TEXT_SizewellC_ISH5_Session4_13072021

Tue, 7/13 4:55PM • 1:25:55

00:04
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 the live stream and recording has begun, please? Yes, I can see and hear you and the live stream and recording have started. Thank you. For those watching by the live stream, can I please remind you to refresh your browser page, I'm going to move on to the item that looks at design and scale of turbine holes, operations service centre and sky bridges under agenda item five, appears to be a general agreement from many indwelt from majority of interested parties that the turbine holds, together with the operation service centre would be one of the most prominent features on the main development site, and the applicant has likened them to being the equivalent of the size will be dome. I'd like to move to East Suffolk counsel First, if I may.

01:08
But I thought I'd just said Thank you, Madam, would you like to hear some review of

01:17
I do I have a question for you? If that's okay, I've noted in your local impact report on pages 50 and 51, which is rep 1045. And it's paragraph 6.38. Do you do have that document? I have it? Yeah. And you've commented on what's being commented on the inability of the design to fully respond to the sensitivity of the receiving environment. And just in with regard to the turbine holes, Sky bridges in the operations service centre. I'd like to understand your concerns in more detail, and whether there are any specific design features or approaches that you think would respond better in this environment?

02:09
Yes, and that's in the context of the design of the nuclear components being we understand fixed. So, I will ask very briefly, I think I will ask Mr. Scripture very briefly to explain his concerns around those aspects, which remain fixed, as we understand. Thank you.

02:38
Thank you, Mr. Derrick. Yes, good afternoon, Madam. Yes, in respect of the main development side, I mean, we have positively critique the sort of design and finish of these, the key the key buildings to which you refer, but obviously, they do remain at scale industrial structures within a designated protected landscape, you know, the the impact of which cannot be mitigated. So it's important to appreciate the context in which we make our individual critiques of the actual design of the individual buildings within this assessment that we've made overall in respect of landscape and other impacts arising from the overall scale bulk and appearance of the project. And obviously, that's in relation to the design of the components that are not basically up for change in respect of their design. So, no, want to say the nuclear components of the design are fixed and cannot be changed as part of the decio approvals. And from our point of view, it means the impact of these buildings will be therefore more

significant, and well therefore, justify a require a greater mitigation or sort of compensation given the A or n be setting up out to clear.

04:06
Thank you very much. Thank you. And can I turn to civic county cancelled, so if you have any comment on this matter?

04:18
Mark Bradford, Suffolk County Council, the answer is no. Thank you. Thank you.

04:25
Can I go back to the applicant, please? Do you have I don't know whether you've got you've got any comments on on what has been said there or?

04:44
What I wonder is is if there are particular points you'd like to address two hours before I turn to the person who will respond to them. And it may be that they can all be wrapped up in one answer, but I'm in your hands as to whether that's likely what you're about to ask.

05:05
Yeah. I think in the interest of timeliness, we do still have quite a lot to get through. I think I'm going to put that question in writing, as part of the next examination round of examination questions, just so that we do make some progress through through the agenda.

05:29
I'm very happy to to, to very happy to volunteer others to respond to that in writing in due course.

05:38
With that in mind, I'm going to move on to colour considerations and finishes. And it is a question for yourselves Actually, I've noted the change to I think it's number 56 of the detailed built development principles, which are contained in table 5.3 of the design and access statement, and that's page 11. of rec 2040. And I think the main change to this is that you've identified that this will now involve discussion and agreement with a Suffolk Council, which I'm sure you know, he suffered council obviously have been involved and are grateful for but my thought process is given the sensitive location within there and be what considerations also been given to the involvement of natural England in the LNB. Partnership.

06:36
I think on the approach to that, and I'm looking around to see who might be able to assist on that. I can explain the I can ask Mr. You and James, who's the architect to explain how we've got to the position we have. And I'll see if there's anyone who can answer this specific question about whether consideration has been given to the involvement of those two parties.

07:06

I do you have further questions regarding colour and finishes? So do you want me on quite happy? Do you want me to continue with my questioning? And for you to deal with it as a whole at the end? Or do you want to deal with that point? Now,

07:19
I think it might be helpful to hear the questions as a whole. Because it may then the that while Mr. Jones is dealing with some of them, I can take instructions on the other matters. So let's see if we can

07:31
wrap it all up without having to come back to you on Tuesday night. So I want to turn to concrete structures on site, and in particular, the proposed stones. Now from the submissions that you've made, I understand that the design team has examined the use of adding padding or pigments to the proposed domes, but this isn't possible due to necessity for the need to be able to inspect the concrete at regular intervals. And please do correct me if I'm interpreting this incorrectly. But moving detailed built development Principle number 63, which is found on page 12 of the design and access statement. Rep 2040. It's stated and I'm quoting exposed concrete will have a consistent pale grey finish. As far as as reasonably practicable. Careful on site attention will be given to the change in backs of either goods and setting out a day joints to ensure a consistent even finish can be achieved subject to operational requirements. And number of interested parties have raised concerns over the well the finish the colour of the domes, and also the ability to provide a consistent colour tone. And my question to you is how is it proposed to secure consistent grey finish in respect in respect of the dome? So that is my main question. But I would like to understand a bit more detail about how that is going to be secured and how it is is it How far is it practical?

09:14
Thank you. That's Yeah, that's understood. I'm going to now introduce Mr. Yuan James. So he is an architect from Grimshaw architects, and I get to ask him to deal with that. And in the meantime, I'll see if I can get any further assistance on the other matter.

09:31
Thank you. Good afternoon. I'm just trying to get my camera to work. That's fine. I can hear you. Okay, I think I shouldn't be visible in there. I yes. Now, I still can't see yet. No, no, sorry. I can't see you. I can hear you. Thank you Good afternoon. I'm Crete structures.

10:03
Sorry, Miss Jones. I still there you are. Finally, I can see you. Good afternoon. Mr. Jones, do you want to start?

