

TEXT_SizewellC_ISH7_Part2_Session3_16072021

Fri, 7/16 3:50PM • 1:24:44

00:04

Well, good afternoon again, everybody.

00:08

We resumed is h 732.

00:14

Mr. tremens? It's your right of reply on the last item. Thank you. So yes, I can be very brief. So we welcome the the comments of Mr. Thompson, we'll certainly look carefully at what some Eastern inshore fisheries puts in. And in response to the comments of Dr. Henderson about the herring spawning in the river, Blackwater, just to reassure him and you that that is in any event, part of our response to it D five, to the written representations of natural England. So you'll be hearing from us on the Blackwater hearing as part of that response. Thank you. That would be that would be good timing.

00:59

Now, I know the agenda says sample aureus being a loser next all over the misprint on my card.

01:07

Miss identifying your Latin poet.

01:10

But I think actually so as to get the maximum benefit from the MMOs presence, I am going to turn to the securing mechanisms to control impacts on water,

01:26

marine water quality, if

01:29

I'm going to

01:32

is that used to tremens or was that Mr. philipose? No, that that's that's me. Although if I get into difficulties, Mr. Phillpotts here to rescue me on the intricacies of

01:43

these arrangements.

01:46

Very good. Okay.

01:50

So let me try to clarify where I look for the mechanisms to control these impacts. Am I right, that when I look at the decio, the only marine environment matters. So see what have mean high water springs, which are controlled by the requirements are the ones listed in requirement? 12. b. So 12 b gives us the permanent beach planning 38. The temporary BLF. And

02:23

anything within sight section? 12. Sorry, yes. That's that's the only issues dealt with by 12. b.

02:36

Yes, yes. So if you if you'd like, yes. Carry on Mr. Mr. Philpott, I'm sure will tell me if I'm

02:43

okay. To

02:45

begin

02:46

with will be up as well. Although I'm in the Marine licence for a minute.

02:59

Now, beach learning is to be one.

03:02

Soft persons events feature temporary beach landing.

03:12

Yep.

03:14

And then I have to go to

03:19

Section 12 of the code of construction practice for some provisions as well. That gives me some subsidiary documents to be created for. So it doesn't give me any subsidiary documents, but just what's in sheduled 12. Section 12. Yep. Yes, you've certainly got the the construction impacts being dealt with by the code of construction practice.

03:46

That's

03:48

under DC a requirement? To Yes, under two. Yep. And then you've got section 12. Part B, of that code deals with the marine environment. And there's a table 12.1 that sets up the control measures to mitigate the potential impacts to the marine environment. Yeah, so I think that's that's the construction impacts.

04:13

Yes, thank you. Thank you.

04:21

And then in terms of the operational controls

04:27

there, as I understand it, there within the decio, there are no securing mechanisms for the operational discharges. That's to say, the cooling water discharge and the fish recovery system discharge, those those to be addressed centrally through the water discharge activity permits of the Environment Agency.

04:54

Thank you, the only other matter I should perhaps refer to it

05:00

In relation to sediments, which are covered by condition 35 of the deemed marine licence, which relates to kriging. And which does have

05:18

I think, what are some standard MMO clauses in there that would cover the discharge of sediment from that kriging process. So require

05:31

chemical analysis of the sediment and that to be demonstrated to be acceptable for the specified activity. And I think there is a condition 36

05:45

of the

05:47

deemed marine licence that deals with the production and implementation of a suitable monitoring plan for the dredging works. So, as I understand it, unless Mr. Robot wants to contradict me that that's the position regarding the securing mechanisms for marine discharges

06:10

35 or 36 of the deemed marine licence as the the Environment Agency permit as well.

06:18

So, if I may take Mr. tremens invitation, there are, of course, other conditions on the D marine licence, which would be relevant to potential impacts on water quality, more generally. So for example, in relation to pollution incidents, chemical spill, that sort of thing, the regulation of matters of that sort, are covered in various places in the licence conditions in ways that would seek to protect water quality from those matters. But that's separate, I think, in conception, regulatory terms and the points that Mr. tremens has just been addressing. Okay, let me get make sure I got I'm looking at the right stuff. So I, I've got condition 10,

07:08

which says no licenced activity or phase will be commenced until a detailed programme works. So that's a construction point. In fact, we're under a heading called construction, I think got 11 detailed methods statement.

07:24

What's that for is that that's construction must be.

07:30

So

07:31

if it helps, if it helps, so in general terms, the conditions are broken up into some general conditions, which apply generally. So one looks for example, a condition nine, which has to do with oil field or chemical spills within the marine environment, you then have a series of pre construction conditions such as the ones you were just referring to. And then in Part Four, you have conditions which apply during construction, operation and maintenance. So they seem to be

08:08

divided in that temporal way.

08:14

Okay, and as I've said, some of them are are relevant to

08:20

activities and incidents, which might give rise to water quality issues, but that's a that's a sort of fairly typical content of a licence as I understand it, as opposed to the discharge activity, which is a separate matter is okay, it's slightly slightly confusing, because Part Three is the one's headed conditions. And then part four talks about during construction operation and maintenance, but that's a set of conditions as well isn't it really, that's as I wanted to do it, they do appear to be drafted in a way that makes them look like conditions and they carry on, I think in terms of the numbering, yes, which precede them but I think I'll be corrected if I'm wrong by the

09:04

by those who know more about these things, but my understanding is that they are a continuation of the run of conditions. Okay. I guess I guess that it's in the standard format, or not the traditional format, okay.

09:20

So just let me just go run through the the constructions arts as well. Which,

09:26

what concerning me 11 is detailed method statement 12. Five days notice to the MMA before you get on with we start work 17 then we get onto submitting plans coastal process monitoring mitigation plan, but if I look at here on 17 there's nothing to stop work commencing before approval. But if I go to requirements seven a that prohibits work on the

10:00

CDF or the H CDF before approval?

10:05

Yeah, so one thing I just want to check, I wasn't expecting to address this. But whether those which are identified as pre construction was a matter of General constructional, whether there's any provision for it are intends to apply at that stage, but I just wanted to check that.

10:29

But in any event, as you've indicated, when one looks back to

10:34

requirement, seven, a, it makes it pretty clear that the features that are identified in seven a that's a soft cursor defence feature and the hard coded events feature

10:48

can't commence until that plan is in place. I think that's right. I mean, just something just keep an eye on making sure those two mesh together, that's obviously important, indeed, is as you'll have picked up, so that that's an issue which is of live interest to ourselves, ESC, and the MMO. So I make sure that swept up in that consideration. So is that the one which which then brings in the the four days?

