

TEXT_SizewellC_ISH7_Part1_Session4_1507 2021

Thu, 7/15 6:41PM • 2:15:04

00:02

Good afternoon, everybody. Welcome back to is h seven, biodiversity terrestrial ecology in this part, I'm conscious that there were a few people whose hands were up as we closed. For less as i as i adjourned I'm sorry, I'm going to move on, as I said, I'd invited submissions earlier on that topic of Marsh Harriers, and all those who said they wanted to at that time, were heard. If you would like, still to make make points, then obviously you can make them in writing at the next deadline, deadline five, but I'm sorry, but we need to hold a bit of discipline on the way in which we're dealing with this. Now, then, I am also conscious that natural kingdoms have notified us that they can't stay beyond five, seven. So Mr. Hains, I'm going to put some points to you, which come further down the agenda. If you could come and join us, yeah, that's fine. Can you see me? Okay, I can see you. Fine. Thank you. Thank you very much. As if you can stay beyond five. I'm sure it will be helpful to all of us. But let's see if we can accommodate you.

01:38

Yeah, we just we just had a little chat. And I think we can do two, five that push it to 530. Anyway, hopefully we get through some some some of the other items where we need to speak.

01:46

Thank you. Okay. On a protected species point, which is in the agenda, I'd certainly want to ask you this in relation to licence applications. In May, you were still waiting to hear to receive some of those according to your statement of common ground. Have you now got all the all the applications that you that you need to advise the Secretary of State? Or are the ones still outstanding?

02:15

I believe we've received the first one last week, and then we received an outline of when the other ones are likely to come to us. And there might be something for the applicant to they want to outline.

02:27

I'm sure. I'm asking you now. I just say, okay, you can get we'll we'll, we'll ask the applicants, but I'll ask them. When it gets to that when we get to that agenda item? Yes, we have started started to receive this. Okay. And well, I was going to ask you, if I will ask you about lessons no impediment, I suppose you're not in a position to tell me one way or the other where you've got to on those because you're gonna just receive the applications?

02:55

Yeah, that's right. So yeah, be dependent on how on the on the quality of the applications and how quickly we can turn them around. And I think the letters are no impediment themselves. On a fairly quick to write Bs, it's assessing all the underpinning licences, of course.

03:10

Yeah, pretty good. Okay, I think those are the only two things which I had too much to deal with now. Thank you very much. Thanks. So what's the terms? I think you're dealing for the applicant with the next point, which is next agenda item, which is D, understand the differences between the interested parties and the applicants on the applicants conclusions have no adverse effects on integrity on a number of matters. Just bear with me, I'm receiving a message from somewhere else. Right. So can we look at the other one of the issues one of the issues that disturbance or displacement effects on breeding and non breeding waterbirds using functionally linked land to minsmere walls versus working? SP SBA stroke rounds are due to noise and visual disturbance? Is that anything more than what we've talked about in relation to the marsh area? Are there any other differences between you on that issue?

04:30

Well, it's it's it's a different issue, sir. I can ask Dr. Grant to give you a word. It's water. Yes. Yes.

04:40

Yep. So Dr. Grant, it explained to me what were the differences are please,

04:46

I'll hand over to Dr. Grant to to give a headline view on the disturbance on the functional link land. Thank you.

05:00

Hello. So there's two different issues here. There's breeding water birds under non breeding water birds and the issues are both related to functionally linked land. The sort of detail of the issue is different for the breeding birds and the non breeding birds. So in each case, the disturbance and displacement does not affect any of the birds that are on the designated sites that affects only those birds that are either using the minsmere size levels are the size Well, why aren't or the size Beaumarchais is, which are the two key bits of functionally functionally linked land in this instance, in the case of breeding waterbirds. It's the reason that there's an effect on the two species that are relevant to your God well and shoveler that you are displacing an estimated about 11% of one species 7% of the other from the total number that are on the designated land, plus the functionally linked land. But it's only the only ones that have been displaced are from the functionally linked land. And we reached a conclusion of no adverse effect on integrity here, because there is no dependence of the birds on the designated land to the functionally linked land or not. So if you lose a proportion of the birds on the proportion of the birds on the functionally linked land, are displaced, it has no effect on those birds occupying the designated land. So it's it's in this case, it's fundamentally different to what we've just talked about in relation to Marsh Harrier, where you have Marsh Harrier on the nesting in the designated land, but are dependent upon functionally linked land as foraging habitat. So they're functionally linked land in this case is linked in the sense that you have additional birds of the same species nesting on that as well as on the designated habitat. So that's the breeding water birds in relation to the non breeding water birds. Again,

the effects of displacement, disturbance and displacement are only relevant, they only affect birds on the functionally linked land, and not birds that are using the designated land. And in this case, it's very specifically, the birds on the sides will marshes that are predicted to be displaced, as opposed to those that are on the minsmere five levels, which is has higher numbers and is immediately adjacent to the designated land. And I can't remember off the top of my head what the percentage. Yeah. So the issue here is that you have the evidence from the literature is that the species involved again, it's, although it's non breeding populations, it's the same species as for the breeding population. So again, it's God well in shoveler, but then non breeding populations of these birds. And the evidence from literature is that in the wet and non breeding birds, there's quite a lot of movement between sites. So the birds are being displaced on the sides, well, marshes, although there is functional linkage to the designated land is not the birds are using that habitat are not only coming from the designated population, there's also large numbers of those birds and then on breeding season are using sites that the old or ASHRAE are using sites that thought nazmir and so, the evidences are quite a lot of movement between these different you know areas. So, you know, quite a lot of transfer and intermixing of the birds between these areas. So on the basis sighs well Marsh is actually hold relatively small numbers compared to these other sites. And compared to the SBA, the conclusion is again, that there is no adverse effect or integrity, because

09:26

the numbers of birds are likely to be lost from the SBA population are displaced from the SP population is likely to be small on because based on the numbers of birds that are present in the sysvol marshes, it seems likely that many of the other sites in the region and an area which are also used by these same birds will be better quality sites and provide better habitat or more habitat. So that is, in a nutshell, I think, where we are on On those on the water birds issue, breeding water birds and non breeding birds, non breeding water birds being slightly different.

10:07

Thank you. Thank you. Okay, let me turn to Mr. Hains at the natural end in that case. Can I help me then to understand the differences between you?

10:19

Yeah. Hello, jack Haynes lecturing and he awful positions outlined in issue 27 of our written reps. And I think my colleague, Richard Saunders is going to take the quiz on this one.

10:34

Yeah, Richard Saunders natural England. So I don't think are there's a massive difference of opinion between ourselves and EDF. I think the issue primarily relates to the precautionary principle. So I think first off, that the reason these areas are deemed functionally linked land is because they are used by the SBA birds. So the home ranges of certain species will extend beyond a site boundary. And in the case of wintering birds, they can they can move several kilometres, particularly winter waterbirds, but also with these breeding birds, depending on the water level, so you can have birds that will, in some years probably nest within the site boundary and another year's nest slightly beyond it. And so, our primary concern is that not only do we need to know how many birds are present, we need to know precisely where those birds are present. And whether they're in an area that's going to be affected by

the development proposal. And typically, for even for like a moderately sized housing development, we'd have two years worth of survey data that will be up to date, which will show you precisely where those birds are. Now, in this case, we have one recent complete year's worth of survey data to show roughly where these birds are in relation to the development effects. And broadly speaking, they show that most of those birds are not going to be within that zone of displacement. But some of them might be and we only have one year's worth of up to date accurate data. And the type of figures that EDF is citing sort of 7% and 11% figures, we would argue are significant. And so we feel that the precautionary principle would not allow us to off the basis of one year's recent survey data to say what to exclude beyond reasonable scientific doubt that adverse effects on site integrity have been excluded. I don't think what they're suggesting is necessarily an unreasonable prediction. But I would argue that without more up to date and more more survey data, particularly in relation to the distribution of those birds, that we would still suggest that that they haven't been able to exclude adverse effects on site integrity beyond reasonable doubt.

12:50

What's the date of the latest survey data which you have.

12:56

So it's the it's the the latest survey for the winter in the breeding is for this last last winter, and the 2020 breeding season. But prior to that, we have very little that tell us where those birds actually are. So there's, there's pretty good information to say how many birds there are across the widest sectors. But the recent data provide one year's worth of survey effort to show precisely where those birds might be in relation to development effects. And if that if those survey years are representative, then their conclusions might be reasonable. But actually, if there's a high proportion of birds using the areas that might be disturbed, then there could be an effect.

13:37

Okay. Thank you, and that's for both the breeding and the non breeding ones. That's correct. Yeah. Thank you very much. Thank you. So two attendees got their hands up. Miss curtly. Hello, can you hear me? Yes, no, you're very quiet.

14:00

Oh, am I I'll turn myself up. Can you hear me better now? That's much, much better. Okay, thank you. Um,

14:07

so what EDF are telling us is that these birds, whether they're the amber listed Marsh Harrier, or water or water birds, that all thrive at minsmere will fly across a huge building site with 24 hour light and noise, that they'll all be fine with little effect. I find that hard to believe. And actually this is all very, very distressing. We were very lucky to live next door to the marvellous RSPB minsmere. And I cannot say that this is going to do anything but be detrimental on on the bird life around here. I mean, you know, they're not a herd of cows. We can't just tell them where to go. Anyway, thank you very much. Okay. Thank you. Miss Kelly, Jesse bassinet.

14:57

Yes. Thank you very much, Josie. ASP net speaking for Walberswick counsel, I would like to make a statement similar to the previous speaker. And this goes for the marsh Harriers. It goes for all the birds, breeding and non breeding veteran in this area. The fallacy of this discussion, as far as we are concerned, is that it's acting as if you know, Wildlife, Cuban life, it all ends at the very border of where EDF is building its site. It's as if the traffic on the A, and I think 20 to 25, the building works at Northern park and ride that none of this will impact any of these birds at all. That just simply cannot be true. And it is alarming to hear that the discussion around mitigation around impact and indeed, whether this project should go ahead is ignoring this huge, huge. So thank you again, Mr. Brock, and we look forward to knowing how this is supposed to be mitigated or not. Thank you, Miss

16:18

besut. Thank you. Thank you, Jenny curtly. You can just pop your hand down. Thank you very much. Rosie Sutherland for the RSPB.