10:09
apologies, I shall take it a bit more slowly with the buttons to make sure that works. So the question the concrete is hugely important, functionally, it's a safety critical feature, which as you've correctly said, means we can't clap that we, when we started, as the architects working on the scheme, we, we challenged a number of things with the engineering team, we gave them a harder time was we felt we could were familiar with dealing with infrastructure projects, and working closely with engineers to

understand what are real absolute constraints and what things might have some more flexibility. Through that process. It's It was absolutely clear to us that the the concrete structures, and also the mix of the concrete that's used is very important in how it performs, and how it performs over the whole life span of the project. The we did look at whether it could be claimed. And as as you've correctly summarised, that's not possible because it needs to be inspected. For cracks, for example, to make sure that it's continuing to operate safely. We also looked at whether it was possible to pigment the concrete with an additive so that we could get a consistent colour or possibly change the colour away from the grey that he might expect for concrete. Again, the the concern there was whether those pigments are a chemical additive, and there was a concern that that might change the performance of the concrete. And the performance. Here's the reason it's there. So that was rejected after after quite detailed consideration with our engineering team in the UK and in France. In terms of control, because the concrete is such an important performance element, it will be very carefully controlled, exactly how each batch is mixed, will be very carefully controlled. And the quality of the concrete pouring and the formwork would we would expect to be of the highest quality. The principal element that has an impact on the the colour of the concrete is the exact mix of the ingredients, which cement aggregate apps for large scale gravel sand. Within those, there's also potentially the the aggregate has quite a large influence. And therefore, ideally, is sourced from a single place. And that's all part of the control all the concrete for this would be next on site. So the the contractor building, this is in direct control of everything that happens with that work. Those are the kind of summary issues around concrete colour. I'm happy to answer any more detailed questions that you might have.

13:07
I do actually and and forgive me, I can't seem to locate the reference of what I'm about to ask you. I believe it might be in one of the local impact reports I've seen an image of the dome in common field in France. Yes. And it concrete as well. And I'm assuming following a similar design before me and it does have a slightly inconsistent follow into it. Now I that I was looking at an image on my screen on a laptop, but does concrete age and does it discolour and what what is what I'm trying to get out is, I don't know the age of that particular dome. So you know, if you've helped me with that, that would be useful and can you talk me through you know, 1015 years down the line, what what a concrete dome may look like on in a coastal location.

14:10
So, I think we can probably source some, some additional photographs for you perhaps in in our submissions in the next next few weeks. The there will be a difference in in weathering, inevitably between the top of the dome is virtually a horizontal surface, the rat coming round to virtually vertical surface so the rainwater runoff will be slightly different and there will be potentially different weather in two different faces, depending on their orientation and exposure to weather. With the the quality of the surface finish is important. If it's relatively smooth, it provides little opportunity for growth of some of the organic elements that might discover concrete over time. Where joints occur, which is in terms of how it's poured, that can have an influence too. So I think probably the best thing we can do is provide some additional information on how we've seen that progress on stations to this design that have already been completed. And then provide some more generic information about how we would expect that concrete to weather over time. Some of this would be affected by the final detailed design of those elements, which is not something that is necessarily complete for this location, though, it's a the the gda

defines the overall design, the exact pour and how those pieces of formwork for the concrete are made, maybe individual to his side,

15:48
that's very useful in terms of maintenance. So comparing the dome of size will be to a concrete structure is there less maintenance, the more more maintenance the same, and what are what what what is required in terms of maintenance to maintain what would hope to be a relatively consistent finish. And

16:13
besides will be down is a stove enamelled steel, which is incredibly durable, even in that quite harsh marine environment. And that's why it's maintained it sort of gleaming pristine white finish over time. The the way that the sides will see domes work is functioning quite different in terms of how they're protected, the system for protecting the reactor is a little different, which is why we have the exposed concrete domes. So as we'll see, I appreciate we haven't provided any details on what the maintenance of the concrete would be in the design and access statement. So we should probably provide some supplementary material describing what that would be. I think we've the engineering team are very clear in terms of some of the inspection regime, but I think we probably need quite a bit more detail on what might be carried out in terms of a visual maintenance regime rather than a function.

17:09
That would be very useful. Thank you that that's helped with my understanding. And I do want to turn to the two cancels I'm going to come back Mr. Phil part to you and I'll get you to summarise as it goes. Could I turn to East Suffolk Council, please and see if they have any comments on what we've heard or the pointing question. Thank you,

17:38
Madam just for your references the LIRR figure to page 53 has the flamanville local impact report. Thank you, Mr. Tate. That's most helpful. I will ask Mr. Scripture very briefly to touch upon colour considerations and finishes in the light of what you have what's just been discussed. Thank you think you may be on mute

18:15
Yes, apologise again for that. Clicking on the wrong thing, yeah. Yeah respective colour considerations and finishes. I mean, our position is that you know, provided the design respects the AONB setting, and also uses the AONB colour palette document. We have no strong views on the colour or tone of the cladding panels, this is to the the turbine Hall and the operational service centre and support any sort of changes in rotation of visual effects in respect of that. But I don't have any other comments to make in specific response to the to Tom's Thank you very much.

19:11
Madam if I can just add in relation to the 56 and following of the detailed design principles, which refers to the role of East Suffolk Council in the approval of the colours. We would of course as part of that process, be consulting with the AONB partnership.

19:36
Thank you very much for that clarification. Could I turn to Suffolk County Council if they have any comments to make?

19:46
Well, thank you, Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, just briefly not on the dome, but on the colour considerations in relation to the turbine Hall. We had noted That in the design and access statement at six point 17.9. That's a paragraph of the design and access statement. It states that it is proposed to identify a range of colours and hues for the turbine halls within their receiving landscape as part of this decio submission, and then detailed design principle 56 says that the turbine walls cladding will seek to provide a responsive surface treatment which changes in colour and tone subject to the surrounding lighting and climatic conditions. Obviously, we welcome those as principles, but we don't think they're very as it were tight in terms of ensuring outcome. So I think we will be looking potentially in the next iteration of the design access statement to provide a little bit more flesh as to how that is actually going to be achieved. In terms of bringing about a successful outcome to what is as you've clearly identified is a key visual marker for what are very large, sizable structures.

21:11
Thank you very much. I'm going to turn to the amb partnership next, and then I will revert back to the applicant.