11:19

No, it's not as though that that is the that is the condition, which requires the

11:28

trying to find which one it is, but it's the maintenance activities, but it's 3434 on page 182 of the track change version, which is rep two Oh, 15. That is the maintenance activities. Plan. And that's the one that I addressed you on earlier this week.

11:52

Yeah, yeah.

11:55

So I've also just had confirmation from Mr. Rose, who I think is you've gathered is intimately involved in this part three and four are also conditions by understanding that was correct. Okay.

12:12

Got that. And one of the things that included when we get to condition 45 is a sample Lauria modelling plan as well. I just note that

12:23

it knows and that's not 14.9 here.

12:27

No, it's not that condition. Condition. 45. On page 185. Work number two Be sure not commence into the sub area monitoring plan is that that was the one that Yeah. And to be as one of the

12:42

full heads, we don't need to worry about it for the other one, because we're in a sample area in that area.

12:52

Right. That's the question.

12:56

I think I think that's probably something that Mr. Roast might be able to help with.

13:03

Because he I know is familiar with these matters. And I think he's just come on.

13:09

Yes, I can speak to that. Good afternoon ago, Stephen rose on behalf of the applicant. You're absolutely right. It's it's the intakes for unit one, which is the most southerly unit where the stubborn area is has been found at the location of the intake is that there's no seven area at the northern intake. Okay, thank you very much. Thank you. Perhaps Mr. Phil portlight come back.

13:34

Yes, thank you

13:39

write case during that case now to the coder construction practice

13:44

and table 12.1

13:48

What the heck is that?

13:53

You're not using paper copies.

13:58

So no, I am using a small device but I should say if we're going into the detail of the code of construction practice and I am likely to have to call on others to assist me because that is that goes beyond my detail knowledge I'm I tend to be dealing with it at the decio level rather than into the details of the code construction practice. But it may be that on the marine elements of it, Mr. Roast is able to assist if not we'll find someone who can will stay excellent it might be of interest to you. If I can get myself on to the right page of it. Just bear with me for a moment.

14:44

Right.

14:48

Say please get to table 12.1 of the keys of construction practice and

14:58

stories Would you be able to give me the

15:00

Document reference because I hadn't anticipated that I'd be October so it's, it's Rep. I'm looking at the rep 2057 is the one with track changes.

15:14

This is annoying, because I thought I had

15:17

I have it now. So thank you might it's disappears my coffee.

15:36

Yeah.

15:43

Got not got the right.

15:48

I've not got the right provision here.

15:52

I think I'm going to put this to in

15:56

a written question later. Otherwise, we'll be hanging around for too long. that that would be a mercy on my part. Because I would also have to familiarise myself with it on the spot. So it may be you'll get a better answer. Yeah. If you put it in writing, okay.

16:14

It's really, it's really a question. If you just identify the point, where the point is that you've got provisions in there which talk for example, about bond height, where you say, avoid altering the five metre bond wherever possible. And you have another one a bit further down, which says, heavy plant movements on the active beach face will be minimised. Now you and I had a conversation yesterday about the use of the word minimise, in

16:45

the context of

16:48

triple their size.

16:51

And

16:53

you have to have a compareur. If you're going to minimise something, and I, I'm wondering where these phrases actually actually get to you, or get the get the regulatory authorities and everything is possible, ultimately, is a question of what you balance it against. So I would, I'm going to ask you, you can think about the reply and and deal with that. Please.

17:20

estimate, say you're breaking up, I understood the message to be you wish us to think about that use of language in that section. And that will be reflected in a written question in due course, but in the meantime, we will give thought to that so that we're ready to answer it. Relatively swiftly. Thank you. Yeah, I'm giving you a heads up. Yeah, absolutely. Indeed, I'm grateful for it. So

17:44

I'm sorry, if the sound is breaking out.

17:47

Keep me posted. If you can't hear what I'm saying.

17:51

I will so far hasn't been problematic, but it is it is certainly happening. Okay, thank you. And then further down that that list in 12.1, you've got provisions which say this is in relation to dredging, dredging worked for the emplacement of heads at the fish recovery and return, the CDO and cooling water should be limited to as small area as practically achievable. And within the worst case assessment of the EAS. And it comes back a bit to what we're talking about in stage one. You've you've got you've got there.

18:27

Something which brings you within the envelope really, and that seems to be to be sensible.

18:32

But I would have thought it strange just to pull that phrase out in relation to the dredging works. And I wonder why it isn't a general application across the whole document?

18:43

Well, so I'd have to obviously ask those who drafted in relation to why it's used there in that particular context. But the code of construction practice serves a wider purpose in this context, because of course, it is not just

19:02

a way of securing construction controls, but there's also instructions, ultimately, to the contractors, so that they know when they're in that particular area. Clearly, they can't go beyond the parameters set by the decio on which the assessment is based. But also they understand that this is a particularly sensitive

19:23

operation and they need to

19:27

follow that particular part of the cable construction practice in order to make sure that the the risk of any impact going beyond that which is assessed is is reduced and kept to a minimum. I mean, that's so that the code of construction practice one needs to understand

19:48

in terms of how it's used, and therefore also how it relates to any other restraints such as parameter plans and matters of that sort. But because I'm not familiar

20:00

With the detail of that provision and what lies behind it, I'm wary of going further.

20:05

That's fine. I just wanted to give you a reason I can't show you the same passage doesn't really matter but but for, for now, I will direct you to it in the examinee in the in the next set of questions. But but you got a heads up on what that is, there's about I have to say that you've touched on something which is

helpful and, and important, but it's also I'm finding a bit puzzling but which is the role of this code of construction practice on the one hand, it's it's a regulatory documents, and it sets out some, some regulatory standards. And on the other, it's a contractual document or it's something is something which is telling me what you're doing contractually.

20:46

And it's giving instructions to your to your, to your contractors, and

20:54

I suppose unconfident to see that the the instructions which which, which you're giving, on the other hand, making sure that the

21:05

the regulatory requirements are met, is up to the undertaker to discharge him, whether he takes it onto himself or discharges sends it off to a contractor is wouldn't normally be a control for a concern for the regulatory authority or for the granting of the permit. Tell me if I'm wrong? Well, so that the way that it works is that the code of construction practices secured by requirement? And ultimately, the person responsible for any breach of the requirement is the undertaker. So the fact that it is that there are various means, as we touched on in an earlier hearing, by which the undertaker seeks to ensure that the contractors stay within the terms of the construction practice. That's not a weakness. It's simply how the undertaker seeks to make sure that it doesn't find itself in breach. The benefit of the approach that is, has been taken, as Mr. Sharp explained, is that by crafting the construction practice in the way that it is, it's intended that it is clear and simple for the contractors, but that also has the benefit. So far as a requirement is concerned, of making it more readily enforceable because it becomes apparent whether or not you've breached it. Now there are some areas of it, no doubt, where people wish to suggest drafting changes. That's a normal part of this process, just as it is for requirements. But that that's the thinking behind it. And conceptually, there is no difficulty, I would suggest, with that approach. There's certainly an enforceable approach. It's a standard approach that there is a code of construction practice or somebody something similarly, so described, which is secured by requirement on the face of the order. And that that is where you would find the detailed controls. Inevitably, therefore, that is something which is then passed on through contractual relations to the people who actually be undertaking the work. But that's not a difficulty. It's not been a difficulty and other orders. And it's not a difficulty in principle here.

