on the point made by I believe my name is and Westover in relation to the planting, and he might be able to provide some assistance on that. So I'll just hand over to Mr. Kraft.

41:56

It could I just when Mr. Kratz finished with his dialogue, I'm going to move on to the power export solution. And it's it's questions actually to yourself. So if you want to swap back to you when Mr. Kratz is finished, that would be helpful. Understood. Thank you.

42:17

Good afternoon, just to address the query from an Westover. Just to confirm that under the sizewell c application, are there is an intention to supplement the planting scheme as proposed under the sizewell b scheme. The planting that is actually installed is a legacy of the consent of the sizewell b scheme.

42:42

And then recognition that the proof scheme is actually reflecting the boundary of the car park, it is to be softened and supplemented under the sidewall see scheme to better integrate it. So hopefully that addresses any latent concern about future

42:59

capacity.

43:01

Thank you very much.

43:06

I am going to now address the power export solution.

43:12

Now joining

43:14

these are probably slightly more technical questions. So I believe you do have a colleague that with you that may be able to address. Indeed, indeed I do. We have Daniel young, who's the sizewell C, conventional Ireland engineering and Delivery Manager, and he is present as it were, in this virtual hearing. And he's available to answer technical questions about that matter, I'm quite happy to pose it to you. And then if you want to hand over to your colleague.

43:47

So I'm looking at the potential use of the gas insulated lines. And I note some of the environmental concerns have been raised by EDF, about the use of insulating gas.

44:02

But I am aware that some alternative suitable gases have been identified and actually are already in use. And I believe that is about 10, National Grid side from 2017. I'd just like to hear your views on that and whether the use of such an alternative gas would make this technology more suitable in terms of size. Well see. Thank you. So I'm going to pass over to Mr. Yang.

44:32

What I would ask is when he responds to that question,

44:37

just to make sure I've understood it. And the way you frame it is not simply in terms of whether alternative gases have been used elsewhere. But whether that would make the gas insulated line solution, a suitable one for sale see. Yeah, and there are other questions I have as well so that if you could answer that particular

45:00

To the aspect on the environmental concerns of the use of the gas would be grateful. Understood. I'll pass over to Mr. Yang.

45:15

Good afternoon, it's Daniel young on behalf of the applicants, I hope you can see and hear me can indeed Miss do on a specific point about the insulating gas. We did address that in our response to the questions that we have submitted that reference our EP, two dash

45:35

108 and also our VP three dash 046. So we responded.

45:45

And but I'll summarise what we said, which is the choice of insulating gas did not materially influence the option selection process.

45:55

But you do raise that as an issue, though, as it is stated as a concern. And one of the reasons why that technology isn't considered suitable at this point.

46:06

Be the insulating gases and direct concern, and sulphur hexafluoride is an incredibly damaging greenhouse gas. But we are aware of obviously, that it's being phased out within the power industry, and alternatives are becoming available on the market. And some of those have been tried and tested in service. So I accept that point.

46:27

So we acknowledge that also in the report that we've submitted already,

46:32

it doesn't materially affect the outcome. Thank you. My next question is, I know you raise some security concerns in respect of the use of the gas insulating lines in terms of the need to cross the fence to the National Grid substation. I just wondered whether there are absolutely no other alternative designs available that would be able to remedy that security concern. And can you just elaborate for me as to what their concern actually is?

47:08

Yes, I can. So it's a security concern, having structures that bridge the perimeter fence, as that's not acceptable from a security perspective to have any structure that provides a bridge over the fence.

47:25

The only solution to overcome that would be to bury them underneath the fence to quite a depth. We did also make reference to that in the report that we've already submitted.

47:39

But I don't think from the reading of the report, it wasn't an it maybe maybe it wasn't 100% clear whether that had actually just been a consideration, or it was actually discounted, completely due to perhaps space constraints, if you could just help. Yeah, absolutely. The

48:00

when we when we talk, when we talk in summary about security concerns, it's more about preservation of the style zone, which exists around the circumference of the site, just inside the site fence. So that is a material concern that that affected our decision making process.

48:20

When it comes to actually

48:23

crossing the perimeter fence itself,

48:26

it is conceivable that we could put them underground, as has been commented by others. So that specific point about how you cross the fence, clearly you couldn't have anything going over the top of

the fence. That would be acceptable, you could conceivably bury it with with some difficulty, but it's probably achievable.