21:20
But um, thanks very much Simon Amstutz from the Suffolk coast nice OMB partnership. Just to remind you that natural England in their written reps and policies, I haven't got the relevant reference. But natural England did make reference to the the importance of the amb view on the use of colour and natural England aren't here today to be able to make that point. I also note that I don't think natural England were involved in the design council process either. But the we've had previous reference to the amb partnerships, use and selection of use of colour in InDesign. Yeah, that was something that the OMB partnership funded itself. It was a significant portion of our of our limited budgets. But we feel it's an incredibly important document if this development was consented to try and minimise the impacts of the development on the purposes of the OMB. And I welcome what I think I've heard from a Suffolk about consulting the OMB partnership on any requirements around use of colour. Thank you.

22:47
Thank you very much. Good hand back to Mr. Philpott, please.

22:52
Thank you, Madam, just three short points. If I may 1 of all I promise to come back to you on the question of involvement of other bodies in the process that's identified in design principle 56, the approval of the colour palette. Essentially, my understanding of our position reflects what's just been said by Mr. Tate that essentially, the way that this is now framed, leaves it to the judgement of the gist of the council as to who they wish to consult when undertaking the process that they have to have deciding whether or not the details are appropriate. And the fact that Mr. taters confirmed the intention

to engage, for example, with a partnership doesn't come as a surprise. That is what we would anticipate and that effectively and CRS to the point, there's no need for further prescription in in that respect, in the usual way, it's for the discharge and vote to decide who may consult the second point, which is related short point, you heard him to go from the county council, in relation to design principle 56, and the desire for more flesh. I don't know whether it's simply that the version of design principle two six, that was being referred to was an earlier one. But what it didn't pick up was the specific addition for a separate council to agree the colour palette, which is of course, the point of which then that matter would crystallise and the decision would have to be made and that seems to me to be an important point in terms of how one then comes to the final view about what the appropriate colour should be. The third matter in relation to the concrete and I understand that essentially the same question that you raised a moment ago, was put to us by His suffered counsel in discussions. And there is actually quite a lot of detailed material that is available, which deals with this issue that has, as you might imagine, been quite a bit of work done in order to identify suitable sources of material for this element of the project, because it's a very exacting quality standards that are required. And I'm told that we can supply that detail to you deadline five, because that was assembled in rooms to assist the counsellors on this point. So we can put that in at that stage just to provide you with a complete picture.

25:51

That would be very useful. Thank you very much. I'm going to move on to night time lighting effects. And in particular, I'd like to look at nighttime facials to begin with, and this refers particularly to examination question I ii 125 and appendix 18 e, which starts at page 190 of rep 2111. And this focuses on the provisional provision of the Hinkley Point C visuals now appreciate we did talk about construction visuals this morning, but I do think it's important to cover this topic as well. At paragraph 1.6, point five on page 201 of rec 2111. It states that the Hinkley Point C visuals are judged to provide a reasonably accurate indication of the nature of construction pays activity that can be expected to be visible at size or see at a similar phase of works and this is similar distance, similar distances. But I am a little bit confused by the latter part of this paragraph which then states that the shape configuration of the temporary construction sites are different, the elevation of viewing locations in relation to the construction sites. The intervening landform landscape, character and effects of screening also differ significantly between Hinkley Point C and sizewell C. And earlier paragraph 1.5 point five the same document the limitations of visualisations in respect of the differences in types and heights of cranes were also identified. However, saying that each of the description of view points does helpfully describe the differences which will be experienced from similar viewpoints at sizewell C. And before I turn to the applicant to discuss this much in a little bit more detail. I'd first like to hear from Suffolk County Council Isa Council and the AONB partnership because I believe in April this year, I think of Hinkley Point C visuals report was circulated to yourselves. And I'm not sure whether that included the visuals that were submitted as part of the examination, or it was something different. But nonetheless, I would like to hear your concise answers in respect of the usefulness of the visuals that have been provided. in respect of Hinkley Point C. I do reiterate that I know we briefly touched on this this morning, but just for completeness, I'd like to sort of discuss this again. If we could start with Suffolk County Council, please.

28:39

microbead for Suffolk County. If it's convenient to you, I think it might be better if East Suffolk council lead on this which is the details of this and then we'll come in if we put any outstanding further comments. If you'd ask for a Suffolk

28:56
I'm not sure madam, my answer is going to be more illuminating Mr. bedfords. We will take that away and reflect on it. Our offices of course being to Hinkley Point and have received their own visuals as it were directly but we will we will comment on that in due course.

29:12
That's fine. And just to the AMD partnership, do you have any comments you'd like to make on the usefulness of the Hinkley Point C visuals that were provided?

29:25
Thanks madam Simon. I'm still suffer customer use a and b partnership. I think the comparison work that we saw as a partnership from anchor point see was useful in as far as it went. But of course, Yeah, sounds like a broken record. We are comparing different things. We're looking at a nationally designated protected landscape here on the Suffolk coast and not least, tranquillity in In, defined through light, spiritual or light pollution is one of the defined characteristics. And we are aware that parts of the IOM be close to the proposal proposed site is a dark sky status. A dark skies site where educational visits go to and I think it's just a few miles from where the proposal is, is. So you know, I haven't seen an analysis of what the impacts of light birth during the nine to 12 year construction phase and if we if we're thinking about educating young people, that's quite a long time of their educational process, as well as the longer term impacts of the operational phase. Thank you.

30:59
Thank you very much. Before I turn to the applicant, I can see Mr. Collinson from National Trust. Do you have your hand up?

31:07
Oh, yes. Thanks, madam. Can you hear and see me?

31:11
I can hear you at the moment, but I can't see you. So I can hear you too. Please don't worry.

31:17
Okay. Brilliant. I mean, just very quick with Nick Collinson National Trust. Just very quickly, I think we spoke earlier about the difference between Hinkley Point C and size. We'll see in terms of the land scope status, the OMB, I think the difference in terms of dark sky status, I think is also important. So this is a dark sky area, we run as part of our operation, very popular stargazing events. And so you know, well over 100 people attend several times a year to enjoy, specifically the dark skies that are afforded on the Suffolk coast. And of course, that's one of the impacts that we'll see if this development goes ahead. Thank you very much. Paul Collins, you have your hand up. Yes, thank you. Thank you very much.