23:21

But you're saying to me that the site specific management plan, for example, is not intended to be something which is enforceable by local authority. It's simply that mine my understanding, and and just harking back to the discussion that we had about this previously, is that the means that are used by the undertaker, to seek to ensure that the code of construction practice is adhered to, is an internal matter. And one wouldn't expect the local planning authority to have to approve every element of the means by which the undertaker seeks to ensure it stays within the scope of the various requirements, whether it's catered construction practice, or something else. The key thing is stay within the scope of the requirement however you achieve it.

24:09

The local I'm interested in what is

24:13

I take the scope of the requirements as I see it in in requirements to says, comply generally at the moment with the with the csep and I read the csep. I see some documents which I'm told yes are intended to be enforceable by the local authority and others which are which are not under

24:34

Yes, we took away that point from the first issue specific hearing to make sure that there is clarity as to whether there are any elements of it which which were there may be ambiguity as to whether or not it is intended to be enforceable or whether it's simply identifying how the undertaker will achieve something. We will look at that. But but that that is essentially a matter of rigour in the drafting review process.

25:00

Which were, obviously we're all engaged in through this process. And we're very happy to, to listen to suggestions on any, any of those sorts of issues is not a conceptual problem.

25:12

Okay, thank you. I look forward to see what comes forward next week. Thank you.

25:17

So,

25:19

and then, let me just now turn in that case to the deed of obligation.

25:24

And he, um, you may be able to get this without without turning it all up. When you get a sheduled live natural environment, it creates something called the marine technical forum.

25:37

Which sounds to me that important for marine ecology. The Marine technical forum is to operate in accordance with the marine technical forum terms of reference. But they're not there in the document yet.

25:51

So I'm not quite sure what it's doing. And

25:54

when are we going to get I mean, there's an awful lot of annexes in the back of there, which

26:00

which are listed but not available yet.

26:04

I'm conscious that we are currently awaiting or so we as in the examination is currently awaiting those terms of reference are I don't know whether anyone is able to inform me as to whether or not those are coming in in the next version. But perhaps, if I seek instructions on that, I can let you know, before we close

26:34

this hearing that my but one more thing I would say by way of comfort on that is of course the marine technical forum is up and running and has been for some time. So I don't think there's a difficulty with the terms of reference. I think I just need to check that you're getting them in the next version. Yes.

26:54

In fact, I'm told they were agreed in 2015. So

26:59

you're finding them? Yeah. But I mean, you've got the general point, which is it's quite, it's quite difficult for us to finish off

27:08

a set of comments about about that, that document. Well, it's got quite a lot of stuff, which is yet yet to come through. So yes, understood. Yeah. Okay.

27:21

I'm going to turn to the marine management organisation. Now in that case, Mr. Philip, thank you very much for your help so far.

27:32

Hello, Miss Williams. And thank you very much. So I want to understand your position on the current draft of the deemed marine licence. I've got the fact that you don't like the appeal mechanisms.

27:48

The applicant says that the revisions, which it's made in the latest version are in response to discussions it's it's had with you. So let me ask the bowl and an optimistic question. Are you content with DML? As we now see it

28:04

whether Williamson here for the marine management organisation, unfortunately, we're not quite there yet. But we are engaging with the applicant on this. There are just a few outstanding matters on the wording of some conditions that are extra two, as you say, the ones that relate to the appeals that we're currently Well, we've already discussed with yourselves earlier hearing. But these will be contained in our newest version seven, the common ground, which we're aiming to submit at deadline six. Again, thank you.

28:37

There are monitoring plans and things which you're asking for. And obviously you've asked for more for more studies, which

28:46

should help in

28:48

getting to closure on those things.

28:57

Yup, I guessing that's why I need to ask you, are you content that you know what is going to be what each of these

29:07

types like there are a number of plans which have to be produced under the Dean's marine licence? Are you content that the conditions specify enough so that you know what the content is supposed to be of those plans? I only asked that because I have seen a comment somewhere in my preparation for today. Asking that very question.

29:30

Yeah, I think there was only a couple that we have extra comments on I know that the applicant has as they've stated to you updated them in accordance with some of our comments. And we are currently just reviewing those amendments to ensure that we're, we are satisfied with the way they have been worded, but we will pop that in our written representation to you.

29:50

Thank you. And if it's agreed you can stick it in the state of common ground. Yes, of course. Thank you very much.

29:57

Does there anything you want to say about securing

30:00

mitigation for marine ecology.

30:03

So just just to note, because obviously the agenda point was water quality, obviously we do differ widely. Okay. Yeah, that's fine. Just want to clarify the scope of the question, I suppose because there are lots of as the applicant rightly said, water quality sort of influences throughout the DML conditions with pollution controls, etc. And they are standard conditions that we're content with. Obviously, in the specifics of water quality, we do defer to the Environment Agency. But to answer your question,

30:36

we are

30:38

there are ongoing issues with the DML conditions, we have got some advice for the applicant that are still outlying in terms of the way that we would like them to be worded and organised. I think yourself, you referenced the difficulty with the pre construction construction operation, we have made some recommendations on how they can be better separated. And that obviously does apply to the marine.

31:01

The monitoring conditions as well, we hope to see some pre agreed monitoring plans put in so that they can be at least the scope determined during the examination before so we would expect to see

31:16

sort of an idea in during the examination, what's agreed and was approved by yourselves or I guess, obviously, the Secretary state, but it would outline ultimately what we would expect to see. So there is less onus on what they provide after the examination is over. So we'd hope to see some sort of pre plans.

31:33

Pre implementation plans, I believe the correct wording is from top of my mind, but that would hopefully outline what we'd expect to see. And at least then they'd be held accountable to what we discussed in the examination with ourselves.

31:44

Okay, thanks very much. That's, that's very helpful.

31:49

I'm going to turn that case next to the Environment Agency.

31:56

Thank you. So scared. So your your views on securing mitigation and water quality via the DCA documentation.