48:47

But that that's that specific location where you'd have to cross the fence was not

48:53

a major influence on our decision not to use that solution. So when we when we talk about security concerns, it's about the the need to instal the gas insulated lines around the site in such a way that it compromises the style zone on the inside of the security fence. Thank you I understand now and

49:20

I understand that there are you know, you have detailed that there are space limitations on site has consideration being given to a hybrid approach of the gas insulated lines. So could you have underground lines, gas lines under overhead? Can you Is it possible to do a mix of such technology?

49:48

Yes, it is. Yep. So we consider the technical report that we submitted talks about all the various different

49:56

options that are available for each technology.

50:00

overhead lines, underground cables and gas insulated lines. And there are various sub options of each of those that could be considered in different parts of the site. And some combination of those

50:13

was also considered when we arrived our conclusion. So

50:18

I suppose in some way, yes, we consider the possibility to use a combination of different installation techniques. But none of them overcome the issues that we describe. Thank you. That's just to help me understand, obviously, the technology and the constraints with that. I do have a question about pylons, are you the correct person to speak to about pion design? Or is that a different colleague? But I think if you're asked a question, then we'll

50:50

is a very simple question. And forgive me, but I'm told there's no such thing as a city question.

50:58

So the pylons that are currently on site and the pylons that are designed that before as in the application, they have a different design?

51:09

That they simply look different? Yes, that's right. Yes. Can you tell me why?

51:16

The, the pylons that are currently on site today that connect the sidewalk complex to the National Grid, are designed to carry two circuits each. So an electrical circuit requires three bundles of conductors. And so the classic design that you see is three bundles of conductors down each side, hanging from arms. So that's the design that's on site. At present, once you arrive at the Sizewell site,

51:46

once a transmission line arrives at the site, then has to connect to the new turbine holes for Sizewell. See, those connections, it requires one circuit for each turbine Hall. And so one circuit is three bundles of conductors, and not six. And those three bundles are carried horizontally on the pylon design that is in the application. And I assume that is the standard approach to standard design, when you just have a single circuit, which consists of the three bundles of conductors.

52:21

I think that's really easy. You probably can guess where I was going with that. And, you know, forgive me if, you know, pylon design, it's not it's not my background. And from a visual point of view.

52:35

If pylons was the end solution, if the pylons were there, and they look the same, there is an argument that that might have a lesser visual impact. But from what you've told me, technically, would that not be possible?

52:57

I think I understand the point. It's

53:03

is not an appropriate technical solution, because the

53:09

the pylons of the style that are on site at the moment, because they carry the each circuit vertically, the three bundles of conductors are in a vertical configuration. Whereas the terminal points in the substation, and in the adjacent to each turbine Hall, I was on a horizontal configuration.

53:31

There isn't we can, we can't be confident there's enough space within the site to transition from a horizontal vertical configuration of conductors. And so the standard technique will be to just continue the horizontal formation of conductors across their entire route, which is about 500 metres 1000 metres. Okay, no, that's, that's really useful. And I do have one further question. In one of the power export papers, it is ref 2189 is dated October 2020. It stated that the applicant is exploring further opportunities to improve design and reduce tower tower heights. And since the production of that paper, obviously a change request went in

54:24

as an obviously one of the pylons was reduced in height. Is that the design opportunities that that paper is making reference to or are further changes anticipated?

54:45

Yes, yes. That's why I was just checking that that was the change. Yes. Thank you that those are the Those were the questions that I had for you. Can I turn to Suffolk County Council, please?

55:04

I've got a question for you, if you don't mind.

55:08

If pylons and the overhead lines remain in the scheme proposed by the applicant,

55:14

I know the view of yourselves that the proposed natural environmental fund contained its schedule 11 of the deed of obligation, which is found in rep three, zero to four would need to be of a sufficient scale to enable long term investment in landscape and habitat improvement and management. And this would be to obviously offset offset the significant long term harm to the O and B, and other areas.

55:42

The schedule covers the, as it stands, covers the construction period for three years, following the end of construction. My question for you is do you have any comments about that length of the improvement funds? And whether you consider that sufficient?

56:01

with short answer, madam is yes, we, we do have a comment. And the answer is we don't consider it that would be a sufficient period, simply to offset the permanent impact of pylons were you to consider that a justified case have been made pylons. Clearly,

56:21

the issue of offsetting for an impact of that nature would require careful consideration and would require mitigation that could be commensurate to offsetting what would be a permanent and long term adverse impact. And we would see it as being likely therefore, that initiatives under such a fund would be more long term in nature, in order to make them as it were commanded to route to the harm that they're offsetting.