32:08
The comments that were just made by the applicant about their representations that sites are very different or was it may have been the AONB and therefore any visuals will not be totally comparable, are true. One of the issues at sizewell is that the consumptions the construction site is not as compact as at Hinkley. And it's elegant, elongated in nature and this will provide a wider frame of light pollution than that as Hinkley Point. Whilst we were all down at Hinkley Point recently for the site visit, I did measure the nighttime glow of the Hinkley Point site one evening. And at about a distance of one and a half miles that was a plus eight plus 10. Lux compared to viewing into the countryside behind it. So there is a significant amount of glow that is coming from that. And I think you heard from from Council of fellows earlier some of the comments anyway from from local councillors in that area about the issues of light pollution in the area. And this won't be any different here in in and around the site, either across the National Trust site or in the village of Eastern East bridge itself. Quite apart from what's been going on at site as well. Certainly speech parish Council has recently had an initial dark size skies assessment of the area around eastbridge because we know a lot of people come here to the campsite and use them as dark skies. sites because there are no real lights in this area apart from perhaps when the bulb is operating. But later on it it is very dark and in fact the initial assessment gave between 20.58 and 21.35 Sqn skies quality metre setting and that's going to be reassessed in the autumn because the it needs to really be done in the September timeframe at a new a new moon. And but the initial assessment is that it's well sufficient for complex Milky Way observation. And it may be even better as a truly, truly your typical dark sky site when measured later in the year. So if we're faced with similar night blows as an Hinkley Point C, then these guys are likely to be significantly downgraded to possibly rural or suburban suburban transition which will significantly impede the visualisation of the Milky Way and anything else on this side so i'd support completely what Nick Collinson says. This will make quite an impact to the Sorry. Thank you,

35:02
Collins, if I could turn to the applicant, please.

35:08
Yes. I'm going to ask Mr. kratt to respond on the question of night time lighting effects and the points that have been raised by others.

35:21
I do before you do that I do I do have a question for you. And would you like to pose that first and then we can go back to me, it is going back to the Hinkley Point C information which you know, that there is there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Phil pop that it is a very useful age. It is. And as I said this morning, I do understand the limitations with that comes with the production of visuals in general. But I the questioner examination question that Li 125 did request that visuals depicting construction, it was produced for nine locations. And, in response, the as I've said useful Hinkley Point C information was provided. Could we also have a discussion as to why it wasn't necessary, it wasn't considered necessary to produce those visuals or if it was a technical reason. And whether they would be whether it's possible to produce them, and of what benefit you think the production of such visuals may be.

36:30
Thank you. Well, Mr. Kratos heard those questions. So I'll pass over to him now to respond.

36:41
Thank you. I'll be as brief as I can. Firstly, with regard to the HPC proxy document, I will come back to that. I've opened the page in relation to the question at hand. But I think it's important to state that the intention of that document was to help characterise an understanding of the lighting effects. Accepting entirely that the AONB setting with regard to its designation, is a different context from HPC. So really to make very clear that those images are not to somehow underestimate the context of the AONB. But really to say this is what the sky looks like in the context of a construction activity of a very similar type in the dark sky environment. With regard to the nature of the impact assessment, we've undertaken tranquillity and the natural beauty criteria have been borne in mind in our assessment judgments. So the professional judgement of my team and myself is before this examination, and properly detailed and coordinated with the lighting engineering team. With regard to the dark sky site, if I could refer it to the original landscape and visual impact assessment, figure 13.2 that does illustrate the location of the dark sky discovery site at West Lawton common as the nearest site for that purpose. It also does indicate the nature of the existing lighting environment. Our lighting engineers, who we've been working with, are aware as we are that we are essentially dealing with a an E one category, environment more generally, within the area, and therefore, the characteristics of dark sky are a proper consideration and the judgments we've made but also in informing the nature of the lighting management plan and the nature of how construction phase lighting would be managed, as much as as possible. So those have been very important issues and one of my colleagues is available here to channel more technical questions on that matter, I would say that we've also been in dialogue with the Astronomical Society to have discussions about the nature of the lighting effects, but also to understand the nature of controls. And I would say that those sessions have been very useful. And my reading of the situation having attended those is that the technical information presented the nature of the lighting management plans have been well received by them as custodians of the the dark sky environment more broadly

39:54
with regard to two other issues, and then I will return On to the

40:02
other response to the particular request. Clearly, we are dealing with temporary construction phase lighting as the principal issue in discussion right now, that does require a certain component of lighting effects. And I think the original policy underpinning the sustainability appraisal for the site would have borne in mind the reasonable levels of lighting control required on a site of the scale, my understanding is lighting management plan, or that has been drafted has been well received. And the nature of the mitigation that has been provided an HPC with a very agile responsive environmental officer working on behalf of the client has sought to address any issues of nuisance or otherwise, that could be reasonably considered. So if I may, I'm just going to double check my notes that I have in front of me in relation to Li 1.25. So let me just bear with me just one second half of the time you need. Okay, so our position as it stands at the moment is that we felt that the HPC document was a sufficient response to deal with the nature of the request. And that, rather than modelling and effect, having a true representation of a similar scheme, would assist in that understanding. Going back to the undertaking we've made in

relation to construction phase activity, I would suggest that I will go back to our client to discuss whether we provide nighttime lighting images, as you indicated, those are very difficult to properly model, given the dynamic nature of the activity. So whilst I can't make a commitment, now, I will take that back to the client. My professional judgement is that the HPC site for ourselves has been very useful to inform judgments, the examining authority and other members of the stakeholder group have also been present for it. And I do believe that precedence is very helpful in informing an overall understanding of the nature of the effect. But I will get back to you on the request for those nine viewpoints to be addressed, to see if that is technically possible. And also the timescales for that,

42:38
that would be useful. And as I have said, I think I think from the conversation we had this morning with, I think it was counsellor fellows. Her understanding, I think the residents understanding would be improved if, and I understand the limitations, if something illustrative he produced. But you know, you've you've said, cause of action, and I will leave that point, I do have another lighting question just before you leave, and you may or may not be the correct person. Just Can you help me the understanding regarding the proposed navigational lighting required for the beach landing facilities? It is I think I'm correct that this currently isn't clewd. included within the assessment

43:26
lamps, I would, I would have to defer to one of my colleagues on that bear with me. See if I can get some direction.