32:06

So we have no no comments to make on on the water quality side, only the fish monitoring plan condition that we talked about before before the break.

32:25

So you want to see a condition saying you will have a fish monitoring plan.

32:31

That there is a provision in

32:35

DML condition 50.

32:39

Our concern is we think

32:42

there's uncertainty whether that can be achieved. And if negative impacts are detected, we're uncertain what mitigation can be, can be provided without

32:56

without for that

32:59

suddenly,

33:02

this system itself could be optimised to to counter those potentially negative impacts. And potentially the compensation may need to be in the form of off site compensation.

33:18

Just Just hang on a bit, I would have a quick look at 50.

33:36

What is 50? monitoring?

33:41

That's that's part of our uncertainty in terms of what what monitoring is proposed, what's achievable?

33:49

And then what happens if, if something goes wrong?

33:53

What is it monitoring the amount of water the temperature of the water, what's in the water? All of the above?

34:03

I believe it's in terms of terms of fish. So it would be the impacts to fish rather than other aspects, perhaps the applicant may be able to give some clarity. So 51 A identifies the monitoring reasons for for assessing the efficacy intake head and the fish recovery and return system. So it's it's quite tightly focused thinking.

34:30

Yeah, 51 A is commissioning a 51 B is operation, but it's the efficacy of the

34:40

intake head and fish recovery.

34:43

Oh, Mr. Phil, what what do you do with the data once you got it then?

34:49

At this point in time when we move over into the substance of impacts on in fish and what we do with the data, I pass back to Mr. James I was simply helping hopefully

35:00

On this specific question that was about the wedding. Okay, that's over to trogons. In that case, what do you do with it?

35:09

Thank you. So I'm grateful to Mr. Philpott for his help previously, I'm going to pass it over to Dr. rose to actually

35:17

come online and just help us with with those points.

35:22

Are you the end of the line is Dr. Rose?

35:25

You know what, maybe not quite, but I'll go first. If I may say, yeah, Steven roast on behalf of the applicant, I will pass it to Dr. Mark records at sea bass as they lead on the on the impingement monitoring. But should just as a very quick heads up essentially, there is there is monitoring of the fish that come through the cooling water system. And it's called an impingement comprehensive inventory impingement monitoring programme. So it monitors are Dr. breakers can get the details if you so require, but it looks at basically the number types and size of fish coming through the system over over specific tidal cycles.

36:06

Those are then compared with the with the predictions from the assessments that we're making add them back compared to the baseline. But if I may, if you want that further detail, can I pass across to Dr. brockholes? Yeah, that's fine.

36:20

Thank you, sir.

36:23

Good afternoon. Can you hear me? Okay. I can hear you. Well, yes, I think so. As Dr. Rowe said, Thanks for the introduction. My practice from from CFS we undertake the impingement monitoring

currently at Sizewell B. And we would be we'd be able to provide a plan for the monitoring at Sizewell C. So as Dr. Ray said, it's the basis of the monitoring is the

36:51

impingement monitoring programme. And it's informed by the scientific advisory report. There's a specific report particularly dedicated to the methods of how impingement should be done at nuclear power stations. And that's that's informed by the by the beams, expert panel. So independent panel working on the best methods available for inpatient monitoring.

37:19

Is that report, one of the

37:23

application documents which we got in the examination,

37:27

I also asked you if it is I'm not particularly wanting to see more, but if it's there already, I'd like to know where it is.

37:34

I'm not sure that it is part of the submitted documents, but it isn't available document. Maybe I could take advice on that and let you know. So if it's I want to know if it is one of the documents? And if so, what it's what its number is so that I can find it.

37:51

That's helpful.

37:55

So my question really, Dr. Brittle was, what do you what do you do with the with the data? What is it when it tells you something What happens next?

38:07

Whether the intelligent monitoring is Sizewell See, would be able to inform whether the impingement predictions that we made the DCF are, in fact correct. And within the bounds of our estimates, from from there than those there's a question.

38:26

In regards to Mr. Scared was just talking about about the the options. Beyond that, in terms of in terms of mitigation? And I think, I think there have already been discussions with the with the agency for for potential potential mitigations I don't know whether Dr. Rose can talk more to more to those discussions that are that are ongoing.

38:52

I think if the discussions are ongoing angle anger to let them go on

38:58

subject and not taking too long really.

39:02

And our wait to see what they what they come out with but I do want to know at some stage what is done with the monitoring data.

39:15

Very good. Mr. Scan. I was with you where I was with you to start off as homeless.

39:27

Sorry, sir. I'm back if he did, yes, that's fine.

39:34

So simply asking for your your views about about securing mitigation and you told me raise it. You're what you want to a fish monitoring plan. We've been talking about that through condition 50.

39:47

Indeed, yeah, it's it's monitored monitoring and I suppose asking that so what question if if monitoring shows adverse impacts what happens next I suppose. Yeah. Okay. As your as your and my

40:00

Question both. Thank you on that.

40:04

Can I turn to element kenzi? Now, please?

40:10

Yes, I just wanted to add on from what louella was saying. And just to clarify the changes that we require in the DML in relation to other conditions to secure marine ecology, mitigation. Good.

40:27

Just finished my note of Dr. rekkles. Right. Yeah.

40:55

Okay, I'm with you, Mr. Tanzi. Yeah, so you've you've touched on it there really, when you were talking about

41:03

the condition 50 about fish monitoring, and you were kind of unsure what was going to be monitored there, we would

41:10

like to have some more discussions with the applicant on the wording of that condition, just to make sure that we are asking for we are stating in the condition exactly what we want to be monitored and the fact that mitigation may be required, if Yeah, the impacts are, do exceed those that have been assessed. And we would like to see it in in principal impingement monitoring plan in the examination that does outline, you know, the mitigation options. And if and the feasibility of those options, like Cameron said, if there were adverse effects.

41:49

And then the same goes for sub malaria monitoring. So this is in relation to condition.

42:02

Condition 45, about the sub malaria monitoring plan.

42:08

On just finish with what you said about conditional 50.

42:34

Yep, sample area. Yeah. And so at the moment, the condition says that the applicant will provide a sub area monitoring plan and that allow outline the extent of the monitoring, the frequency of the monitoring, and the methods of the monitoring, and it will demonstrate how the design reduces the loss of reef as far as practicable. But we would also like that monitoring plan to outline the mitigation options. And so if they can't avoid impacts to sub laryea, how are they going to mitigate for those impacts.

43:11

And the sub malaria monitoring and mitigation plan should should be submitted to the examination as well. And so that that kind of outline, monitoring and mitigation is agreed and we would look to natural England advice and ecological advice on the appropriate mitigation that should be used.

43:34

Right to remind it, so which is the solarium condition 4545.