56:52

Thank you. And I do want to speak to each is separate. But before I turn to them, is there anything that you heard from the applicant earlier that you wish to comment on at this stage?

57:04

But um, obviously, as I think your questions have clearly been put to the applicant, you've fully absorbed, the technical reports that we've provided to you in the comments on those technical reports. I do have Mr. Bradshaw, who is the principal engineer from afri. Here

57:24

to assist if you had any outstanding matters, but as I understood the points that were being accepted

57:32

on behalf of the applicant by Mr. Young.

57:37

The The only issue that Mr. Young was saying was effectively not capable of resolution was the as it were, what he put as a security concern, which we consider is not been articulated in a way which demonstrates that that is an insurmountable

58:02

concern, which cannot be satisfactory, resolved through the design of a hybrid solution, as he accepted was technically feasible, and to deliver a gas insulated lines outcome, which would not involve the use of pylons. I don't obviously rehearse the detail of that technical, the technical reports. And I don't think I need to rehearse obviously, what we said about the visual impact of the pylons and you're clearly fully sees of that and the respective viewpoints.

58:40

I think my only my only question, perhaps if I can to you was whether you felt that you needed anything from Mr. Bradshaw, the author of the free report to assist you in your understanding your your content that you've got sufficient understanding of the technical matters, I am content today. If however, you know, with further consideration and receipt of deadline five submissions, I do need any further information. At the next round of examination questions. I will pause them the questions that if that's all right with you, yeah, absolutely unbreakable. Thank you. If I could turn to East Suffolk

59:19

Council, please.

59:21

Thank you, Madam, we set out our position in the Li R. But also in the document, which is rep three oh 60 which is our comments on others comments,

59:34

setting out our position so I wasn't going to repeat that.

59:40

But secondly, we do have common ground with the county that there needs to be an element of the natural environment fund. That is for the lifetime of the project precisely to deal with the impacts of the pylons which we recognise. Thank you. If I could turn to the Airbnb partnership, please

1:00:02

Thank you madam Simon Amstutz cosin, suffocation haze era of outstanding natural beauty partnership.

1:00:10

Again, I'll be very brief. And to add to our earlier written representations.

1:00:17

The IRB partnership is obviously not qualified to speak about some of the technical aspects of moving the electricity from where it's generated into the National Grid infrastructure. But I think what I was sort of picking up there was that there was a technical solution that wasn't or didn't appear to be paying regard to the fact that we're in a national designated landscape.

1:00:49

So yeah, there was there was concern there.

1:00:52

And obviously, pylons do not contribute to the purposes the statutory purposes of the A and B. And that can be demonstrated through national grid's own

1:01:07

visual impact provision,

1:01:09

which looks to

1:01:12

offset and mitigate and compensate for the impacts of their infrastructure. And the OMB partnership has recently secured funding from that

1:01:26

provision for mitigation projects just a few miles north of the proposed size website. So it seems slightly uncomfortable, that we're seeing investment through that scheme. While at the same time we're working our proposals to put up new pylons, which will then

1:01:49

to tract from the purposes of the A and B. and, perhaps again, leave you with the thought that Yeah, because these it appears that these these connections can't be put underground, because of what I understand to be some of the restrictions are on the site. Is this site, the correct site for a development proposals of this scale? Thank you very much. Okay, turn back to the applicant. Mr. Philpott, please.

1:02:23

Thank you, madam.

1:02:25

Just two points, if I may. I do think that the way that the county council characterises Mr. Young's position is accepted. But I wonder whether rather than going around the houses again, given that you've got quite a lot of detailed response from us on this, we might just make the position briefly clear in the written summary.