16:27

Thank you. So and Please, could I bring in my colleague, Miss Miller to to make a few points. Thank you. Thank you,

16:36

sir. And just to start with just to say that I entirely support the comments of natural England. There are a couple of things I just wanted to add. Firstly, to address the point about functional linkage, as has already been stated, there is quite a bit of movement between sites. And that can partly depend on for example, water levels on the south levels and on the sidewall marshes as well. And where birds are finding optimal conditions. Birds might breed in the SBA one year and just outside the next. The South levels in particular are directly contiguous with the SBA and they are managed as part of the RSPB minsmere reserve. And I think it's also important to note that the supplementary advice on the conservation objectives do actually mention the South levels as well. Just in terms of reference that we mentioned in our written representations just run out even the old technology fails or some technology supplementary sites, will this one does. Right supplementary site. supplementary advice and conservation objectives. Yeah. And secondly, the the other reference I wanted to mention was the Chapman and tilsley report for natural England, that again, we supplied with our written representations. There's a case there, case e 20, the Haitian to M six link road that mentions a case where fields near nspa were used by breeding birds. And in that case, functional linkage was concluded. for that particular case, I don't think they concluded the impacts were significant, but that the functional linkage did exist in principle was was between what and it was fields just outside and SBA that we use by breeding birds, so a similar sort of principle to the birds breeding on the south levels here. The second point I just wanted to add was about the distributional data as mentioned by Mr. Saunders. Again, we're concerned about only one year of distributional data and in particular, the only having that one year and potentially the methodology used as well meant that birds that breed in ditches, and longer vegetation away from the main pools on the south levels might not have been represented in those data. So the assumption that an even distribution of birds on the south levels as has been made by the applicant, we think that is actually a reasonable assumption to make in the absence of that distributional data. Finally, just to say, again, we agree with the conclusions of natural

England, the levels of displacement predicted are significant 11% for gadwall and 7% for breeding shoveler. And for wintering birds, I think it's around 4% displacement being predicted. And in either case, we would agree that it's not possible to rule out adverse effects on integrity in those cases. So in our view, there is a need for a very robust monitoring and mitigation plan to address those impacts. Thank you

19:54

may have misheard you just get this quite right. You said that you are you are concerned that the is only one year of distributional data. I thought I heard you say you think the applicants conclusions on that are are okay.

20:10

And the point was the the applicant has used an assumption of an even distribution of birds across the south levels, because they've only got that one year of distributional data. So though in their documents, they've pointed out that on their surveys, most of the birds were found around the pools in the northeastern part of the South levels, because they've only got the one year of data and they can't rule out the fact that birds might be breeding elsewhere in some years, and also the methodology that they were using, it's possible that they may not have seen those breeding in ditches and some of the ditches that we would expect to be used, at least sometimes do stretched further to the south of those northern pools. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you.

20:53

And so just to add, I believe I'm right in saying that the David zealously associates document for natural England natural England guidance. And also, Miss Miller referred to natural England supplementary advice on conservation objectives. I believe those aren't standalone documents. But if I could just mention that there are in several places in our written representations, for example, footnote 163 and 164. And those are hyperlinked so you should be able to then open the documents, but we can provide them in their entirety if that would be useful.

21:30

Footnotes 163 and 164. of Thank you, so that's the RSP vs. Written repertory RSPB and Suffolk wildlife trusts written representations. Okay, thank you very much. Thank you. Mr. Scott, what's your Thank you.

22:00

So I did want to get in on the pre t discussion. But I didn't have a hand up on my my screen. I said about that, which is if your answers in writing so that we have corrected, I don't want to come back on that. But I wonder is there a slightly different approach on this because it's an observation, obviously, from a not from a professional point of view, on ecology on birds and so on, but interest in the law, that it could be seen as rather crude analogy that there's sort of salami slicing problem going on about the discussion, obviously, of the precise proposals of the developer and precise responses. But it seems as though there is a major problem with the, with the marsh Harrier, which has been constituted as needing compensation. Whereas what in fact, has been provided, I think, is a point implied by Paul Collins, that it could be what's been proposed could be regarded as mitigation. But when we come to

minsmere where there is a wider concern, the focus is narrowed down to the issue of, of whether it's the integrity of the site, and then it's narrowed down again. So I wonder whether it's a methodological approach to or to ask, which is say, Are there not is there not a level of effect on minsmere and the and the various populations, not just birds, which might be subject to examination for the point of view of mitigations, which could be transposed into conditions in the decio, about the construction site and so on, because that's obviously the period that there is concern. And I also wondered back on the sensor as a comparative to the treatment to the marsh areas, whether there might not be other foraging birds present that like deserve the same treatment in the in the relevant populations. Thank you. Thank you, Esther Scott, and Dominic wood field. Thank you, sir. Just a very quick point.

24:14

I'm habitats regulations assessment practitioner of about 2526 years standing. I find it quite extraordinary to come across a situation where impacts on a population of birds that are contiguous with a population that's the basis of a European site designation. So one contiguous land impacts that are in excess of 1% can be disregarded so easily. Though, I would definitely support what the the cautions that natural England have expressed and the RSPB have supported. That sounds to me every bit like a potential adverse effect on integrity and given the uncertainty of our new one year's worth of data. It seems an extraordinary leap of faith to to come to a conclusion along those lines. At the end of the day, populations of water birds breeding waterbirds on it on a contiguous site. They are essential for the recruitment of the population into the main site. So if for whatever reason it predation or whatever birds are lost on the main site, if there are significant impacts on the surrounding area, and the other parts of the continuous population, then clearly that has the potential to impact on the SBA. So there's a clear impact factor there, which seems to have been disregarded. Okay, thank you.

25:46

If East Suffolk council or Suffolk County Council or anyone else wants to raise anything, I'm not seeing any hands up. So I'm assuming that I can now go back to the applicant. And we shouldn't see more hands going up. Thank you, Mr. Jones. What I tried to do is to understand the differences. So bearing that in mind, and I've heard what everybody has, has said, Do you want to to respond on anything? Or should we leave it at that? We've got the we've got the points here.

26:24

It's encouraging to learn that there's no massive difference of opinion. I think we've identified the the points of differences essentially relating to the survey data and the issue of precaution. Would you to come back to the RSPB in any event deadline five. So I think rather than asking Dr. Grant to respond to this as it were on the hoof, it would be sensible to do that in writing. Yeah, thank you, if you're happy with that.

26:57

Now, I'm happy with that. I, as I'm trying to understand the role I can't resolve before you know,

27:03

I also ask him to deal with this Kirklees point about the commuting birds, which is concerned about flying sight.

27:11

Okay, that's fine. Park. Awesome. Tonight, Mr. Scott, your hand is still up. If you could pop it down, please. That'd be good. Get your man hours chairman's.

27:30

Hello. wasn't quite sure if you're wanting me back on or not. But this is specifically in relation to a point regarding commuting birds. That's correct. Yeah, so I mean, it's not clear specifically which commuting birds were being referred to. But you know, for Marsh Harrier, for example, we assume that the, the birds from the nesting area will not commute across the development site into the sysvol marshes. I think that's a precautionary assumption. And that's the basis for the displacement from the foraging habitat. The other birds that I think might be relevant here would be the white fronted goose. And they are commuting from feeding areas. North Warren, I think, to the roosting area, at minsmere, and it wouldn't involve, you know, a great diversion on that flight route, to take them round. You know, rather than going over the site, if they were poor, or flying over the site, because of the construction noise and the lighting and such, like, it wouldn't be a major diversion. So that, you know, given the birds are only doing it twice a day, you know, wants to go to the to the feeding sites wants to return to the roost. There'll be virtually no energetic cost of any significance to doing that. Okay, thank you. Thank you.

28:54

Can we do the same process and that case for the next differences point, which is recreational pressures on European sites and to discuss the monitoring the mitigation and management proposed, so as to conclude no adverse effects on integrity? So let me start with you, Mr. chairman's and your team?

29:11

Yes, I think probably our pass first to Mr. JOHN Rhodes, who we've heard from the forefront quad. To deal with the numbers there are two, there are two points a century. One is the displacement of visitors. The other is visits by construction workers. So those are the two issues. I'll ask Mr. Rhodes to to deal with that. And then Mr. Lewis to follow on to deal with the monitoring and mitigation. There are two monitoring and mitigation plans in the course of development, and he can take you through those briefly. So, Mr. Rhoades first, please,

29:50

after those two I'll turn to natural England. Good afternoon. So can you, you can see me, I can see you, you're quite quiet. I'm going to get your microphone a bit closer to yourself.

30:12

Okay, thank you. JOHN Rowe, the applicant, said, we think in relation to this, there may be three points in your hands system level of detail and how we deal with them. But the first is whether the assessment is precautionary. And what it shows us, as you've seen, there's quite a lot of information before the examination on the numbers, the survey and what the numbers mean, and how do you interpret the numbers. It's not an easy subject for a hearing, but quite like to tell you just briefly why we think the assessment is precautionary, and what it what it means our view of that. And then in terms of the

impacted identifiers, if any highlights dealt with through monitoring mitigation, and then there is a third point, I think, between the parties, which relates to whether Assange is required or not.