43:47

Before

43:49

so we'd be looking to add some wording in there that said that the plan outlines mitigation options,

43:57

and possibly some wording that said that this plan will be agreed, approved by the MMO in consultation with the statutory nature conservation body.

44:09

Something like that. Got it. It's got a reference to consultation within it was natural in an already. Right. Okay. Oh, yeah. Sorry.

44:18

We find one.

44:22

Right. Thank you. That was very helpful. Yeah, I guess the issue is just around the mitigation at the moment. We're not sure what mitigation will be in place if they can't avoid impacts to the saddle area. Yeah. Yeah. All right. Thank you.

44:40

Is there anybody else who wishes to raise issues about

44:46

the mechanisms for delivering

44:51

for securing water quality and actually wider ecological issues

44:59

next

45:00

Yes. Hello, Mr. Wilson, we haven't heard from you for a bit.

45:06

However, this VA couldn't miss out on the final day. And just a quick question, we're talking about monitoring impingement, whereas Mr. Henderson said earlier,

45:17

there's a great loss of fish through in treatment, just wondered what conditions are in place to monitor those fish that are in treatment.

45:28

Okay, now let me let Mr. Truman's answer. answer that one. Thank you very much. Thank you.

45:35

And Mr. Wilkinson's got his hand up as well.

45:40

Thank you, Mr. Brock. Thank you, Mr. Brock. We I'd like to go back to Dr. Breck calls from CFS. He says that the

45:50

reality and the estimate between the impingement figures would be checked by monitoring.

45:59

I don't quite understand where that estimate is

46:03

available for us, because our estimate that we prepared from size will be figures which we put into the public domain, some months ago was criticised by Sue first we said that there were about 20 million fish impinge. And that's obviously the thin end of the wedge because there are lots of pigments that we don't understand that don't know about this much more of fish, etc. But 20 million a year that was considered by sea fast to be a considerable overestimation. And yet we heard from Dr. Anderson this morning, that the CFS figures or the criticism of our figures

46:41

are impossible really to give any credence to because the level of impingement is really unknown, and that any figures that we come up with are likely to be a massive underestimation. So there is clearly a great deal of discrepancy about what the impingement figures are. And I just wondered where we could find the CFS estimations for impingement. Okay, that's something else I'll ask the applicant to deal with. Thank you very much.

47:14

Thank you, before I return them to Mr. Truman's, it's nothing else, the only other people who want to raise points. No. Mr. trogons. I think we're almost at the end now of mitigate of

47:29

questions on the mechanism for securing and controlling this stuff.

47:34

Yes, thank you, sir.

47:36

I can hardly hear you, Germans. Sorry.

47:41

Sorry. my microphone not slightly displaced. I'll turn to Dr. brackets to pick up on those points. I think he can deal with the sub malaria monitoring, there is a monitoring plan, do a deadline seven, but he can give you some idea on progress on that. And I think he can probably also pick up the the points made by Mr. Wilson and Mr. Wilke Wilkinson, on the CPS estimates and on the entrainment. So, if I could pass it over to Dr. brockholes, please.

48:14

Yep, thank you.

48:17

Yes, hello, again, my brockless from C fast. So I've just picking up on the on the subtle area point first. As Mr. chairman said, The intention is to provide the high level monitoring plan as requested by the LMA for deadlines seven.

48:33

And also the the enhancement options. This is the intention is prior to deadline seven to try and consult with natural England so that we have that available and that consultation. We don't have the dingdong as you as you put it earlier, sir. So that is a term for it, then please let me know.

48:52

Yeah, so hopefully, hopefully that satisfies that question. In terms of the question about impingement. I don't think there is uncertainty. So in our impingement predictions, they are clearly laid out through the through the documentation that we've provided throughout the decio process. But most recent impingement predictions are in wrapped to tensor. And that's appendix seven out. And within that document, for full transparency, we have provided estimated most concurrent estimates in relation to what was originally provided in the decio. We've also provided it in a stepwise manner been litigated and then with each subsequent level of mitigation until you have for mitigation, so each step of the process can be can be determined and said that's rep 210 and appendix seven L. Seven L. Now, picking up on the on the final point that came in in relation to the in training uncertainty. And Dr. Henderson picked up on this earlier he is quite right that the number of fish that are either impinged or

50:00

trained very much depends on on the length of those fish and the relative width is something known as the fineness ratio. And that determines whether or not they pass through the drum screens and are if they're impinged on the drum screens they would then go down the route and be discharged by the FRR. If they pass directly through then they can they are in trained and remote through what's the what is the gauge of the the size of the holes on the drum screens and drum screens are a 10 by 10 millimetre mesh, okay. Okay, so it's the very smallest proportion of the fish that that are

50:38

in trend.

50:41

Now obviously, as Jensen said, long thin fish are able to pass through and I can probably pick up on roulette pad in relation to his river lamprey comment in in written reps and less and less you'd like me to touch on that so otherwise I'll I can talk about the

50:59

for in front I was gonna do

51:02

when they tell me about his river lamprey point please. Okay. So Dr. Henderson said the river lamprey based on the finest ratio would would be impinged at 20 millimetres. We do have.

51:17

We do have the the actual length distribution of the liver, excuse me, river lamprey that are caught. And that is in one of the technical appendices.

51:29

I can just hoping you're telling me rather than sending me to the technical vendors, Appendix they, yes, yes. I mean, almost all most of the liver river lamprey that we catch are above 13 centimetres, 113 130 millimetres, and that's somewhat consistent is what you would expect. Because river lumber is smaller than that still in the freshwater environment. They haven't metamorphosed and been released into the sea. Now, it's true do catch a few smaller than that they are impinged.

52:01

And they're probably most likely flush out from the river. But again, we can provide much more detailed responses to Mr. Dr. Anderson's detailed comments in just just forgive my unfamiliarity with the size, length and width of fish 113 millimetres is that the length or the width 130 millimetres is the length. The length good. Okay, thank you.

52:30

Yes.

52:32

The other the other point was that juvenile fish aren't aren't detected in the entrainment sampling point raised by by Dr. Henderson earlier, but I think if we can, we can look at the impingement reports, particularly for species like Eric Sprott, which have been key to today's discussions, you can see that the entrainment sampling picks up a lot of those fish. So I don't think that this big gap between the entrainment fraction and the impingement fraction is really that valid, sir. And the other point that I make is, based on what we do know about the impingement fraction? It's not

53:15

it's not beyond the capability to back propagate and see what portion are are missing.

53:23

If any, right.

53:26

I'm glad you've raised that. And you've you've you've addressed it, I wouldn't be helped if you were to

53:34

deal with that. In your written submissions, which comes which come through?