1:02:50

But you do you do have a lot of written material from us on this. The second point is simply to go back and just touch on the point I made earlier. Again, this is an alternative that is being promoted by the county council. And therefore, the same considerations arise in terms of decision making, I won't repeat the points I've made. But on this one, I think it's also worth considering

1:03:20

the issue which is identified in the second bullet point, paragraph 443 of the N one,

1:03:27

which is to consider whether there's a realistic prospect of the alternative, just pausing in in this case, that would be the sizewell c power station, but redesigned so as to adopt some form of the county Council's proposal for export, delivering the same infrastructure capacity in the same timescale as the proposed development. one only has to ask himself the question, Well, okay, well, what happens if, at the end of the examination, and at the end of the period for the secretary state's decision, there is a decision to say, well, let's have size we'll see, but with a different form of export. What does that mean in terms of delivery of capacity? Clearly, it can't satisfy that test, because you automatically put yourself back by a considerable period of time. That's if it works. That's if it is in fact a better solution, which we say is not the case. So

1:04:28

it's the same point about understanding where this is going in terms of decision making, which needs to be borne in mind. But we'll we'll pick up the point about exactly what the nature of the difference between us is in our written summary. Thank you very much.

1:04:48

I like to move on to Agenda Item Number six, which is main development site design considerations. We do have as you

1:05:00

roll away quite quite a lot to get through. So, bullet point one. I'm going to combine this with the agenda item on the accommodation campus as well just try and ensure that we do cover all of the ground. So, this agenda item looks at additional design principles to be included within the design access statement. Design Principles for the accommodation campus as set out in Table A point one of Appendix A of the design and access statement table. So the design and access statement and the most recent version of this is found on page 24 of Rep. 2040. And in response to answers received to examination question, Li 141, which asked about the suitability of the accommodation campus key

design principles contained within table 8.1. the applicant's produced a list of amendments to the content of this table, and this is contained within pages 703 to 705. of rep 3046. I would like to ask, I would like to get the thoughts of the two councils and then the AONB partnership on the proposed content, that these design principles and whether any of the amendments and additions address any of the concerns that have been raised. like to start with East Suffolk council first, please.

1:06:41

Thank you, Madam, can I ask Mr. Scripture to deal with the general

1:06:46

point first, and then we'll come on to the

1:06:49

principal's in particular in relation to the accommodation campus?

1:07:19

I'm not seeing anybody I am now Mr. Granger

1:07:22

pologize. for that?

1:07:28

Yes. Do you mind repeating your question? No, it's fine. The applicant provided some changes to the key design principles.

1:07:37

Within table a point one of the design and access statement, it's an answer to question examination question. Li 141. And just some additional content to the principles have been included. And I just wondered whether you've had an opportunity to look at these and whether they address any of the concerns that have been raised about the accommodation campus in particular.

1:08:05

I don't believe I have seen those. I apologise. That is absolutely fine. And this is one of the issues with questions. Sometimes we ask questions that people haven't had the opportunity to look at. And I'm quite happy for you to take that away as a question and provide an answer at the next suitable deadline. Thank you. I will do. That's fine. Mr. Tate, is there anything else you wish to add? Are you happy

1:08:34

with that approach?

1:08:36

We'll deal with it in that way. Thank you, Madam, that's fine. Can I turn to Suffolk County Council? If it is the same for you? I'm happy for it to be addressed in writing. Madam, we're continuing to deal with it in that manner. Thank you.

1:08:51

Can I turn to the AONB partnership as well, please?

1:08:57

Thank thanks, madam Simon. I'm stoked from the south coast news. I have a partnership. We've not had a chance to review that either. That's fine. I'm more than happy to deal with that in writing that. If I could just turn to the applicant for a moment, please.

1:09:18

Thank you that. I mean, I did say we wanted to go through the agenda quickly. So that is

1:09:25

so I have a question about the accommodation campus. And again, it is a it's a design related question. So I'll ask it to you. But I understand that maybe, colleagues? Yes, I've got I've got two people who might potentially answer that question was Mr. Crack you've heard from the other.

1:09:46

The other one is the architect Mr. Jones. But But if you ask the question, and then we can decide how best to deal with it. I'm looking specifically at the design of the accommodation campus. I'm aware that the final finished

1:10:00

Hey rents is a deep issue to be dealt with as a detail the top design issue, which will

1:10:07

be determined at the next design stage, however, in your response to examination question, Li 139, which can be found on pages 968 969, of rep to 100. It stated that, and I quote, If modular construction is used for the accommodation blocks, careful consideration will be given to their design. And that just got me wondering, and it is only a small question whether that statement meant that other design options other than modular options were being considered? And if so, what are they?

1:10:50

I think that's the question that Mr. kratt is going to be able to answer so I'll pass on to him.

1:11:03

Just to answer that

1:11:05

question,

1:11:07

modular design has been considered as one of the likely scenarios given precedent sets, HBC. But given the commitment to provide additional design principles, and explore this matter further,

1:11:24

it hasn't been decided formally, whether it is only going to be modular.