43:34
Madam, it may be that tomorrow, I think we've got Steven roast, who will be coming along for the session, which deals with focus not dealing with these impacts, per se, but it deals with these bits of infrastructure. And it now we've got notice of the particular point. If that suits you, we can come back to you.

43:57
My question is if you want to pose and then just provide privacy as a suitable point is simplified. Why isn't the proposed navigation lighting required included in the assessment today? And will it be moving forward? Thank you. We've got a note of that and we'll come back to you. I just would like to turn to East Suffolk. A council just very briefly, if possible about the lighting management plan. Yes, ma'am. Quick question for you lighting management plan which can be found at a pp 182. I just want to check with you whether your content that the appropriate controls are contained within the plan or is there anything else you are discussing with the applicant or feel is necessary at this point?

44:55
The amendments that need to be made those are predominantly thought ecological reasons. And so we're expecting to have a revised version of that in due course. But as I say they relate primarily to ecological matters. And we'll be making that point on Thursday or Friday.

45:15

Thank you very much. Suffolk County. Councillor, do you have anything in respect of the well, either the conversations we've been having to date, or specifically about the lighting management plan you'd like to make? No, thank you, madam. Thank you very much. Mr. Phil Potter, I'm assuming you are aware of the discussions regarding ecological considerations and the lighting management panel. Do you have any comments you'd like to make on that?

45:45
I'm aware that those discussions are taking place also aware of the sensitivity so far as ecology and lighting is concerned, I don't have anything to add at the moment, but I am conscious of that discussion.

45:59
Thank you very much. I'm going to move on now to propose design of size, I'll see power station the effect on the iconic status of the size will be power station. So the dome associated with sizewell B is said to be seen by many as an iconic design feature by people both living and visiting the locality. And in contrast, and this is for reference to a written representation by together against side while C and that search grep 2481. f, the size while c design will result in a grey, monolithic concrete slabs creating a blot, blot even on the landscape. This is a question to the applicant. So again, Mr. Philpott could talk to you please. Thank you, bearing the comments that I've just made in mind. And in respect of the sort of main access building, and noting your answer to question Li 130. On page 956, of rep to 100. I understand that some discussions have been going on in regard of a respect of a more agreeable design. Can you just help me understand what that is referencing to in terms of an agreeable design? If you need to tear this one away?

47:29
To that I have to say that we're getting some getting some positive looks at this end. And therefore I think we ought to just look at that in check.

47:37
Yeah, so that's right, just for your reference. It's I i 130. And that's page 956. of rep to 100.

47:50
Thank you, I've got a note of that. I understand the question. If there's anything else on that topic, I have people who are able to speak about that particular one, I'm afraid I can't do it off.

48:02
There is a more general topic, and it's probably one for one of your colleagues. I just want to discuss briefly how they propose design of size while c would complement what is considered an iconic status of size while B. Yes, I'm

48:16
going to again, have two speakers deal with this, first of all, Mr. kratt, and that he's going to hand over to you and Jones to deal with that matter. So I'll pass it over to Mr. Crabb first.

48:31

Thank you. I have just a couple of points on that. And then I'll pass over to you and I think more broadly the design and access statement, which you and will elaborate on sets the context for the design approach, which is to accept that the setting of size will be will alter in the context of the new development. There are design principles in place that seek to define responsibility for making sure that size will be is properly considered as part of the design response principally related to the actual alignment of the main structures along the single line. And you and will detail that in a minute with reference to figures in the PAM design and access statement. If I could just pick up on this issue to do with iconic design in preparation of the AONB natural beauty and special quality indicators document that we authored. And just for clarity was adopted by local both local authorities and the amb partnership. It was obvious from those who contributed to that work and the documented evidence that we explored. That opinion is definitely divided and varies with regard to whether sizewell B is indeed iconic So I think we need to be careful about the use of a word as to what status that's generates in proper consideration of the matter. It is certainly not definitive in that regard. What we have discussed with the local planning authorities is the fact that sizewell b does set a very good benchmark for design quality and integration within the AONB. And what we have termed establishes the behaviours for development moving forward. So with that in mind, I'm just going to pass over to you and to talk about the behaviours of sizewell C, as it responds to the behaviours of sizewell B, just to look at how those compliment each other. How many, so I'll just finish and Passover.

51:05
Okay, I used to build this bit more slowly that works smoothly this time. Thank you, Allister. We started our work on designs for this station. Looking at the context, both the landscape context, which has been a huge influence, but also the build context. The section 2.11, or two point 11 of the design and access statement looks at size, array and size or B and their influence, in particular, I'll come and look on in a moment to some of the detail of size will be and how that might have influenced us. But section 611 of the design and access statement looks particularly at the composition of the three power stations together. Because all those sides will a is now decommissioned, because of its a the the particular set of of how that worked. And the age of that design, it may well be one of the longest legacy elements on the site. So that's going to be influenced on this on this composition for a long while. So we've seen sizewell C as part of this sequence of three power stations sitting there as a group representing different areas of nuclear power generation. It's very clear that the dome on size will be is is the dominant recognisable feature of that in this landscape. In our initial work, and subsequently, we used 3d modelling looking at this whole area in context with the proposed power station and the landscape. A number of viewpoints were established to the Lv AIA which we've assessed, and it became clear from that that views along the coast, particularly from the north, but all the way along the length of the coast here were the sort of dominant feature that we needed to look at views further inland was screened to a greater or lesser extent, depending on on distance. And in those views along the coast, it was clear to me was that the turbine halls were the most prominent elements. And we had a question earlier on about the design of those which, which we will we'll do the work on it in writing later on. So recognise So for us, it wasn't a case of reproducing size will be where we've got different technology that we're using here as well. And the appearance of size will be is to an extent driven by the technology that's used, which is why I can have a cat. So we were we were keen to be be clear that the technology of size we'll see is different and that ought to come through in the architecture. But we will also wanted to be clear with ourselves about which things were most prominent had the most impact on