53:42

Yeah.

53:45

Very good. Okay. Thank you.

53:48

You could do that. But that's okay. There are lots of technical points there. But we will we will respond to Dr. Anderson is Elsa. Indeed, indeed. Thank you very much. Records.

54:01

And Dr. Henderson, I see your hand is up. You have had a go already.

54:08

But to just I think I may just to say that response. I mean, their response with a mind saying whether 130 millimetre lamp Ray would fit through a 10 by 10 millimetre mesh. Okay, thank you. We'll ask them to do that in their in their written document when it comes through.

54:29

Right, just let me check my notes.

54:37

Very good. Mr. tremens. I don't have any other points which I want to raise at this stage about securing these methods about security mechanisms. Thank you for that. Thank you. So

54:54

I just I complete what you want to say from what Dr. Brown said. Yes, I think that's been helpful discussion. We'll take those

55:00

points away and will respond. Very good. Thank you very much indeed. In that case, I think we can now turn, I'm going, I'm going to write to I've got some questions about salary, and I'm going to put those in writing to you.

55:15

I think we can now turn to Mr. Collins, and to sections 48 and 41 of the natural environment and rural communities act.

55:31

Mr. Collins, let me try to get my copy of Section 4041 up on the screen. Yeah, I got it now. I'm not sure you're going to need that in that way. But anyway, we can see where you want to go with this. Just let me just

55:50

make about it. Yes, hold on a second. I just need to make this document slightly larger so I can actually read it since participant is now exiting.

56:07

Okay.

56:09

Yeah, so

56:12

thank you, Paul Collins from minsmere level stakeholder group and stop sighs I'll see.

56:18

Nice bridge parish Council and myself.

56:22

Whilst the Secretary of State will eventually have to take note of the impacts on biodiversity, with a view to increasing the bio biodiversity through the natural through the various acts 2006 and the Planning Act in 2008. We also know that as the government's recognition of importance and biodiversity increase, that further requirements were liable to come forward in the environment bill, which should come in force later this year. But for the present, I'm specifically concerned by the statements from the applicant that they've calculated there are approximately 19% increase in biodiversity will be achieved as a result of this project plan. That is somewhat oversimplified view of what will actually happen on the site, both for the period during development of the power station and then the inevitable time it will take to realise the biodiversity increased for a variety of reasons, such as it taking years to decades to reestablish mature areas of woodland, lowland Heath acid, grassland, et cetera. Recently, Adam rowland's are the RSPB referred to a proposed development near Colchester where he indicated that from RSPB his experience in establishing grassland as in grassland habitat, it's an intensive and lengthy process that can easily take a decade to be successful. I don't think I need to talk about how long trees and functional woodland habitats take to establish from saplings or even five to 10 year old trees, such as implanted already on the ADF state, close to the sluice path in the minsmere Valley. We're also aware that some of the planting has been established at pillbox field as mitigation for the size will be read facilities, facilities relocation have are already failed and will require additional mitigation planting to that at that site. That sort of sets the context into which the application applicants calculations of biodiversity increase should be assessed. The applicants evaluation of the main site with its offside areas are evaluated at baseline and post intervention to calculate the biodiversity net gain. There are issues with ETFs inclusion of some compensation sites within the post intervention calculation as well as existing issues of lack of habitat maintenance to produce good results, which have been pointed out by Suffolk County Friends of the Earth in their written representations, rep 2445455 and 456. And the pillbox field situation that I referred to earlier.

59:05

In many other development situations by diversity net gain analysis will be applied to interventions that are made to the land with little or no other activity. Once on the land once the starting state has been determined, and the enhancement or intervention is started to drive forward the biodiversity net gain. This is not the case at sizewell C. For sizewell See, what these simple calculations and claims fail to achieve is to recognise the time element of these changes and cumulative loss of biodiversity at the site over the period of the development. The sidewalk construction project collapse for approximately 12

years, and removal of the various areas and habitats, existing uses and the biodiversity contributions of those areas has a significant negative impact over the timeframe of the development which needs to be recognised and

1:00:00

assessed, while some of the off site habitats are already in place, but have disputed value, when it comes to the main site on day one of the first day, your first year of the development, the main site will start to be cleared and fairly rapidly its contribution to biodiversity units. The measure that is being used in these assessments ceases, this area will provide no biodiversity contribution for a minimum of 12 years. And then as I discussed earlier, it will take significant length of time to establish the post intervention landscape and habitats on this site.

1:00:37

So we should look at the impact on biodiversity at this development over time, as there is undisputed damage to the environment by the construction site works. In many ways, the analysis which follows is analogous to the lifecycle assessment for carbon dioxide that is still disputed in its own right.

1:00:56

In terms of those biodiversity units, which are the current versus biodiversity net gain calculations, the on site loss over 12 years, is 1,244.4, or five times 12 or 14,933. Biodiversity units, if you like. The offside areas already established,

1:01:19

are already established. And whilst I agree with Suffolk coast Friends of the Earth that they are not in good condition and less are certainly not contributing as many units as claimed in the calculations. I have accepted for the purposes of this discussion today that I will use EDF figures, even though they are liable to be over estimates given the condition that the areas so over the same 12 year period, they will produce a positive contribution of 6603 biodiversity units as a result of their existing improved post intervention score over the baseline. So if we subtract the main site 12 year loss, we are still left with a deficit of 8330 biodiversity units, but 12 years, the post intervention condition of the main side is worse than its baseline. By 326 biodiversity is, as a result, the annual positive contribution of the offside areas that we've just discussed that 550 units is reduced to 224 units for years 13 and beyond.

1:02:30

Those 244 biodiversity units now have to also pay back the 12 year deficit of 8330 biodiversity units. If we divide 8330 by 224. The payback comes out at 37.2 years over halfway through the operational lifetime and the generating station.

1:02:54

According to EDF net gain, for just this portion of the construction area is 18.03%. Can't see where that comes from. It's clearly ridiculous and completely ignores the damage of 12 years of construction to the biodiversity of this area.

1:03:12

I have referred to the issues of inclusion of reptile mitigation areas within the post intervention schools for the off site areas already. So that will necessarily further reduce the compensation the off site areas to the main site and extend the payback period. There are other issues that cannot be accounted for in these calculations. And perhaps the main one is that triple si sites and other designations are excluded from the calculations now, as it is recognised that their special characteristics cannot be accommodated within the current framework. So all the losses in the triple si area for example, Fenn Meadow wet woodland reedbed cannot be accounted for as losses in the above calculation, EDF have risen as a result excluding the old first farm reedbed from the off site calculation. Although other landscapes there are included. It is widely accepted that the urban setting of the reedbed cannot really replicate and compensate fully for the remote reedbed within the size Walmart triple si. So that is a further reduction.