1:11:29

With regard to materials, I think, even if it's not modular

1:11:34

reference to the importance of material finishes and design remains relevant. So I don't think it's to the extent it only relates to modular design. So if it's not, again, can you help me here? If it's not modular design, what would it be just a standard, though, it would again, it would be subject to the design principles, and still be under the same scrutiny in terms of design quality. Okay, thank you. Thank you for that. I do.

1:12:03

I don't suppose Mr. Philpott has anything else to add to that point to say if you've answered

1:12:08

No, thank you.

1:12:10

Do you have a question then for

1:12:14

Alison downs have stopped sighs while see if she's available.

1:12:21

Hello, Mrs. Cassini. Hello. Just a quick question that I've noted the concerns that you've raised regarding location of the accommodation campus in respect of insufficient justification of citing, along with other concerns. I also heard obviously, the concerns regarding housing pressure that were raised the issue specific hearing on Friday. Is it possible for you to just help me with my understanding and expand a little bit on the suggestion made by stop sighs well see that a site which could leave a long term legacy for affordable housing has been rejected without valid justification?

1:13:01

Well, we don't feel that then the applicant has justified for reasons which satisfy are certainly the claim that the accommodation campus needs to be one single huge site and reasons for our objection to that are obviously a combination of, you know, the proximity of so many workers close to a tiny Hamlet, you know, the potential for antisocial behaviour, and, but also the sort of visual impact. I mean, that's the main route by which people who live in East Greenwich, you know, go and do their shopping and laced and and what have you.

1:13:36

We very much supported efforts of Suffolk County Council to explore a range of alternative locations. And also, you know, which followed the split site accommodation strategy that was pursued that was pursued at Hinkley Point. Now, the legacy Hinkley Point is that the way the Bridgewater campus has been laid out, is in a sort of road network and with utilities, all installed so that after the campus is removed, it can be used to build housing, not necessarily that the the structures themselves are turned into long term housing, we certainly felt that, you know, a split site option, where, you know, there were, the workforce was sort of diluted and, you know, in more urban settings, which were better able to cope with such an influx, you know, would be a more appropriate way forward. And in the long term, this could facilitate the building of more affordable housing in the local area. So that was the sort of basis of, you know, our concerns. And, you know, we were flatly told that the contractors don't like the Hinkley Point model. And we've felt that that was what we were quite shocked, actually, that the views of local people should be sort of dismissed in such an abrupt way. And when it wasn't just us it was it was also

1:15:00

Suffolk County Council raising the possibilities as well. Does that help you? that that that does, I just wanted to make sure my understanding of the point that you you've made that that's very helpful. Thank you very much. Okay. Could I ask if the applicant wishes to respond to that point at all?

1:15:18

Yes, ma'am. Just briefly, I'm going to ask Mr. Richard Jones, to respond to that.

1:15:26

Thank you. Yes, I just wanted to quickly pick up on on on a few points. So

1:15:33

it's certainly not the case that the applicant has gone through a very, very considered process on this. And if you were to turn to

1:15:42

not necessarily now, but rep two dash 108, Appendix five be of our responses to the first written questions. You'll see in there, there's a campus site selection, technical note. And that process, essentially began in way back in in 2010.

1:16:01

And the long of it, I suppose, is that there were originally 23 sites, that then got dwindled down to 1816, and then three, through a series of appraisal processes. And then those three following engagement with the Councils were then sent out to consultation, in the very first consultation, the stage one consultation, and that identified three potential locations. There's the broadly the now now proposed location, and then there was another location a sizable gap, which was wholly within the AONB. And then another option was termed laced in East which is partly within the AONB, and then the remainder in it setting. And the feedback that we received from that stage one consultation was clearly that that option one, the now proposed location, was deemed to be the most appropriate by those that

responded to that stage one consultation. And that was, in fact, mainly due to the distance from from local communities, and the proximity to, to the main construction site.

1:17:09

And it was also informed by lessons learned. And so

1:17:14

it's, it's, it's an approach that's been tried and tested at Hinkley Point C, and also at the flamanville sites over in Normandy. And clearly placing an accommodation campus on site has very significant reduction in traffic and any associated impacts that that might come with, with a development in an off site location. But also it's best for workers. So in terms of the quality of the immunity, that you can offer the reduction in community time, commuting time, sorry. And the increased productivity, health and safety and everything that that goes along with that there's there's very clear tried and tested benefits that go along with with the the on site location.

