

Sizewell_CAH1_Session1_Transcript

Tue, 8/17 3:29PM • 1:30:19

00:07

Good morning everyone and welcome. It is now time for me to open this compulsory acquisition hearing, which is being held in connection with an application made by nnb generation company acid see limited for an order for development consent for the construction operation and maintenance of the size we'll see project. Now before I go further, can I confirm with the case team that I can be heard and that my camera is working? And also that the live streaming and the recording of this event has begun? Yes, I confirm I can see and hear in the live streams working. Thank you. Now for those people watching the live stream. Let me explain that if the proceedings are adjourned at any point, we will have to stop the live stream in order to give us clear recording files. When the meeting is resumed. You need to refresh your browser page to view the restarted live stream. Or remind you again of this should we need to adjourn. Now let me introduce myself and my colleagues who are with me today. My name is went MCI I'm a Bachelor of law non practising solicitor. I've been appointed by the Secretary of State as a lead member of the panel of examining inspectors that together comprise the examining authority for this application. The other members of the panel who are here today, Edward mourned and David Brock, will now introduce themselves to you. Firstly, Mr. Moreland.

01:45

Good morning, everyone. My name is Edwin Nanda. I'm a chartered town planner, and I too have been appointed to be a member of this panel. I'll now pass over to Mr. Brock.

02:00

Good morning, everybody. My name is Dave Brock. I'm a retired solicitor and I have been appointed by the Secretary of State to be a member of the examining authority. I will now pass it back to my colleague, Mr. McKay.

02:13

Thank you, Mr. Brock. Now, we're assisted at the planning Inspectorate case. Now joining today, we have the planning Inspectorate case team manager Sean Evans, the other colleagues from the planning Inspectorate who will assist us today are Georgiana Hannigan and Jake Stevens. If you have any questions or queries about the examination, or the technology we're using for virtual events, they should be your first point of contact. That contact details can be found at the top of any letter of you've received from us, or on the project page of the national infrastructure planning website. Now, before I get on to the main part of this hearing, I'll ask my colleague Mr. Brock, to highlight a few housekeeping and background matters for today. Mr. Brock if we don't have Mr. Brock, perhaps I can ask Mr mourn to deal with that.

03:25

Certainly, the compulsory acquisition hearing will be live streamed and recorded the recordings we put published on the project page of the national infrastructure planning website as soon as possible after each part of the hearing closes. To assist viewers and listeners, anyone speaking should introduce themselves each time they speak. As the recordings are retained and published before my public record that can contain certain personal information to which the general data protection regulation applies. The rule eight letter includes a link to the planning Inspectorate privacy notice, which provides further information on this topic. If there is a need to refer to information that participants would otherwise wish to be kept private and confidential. It should be in written form which can be redacted before being published. If you prefer not to have your image recorded, you can switch your camera off. Now to avoid background noise, I will repeat the requests made in the arrangements conference. Please ensure your microphone or telephone is muted. You stay muted unless you are speaking. During a physical hearing, we would normally have breaks to avoid fatigue and we'll do the same in this virtual hearing. Our intention would be to take a 15 minute break at about 90 minutes and a longer break over the lunch time period. Now the purpose candle Up to this issue specific hearing. It is a compulsory acquisition hearing being held to ensure adequate examination of the provisions set out within the development and Trump's consent order, seeking to authorise the compulsory acquisition of land and to assess whether the conditions relating to land being required for the development or required to facilitate or be incidental to that development are met. Whether there is a compelling case in the public interest for the land being acquired compulsorily. As explained in the detailed agenda, the first part of the hearing will deal with matters relating to the applicants strategic case for the grounds of compulsory acquisition, and temporary possession powers. Consideration will also be given to matters relating to statutory undertakers land under sections 127 and 138 of the Planning Act 2008 and also crown land, it is not the place for individual objections to be heard. The second part of the hearing will consider all specific representations made by affected persons. As indicated in the agenda questioning at the hearing will be led by a member of the panel supported by other panel members. It is for the examining authority to determine how hearings are to be conducted, including the amount of time to be allowed at the hearing for the making of a person's representations. Our aim is to use our powers of control over the conduct hearings to ensure that they are carried out as efficiently as possible. while remaining fair to all parties and thorough in our examination of evidence. participants should note that written summaries of your oral submissions to this hearing should be provided to the planning Inspectorate, by deadlines seven, which is Friday, the third of September 2021. I'll now hand back to my colleague Mr. McKay, who will continue the introductory matters.