31:01

Yeah, I don't want you to go into into figures. But in the principles that you've just discussed what we find

31:09

Fine, thank you, sir. So in relation to the figures, we say the way we've dealt with the figures is precautionary, just summarise those four reasons for that. So the first is, so you know, this is based on a survey in 2014 sites around sizewell site, 29% of people said that they were displaced or somewhere else. So we've assumed that they would, even though we say those type of surveys are, tend to be pessimistic in terms of predicting an outcome. But then we've also assumed all the people who to say they would displace, would displace to European sites. And there are two, we think, remarkably, precautionary things about that. One is that they, when people say where are they displaced, they give a location, we assume that the location they go to takes them to European site. So if they say they displace to oberer, for instance, we assume what that means is they wouldn't go to the time on the beach, they go to the old or history, SBA, they go to the nearest European site. And when they say they go to thorpeness, we say, let's assume they go to sanderlings. And we think that's a very precautionary remarkably precautionary thing to do. Yeah. And the second aspect of that is, not all of them told us where they would go. And so about two thirds of them named a location. And we did what I've just described with those destinations or locations, but about a third of them didn't say where they would go. And we've assumed that that term would behave in exactly the same way as the people who gave those locations. And again, that's precautionary, because around half the people into the local area at all, they were visitors. And it may be that if they're displaced, they're just placed somewhere remote from here, and not to European side or wherever. But we've assumed that they are displaced in exactly the same way as the ones who gave a location. So we think that's a very precautionary thing to do. The third thing we did with the figures was not to take account of those who would be displaced from your from European sites as a grocer. And so, for instance, one of the survey locations was done at Chase, some people said they would displace from donor Chief, we've assumed that they wouldn't. So we're not taking any deduction from displacement. And neither in that context, we made no allowance for what you've heard. Elsewhere in the examination were interested parties are saying the number of visitors to the area would reduce this was the tourism discussion with as you know, our our cases, and we don't think that's the case, I've not made any allowance for that. Yeah. And the fourth area of caution we say is that no account would have been taken off the measures that were proposing in the application to deal with displacement. Because of course, those wouldn't have been apparent at the time of the survey. So for instance, are proposals that altos found the recreation is not something that was drawn attention to or would have been widely known during the survey, what we're doing in terms of recreation, rights away enhancement, the payment were making in relation to the displacement strategy that the District Council runs, those are not matters that were taken into account in our assessment of impact and numbers. So it was a precautionary assessment deliberately, in relation to what it showed it showed low percentages of additional visitors at European sites with exception of two and that was linked north and the outer area at minsmere. So the conclusion we reached was that we didn't think if you like that an increase in numbers was itself an impact. So long as the His numbers

were either small or they were too well managed areas. But we did conclude that it was sensible to put in place a monitoring and management mitigation measures at minsmere and sanderlings. North. That was the basis of our assessment. So we say that was precautionary. And then we can come on to explain how we think the management and mitigation would work. Unless you think it's sensible to stop there and ask people if they agree with the precautionary assessment, which I think they know and no one say that say the whole of your, your explanation, please. Thank you. So just just one last thing about the numbers is we've suggested that the parties may get together next week or the week after those who've expressed a particular interest in the calculations to see if we can get closer reaching to reach agreement on those and we are hopeful that we that we can, but in relation to other monitoring and management would work. Mr. Lewis is going to explain that so.

36:05

Hello, again, sir. So in relation to the monitoring plans that Mr. Rhodes has just just trailed, I think you'll be aware that we are, we've drafted two of these plans, one of them is already before the examination that is for the minsmere to Walberswick European sites and sanderlings north, which we shared with examination, D two, and we do intend to update that further, at D five, that includes embedded mitigation measures, effectively from day one, so not dependent on any triggers. So includes wardens, the undertaking of surveys, including ecological surveys, and engaging with visitors to understand them and document their behaviour, but also to influence where possible their behaviour in relation to potential impacts just to briefly say something on the types of harm that we're addressing here. And obviously, this is covered in the SH ra document itself. But it's things like increased trampling of habitats, and disturbance effects from people and dogs. So those are the sorts of things that you'd expect on these, these European sites, in relation to triggers for the additional mitigation in the minsmere plan, we'd originally not proposed any defined triggers within the plan itself, and that those triggers would be set at a later date by the environment review group. And if you if you're familiar with the document, that's what it says. But what we're proposing in the updated version is that we include what we call a 5%, investigatory trigger, and that's just using raw visitor numbers through either manual counts or click counters on car parks and the like. That 5% trigger would be the trigger for further investigation. So the environment review group would then determine whether further surveys were required, but also leading on to the potential for additional mitigations. So that point will be updated in this contribution when we give it the five the environment review group would still be responsible for defining those additional triggers. In relation to the minsmere plan, just to point out that this has been extensively discussed over a period of months with the RSPB National Trust and natural England. We did agree a number of changes, in addition to the ones I told you about in relation to triggers with the RSPB on the ninth of July and a meeting on the ninth of July. And the other thing to say in relation to the minsmere plan is that it's already secured under the date of obligation. And the two funds, they're in an initial Fund, which funds the mitigations from day one, and a contingency fund against which the additional mitigations can be drawn down upon. Both of those are set out in the deed of obligation. I'm turning to the second plan, just very briefly, because I know you haven't actually got this in front of the examination at this point. That's a monitoring plan for the sanderlings Central and the old war estery. We will submit that D five. The difference between this plan and the minsmere plan is that the only embedded mitigation in that plan is that which relates to the project as a whole. So I think we need to talk to the points about the benefits of old her form, but also things like information for campus workers and those things that might influence the behaviours of campus workers. Obviously, if we're applying

those in respect to the minsmere plan, they'd also be relevant to to the sanderlings, an adult or essary plan, if that makes sense. relation to that plan, we would commit to monitoring from the outset. So that includes visitor numbers and ecology. And there's a fund in the deed of obligation to to fund that monitoring from from day one. And again, we would use that 5%, investigatory trigger to determine whether there was a need for further monitoring or mitigation. So you that that sort of investigatory trigger would mirror the one that we're going to bring in, in the minsmere plan, if that makes sense. So there's there's an alignment where we need to across the two plans. I think I've already said that, say that's the funds. They're a secured against the in the deed of obligation. Is that helpful?

41:05

Thank you. Yeah, I understand your position. Thank you. Thank you. Trove is anything else that you want to set out though? I now turn to natural England for the

41:14

teak. No, so you can go to natural England. That's fine. Thank you. Mr. Hains?

41:23

Yeah. So yeah, jack canes natural England. And, again, our position on this is laid out within issue 29 of our written representations. But you have to provide a bit of a summary of opposition. And we agree, the differences between you really, yeah, yeah, so we we agree that the developer would need to change the way the designated sites in the area, and they use recreation during construction operation. And that's, that's both from the population of workers and displace local people. And in terms of the package of mitigation measures for that, to ensure that no adverse effects to those sites occur. And we consider in our in our expert opinion, that this should constitute a two pronged approach. And so the first aspect of that is the provision of the provision and promotion of on site, alternative greenspace following sangs guidelines, which are included within our details, which include not written representations and within close proximity to the main development site. And the the aim of that area would be to minimise any increase in recreational pressure to designate the sides by as far as possible by concentrating, recreation close to the campus. And it's our understanding that the applicant does consider the oldest farm is a alternative green space for the displaced local people, but not for the, for the campus workers. And that's, that's partly based on an assumption of Hinkley Point C, which we don't, we don't believe to be a fair comparison. And the reasons for that are laid out in more detail in our representation, but you can go and go into that in further detail if you'd like. But in particular, I think, in our opinion, it's important to note that Hinkley Point C and so the proposed size or C development are going to be set in a very different landscape. Now with a very, very different suite of designated sites and property rights away networks around them. Yeah, I can provide more detail on that. But that's that's the that's the that's the basis for providing the on site, green space. And then the strategic offsite measures which the applicant mentioned earlier, that's the the measures to deal with the, in our opinion that the in combination effects of accepting that However, while you design a green space, close to the new population of workers, some will want to visit the attractive nearby designated sites anyway. So that's where this wider package of strategic Access Management measures to make the designated sites themselves more resilient to those pressures comes in. And I think we've made good progress with the applicant on those. And there's also an agreement as I understand that repayment into the

Suffolk coast, recreation disturbance avoidance and mitigation strategy. So I think I think we're, we're making good progress on that. But in our opinion, the requirement for saying things and still stands.

44:34

Okay. Thank you. Thank you. I think that's clear. And you give me the pointers. So this is our councils, Suffolk County Council have anything they want to contribute. I'm not seeing your hand up. So I'm thinking it's probably not.

44:55

Oh, sorry. I put my face on before putting my hand up. And you're here. Andrew at Suffolk Council says, you know from the local impact report, we've generally deferred to natural England on HRA matters. But we did have something extra to say on this question. displacement and increase in population as a result of construction. Our position is that pending the completion of the ascertainment of the mitigation plans and the like, we are not persuaded the magnitude of impact has been yet adequately assessed in the HRA, there is one important component of that package, which is the contribution to the Suffolk coast Rams. And we dealt with that in the lie at paragraph 830, matters have moved on since then, given what we now see in the deed, and the basis of that contribution has been agreed with the applicant. So that is the first step towards reaching some agreement on figures. And there are many more steps to go. Okay, thank you very much was to take

46:34

assuming Suffolk wildlife trustee having saved because I don't see Sullivan's hand up, nor any others don't know message. Your hand has gone up.

46:49

I'm so sorry, sir. I was I was just just waiting briefly, I have a very short point to make. But again, if I could invite Miss Miller, just just to cover a quick, a quick

46:59

word. Thank you, sir. And yes, our main comments on the assessment methods are set out in our written representations, which is wrapped to 506 in appendix two to those, but just to update on progress since the start of the examination, and since our statement of common ground, and we've welcomed the production of the minsmere monitoring and mitigation plan, rep to 118, that the applicant is referred to. And we've been pleased to see that some of our recommendations about monitoring locations and types of mitigation measures have been included. We've made some further comments around the development of that plan deadline three in rep 3074. And as the applicant mentioned, we've had some helpful further discussions. And there are some issues that still require development. Within that plan. That being our view. So things like the scope of the monitoring in terms of the habitats covered, and the timescales and the process to implement the additional mitigation measures in a timely manner as the scope of the warning roles that are proposed as well in terms of responsibilities, geographic deployment and resourcing levels. We are also looking forward to seeing the old or history and sandling South sbas monitoring and mitigation plan that the applicant has mentioned and will provide further comment once that has been submitted. Our main area of difference and we support natural England strongly on this point is around suitable alternative natural green space. So as natural

England mentioned, the proximity of large amounts of construction worker accommodation to sensitive parts of designated sites means that we're quite concerned about potential for impacts. And there's not a large amount of housing in that area. So this is a significant additional impact. And we consider that the provision of SANGS is an important stage of the mitigation hierarchy because it avoids or reduces the impact rather than the next stage being mitigating it. We're also concerned that the applicant has made statements about construction workers and the sort of typical uses of designated sites and saying that construction workers probably don't fit that typical profile, and that most workers won't have dogs, etc. So they're not expecting significant impacts from those. But we're concerned that given the profile of the workforce that there may be an interest in sort of active or sporting recreation. The Suffolk coast is quite a popular destination for sports like mountain biking, and watersports, and those could be attractive to the construction workforce. And they could involve sensitive parts of designated sites as well. So again, we do support Natural England's comments that SANGS suitable alternative natural green space, sorry, should be used to reduce those impacts.