the views along the coast and that is the turbine ports. So our response to how we develop the design for the turbine halls and the RSC comes to an extent from our understanding of how size will be works in its landscape. So as well as analysing the building we analyse, analyse the landscape, we analysed size, well, the and the key one of the key features for us, and that was that it's relatively simple. Although there are a number of box forms below the dome, the fact that they're all finished in the same blue kind of simplifies that the more cluttered environment of smaller buildings at a low scale is screened by the sea defences again. So these were elements that we thought were important lessons to learn and to repeat in sizewell C. So the use of landscapes Reading for all of the the smaller scale and scenery buildings is important to us. And then that led us to trying to simplify the turbine Hall design as much as possible. And then focus into another lesson learned from sizewell B, which is to do with the character and money of the cladding and how that manipulates perceptions of scale. In the design and access statement, you'll see that in Section 614. And

55:34

that partly comes from the way the elements are introduced into the design. So there's, for example, a small example, there's a rail around the top of some of the blue box structures on the side as well B, which looks like a handrail, you kind of imagine that it's about sort of a 50 millimetres diameter, it's actually sort of 150 200 mil diameter. So that's a detailed example. The other way it plays with your sense of scan is that there are no recognisable elements that are human scaled, there are no windows, there are no doors for personnel, you can't see people working there. So it's got this sort of, we felt that directly addressed the A and B tranquillity issues as well, it seems sort of slightly enigmatic and mysterious, as well as scale this. This also relates to the lighting issue that we were just discussing. So in in size, we'll see we were keen to take that lesson. And we've been very careful to ensure that there are windows facing onto the coast. And that lights go from the building itself onto the coast is absolutely minimised. So, we've taken taken that as part of our, our lessons of working alongside an existing iconic design. But we haven't reproduced it, we're not looking at it as a white dome with blue cladding. Going back to that thought of there being three generations of nuclear power on this site, we felt it was important that we looked at current technology and finishes for materials. And therefore we've looked at a different it is aluminium cladding, again, which is what the blue cladding on on the size or beers, but we're looking at a different coating system that is more durable. You may have noticed, if you've visited the site that in some areas, the blue finishes start to fade quite badly now and there is a little bit of corrosion coming in on the edge of that aluminium. So we're looking at something that's more durable and therefore maintain this appearance longer, and also represents that, that third generation of nuclear power. I think that's probably enough for me to save the load. And this is more detailed questions about that relationship. Thank you, Mr. Jones. madami, Fannie Mae, I can come back to you on the other point you raised about li 130 pologize for the fact that I didn't have the detail instantly to hand the the building which is considered here, the main access building has a sort of gatehouse function. And the point that was raised by the Council was essentially that it ought to be received some sort of different treatment to recognise its its status as a point of arrival. And so, what is going to be proposed at deadline five is a new design principle, which identifies how that building's external treatment is going to be address in order to reflect that fact that as I understand it has recently been shared with the councils that will be coming forward at deadline five. But that that is therefore the fruit of the consideration that has been given that is referred to in the answer to that question.

58:58
That's really helpful. Make a turn to the air and be partnership. I noticed you've got your hand up and I do actually have a question for you. But I'll let you make your your observations first.

59:09
Madam Simon hamsters suffer kasnia B. Thank you for letting me make my point first before the question. I suppose the point I wanted to get across was very much around the the embedded mitigation of of sizewell C. And the views particularly from from the north I think will be will come compromise that will compromise the the embedded mitigation of sizewell C, before you even start consideration of the the addition of pylons which will further add clutter. I've also seen some points around the use of screening and always raises some concern. With me when we're talking about screening, because are we screening something that doesn't fit into the character of the area? And also hurt? I thought I heard the fact that we won't see the people that are working in the buildings. And perhaps the app can can just reassure me that that is the case, because I understood that there were some proposals after the design council inputs to to allow people to not actually be working outside the building, but have some recreational space out of the building. And I suppose my final point is around, we're hearing that information is being shared with with the council's I think that is Yeah, it's slightly difficult for those of us that aren't statutory bodies, or perhaps even the wider community. We're not seeing how these decisions are coming to to bear. So there is concern there. I think he also wanted to ask me,

1:01:09
I did and it may be something that you potentially have to take away. I know that at one of your submissions, your concerns were raised that the main development site was going to be little more than a replica even of Hinkley Point C in terms of design. And this question was posed to the applicant in question Li 121, over to 100 rows. That has been answered and the applicant has provided a comparison table in appendix 18 d of rec 2111. Now, I don't know whether you've had an opportunity to have a look at that. But my question is, if you could have a look at that, and perhaps in your written submission, consider the information and let me know if you're still have the same opinion that the design is just a replica of Hinkley Point C, which and then your considerations of the suitability of that place.

1:02:09
I think it might be better if I took that question away, because I've not looked at the detail of that. And I remind you of the available resource and partnership to engage in that process. But I appreciate your your understanding of that. That some time. Thank you very much. Both Do you have your hand up? Yes, thank you. Good afternoon. I

1:02:33
don't know I just made three short points under this heading if I may. One is the design of the reactor buildings. The second is about the lessons learned that Mr. Jones told you about and the third is the effect on sizewell B. Versus point about the design the reactor buildings while the applicant accepts that they haven't considered alternative reactor designs, and that it follows subject to what's said in the response to the examining authorities questions, broadly speaking the design of Hinkley Point C. And