07:10

Thank you, Mr. mourned. Now I'll now ask the applicant followed by effective persons who were named on the detailed agenda and who are present to introduce themselves. So first the applicant.

07:24

Good morning, Madam, I hope you can see and hear me. Yes, thank you. My name is Harry woodfill part QC, instructed by Herbert Smith freehills. And I appear on behalf of the applicant. I'll be supported today and throughout the week by a number of other speakers, but I'll introduce them as we go along if that's acceptable.

07:46

That is indeed Thank you. So, if I can ask a Suffolk council to introduce themselves.

07:57

To My name is Buckeye. My name is Philip Ridley. I'm the council's head of planning and coastal management and I'm a charter town planner.

08:04

Thank you. Good morning. And Suffolk County Council.

08:15

Good morning examining authority. My name is Michael Bedford Queen's counsel. I'm instructed. I shot Pritchard on behalf of the County Council. And I may call on various members of the team from the county council whose details we've already supplied you with during the course of the session.

08:34

Thank you. And I believe we have a Michael Horton who is attending by phone on behalf of a number of affected persons. Is that correct? Mr. Nye, you present? Yes,

08:48

I'm present. I'm acting on behalf of various landowners. I'm a chartered surveyor, and I'll be representing the grant daily bacon and Bowden families.

09:00

Thank you. I believe that one of those affected persons are in fact present themselves. is David grant here. No, sorry. Well, you were were on my attendance list. But it may not. All right. Are you are you by phone as well? Mr. Grant? I iPad I think are you are you are you with us by phone? Or are you visually? It's just that I can't see you. Oh, I was trying. I was trying to say that. Oh, that's Thank you. No, no, just just getting getting my parents sister who's on the phone and who's not. So that's really helpful. Good morning and thank you for attending Mr. Grant. Right. Now, according to my attendance list that's been kindly prepared by the case team. Those are the only people who are present today, although others may attend tomorrow. Can I just check that I believe there is someone else that might be on the phone? Can I just check with Sean Evans if there is anyone else that I should have covered? We do have another phone participant, but I don't know who it is. Our perhaps we could if they are there, if we could ask them to introduce themselves. Hello, my name is Sally. What? Can you hear me? Yes, I can. Yes.

10:38

Sorry about that. I, unfortunately, was a klutz and clicked on to hearing for this morning, so I'm on the wrong link. But anyway, I'm on the telephone now, and I'm representing Sal Whitwell and co misdial in this hall.

10:55

All right, that's helpful. I don't know if if, if you could be redirected, or if you're content with being on the phone.

11:05

I'm happy to try and click in with my iPad, but nobody was letting me in. So I went on.

11:13

All right, well, thank you, at least at least we have you in contact, like pastor just asked the case team to look into that in the background to see if we get you on a proper link. Thank you. Thank you. Right, those I believe are all the attendees for today. I do hope that you've all had the chance to read the detailed agenda for this hearing. During the hearing today. During part one, I have a number of questions for the applicant and the other invited parties. When we get to part two, each affected person who has indicated a wish to speak will be invited to give their evidence in turn, and respond to questions from the examining authority. The applicant will then be given an opportunity to present their evidence in response to each what is now exiting and respond to questions from the examining authority are the main documents I have that I will be referring to today. They've already been set out in the detailed agenda for this hearing. So I won't repeat them now.