49:47

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, sir. And I'll keep this very, very brief conscious of time. But yes, just to echo Miss Miller's gratitude to the applicant rule. would be useful to have had those discussions. And it's really just that the level of detail within the term as tied into diisostearyl to requirement for and the way that those two plans are, are referenced, again, look forward to discussing this further with the applicant but just wanted to flag now we are concerned that there isn't that sufficient detail, and therefore both proposed mitigation and monitoring isn't as securely tied as it could be. Thank you. So, okay. Thank you very much. Mr. Streeton. Thank you, sir.

50:37

Just two very short points from us. It's really in response to Mr. Rhoades first point or whether there are approaches precautionary. We said that not for two reasons. Firstly, because of the age of the survey data, we said there's insufficient account taken for change since 2014. Not just in terms of population numbers, but also lifestyle change, especially in the course of the past two years where people have been recreating outdoor more as a result of the changes to lifestyle from the pandemic. And secondly, and perhaps the more important point is we say there's insufficient consideration given to in combination effects with other developments and the cumulative pressure that will be put on recreational use of specialised conservation SPS.

51:24

Thank you. Mr. HAITI'S? Hello, sir, Mr. Hayes National Trust. I just like to say that we concur with the statements of National Trust and RSPB. We have concerns about the application shadow hubs risk assessment in relation to recreational pressures. And these have been detailed in our written representation, our EP two dash 150. This is because we consider the conclusions in the assessments have been unqualified and done, it has largely been left out of the assessment, although it's extremely sensitive political interests, particularly nature with a quarter of the SBA population. Remember minsmere warboss work is sent and vegetated shingle and other breeding birds, Ethan birds. We were concerned about the impact of visitors that have been displaced onto Donald Heath. And we don't feel this has been adequately assessed in the HRA or that environmental statement largely due to flawed data survey methodology and lack of precautionary approach. And some of the ecological features

donachie had just not been considered at all. Accordingly, the conclusions have no adverse effect on citing credit, integrity, don't feel qualified. And we have outlined these concerns or detail these concerns. And the applicate didn't attempt to address any of this. Any of the issues raised from that. We do feel this can be resolved by being the assessments been based on robust data and data collection methodology and sort of just improved approach and particularly recognition that's been achieved affinity receptor site. We welcome the monitoring and mitigation plan. And we feel this step in the right direction but has a long time to go. And we've been engaging with EDF in discussions about that plan and submitted detailed comment and deadline three, that's our EP three dash 070. But we do feel that measures to avoid recreational usage of the spscc etc have not been proposed. And that is to a sangs approach. We need to ensure that sensitive sites like Danny sheets are not impacted by increased footfall and don't feel again for punishing has been recognised in the abstracts through into this requirement for the monitoring patient. And therefore we are fearful that data sheets could just be left out because it hasn't been included in that that assessment any sort of adverse impact and also non European, not been captured as well. Such as stone Kenny and Dr. blahblah woodlark. Although they May be captured by some of the measures stone Kelly is a bit different in that it's hard to tap comments and also vegetated shingle has been largely left out, which is highly sensitive for occasional disturbance. We acknowledge the provision of Kenton hills, an outhouse farmhouse, we don't feel that this is we don't see any evidence of assessment, this in terms of its capacity or adequacy, as an alternative, greenspace

55:35

daanish, it must be included in any mitigation, and monitoring proposals, and that these need to be in the right order, in terms of monitoring, and then mitigation. And we are concerned that we manage the site cap solely for its ecological importance and to invest, you know, through our staff in managing that site. And we feel that behaviours hasn't been fully captured here. And that is often what causes the impact through disturbance. Dogs off leads, particularly, is quite easy to manage people who know how to pave that it's quite, you have to invest a lot of time and resources in getting those people who perhaps aren't familiar with the site, etc, to perhaps have a less impact on the site. And we would put that management in place before those impacts happened. And that might muddy the waters in terms of identifying those trigger points, which are mentioned in the monitoring and mitigation plan. And we'd like to know what those triggers are, and how they can be timely enough to avoid any adverse impact on the sites and how they capture those behaviours, as well as just quantifiable numbers. Thank you. Thank you, Miss. Hey, Mr. Wilson, you have your hands up.

57:07

Yes, thank you, Mr. Brock. Chris Wilson, on behalf of together bank sighs we'll see you just quickly. Piece of clarification for good, as mentioned, evolved hearse farmers, recreational self displacement facility. And I thought it was for Habitat compensation. And I don't really see the two being can work side by side. If you're given access to otters farm to walkers and dog walkers and that sort of thing. I don't really see its value as compensated for your habitat, or just looking for some clarification. You have to ask the African. Thank you.

57:49

Very good. And you put your hand down Mr. Wilson, and also miss Hey, thank you, Mr. Truman's? Yes, thank you, sir. I think I've been round the room and I got flavour more than the flavour of the differences between you in the same way as we just dealt with the the nesting and non nesting birds. Do you want to come back? Or are you happy that I got the picture? And there's a lot of point reading in

58:25

responding. Well, a lot of that comment is very encouraging. Sir. Clearly the applicant will work with the interested parties outside the examination process to try and accommodate those concerns. The the one point I did want to give Mr. Rhodes a chance to deal with was sang that is plainly that's a clear difference principle. Between us we don't accept that some song is justified by analogy with with new housing cases, the campus workers, I did want to give Mr. Rhoades Trumps to deal with that. And perhaps also we could just provide Mr. Wilson with a very brief clarification of the role of all Hurst form in terms of recreation which may set his mind at rest on that point. So

59:10

hang on, I was just because I'm conscious that we've we've worked kept natural England in and they kind of said that they'd be able to stay till half past and there are a few points which I want to raise with them. In in this topic, if we could Would you mind if we saved Mr. Rose until I dealt with those with natural England and then on the Wildcat Thank you very much. So Mr. Haines raised nothing has raised the point about collision risk and, and new new pylons. Can you just explain to me briefly what What your point is? Is it simply you haven't got a you haven't got a collision risk assessment?

1:00:06

And yeah, in short, yeah, that our advice was that those additional pylons in the area and present a collision risk the burden this hadn't been previously assessed through the habitats regulations assessment that's being an identified risk. We felt that the, the illustrative plans think much of a clue as to the scale of the proposed power lines relative to the buildings and the degree to which they protrude from the buildings. And the survey worked in for many Impact Assessments not being conducted or any mitigation considered. So basically, those risks hadn't been considered by the applicant. But we know that the applicant has stated in the deadline three response to our written representations that they consider the extent of change and the baseline situation to be minimal in the context of existing power lines, so we're going to review that in further detail following this week's hearings, and then we'll provide our updated written response on that. So it was just it was just an area where we felt that there was a risk that hadn't been properly quantified. And this this is this is in a

1:01:16

habitats regulations context, not in an environmental assessment context. Yeah, primarily in an HOA context. One of my colleagues has just asked me to point out to you there is a pylon plan with the documentation, and just wonders was not you've been able to find that revenue bond to you? Yeah.

1:01:40

Thank you. I think you've just indicative drawings retain, but perhaps there's something more ice detail.

1:01:46

Okay, and hang on. The other thing is, you know, national has said that you're satisfied, the proposals in their current form, have scoped in all of the relevant European sites. But you raise the possibility of further impacts, which have not yet been scoped into the HRA due to water use. My question to you is, is that about the need for the winnetta wine app, the ryan EP study, is that, is that the issue which you're raising there? Yeah,

1:02:26

that's wrong. I'll just get to my notes, because it was under tomorrow's. I'm sorry. No, no, that's fine. I've got it to hand. See, this, this point was around the winner. And, yeah, we received this last week, a version of this document last week, which we, which we'll review in due course. And in terms of our interests, the first key consideration is whether the proposed level of abstraction at those in the area itself will have an adverse effect on any water dependent designated sites, which wouldn't have been scoped into this, the current assessment, current HRA because they want to be unforeseen. And secondly, whether the second point is whether there'll be any wider impacts on protected sites, landscapes or species from any associated work, such as pipelines or any other associated infrastructure. So yeah, I think we're not quite clear on how much of that's addressed in the winner? I haven't. I haven't looked at it yet. But I do know that there's a auto strategy proposed by that deadline five, and we're hoping that some of that wider those wider impact assessments will be included within that. And yeah, we can advise that further. Once we've seen that if that does include does indeed include those details.

1:03:46

Good. Good. Okay. Yeah, I think that's, I have the sum total of the points on this, which I wanted from you. Thank you very much. My colleague has got she says it's an app. Oh, one nine, the pylon plan. Okay, thanks. That's very helpful. There was an info may assist in terms of location hasn't been updated since the change. Right. Now then, Mr. tremens, and we were going to give me Mr. Rhodes to talk about saying,

1:04:28

Yes, sir. We will do that. And I'm Mr. Philip can then deal with the windup point he tells me but perhaps we'll hear from Mr. Rosen signs first. Thanks. Yeah.