we therefore say, well, therefore it's not. It's not a landscape led design for this location. And that must be correct. And there's no explanation as to why that's the case beyond the fact that that's the design the European pressure reactor design that's been approved by the Office of nuclear regulation. But there's no evidence that the applicant has explored alternative designs for the r&r since the 2012 approval of that design, or indeed presented the examining authority with the comparative costs of exploring a landscape sensitive design for this location versus the European pressure reactor model. It's notable, madam that blnr has approved and is considering a number of other designs as a Westinghouse design and attach the design and the general nuclear systems design that are all under consideration. I have been approved in the first two instances. And we therefore say that the applicant has not discharged the obligation five 910 or the N one way there are detrimental effects on the landscape. And that your know that it's accepted that there are detrimental effects on the landscape arising from the main platform design buildings, that they should explore the extent to which that could be moderated. And as I said that that hasn't been done that cost benefit analysis hasn't been presented. And therefore there isn't the evidence from which you can draw the inference to anticipate what my friend Mr. Phil pop may draw your attention to that the alternative designs are not commercially viable, or they're not physically suitable, such that they can be excluded on grounds they're unimportant or relevant to the IPC decision, which is a quote from patient Latinos to football took you earlier. The second point is about lessons learned. Mr. Jones said that one of the merits design merits of the sizewell B. scheme is its simple design, its lack of clutter. And that was a design influence on this scheme. That insofar as that was a lesson learned and a design objective, with great respect to him, it seems to have failed certainly in the eyes of natural England, because if one looks at their latest representation, which is rep 2153, on page 52, they say that the additional pylons and six mono poles will add visual clutter and detract from any positive attributes, brackets, strong clean lines were added to buildings may be able to achieve so insofar as that was influence, it wasn't an objective that's been met in their eyes, and we respectfully adopt what they say. And finally, madam in terms of the effect on size well be, we just draw your attention to what natural England said page 46. And same representation at two points. One is the large and prominent structure in terms of its size, and indeed, its height, especially when viewed from the north looking south, from coast guard cottages. And I know that's a topic you're going to explore in more detail in a moment. And secondly, it would self evidently introduced great massing and spread of industrial development, which natural England say that will have an adverse effect on appreciating the design of size, or B. And we respectfully endorse that and draw that to your attention. Thank you, man.

1:06:36
Thank you very much. If I could turn to his support Council for any comments, please.

1:06:46
Thank you, madam. First of all, we welcome what has been said by Mr. Phil part about an additional design principle relating to the access building. And I think we've we've just received notice of that set, and we welcome it. Secondly, overall on this matter, the council's view is that sizewell B's dome did establish a benchmark for good nuclear design in a sensitive location and a protected landscape. And the council is disappointed that the design quality will inevitably be lower for sizewell C, driven by the fact of the design of the nuclear components being fixed. And in particular, it regrets that the white dome blue base design of the base station, as seen in isolation or dominantly will be obscured or

compromised in some key views by the station bulk structures. And therefore, that makes it all the more important that the the natural environment fund is adequate to address those harms.

1:08:02
Thank you very much. If I could turn to Suffolk County Council, please, for any comment.

1:08:11
Thank you, Madam microbead. For Suffolk County Council. Both of the points I wanted to make have just been made. We agree and endorsed the point that Mr. Tate may view about the disappointment of the outcome of the design process. And therefore the critical importance, therefore of mitigating and offsetting the residual impacts. And if Dr. Bose hadn't drawn that link between clutter, and the pylons argument, we would have certainly done so. terms of the lessons learned that lesson clearly wasn't learned.

1:08:41
Thank you very much return to the applicant for final comment on this topic.

1:08:48
Yes, I'm going to ask, first of all Mr. Kratz to deal with the points about pylons and clutter. And then when he's finished, I'm going to ask Mr. Ewing, Jones, to deal with the issue about whether there was a change following the design Council, which allows people to be seen contrary to what he was saying. So when they've dealt with those two points, I just come back briefly on something else that Dr. Bose raised. Thank you. Thank you.

1:09:28
So yes, just to address the issue of pylon and clutter. I think the first thing to say is that size will be as a power station is not without pylons. And I think one of the ongoing discussions we've had as a design team is that it's a slightly fellas philosophical point, but I think one that's important is that the thing you remember about sizewell B is a blue box with a white dome. The reality is when you stand and look at it, there's an awful lot more how Putting, including buildings right up to the frontage, which are quite and quite different. And the ancillary structures to the rear are definitely there as are the pylons. And I think some of the issues around design discipline and lessons learned are about the importance of establishing a strong quality iconic image. And hence, this idea of the alignment of the principal structures are forming a really important part of the design resolution. In that regard, two points on that the most intimate and close relationship that people walking up and down the coastline will have and the views often down the coastline will have is of the turbine Hall sitting forward of the pylons which sit further west and closer to the triple si. So from the perspective of the building being seen, or the turbine holes being seen in the purity of their form, we would disagree with the contention of natural England that those clutter and destroy the potential of the strong clean lines because those elements are essentially behind the main turbine structures in the principal views and the experiences of people walking past them at a greater distance going back to viewpoint 17, up by Coast Guard cottages, whilst we accept that the change as a result of the project results in adverse effects as recorded in the error in the Lv AIA. The effect of sizewell C, is to actually screen quite an extensive amount of the pylon clutter associated with size will be the new pylons you refer to madam are the ones that are more apparent, in

the view, with a lot of the clutter of cables and pylons have be actually being screened by the development. And that takes me to my third point that the site will be structured, the blue box with the white dome remains identifiable within that long view. So to the extent that sizewell B is compromised in its setting, it remains as an identifiable feature in the landscape. And we think that is important in the discussion, if I may just also just finally respond to two other points, one relating to replication and you've asked the IRB partnership to give consideration to the responses we provided in Li sorry, I i 1.21. Sorry, the numbers are getting long. From our perspective, we believe professionally, that those demonstrate that it is not a mere replication, and that we have responded in an appropriate way as far as reasonably practicable, which is the test we believe we are pushing for, in relation to responding to a Suffolk specific outcome. And those are very material and have taken an extensive amount of discussion with the project team to secure those they have not been necessarily easy to secure, given the the technical issues to be resolved. The other thing I would raise and it's really just to push back if I may, and Mr. Tate's comments regarding the comments of ESC in relation to the disappointment associated with the extent of replication, the design chapter within the landscape within the local impact report, or your records, was it does point out some challenges associated with the scheme. There are many positive endorsements of the approach that have been taken, given the context of the limitations and I just wish to address that point and bring it to your attention. That is it from me, if that's okay, and I'll pass over to you. Thank you.