1:17:59

And it is the case that the county identified a number of additional sites. And they were included within that site selection technical note and and when that information was produced by boy consultants, I believe it was clear that the that the county didn't necessarily sign up to any one of those sites, it was purely done as an exercise to identify that that alternatives do exist. But they've been assessed as as part of that process. And importantly, the statement of the draft statement of common ground with the county and also the districts that you'll find it, rep two dash 076 points out that both parties agree that the campus is in an acceptable location that balances the needs of the projects, and both environmental and community effects. Thank you very much. I'm gonna turn to the two councils then those two gentlemen with their hands up, I can see that you've got your hands up. So if I could ask her if he suffered Council, have any comments to make at this stage on anything that they've heard?

1:19:13

No thank you other other than to confirm that we do accept the acceptability of the location of the accommodation campus in principle, and we'll come back to on the additional design principles that had been provided. Thank you, Mr. Tate. Mr. Bedford, do you have any additional comments at this stage?

1:19:40

apologise but in my videos, it could be on off on off.

1:19:45

When we clear we did press the applicants to explore that issue fully. But having done that my team

1:19:52

is now exiting.

1:19:55

I have this effect.

1:19:59

I say we press the apple

1:20:00

comes to explore that matter. Now they've done that we again have not taken issue with either the size or location of the accommodation campus. Thank you for that. I can turn to the Airbnb partnership please.

1:20:15

Simon Amstutz, sopcast NATO partnership. With respect to all of the a&p partners, I think the partnership would like to point out that development within the setting and in this case adjacent to the ANP should be subject to very similar assessments of the impact on the AONB. Thank you very much. And Graham, because I can see that you've got your hand up as well.

1:20:46

Yes. Good afternoon. capsular. Grey, and because I'd like to concur with Alison downs with regard to this

1:20:55

trip to Mr. Because I can't actually see you I don't know where they think my camera is working. I don't. That's absolutely fine. I can

1:21:04

put it right. But being tech minded is something which I don't think it's probably you, Mr. Vickers, but I can hear you. And that's and that's all that matters. So please. Yeah, I think I can care, obviously, with Alison downs on this. I mean, you know, environmentally, and I think this is why we're having this discussion and environmentally, it's the worst possible site. For an accommodation, it's going to have an impact on the n and b. They,

1:21:34

EDF put forward three options. And those options immediately, the gap was was dropped. But we never really heard a good reason why the east side laced in Ace was dropped. They said it was about the entrance. And I believe if you look in the report of where Boyer and Kat cannon, they resolve that problem with an access via another position on the site, it has good exit access to the south to the site, EDF talk about two additional entrances to the site one being on the existing a site and another one to be facilitated, it would take the impact away from the community in East bridge and take the impact away on a an OB, we still have not had good reason as to why that site cannot work. And it's important, it's close to the community of leisten. And it will facilitate workers needs far more than then a position of isolation for workers who basically will be miles away from anything it's going to increase traffic flow from from the site on a daily basis because those workmen are going to work hard and they are going to play and they are going to need to go and find facilities to have their leisure time as much as much as we are trying to be convinced by EDF that basically they will have all the facilities on site. I would ask you and ask many, many people, do they want to work sleep and play in the same place? The

answer to that is no. It suits EDF to leave it in that position. So I beg you to look at that, that ask EDF to come up with a credible reason why that site cannot work if it's their intention to to put accommodation

1:23:35

in leisten in its form for the workers at that level of population. And I think we need to look at that seriously. The other thing is there are many sites around the area, which will facilitate for a legacy. And I think, as Alison has said, that also needs looking at we are impacting.

1:23:58

We're talking about those impacts. We're talking about design. And the reason we're talking about it is because of the effect it's going to have in the position it's having, we're going to they're going to place it Thank you. Thank you very much. Mr. Baker's, if I can turn to the applicant if they have any further comments, please.

1:24:16

Madam No, thank you. You've heard Mr. Jones, hopefully helpfully and succinctly summarising the thinking behind it, but also giving you the references to where you'll find that in more detail in writing. There's nothing to be gained by our repeating

1:24:32

Thank you very much. It seems like an opportune time to take a short adjournment it is now five past three and I am going to adjourn till 20 past three. Thank you very much.