1:04:39

So don't worry for the applicant. So would you mind if I just picked up a couple of the other points that were raised by interested parties as part of the discussion about sayings? So I can,

1:04:50

if it's, if it's brief, yes, that's fine. I'm concerned about understanding that what the differences are rather than resolving them with you

1:05:02

I'll be as brief as I can. So thank you. In terms of the point, the point is made by a number of people, we will try and agree the numbers, but there isn't evidence before you of harm likely to arise. particularly given the precautionary approach, we've taken to the assessment, we're really grateful for the parties

engaging on the monitoring and mitigation plans. We all have the same objective. Here, it's a very good discussion that's taking place. And I don't think any of the parties have expressed a concern need to be concerned about the plans, because we're very open to discussions about how they can work. The triggers, particularly, we've suggested that, as Mr. Lewis said, have a low level of precautionary trigger of 5% increase in use of any site leading to investigation of what measures may be necessary. But it will be for the ecology working group to discern what the triggers should be with the benefit of after that initial phase of activity before they get working, if you like we're gonna find percent trigger after that is for the group and the governance process to design monitoring it should be and also to decide what the mitigation should be. And we think most of the mitigation measures that might become necessary if monitoring shows that they are would be quick to put in place, we're trying to design the process to enable that to happen. And we want to continue discussing that with with relevant parties. The Rams payment, we haven't suddenly come to that something we agreed with the council some time ago in terms of making making our contribution to the Rams payment. But it does go to one of the other points about cumulative effects. So each development which may have an impact in terms of recreational pressure or displacement has to mitigate its impacts. The Council has clear policy regime then requiring Rams payments per head of population or new dwelling within the area to clear local planning strategy. And for the larger developments and significantly large scale residential developments to provide their own sangs. And we think the cumulative issues are addressed through the policy approach. In terms of damage heats, and whether it's been left out of the assessment that was slightly surprising given the duchies was one of our seven survey locations, we've collected data and dunnage. Heath, we've specifically tried to identify what we think the impact is done, he was one of those areas where I said we've taken a precautionary approach by not accounting for those who said they may displace from damage checks. But any event damage chief will be covered by the mitigation which we're committing in the minsmere and sailings North monitoring and mitigation plan. So it would be in place before the impacts arrives exactly as a National Trust, have asked, because the behaviour which they're concerned about, particularly dog walking is not something that we're anticipating from our construction workers at the campus or the caravans who would not be entitled to have dogs. And we have also, as you know, a discussion with the National Trust about a separate resilience fund. For any additional effects, done a cheater, we do think that we're addressing that, but we want to continue to discuss those things with the National Trust. There was a question about whether orders farmers is good enough for sangs want to come to talk about that. But how could it work side by side with nature, conservation. And it has occurred to us that we haven't necessarily provided you with enough information on on his farm. I know you have a lot of information, but we're producing a paper for deadline five and altos for home, which we'll explain. So what you saw on your side was the separation between the nature conservation restoration and the recreational, recreational habitat, sorry, recreational area that we're creating. Which takes us to the question of sang. So, sang is something as you know, which normally arises for from New large scale residential development. And we think there may be some misunderstanding from National Trust, sorry for natural England about the impact that we may be having in that respect. So naturally, there's written representations talk about building accommodation 5000 new workers in an area remote from residential dwellings, which is sensitive to these issues. So as you know, we're not building new accommodation for 5900. We're building the campus and the caravan park. Other than that, the non home base workers those who are new to the area, would principally be occupying existing accommodation in the terrorists sector or the private rented sector across the wider catchment area. And whether they would add in net terms to those who

might otherwise occupy that accommodation is obviously a matter of opinion, but it's not going to have the impact of bringing 5900 new dwellings if you'd like, to the area and of course, that 5900 is the peak of non home based workers experience for only two years. And when you think about the nature of construction workers during that time,

1:10:22

and we've submitted information about this, and I won't go through that, but it may be helpful to say that we did a survey of outage workers with this information is in the shadow HRA in 2016, to try and understand their recreational behaviour and also their accommodation. Use and 297 average workers were surveyed in 2016 2%, said they visited menswear 2% said they visited doughnut cheese and one only non home base Walker said that for recreation, they walked the dog in the countryside. We think that it helps to recognise the different nature of construction workers, the likelihood that when they have recreation time, they'll be going home. And the greater end professors, one of the interested parties that is likely to be an active sports for which we're making direct provision. mountain bikes was raised as you know, we have a strategy to invest in significant improvements in rights of way. So we think we're trying to address that through a cycling and rights and waste strategy, which doesn't need to involve impact on designated areas. So we don't think that the evidence exists. That would require a saying, but we don't want to underestimate the contribution which all of us is going to make. And if one was to do a residual calculation of what you thought the net impact in terms of construction workers living in the area would be, and then try to apply that to a savings calculation in the way that's normally done from residential accommodation. We'll attempt that but it's it's not something which is really susceptible to a great deal of science, because this isn't normal residential accommodation. But natural England, for instance, they will have 10% of the workers are using European science and say, they say well, let's assume that's in development 250 dwellings that would still need a saying. So if it would, if that's right, then the same would be about four or five Hectors on the basis of the normal calculation orders farms, recreational division is much greater than that. We haven't called it a saying, because we think it serves more than that purpose. It serves a purpose for displaced people, not just construction workers for displaced people, recreational there's also people in leisten, who may not otherwise, then go to European sites, people displaced from the beach, if there are as well as the construction workers. But it's a very significant recreational resource, which in terms of size would more than meet the same requirement. So we say on that basis, saying isn't required, if it was required. Additionally, there isn't one in the application, it would need to be the subject of compulsory acquisition powers. We don't have spare land for assigning and we don't think it would come close to justifying the acquisition of some of these land and to provide a sang for residual impact of construction workers that's not met, and others farm. So So our cases, and we've done everything we reasonably can to address recreational pressures, and we have a good range of measures in place that we will continue to refine particularly the management plans and discussion with the interested parties. Okay, thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Phil. What? Yes, that was it. Why app when app?

1:13:54

Yes, when app I think I'm not sure whether there is a correct way to pronounce it, but I'll call it the when app. So you indicated earlier that although this was down for Friday, you wanted to have an update today? Well, I just it was but it obviously is not marine marine ecology. So it's no quite. I've sought instructions. And I'm told that Northumbrian water limited will be submitting an update on there when

EPA investigations to the examining authority. And also at the same time, as I'm saying to us tomorrow, it sounds from what was said on behalf of the Environment Agency a little while ago that they may already have it. But so that's the position as it stands today. As you anticipate that there'll be discussions between ourselves and Northumbrian water limited once we've received it, and we'll have to consider what it says and report that once we've had a chance to do that.

1:14:56

Okay, sounds like it's progressing. Thank you. Thank you very much. Right. The last thing I was asked on the differences point was to trogons. The Environment Agency has asked for European sites to be included. Now, the question is, have you done or have you put all the sites in which they wanted? What's the answer on that one,

1:15:31

please? Well, I'm wondering if, Mr. Lewis, they will help them at all. Perhaps some, Mr. Simpson, untold, actually, Matt Simpson, who is from a calm who is the HRA lead. So Mr. Simpson could make himself known

1:15:53

if the agency will will also bear in mind, I'll be coming to you and asking him what your view is. Thank you. This is

1:16:00

Yes. Hello, Matt. Matt Simpson. I'm leading coordinating the HRA Process on behalf of the African. I, I think the only thing I can think of what's been referred to here is European sites for migratory fish species. Because I'm aware that the Environment Agency did request consideration of sites beyond what we can weed couldn't address in the main shadow HRA. So in response to that we did look at product called a large number of European sites, migratory fish species, running basically on the coast of Northern Europe, all the way down to Brittany, and round The southern coast of the UK, into Wales. And the species that we we scoped in, we're polish, add additional 20 chard sites and additional land prey sites. And so we did provide further assessment of quite a large number of sites in the shadow HRA agenda, which was submitted in January. And the In summary, so there's a lot of sites considered there. But in summary, we carried some sites through to the lightly significant effect stage, but conclude, no lightly significant effect on the size that we do carry through.

1:17:33

But just just to help you, as far as you're concerned, you you have dealt with all the things that you've asked for, as far as I'm aware, I'm not aware of any of that. Let me just go to the agency in that in that case, and stay on the line as it were.

1:17:55

Mr. Scared? I think it's it's the answer you gave to our first set of questions. HRA 1.2, which isn't quite clear on this. So can you tell us whether or not as far as you're concerned, you reached over you received everything which you are requesting?

1:18:21

Sorry, Sir, I've I've not quite got that information in front of me. I wonder if we can, can take that away and, and respond to that. So

1:18:30

I think that's going to be the simplest thing. I don't want to spend to waste your time when others didn't. That's not that that will be fine. And perhaps we could get that first thing tomorrow morning. We'll take Thank you very much. Indeed. That's, that's fine. Mr. Jones, back to you. Is there anything, any other sponsors, which you want to give?

1:18:51

Just to say that the material for two by Simpson is in the HRA agenda of January 2021. That's where you can find that material in relation to the collision risk point which which Mr. Haines raised, rather than taking up examination time now, it seems it may be appropriate for that to be dealt with, directly between the applicants and natural England. Right, further information to see whether their minds can be set at risk on that collision point.

1:19:29

Yes, that'd be fine. Thank you. Thank you. I think I mean, just as we as we leave this and and we've got protected species next on the next list, which I'm actually going to turn into sampling questions, too, I think. You do have an awful lot of stuff which is not yet agreed with natural England in particular, but also with others and in relation To HRA we're getting towards the point where the release will be produced. I think you can read my mind on this are driving it absolutely clear, we are concerned at the amount of stuff which is still outstanding and to be blunt at the amount of material which is still being produced, while we 14 months after the application has gone in halfway through halfway through the, for the examination, so please do what you can to bring stuff to a conclusion. rapidly. Yeah, very good. Okay, well, we'll leave in that case. The news that at a point, I said, I will turn protected species points, which I was going to raise into written questions for you and now turn to

1:21:23

I think species is going to service whether we go into the desert. Mr. Brock, you're frozen. think we're aware that Mr. Brock's got a technical difficulty. So if you can just bear with us a moment. Hopefully, he will come back online very shortly. Right.

1:23:08

Now, just to say Mr. Brock does seem to have a legal issue at the moment, he indicated just before he left, he was going to deal with protected species by way of certain questions. So believe the next item he was going to deal with was in relation to ancient woodland veteran trees and the root of the TVB. So

1:23:37

yes, ma'am. I'll hand back to Mr. Phil port for that item.