1:04:19

EDF of assess the two villages bypass the size will link road and the Oxford roundabout, with surprising results from the software for the size while link road with a 45.6% positive contribution compared to the other team giving negative results. No assessments have been made for the two parking rides sites, or the freight management facility, which are all sites where arable land will be converted to car park and mainly hard surface once again removing the majority of biodiversity units over for the period of their existence before being returned to original use and thus no net gain at best. Once again further deepening the negative impact of land

1:05:00

In the anti payback period,

1:05:02

On a final note of reflection of a well used, but perhaps not fully appreciated phrase by many people, including myself, I think what the above represents is that this project is an unmitigated or an unmitigated disaster, whether you look at the environment, the ecological or the biodiversity aspects of its impacts. Thank you.

1:05:27

Thank you, Mr. Collins. Thank you,

1:05:32

Mr. Phil Parker and Mr. trogons. I'm not going to come back to you just yet, because I've got three Hands up.

1:05:39

But I think we are close to closing now. Mr. Langton. And Miss Sutherland and Scott are the three people who got their hands up. I'll take you in that order, please. Mr. lankton.

1:05:57

Good afternoon, sir.

1:06:00

Tom Langton independent ecologist and local resident.

1:06:05

Yes, I echo

1:06:07

pretty much all of what Mr. Collins says.

1:06:12

And I think it's one of the things that has been very clear is ETFs advertisement of the of the biodiversity net gain achievement of their scheme. So I think it's fair to say that

1:06:26

it's front and centre. And therefore there does need to be a degree of transparency.

1:06:33

Biodiversity net gain is one way of assisting public bodies with measuring compliance with the biodiversity duty.

1:06:43

metric three, the different metric three has actually just been published. So there's a extremely good way ADF can check its calculations through that, and gives them a splendid opportunity to celebrate the transparency and avoid the kind of problems for example, that happened at middlewich with the Ministry of Defence ranges,

1:07:06

where they were called out later on for the numbers not adding up.

1:07:12

So

1:07:13

I think that's,

1:07:16

that's extremely important and overlooked,

1:07:20

area that is frustrated, to degree, just about everything surrounding this project. And so we do really need to see full disclosure in order to examine it and to help you examine it properly.

1:07:35

The bottom is to duty of narcotics dens, also to a wide range of species that have been scoped out of the

1:07:42

the road as it moves from the link road through to signs off the site.

1:07:50

Again, I'm greatly concerned that the design manual for roads and bridges in relation to biodiversity has not been followed with respect to good practice. I think we're looking at a very bare application here the kind of project, obviously, the link road, the county is not happy with the biodiversity things at present. Again, we're looking towards

1:08:15

only being able to really properly comment later on whenever that will be. So

1:08:20

I'll just repeat with apologies, comments I made yesterday about that. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Langton. Thank you. And I should have said to Mr. Collins, who I'm sure are still listening. I hope that you'll put your a note of your submission in

1:08:37

your semester. You'll put it in at the end of the week at the next deadline. Certainly, I will. Thank you, Mr. Scott.

1:08:54

Thank you. Can I follow up support what Collins said in particular Mr. Langton. But I'm wondering when I've not been able to follow Savile area about which I don't know very much. I've been looking at the employment bill and its progress through Parliament. And I gather Queen's assent is foreseen sometime in the autumn. But, Bill right now, Bill, I think many of our members Okay, sorry, Bill, sorry, the environment bill very clearly. And there are obviously many provisions in that which would would affect the narratives that have taken place. So can I ask you, of your viewers the inspector, what is the key date for yourself in terms of the legislative reference? I mean, I followed some appeal court cases and so on and read them and heard the barristers referring to you know, the black letter of the law as it is. And I just wonder what, what the date is that applicable for you in terms of your own legal reference. It will be very helpful to us

1:10:00

the close of the examination. From that point onwards, we cannot take further evidence into account. By the time the sector state takes its decision, my understanding is that it has to be taken in the light of the legislative regime as it exists at the date of the decision.

1:10:28

And the closer examination is of 14th of October, the Secretary of State does have the ability to, to re consult on things during his or her decision period.

1:10:43

Thank you, Mr. Scott.

1:10:46

Rosie Sutherland,

1:10:49

and Mr. Langton Scott, you can put your hands down now.

1:10:55

Yes, no solid. Thank you. So

1:10:58

I'm just three very short points. I hope. So first of all, we're grateful that biodiversity duty was included in the agenda. We have covered that and our mission wraps. And I don't propose to say anything more, we've also covered our concerns with the diversity net gain again in our in our written reps. So do not propose to repeat that. Now. The point I wanted to raise was in relation to these general legislative duties. And referring back to agenda item, two, a from yesterday morning, from section 28 of the wildlife and countryside act, specifically 28 G. ease and the furthering of conservation of tripolar sighs, I

1:11:44

saw that I, I said that, we will go back and look at sections 14 and 41.

1:11:53

Which I

1:11:55

had thought we all that was on the agenda. We were short of time, and it could have been dealt with by in written form. But

1:12:05

a request was made that we could we could deal with deal with this. And I said that we would do if we had time, I didn't really want to read them things which would dealt with pretty well, I thought in relation to wildlife and countryside act as well. And I don't really want to have to go around on on on a whole round of

1:12:24

risk responses.

1:12:28

Appreciate that. So this is not on 28 g it was it was to bring in 28 G and also the biodiversity duty. And just to very briefly cover, there is also a duty under the conservation of species and habitat regulations,

regulation 10. And since the applicant has confirmed that they will produce a note to be clear on what may be involved in ensuring those 28 g duties are fulfilled by the Secretary state.

1:12:57

I thought it might be helpful to mention sooner rather than later that there is auto regulation 10 which talks about preservation, maintenance and and diversity for wild birds, along with competent authorities using all reasonable endeavours to avoid pollution or deterioration of wild birds. So forgive me for trying to point but if a note was going to be produced, for which we are very grateful, I'd be incredibly keen if it could be expanded to also include regulation plan of the Hapsburgs. No, I thought so. That's the ordinary habitats regulations, regulation. 10. Yeah. Thank you. So I'm very good.

1:13:37

Right.

1:13:39

Mr. Trump has almost fell apart. Which of you is it to be or both? I don't really mind. I think it's, I think it's me probably rather than a double act. So

1:13:49

Mr. Collins, I'm grateful for him agreeing to put in his written version. I think to do it justice, we'll need to see the versions of your wealth of detail and figures in there, but we will consider it carefully and give a response and also at the same time, look at the point made by Mr. Langton about difference metric, three, see whether we need to say anything on that.