1:14:18

Okay, I just wanted to pick up on this specific point about that was made about design cancelled cable feedback. The The, the feedback that was mentioned was specifically about the operation of service centre, which is the the multifunction building that sits between the two turbine halls and therefore is another reasonably prominent structure on the on the coastal elevation, and it's been designed as a suite of buildings with the two turbine halls. So the first thing to say on that is that the scale of that building has been deliberately reduced. Compared to the version that He exists at Hinkley Point and at the same time, we've included some additional facilities that are not in Hinkley Point building. So that's a substantially different design, which feeds into the replication discussion. The point that design council made was largely about the amenity of the the immediate value provided to workers in the office accommodation in the upper part of that building. And whether they might benefit from from views out and indeed, views of the coast. were confident that the planning of that building with a large internal atrium and its distance from the turbine holes provides plenty of natural daylight and views for staff in there, and that it meets all of the for example bco guidance British Council officers guidance for office space. We disagreed with their suggestion that views of the coastline looking East windows facing east would be beneficial in the overall balance of immunity for staff, dark skies elevational appearance are the issues we talked earlier about whether staff will be visible, which I think was the point where we we came into this this particular issue. We disagreed with that feedback from design council cave. In our planning of the RSC, the functions that we have along that Eastern elevation are all essentially blackbox functions. So things like simulator and other spaces that don't actually need windows, they're for activities that are not daylit at all. So we were quite deliberate in the planning of the building so that we've placed office space that would benefit from daylight and views away from that coastal view. So yeah, that's it, we kind of on the specific point we disagreed with cave and there is no change the design, what's in the design Nexus statement is what we're expecting to refund. Thank you. Madam just then finally, if I may, I was wanting to respond to the particular point about considering alternative

reactor technology. And I'll do that briefly at this stage, because we'll provide a more detailed response in writing, if we may. But just in terms of some headline points. The first point is that the submission and I emphasise its submission, you're not hearing any evidence from Dr. Bose, who is of course, like myself an advocate. The submission does not engage with the evidence that you've been provided, that shows the detailed explanation of the differences in what is currently being constructed in p point C. And therefore what's reflected in the design there. And what is proposed here, and the significant differences that exist, having regard to the AONB and the design efforts that have been made to come up with something that is appropriately responsive. So that's the first point. The second point is that I may be wrong, but I'm not conscious that there is a worktop alternative twin reactor proposal, that is before the examination, using different technology that is said to be a preferable alternative that has been shown to work. It is in that context, I would suggest vague, and in ko eight. As an alternative, I've identified what the MPs says about alternatives that fit that description. And secondly, it would inevitably fail when considered against the second

1:19:15
guiding principle in 443, which is about the realistic prospect of delivering the same infrastructure capacity in the same time scale is to propose development just to complete non starter on that basis, but it's also and this is just the final headline point I would make. It is inconceivable, I would suggest that it could be said to be a proportionate approach to alternatives, which is the very first bullet point in consideration of alternatives in order to comply with policy requirements should be carried out in a proportionate manner to suggest that when one is is looking at five 910, which is in relation, of course in response to a particular development proposal. And the requirement to assess any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and the extent to which that could be moderated to suggest that that requires the applicant to consider alternative reactor technologies, as opposed to the sort of process that the applicant has gone through here, clearly disproportionate. And those are the headline points I would offer now. But we will come back to you in writing. Now we've heard the submission.

1:20:47
Thank you. Can I turn to Mr. Scott, please? Because I can see you've got your hand up.

1:20:55
Thank you. I want to raise a question about design and, you know, taking a lead from this to fill part about criteria such as incorrectness and proportionate response and so on. Some, I think it's 18 months ago at a forum that with who I think is different, and certainly LNR, I did give a report from press series of sources in France, about what the French government are doing about the EPR reactor, there's not a question of alternatives. It's simply to report and ask the examiners if they would take an interest in what is actually happening about the the the EPR in France, which is, roughly speaking that, and it's not very clear that depending on which statements, you read, EDF are considering a new fifth generation reactor or the redesign of the EPR in the light, in particular, the flow of the experience. And my understanding is I'm trying to focus this down to sort of a planning issue that conforms to the, you know, the remit that the inspection of God. But the the the one of the issues is the concrete dome. And there is certainly on record in in public. A proposal that the dome at flamming V, which is a single reactor be lifted off in four years time to enable an inspection of the of the inner cylinder, which is the not the containment vessel, the actual route to the vessel, because of worries about welding. And this

is, you know, a common experience. So there is actually quite a serious design problem. And I wonder whether your approach to that might be to look at the flammer v experience, I think it's due to come online or to be the, you know, have tests at the moment. But that it could well be that if there are those issues persist, the responsible thing would be to continue with the cranes on site, and, and other facilities for a period until that issue is actually resolved because that the element of the design is quite distinct. The other thing that I explained at the LNR meeting, having asked dlnr, whether they were in regular contact with the French, and they said they were and they exchanged information, and so on. So there's no no problem of that lack of understanding here. That the other aspect of French nuclear strategy, which is a transition strategy to reduce the volume of dependence in France, is the upgrading of some of the other reactors, which are, I think, the second generation of pw Rs. And they're doing that in terms of putting what they call, the French word is sondre. They're putting reinforcement underneath some of the reactors to extend their life. And they're also putting hydrogen extractors on top of them. Which is quite difficult if you've got a concrete. So there are actually some quite serious design issues. I mean, it's something I followed for some time as certainly not a not a professional. But this is quite quite normal public narrative in France. And I would, I would beg the examining authority to actually look at it as a practical issue about site design. Because it could well be this is not simply a matter of approving a bill a building with a dcl and conditions and so on, and then the thing being completed at some point and they're going into operation I mean, the operational design problems are very, very practical. Thank you.

1:25:09
Thank you, Mr. Scott. Mr. Philpott. Do you have anything to add to Mr. Scott's comments? Madam on,

1:25:17
confess I'm not entirely confident as to how what's been said relates to the decision you've got to me. You have a proposal before you we've expended if on reflection, there's anything in what he said that you want to ask us about. I would suggest that to put in a written question, I don't have anything more to say at this stage.

1:25:38
Thank you very much. At this point, I'm going to adjourn for 15 minutes, I'm going to adjourn till 5pm. Thank you very much.