1:23:42

Thank you. Hello, again. So, Mr. Brock receipt, we've received your deadline for submission. That's right for double o six that was in response to the rule 617 requests following the site inspection. And I think he was wanting at this stage for you to screen share the updated clearance plan. I don't know if that's possible.

1:24:10

That was a matter. We were going to do through Mr. Rhodes. And I understand that that is set up. So I'll hand over now and hope that that is what in fact happens.

1:24:35

It is in hand, I promise you that the the pause is just while we get it up on the screen. So if you'll just bear with us a moment. Thank you.

1:24:56

So I understand it's going to come up on Kali Linux. Is screen. So if, if that can be brought up by the examinee authority, I think that is how it's going to appear.

1:25:51

do apologise, we this has come up slightly quicker than we had anticipated. So the the fine details are just being ironed out now.

1:26:06

I wonder if we might just have a five minute agenda. And that makes sense. So then when we resume hopefully we'll have it sorted out. Sorry about that. That's great.

1:26:19

So if we turn now and we return at quarter to six? Oh,

1:26:25

I do. But I'm told it's ready. If we do that. If we just see if this works. This does that now. I think we've got this fences. screen, but whether we can see the images is another matter? Yes, exactly. There we are. Right. Thank you for that. So I hope that was the plan that you were after. Right? I'm grateful. I'm grateful to those who have more technical knowledge than myself, we've managed to achieve that. I'm going to pass over to Mr. Rhodes at this point, because he will respond to questions about these plans.

1:27:53

Right, Mr. Rhodes. So one of our rules. 17 requests asks about the location of veteran veteran trees that would be felled. And on the footpath between Foxborough Ward and farnum. Hall. There appeared from finger one that one that you know, more notable tree was to be felt. We just wanted confirmation of that. And also of the six trees along the line of the footpath there were six trees of which for a veterinarian, and one is to be felt. So we wanted to check that.

1:28:32

Thank you. That that's correct. And our deadline for submission, we provided you with plans, you recall figure one and figure two, in response to your request, which identified the location of two veterans, two trees that we thought would be lost. And we expect to be lost as a result of the works in the location we're looking at, at here, a veteran tree and a notable tree. And the other trees we expect to be retained. Thank you.

1:29:06

So the updated clearance plan, your response note rec for Ws six, that says in paragraph 2.2, point two, that it results in the retention of an eight metre hedge row to the south of the existing part of that farm Hall. So really, I was wanting you to show that to me, please, if you can. Yes, about a reference to the plan to the updated clearance plan.

1:29:38

Yes, well, I don't have control over the screen. And I don't know if those you do have a cursor, but can you see the way in which the Hydros to be lost going across the line of the road. Whereas those two values bypass h two two. So the double line of lost Heads right there, right? The lower of those two lines, the sudden line on its western extent, you can see that those are those little purple squares two are filled in. Yes. And according to the legend on the map that's to be retained. So that comparison, which is extremely difficult to spot between this clearance file, and that which had previously been submitted is the filling in of those two little squares. And that's eight metres and reasonable on behalf of the applicant went back to the designers and said, Is there none of that headrow that can be retained. And they believe that well, they're now confident that those eight metres strip which accounts for three trees along that alignment can be retained, hence, the change in the plan. The other thing that if I may say, which is relevant to this is the notable tree, which exists very much in that location. We've also asked the designers to consider whether there is any prospect of that being saved. They're doing a detailed survey of that tree now and closure investigative work and whether the earth works around it mean that that tree has to be lost, it's very close to the area that we're focused on here. And we'd like to discuss that with the counsellors from report back to you about whether in fact that train needs to be lost at the moment, we're declaring it as a lost tree. But we're not convinced that it's necessarily inevitable. And we want to do more detailed work, study that and agree that with the council's

1:31:47

and when do you anticipate that that study in those discussions will be completed? So when when will that be reported that to the examination?

1:31:56

The investigation is going on now? So in terms of deadline, I would say six.

1:32:04

All right, thank you. Thank you. So we've got that. So looking at the plans, which are figures, one, two, and three, could you explain to me the meaning of the TVB development site boundary in the permanent boundary? Where do we see those as limits of activity in the decio? In relation to figure one and figure two, three? Yes. Not immediately. If it helps, perhaps you could provide that clarification in writing. I was just so were you going to suggest that

1:32:57

I was just thinking it's an easier thing to annotate and plan to try and describe that

1:33:02

I saw right and the next point may have a similar response. So concentrating on this transect route between foreign and Wolf farm house, and the farm and farnum Hall complex. Could you summarise for me the conclusions you reach in relation to the activity of Firstly, bats, and secondly, birds and the effect of on them of the two village bypass?

1:33:36

Certainly, it's not obviously my expertise. That would be more Mr. Lewis. But is it sensible for us to do that in writing? That would be very helpful. Thank you. Thank you, as long as you as long as you've got the point that that would be absolutely that particular transcript. There. Yes.

1:33:57

And then the next question was the bypass will be in a cutting at the Foxborough wood farm Hall complex. So we were wondering whether there would be any drawdown of groundwater on or on the behaviour of surface water and water bodies at farnum Hall are along the route of the two village bypassing cutting.

1:34:23

Bound will certainly write that down as well. We've made certainly more expert than may have made investigations into that and advise me that the water table sits well below the level of the cutting. So don't anticipate any interference with groundwater. But we'll record that in a proper formal note.

1:34:43

Thank you. So those were all the questions so far that we have for the applicant. I understand that Mr. Brock may have got back into the meeting. I'll just check with him and see if he wants to.

1:35:00

Yes, he's back. He's back. I'm sorry about that excitement. It was a bit too,

1:35:08

too much to hate that we get through the whole thing. Thank you, Mr. Rhodes. And I caught that. We're going to get some better annotated plans out and be tremendous. Let me turn to let me turn to miss Morgan. Good afternoon. You've been waiting patiently, I think, or all day. So my question for you is I hope that you've seen the applicants submission documentation, which we began to look out there in relation to our questions following the company's site visit. And what I'd like to know from you is are the representations which you would like to make to us that orally now about the dire biodiversity effects on the college year Fox reward farnum Hall, the farmhouse pond? Would the Nuttery belt bass and other protected species?

1:36:04

Yes, I would. I'm personally, the applicants review of the ancient trees and veteran trees, is the trees in fact that are going to be removed. I don't think he was particularly clear about how many there were and exactly where they were. Because I think there's an extra one that he was sort of hidden away. So I'll put that in my written representation, just to make sure that we're very clear on that. My our major concern is about inadequate baseline serving information that has been used to form conclusions about the roots and the harm to biodiversity, which continues even at this late stage. We have still yet to see a hydrology impact report on Foxboro wood, which is always already showing signs of stress as we showed you in our a company site walk. And they will promise that that would be supplied and then saying that actually the water level table is below the 4.5 metre cutting I'm not sure how correct that is. We were also waiting for recent pond surveys and the applicant has done these because we saw them, but they have said they will share this information at a later date. But more probably the most pressing problem was that they've got direct blandit take Nasri belt, and were asked to do a very late survey which they did two weeks ago and they confirmed that it was okay Nash with an understory of cow parsley and nettles. I'm in a very easy desk sorry, were brought up a previous Suffolk County Council survey of this woodland saying it has nine different species of shrub layer important 14 different ground floor species with bluebells, dogs, Merc, Mercury and primroses. These are all ancient woodland species. They're also annexed to bannocks. But found at this nursery belt. I think what I'm trying to prove is once again, the information proffered by the application so far has been one of us, chasing them to show the true picture whilst they show a very different picture to what actually exists in situation. What seems to be happening is the applicants are trying to keep fit, they're serving into the design of their scheme, not the other way around as we feel it should be. We'd also like to note that this includes any proper assessment of the one alternative put forward by the parish council way back in 2017, which highlights a failure to meet mitigation hierarchy key to ecological planning.

1:38:33

Thank you. Thank you very much. Mr. Tate. I think as your saw your hand is up. Now states hands one down Mr. Street.

1:38:59

So it's only gone down because I put it before I turned the other two things on. So just very briefly, so I think other designated sites we've jumped over I understand is, is that going to be dealt with On another occasion, or in writing, but on that assumption, the only one the other designated site that is relevant Under Item G is Foxborough wood. And there the council is concerned about the adverse potential impact on the world through hydrological changes. And we're awaiting further information from the applicant in that regard. And on veteran trees. We're pleased that is now being looked at more closely. We didn't consider the assessment of that matter was sufficient. So we're awaiting that further information. And also we'd like to Know that what what the mitigation or compensation is proposed for that, but we hope that it's going to be coming forward in due course.

1:40:08

Okay. I'm sure the applicant has heard that. Thank you very much. Mr. streeton. Yes,

1:40:15

we have a short point on ancient wood and I'd like Mr. Taber to deal with if I could ask him to speak. Very good. Yeah, go ahead. Good afternoon, sir. This is a short point in relation to ancient woodland on another of the associated sites. It's that the northern Park and Ride site. So there's that, as you may be aware, from the site visit, there's a an area of of Woodlands to the west called Little nursery word. Having had a look at the applicants surveys, and in particular documents, a PP three six for this company confusion within it as to whether this is a parcel of ancient woodland or not, because that I'll give you the references and paragraph one for 21 of appendix. Hang on of sorry, AP, a pp. 364. So it's in one paragraph 1.4 point 21 of appendix seven eight, there is a comment that the woodland supports ancient woodland indicator species. And in annex seven a point three of the same documents. There's a conclusion that the woodlands is thought to be a remnant of ancient semi natural woodland, and due to the broadleaf trees and ancient woodland indicators, but yes, in the same documents paragraph 1.5 point 12 of appendix seven a. It then concludes this nursery word is not recorded on the ancient woodland inventory inventory, and is therefore unlikely to be a relatively recent origin. So there's a clear discrepancy between the two they're updated survey work was already undertaken in 2020, which is document a yes, oh three, six. But comparing that the details, it seems yet another area where it doesn't match the species that recorded. So this will clear confusion as to whether or not the woodland that adjoins northern part of my site is ancient or not. And I suppose the point that that leads to that means that the mitigation that you need to provide in our in our view, we say is that you need to assume the city's ancient Woodlands if there is a lack of clarity here. And whilst there's a buffer of 20 metres proposed, there doesn't appear to be a greater series of detail in terms of what's proposed there, it appears from the the landscape Master Plan, which my document here is as one to four, that this will be grassland cover only. But in contrast, natural England's guidelines, talk about buffer zones, as consisting of a mosaic of habitats that are complimentary. So Woodlands mixture of scrub grassland, and Ethan's and wetland. And so just providing grasslands offers little to mitigate for functions and effects such as just noise disturbance and lighting, which obviously will also impact on protected speech, which I know is obviously a separate point, but noting that there were features with potential to support recent bass in that woodland, so it's just a point to flag to your attention in relation to ancient woodland.