1:14:14

On the on the issue of the notes, grateful for Southern drawing our attention to regulation 10 will ensure that's covered in the notes. I was going to suggest. So we'll expand that note also to cover sections 40 and 41 of NERC.

1:14:34

I say that because I think there is actually something we need to say about that in terms of how it fits in with the policies in E and one, particularly paragraphs 5.3 point seven and 5.3 point 17. And also, there is some potentially quite helpful guidance as to how other

1:15:00

The examining authorities have dealt with that duty in the context of the Hornsey project three, summit extension. So we'll include that in the note, we want to give you as much help as we can in in how to grapple and the sector of state to grapple and due course, with those those duties, so just to give you a forewarning, we'll include that in the note, I wouldn't be obliged if you could do that I've sort of held back on all this over the past two days. Because I'm conscious, I've already asked it, we've already asked you questions about 40 and 41, the the the one in 41, which

1:15:43

so I suppose we take in sequence 40 says

1:15:48

public authority must have regard

1:15:52

to the purpose of conserving biodiversity. And then we're

1:15:58

directed to the UN Convention on biodiversity.

1:16:03

And then

1:16:05

some information about what conserving biodiversity means. And then we get into 41, which says the Secretary is going to draw out the lists.

1:16:17

And then 41 three says, without prejudice to

1:16:21

what's come before, a state must take such steps as appear to state to be reasonably practicable to further the conservation of the living organisms and types of habitat, including any list published under this section and promote the taking by others of such steps, and

1:16:40

possibly attempt to ask the question, well, in relation to this application, what are the living organisms and types of habitat?

1:16:49

Which are in those lists, but which are relevant, relevant here? I'm not totally sure if that's actually

1:16:57

a useful question. But I'd be interested in your submissions on that when you are making doing the note.

1:17:06

Well, we'll we'll deal with a subtle area, interestingly, is one of those we've just discussed it. I believe that we did actually put in,

1:17:17

in not our responses to the examining authorities first written questions, volume three dependencies, Appendix seven be

1:17:29

something on the these duties. I think that did include actually an indication of the how the relevant species have been, have been covered. So we can refer you to that. But we'll take another we'll take another look at that. If we need something more on it's in the note that I've trailed with you, then we'll do that. Yeah. Yeah. Well, thank you for Thank you. That would be so appendix seven be of your responses to our questions. Yes, that's right. Thank you very much indeed. Yeah.

1:18:05

Right. Are you done?

1:18:09

Yes, I think so. Sir. Thank you very much. I think someone else has got their hand up, though. Oh, you're right. Miss Fulcher.

1:18:20

Hello.

1:18:22

Yeah. Hello. I'm just coming in.

1:18:25

I can hear you. Yeah. Okay. Thank you very much. Yeah.

1:18:31

Under that act, I see, one of the problems is that we don't know what some of the species are. I'm referring in particular to the invertebrates, which as you know, are a special interest feature of the triple si.

1:18:50

If we look at the report and survey from 2014 796 species are recorded 55 of which have a recognised conservation status, and there's no 10 are listed under the nerf app. Then if you look at the latest survey for the following two years, that sum of total invertebrate species increases to 2068. So we can assume from that, that there are a considerable number, more species, which would be listed under the alert app. I think this is important because if we go back to the compensation of the fan Meadow lands, we've got to know what we're compensating for. Now, if we don't know what the

1:19:51

the special features are, of principle importance under this act, then how can they be properly

1:20:00

compensated for

1:20:02

a few we do know.

1:20:05

For example, a couple of the butterflies why it's abnormal brain lane. Also cinnabar moth, White Mantle Wayne Scott on the winner act also read databook re. So a few we do know, but most redoes purchase the remedy.

1:20:25

Thank you. Okay. Thank you. I'll leave the I'm going to leave Mr. Jovens. And his colleagues to respond to that, if they would in their written submissions. Thank you very much.

1:20:37

Very good. I think that

1:20:40

brings everybody else's contributions to an end.

1:20:46

There are, let me just say, say this, if there are matters, we've seen quite a few that

1:20:53

we've seen that there are quite a few things yet to be bottomed out, we may get to the point where we see that some things can't be can't be bottomed out. But if there are matters which remain unresolved, by the close of the application, we do need to be absolutely clear on what the differences are between the parties are almost the same. It's common ground a part of the are part of part of doing that. So if you are sure you, you were expecting me to say something along those lines. And and thank you. Let me remind everybody that any post hearing submissions, including written summaries of cases which you have made orally at this hearing, should we submit by deadline five, which is Friday 23rd of July 2021. If there are no other matters, which anybody wishes to raise, I shall now close the hearing.

1:21:53

Mr. Chairman, we have

1:21:55

Miss Sutherland

1:21:57

popped up popped her hand up. Hello, Mr. Yeah.

1:22:00

Thank you, sir. Really not wanting to push too much at very, very quick request, if I may. We believe that in addition to the rule eight three, timetable, we believe in areas of concern to the RSPB and separate well addressed. There are 15. Further documents containing new information being submitted at deadline five. And we believe possibly another 11 documents being submitted at deadlines six. I say

that with the huge caveat that during the last few days, we believe there are further documents that have been referenced that that weren't already on our list.

1:22:39

I do want to be very, very clear that we are we are grateful for the discussions we are aware in detail what some of those documents might contain. But but there are others where we are not. And my request, if I may, is just whether the applicant could produce a list of what is coming at deadline five. And what is coming at deadlines six, forgive me, I did just want to also flag that there are only 10 working days between deadline five and six. And my understanding is that we have to comment on the 15 new documents, as well as the other submissions already listed. Within those 10 days by deadline six. I'm very much going to stop there. But thank you for letting me make that final point. Thank you Mister chose pointing out to put your hand to God as well.

1:23:31

I'm sure it's good housekeeping for all of us, Mr. Tobin's. If we if we've got a good list, we can tick them off, make sure they will come in. We'd need that list for our own purposes, clearly. So there's no objection whatsoever to making a list available. What's going to come in at those two deadlines? I'm getting a nod from my client site. Say that with a degree of confidence, I think yeah. Yeah, that sounds like Good Housekeeping all round. I'm glad to hear that. Well, listen. I will. Now say thank you very, very much for everybody's participation, yesterday and today.

1:24:05

And indeed, all of the hearings, in this past fortnight, we covered quite a lot of ground. We have got a lot of new information and being able to, to delve and clarify many, many things. There's a lot of work to do going forward. But thank you again. We look forward to seeing many of you again, in due course, and I now close the hearing the time is 14 minutes past three. Thank you very much indeed. Have a good weekend.