1:43:35

Okay, thank you, Mr. Street, and you made a lot of references to a lot of paragraphs in quite a lot of documents. When you put in your written submissions at the end, or next week. Please make sure that you've referenced those clearly for us, and that you set out the points which you're dressing, thank you. I just need to get a bit of housekeeping here. Miss Vince, I think you are. Your camera is sort of still on. And it's causing a bit of difficulty. It may be if you exit and come back. That would be helpful. Mr. streeton you're now frozen on my screen. It sounds like a fun afternoon, doesn't it? Right. I'm going to carry on and ask Mr. Bedford, whose hand is up?

1:44:46

Thank you, sir. Michael Burke from Suffolk County Council. So just going back to the agenda. You had indicated before you lost your connection that you were dealing With item two, he protected species in writing, which I understand, that's fine. Then, when Miss MCI took over, started item G, ancient woodland and passed over item F, Mr. Tate, I think has already said that he assumed from that, that you were, as it were implicitly taking item f as another item in writing. And if that is so then we will raise

that point about anxiety. And if I just tell you that because it related to a designated site that say the county wildlife side suffered suffered shingles beach, it is a quite separate issue. So it would be quite as it were confusing to dip into that. So we would tend to deal with that in writing. I just wanted in a sense confirmation that that's what you intended to do.

1:45:52

Thank you. Okay. What has happened is that in preparing my questions, and looking at the size of the agenda, I decided that we would not look at designated sites or orally. So, yes, please and thank you for stopping stopping us. submissions on other designated sites will be perfectly in order in the written submissions, which come in at at the next deadline, are grateful Thank you, to you as well. Right. Mr. Woodfield? Very quick points.

1:46:40

I believe that Fern raised an issue to record for males quite close to the the two villages bypass and patients who connected habits out that will be affected by the bypass. There doesn't seem to have been a response on that point from the applicant. And I wonder whether they are now looking into this issue and putting some surveys in hand.

1:47:06

I asked the applicant what the answer is on that. Mr. Truman's? Or was it Tim's to Phillpotts? Who is in the driving seat now?

1:47:18

So this is one for me. So I've got Mr. Lewis, on how to deal with these matters. So we've got points raised by Miss Morgan, which were related to the to village bypass or collection of points there. Then we had a point raised in relation a separate point raised in relation to the northern Park and Ride site on behalf of the evening Hall estate. That was the point we were looking at a moment ago, by reference to AP three, six for an ASO three, six, which slightly off topic. So I don't know whether that is something that Mr. Lewis will be able to respond to or not, but I'll give him the opportunity. Yeah, I'm sure he'll indicated that something he needs to take away and respond to in writing. And then finally, Mr. Woodfield raised a query on behalf of Fern about further surveys and whether that was being done or not. So I'm just going to offer Mr. Lewis an opportunity to respond on those three points. Thank you, that'll be very helpful. Hello again, sir.

1:48:45

Hello, in relation to Sarah Morgan's points, specifically in relation to I think Nuttery belt. I've got some material in front of me which we can share by way of a note which demonstrates that this isn't ancient woodland, based primarily on cartographic evidence, which is the main way that natural England determine whether an area of woodland should be designated as as ancient. The presence of several and ancient woodland indicators in the grand floor of a woodland doesn't necessarily mean that it is ancient woodland indeed, if I recall correctly, the parcel of land to the east of FoxPro word at Palance Grove at Central connecting belts got primroses as well so I mean, some of these ancient woodland indicators can colonise adjacent areas of woodland even if those Woodlands aren't adjacent, but I'll put that in writing in relation to the status of natori belt in relation to surveys prove worth making the general

comment that and you probably pick this up from the submission that we did make it a default Access historically has been quite difficult to some of the woodland areas here. And that continues to be the case. But obviously we've made every attempt to try and survey these areas. I think in relation to the point about the the species that we recorded when I think we were viewing the woodland, from the outside looking in nettles and cow parsley and such, like, it's probably not a surprise that those will be the species that are visible from the, from the outside of the woodland as you're looking looking into it. And those are the sorts of species that that you expect to see on woodland edges where you've got very intensive agriculture adjacent to it. So you get those highly nutrient rich species at the edge of those woodlands. So we wouldn't have been able to necessarily see into the woodland to see whether bluebells or or primroses were present. In relation to the point about door mice. Door mice are very rare in East Suffolk. And there is I think is one of the contributors mentioned a recent recording he suffered and there's only one recent record north of the stare and he suffered and I've got a map in front of me illustrating that which we'll cover in a note but if it would be helpful to the panel and August is a very good time for surveying dorm ice and we be survey dorm is for you. I wasn't suggesting so that you would you would survey them for us but we're more than happy to undertake a survey of door mice and the one thing that obviously that might limit that is access to woodland as I've already hinted it has been quite difficult but we'd certainly seek to access all the woodlands that we could in that survey and we would also look to survey the area of woodland between Foxborough wood and Palance Grove because, importantly, if door mice were to be present in Foxborough, or any of the ancient Woodlands here, they would undoubtedly use that woodland corridor between Foxborough wood and the eastern portion of talents grow. So we'd like to survey that as well. But we'll see what we'll see what we can do in those surveys, and we'll come forward with that report. As soon as it's possible. We'll undertake that survey in August. In relation to little nursery word, I'm afraid I haven't got the material in front of me in relation to that. So we will come back with a written statement on that if that's okay. In ratio, that's fine, right? Yes, that's fine. Thank you very much. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. So

1:52:32

those are our responses to the submissions you've just heard. We noted obviously, what Mr. Tate said that that relates to information that's forthcoming. Yes, thank you. Fine.

1:52:47

Right. I think that deals with what I wanted to investigate in relation to the to the bypass and the ancient woodland, which leaves the cycle link road. And then something about letters of no impediment, where I've already heard from natural England on and it's just a question of going out date from, from you, and the Environment Agency if they would like to contribute as well, although I understand this slightly different approach. I beg your pardon. I've got two hands up three Hands up. Miss Morgan. I think your hands has been up that's leftover from when you you spoke earlier. Thank you. Miss Galloway.

1:53:43

Hello, my point is actually in respect of the link road I can mention it very good.

1:53:48

No, no, hang on. I now know that you want to do it. Do that. Mr. Collins. Yes, maybe I've missed something. But are you doing point i duties under the SS 1441 the natural environments and rural

communities at first I I decided that could be dealt with in in writing something in particular want to say about it? Yes, there is. Well, let's wait and see if we if we have got if we've got time, and if not then perhaps. Well, there are there are other two ways of dealing with Mr. Collins. One is if we do manage to finish on in good time tomorrow, then you can come back with your point. And if we don't then if we can put it in writing that would be lovely. Okay, thank you. Very good. Okay. So let me now do turn to the sizewell link road. And I want to start missing a gap I'll come back to when we when we get to it when my dealt with first of all the Environment Agency. You there still wants to scared

1:55:02

I am indeed thanks gate in permanent you say

1:55:06

thank you, Mr. Scott in your intersect common ground with you You are saying the environmental statement doesn't capture mitigation for loss of water courses. Is that still a position? Have you had discussions about it? Could you bring me up to date about it please?

1:55:28

Mind stunning is that still is our position. My colleague, Kirk Markin is here to talk. Talk about talk through that topic is not okay.

1:55:38

Very good. Okay. I have one other question for you. But we'll do this one first. Post mark.

1:55:50

Good afternoon, sir cook market Environment Agency. Yeah, our position for the size will link road is that it will cross seven water courses, two of which are main rivers, the area covered by each new crossing will effectively be permanently lost the biodiversity of the area. We feel that inadequate baseline surveys have been provided for the area impacted by this road. No information has been provided on the temporary loss of water courses for the construction activities. No mitigation or compensation has been secured to offset either the temporary or permanent losses losses. We require as a minimum, no net loss of water costs from development. We have been in discussions with the applicant over appropriate mitigation for impacts to the water courses from the SLR and we await proposals from them. And we will engage with them and advise them where we can.

1:56:46

Okay, so you're in dialogue with them just hasn't been resolved yet. Yeah, that's opposition. Okay, thank you very much. And the other questions stay on the line because it may be that this one's for you or you may want to pass it back to Mr. scared. You all the agency says that you have insufficient baseline mammal or invertebrates surveys. In relation to the link road, EDF say they're conducting additional surveys in 2021. To verify that, first of all, have I understood that correctly? I'd like to know I guess this is for the applicant clear timescales for completing that. We're over halfway through 2021. My understanding is that you want to see better how the mitigation proposed is captured and secured.

1:57:43

Yep, should I or should I respond? So first year, we've looked at the baseline surveys provided they don't cover all of the watercourses. They're only for one year. And they were taken on a particularly dry year. And we don't think that it was a reflective of the ecology that could be using the area. So we'd like a greater number of surveys provided just to reinforce the conclusions that they've drawn. Our concerns with the some of the primary mitigation, it has been identified. The portal culverts have been identified as a form of primary mitigation for hydrological connectivity, but they haven't been highlighted as required as a requirement to continue to the safe passage of mammals along the water course, primarily dispersing otters. And it was for that reason we highlighted it we'd like it captured that dispersing artists will be using those watercourses. And it is a form of primary mitigation for those mammals as well. And do we see or is it a question also alleges as well? otter ledges were necessary where flood events will preclude the use of the portal Colver edges. So if that if that's the case, then there needs to be an off the ledge as well. in most circumstances, I don't think that's the case. But it was our concern was that by not capturing it as a requirement for dispersing otters. It may have folded out of the design requirements at a later stage. So just saying that it needed to be there for hydrological connectivity wasn't sufficient to safeguard mammal passage. Okay, I can go to the applicant. Oh no, let me know I need to go to Edwina Galloway, please. Hello.

1:59:36

On behalf of cell cell comm culton parish council because for some reason, our parish is referred to by the applicant as south of Oxford or as a series of small Hamlet's in Saxmundham. Our data seems to get lost in the roundings. We have actually done our own surveys on our end of the link road and we have included Did those in D two, but I'm particularly raising them because they include a number of Red List species and other endangered species, separate priority ones. So they are available and have been available to the applicant and the planning Inspectorate since June. Thank you since

2:00:22

June, I guess you're saying as yet you haven't seen a response from them?

2:00:27

That will be correct. But your colleague, Mr. Humphrey, very kindly indicated that it will be helpful last week for them to do so.

2:00:35

We speak with one voice. Thank you. Thank you, Miss Galloway. I'm grateful. Mr. Langton. Oh, I'm sorry. Are you are you on his you're in his thanks, mister. Who I got now. Right. Mr. Langton.

2:00:58

Thank you, Mr. Brock, independent ecologist. This is an area that it's very close to where I live. And I've known it for 30 years as I have the area that the link road goes to. And I can say that this is a very rich area for animals crossing. And I wholly endorse the views of the Environment Agency in terms of the oversight overlook of small animals but also large animals, a lot of deer get killed on the road here and badgers and there's a complete lack of provision for these across the the link road and the access road for that matter the major impact of sysvol see ecologically for me is this is the severance not just to the AONB, but right away across the link road and access road together, what they do is they perform a

barrier to all of these animals, many of which can cause fatal motor accidents. And the case of the the need not just for culverts and underpasses for for these animals so they can safely cross and keep motorists safe, but also the provision of fencing to do that, and the provision, the working out of the amount of habitat that is gained or lost, is missing. It is yet another huge area. And I apologise I'm not having a go inspect for it because I see the prevarication and delay caused today by the lack of information and the promises to come back later, as wasted a third of the time today. And we really should have another day for some of these big issues, protected spaces, other designated sites, huge county wildlife sites being destroyed. So I don't mean to go on. But I think there's a case here for an extra day, or at least a half day, sometime later, to cover help some of these issues that also relates the lady with for me has mentioned to the poor biodiversity, narrow cat species. So I feel as though I'm not I'm not criticising, I'm just saying I feel I'm across the spectrum. I'm just saying I feel shortchanged today on these matters. Thank you.

2:03:27

Thank you, Mr. Langton. Thank you. Now I just couldn't do it. lets you know the hand count at the moment. I've got. Mr. We saw Mr. Tate and Mr. Bedford have got their hands up. And then I want to return to Mr. Phillpotts to to wrap up. So, gentlemen, Mr. Bruce, I had his hand up first, I think.

2:03:55

Hello, everyone. One thing I noticed. Mr. Langton, could you switch off your camera, please. But there's a website. My note was like I couldn't get the camera system to work. So I believe you can see me now. I've got you. Thank you. So Roger Pearson. I'm now talking on behalf of David grant, the owner of 40 Hall farm, who has employed me to particularly Look at his part of the land along the link road. And what I've done is quite a detailed examination of the various submitted documents by the applicant and raise a number of shortcomings. One of which has just been touched on the fact there's still surveys ongoing, and the whole matter then of timeliness. If surveys are going on now. Will they ever be able to get into the process to be examined to looked at by third parties and have that interchange with the applicant and yourselves in order that there is a proper examination of those surveys which are currently ongoing. So that's that first point, consider Learning timeliness. And so Mr. Grants land is in some of those 2021 survey. So that's why it's got concerns that things found in his land may not get bought attention of yourselves, in good time had a detailed look at the information relating to bats and this flags, particularly bb astell. bat, but I won't go into detail because there was a very significantly sizable and detailed submission on behalf of the local councils regarding barbas doll bats, and there's a section specifically there on the size or link row, but I flag that you. You do want their local impact report. It's an annex to one of their local impact reports. Yes, I can I can give you the quote, If no reference numbers only one only one local variable, but yeah, yeah. Sorry. There were two. Yeah. Yeah, they were too detailed back reports, as it may be. One is the deadline to submission. I think that's why the second one is you want to look at put the written submission in late Okay. Then, breeding birds. This was a gap in the survey coverage for the whole farm was not properly covered. Because of the weights, it sat between two different survey routes that they used. And so there is a lack of information on breeding birds. And obviously one of the consequences of lack of information then is a lack of information coming forward in terms of mitigation, and want to flag particularly Skylark because if you look at the mitigation proposals that are in there, it's a lot to do with ponds, trees, hedges. None of those habitats are used by Skylark. So what you've got is a loss of Skylark habitat

under the footprint of the link road, including the Mr. Grants land and then you haven't got mitigation to supply that open habitat that skylark require. You can't make obviously more more farmland I think that's well known to most people you can't, you know, no, finite supply. Exactly, but what you can do is improve the quality of farmland for Skylark. But in the applicants proposals, there is nothing there to provide additional improved quality of habitat for for Skylark. It adjacent to the footprint of the link road, great crested newts, a number of ponds on Mr. Grant's land and having looked at what's proposed on his land in relation to what's there, what's to be lost and what's to be played replace for mitigation. few ways that it's inadequate, and if you compare it to the sort of requirements that natural England has through their district level licencing system, there is quite a clear shortfall in the number of ponds being provided on Mr. for Mr. Grants land or for the whole farm. That's great, this new issue and the Skylark issue, although I haven't looked at the rest of this the link road, but I would have a strong professional gut feeling that the same may be true elsewhere along the link road that but Skylark habitat has not been mitigated for and Greg crested newt ponds will be mitigated for but at a lower level that will be expected if this was a development that went through the district level licencing system. So I think those are the key things that I'd like to pick out for your attention and also your decision as to whether you pursue those with the applicants in terms of written questions.

2:08:45

But I guess if I can emphasise that, that wider than the Mr. Grants, land, Skylark particularly is one that seems to me that that is a significant issue that would be worth following through because it appears that the cost of the whole of the league motor maybe across all the other road events as well. Scarlets maybe missed out. So thank you very much.

2:09:06

Thank you, Mr. Pearson. Thank you. I'm just looking at the time again, and we've got Mr. Bethlehem state and I sort of want to go back to Mr. Phillipotts. I don't think I can sensibly ask Mr. Philpott Mr. Tate, though so I was to Bedford was to take to deal with their things in six minutes or less than and then give it to Mr. Phil part. So what I would like to do is to listen to Mr. bethlem state and then I'm going to suggest this to Phil pop that first thing tomorrow morning, if you would like to respond on the things which have been dealt with in relation to the sysvol link road.

2:09:53

So very, very happy to do that. Obviously quite a long list of points. So I think we probably be more efficient. Collecting our response together if we have overnight to look at it,

2:10:03

yeah. Thank you. Thank you. And yeah, I do want to get the marine marine stuff done tomorrow as well. So thank you very much. i. So, Mr. Bedford.

2:10:22

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council very briefly, in relation to the CyberLink Rodolfo, you know that the principle of that we very much welcome as a mitigation measure. For the construction works, we've got a bigger concern about whether it needs to be there on a permanent basis. And obviously, that does have a relationship to the ecological matters, which have just been

reversed, particularly the severing of ecological corridors. We've addressed that in part in what we said in the local impact report 8.3 8.126 to 8.132. And then also in our written representation, Section three, but as it were, whatever the outcome of that debate, certainly, if the SLR is to remain on a permanent basis, it just underscores the need for the OEMs to adequately address the mitigation for it. And we don't think they're there yet, with the current form of the O land. So those are our points as succinctly as I can make.

2:11:27

That's very succinct. Mr. Bethells. I am very grateful to Mr. Tate.

2:11:39

Thank you, sir. The only matter I want to mention, sir, is the question of the impact on bats of the SLR. The council considers that has to be considered in combination with the impacts from the the main development site, and at present, it doesn't in relation to that combined effect, appear to have been considered adequately. So you will know that the council has significant concerns about the assessment and the consequent impact of the proposals on bats. There was much I could add and asked Mr. Mayor to add, but I think that will trespass on the subject of protected species. So I'm just putting down a marker now that we will submit in writing our comments about that, rather than in general, including in combination, rather than draw on it now because it will crawl into the main development site. But I don't, yeah, you'd like that, particularly at this well undertaken.

2:12:52

I think the only alternative would be to if we had spare time tomorrow to do that. But I don't really think that is going to be satisfactory. The figures I've said to everybody so far. We'll I'll do that in in writing. So if you could deal with in writing as well, that I'd be most grateful. Except, thank you. Thank you very much. Indeed. I just want to make a note about something. Right.

2:13:23

Good. Mr. Philpott. Just one last thing I wanted to say to you. I got two minutes by my clock. Simply this when I closed is each one. I completely forgot that I had asked you, if you would come back to me with your answer on that. Article of the decio articles 53 and 54, which seems to be outside section 120 and shedule. Five. And I wonder if when you are on tomorrow, to wrap up the SLR points, if you would mind outlining to me what your response is on that. And then I'm sure she'll see it in writing, as well afterwards.

2:14:09

Very, very happy to I was ready to deal with it. By the end of issues. One would we run out of time, so I'm happy to fit that in tomorrow.

2:14:16

It was entirely my fault. I forgot I was mesmerised by the clock. Very good. Well, that's all in that case. I would like to thank everybody who's been here today. It's we've dealt with a lot of ground I'm sorry that my laptop decided to teams was all too much for it. Many people feel that way. From time to time, I'm

sure I'm going to adjourn the hearing now until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. And the time is now 6:29pm. So thank you very much indeed and I look forward to seeing you in the morning.