12:26

So if we just proceed now with the main part of the agenda for the CH part one. Now the first item on the agenda item two A that is whether the purposes for which the compulsory acquisition powers are sought to comply with section 122 to the Planning Act 2008. This Section of the Act sets out the purposes for which compulsory acquisition may be authorised. The applicants statement of reasons in support of the application at section six sets out the purpose for which compulsory acquisition paths are sought, including associated development and explains why the applicant considers the proposed associated development to be consistent with the principles set out in the associated development guidance produce for applications for the development consent for major infrastructure projects. Now the examining authority is asked the first question ca dot one dot naught on this topic, and the applicants provided a response in relation to the provision of the two village bypass and the size will link road is associated development. So my first question on this item is for Suffolk County Council. Perhaps you could turn your camera on Coronavirus doing so sorry, just a bit slower. I'm a bit quick off the trigger this morning. First, please Could I check with you your position in relation to Section 1222 of the Act and in particular proportionality of the size or leak rate is associated development its retention on a permanent basis.

14:23

Madam Yes, thank you. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. Our position remains as we have already rehearsed in the various earlier submissions, dealing with the traffic and transport matters at this specific hearings relating to traffic and transport. We do not consider that there is a adequate justification for the permanent retention of the size bowling road after the completion of the construction period. And our assessment is that the balance of detriment against what we see as the limited legacy benefits is such that the permanent retention of that feature is not justified, albeit that we absolutely emphasise that during the construction period, it is essential mitigation, which needs to be provided for the duration of the construction period. So the consequence of that position, when you then translate that to the compulsory acquisition tests, which as you say have been set out in section one to two, and in particular one to two sub sections two and sub sections, three, obviously, in a physical sense, the land which is the corridor of the route is required in order to construct a size well link road, there may be

some finessing as to if it was to be constructed on a temporary basis, would it necessarily require precisely the same length take all, for example, would some of the landscape mitigation might not be necessary if the root was there on a temporary basis, but that's, that's the point probably fairly fine detail. The more substantial point is that if the root is only required during the construction period, then it is not a justified interference with the private REITs, which are affected to take that land on a permanent basis. And a lesser intervention would be more proportionate, that is to say, temporary possession of the land required, and therefore, that the size of our link road at the end of the construction period would not be needed, it could be removed, and the land returned to its previous use and restored to its previous condition. You will note by way of as it were comparison, that in relation to the green rail route, that is effectively precisely the mechanism that the applicant has chosen, that is to be provided on a temporary basis, it is to be removed at the end of the construction period. And as a matter of principle, we see no reason why the same approach could not be taken in relation to the size of our link road. And so therefore, the consequences that we consider that as regards to the test in Section 122, there is not a compelling case in the public interest for the land to be acquired on a permanent basis. And therefore, it is not justified to take that land for the permanent provision of the sysvol link road. And lesser alternatives, including temporary possession will enable that to be provided as a construction road rather than as a platinum road. Head. That's sort of a summary of acquisition. I'm afraid at the moment you appear to be on mute on my screen. That's because

18:15

I was bound to do that I was trying to write Thank you. Thank you. Yes, indeed, that's very helpful. And just so I will be returning to the topic of permanent retention of the size we'll link wrote, both when we're looking at reasonable alternatives. And when we get further down the agenda on to the compelling case. So at the moment, I was just considering it in terms of whether it was proportionate as associated development, but that you've helpfully covered one or two other points as well. If I could just check whether there's anything that a Suffolk council would wish to say on that topic

19:03

fairly readily on behalf of the Suffolk Council, nothing further to add to what we've already set out in our previous statements regarding the benefits of the permanent retention of the road without a planning judgement no in relation to the one to two tests.

19:19

Right. Thank you for Thank you very much. And are there any other affected persons who would like to contribute under this particular agenda sub item? Just

19:42

I'm not seeing any hands up on on my screen. So if I could ask the applicant to respond, please.

19:54

Yes, madam. I'm just dealing with the edge. genda item that, that we're talking about now, which is related to section one, two to two, and not, as I understand it one, two to three, which is the compelling case, which Yes, that's correct. Yes. Because some of Mr. Bedford submissions, as you picked up, um, did rather stray onto that question. And, of course, what the examining authority and ultimately the

Secretary of State has to address under Section 122. r two matters. First of all, is the land in question. And here we're dealing with.

20:45

Sorry to interrupt you. I can't see you. And I don't think the case team can have Have you got your camera on?

20:52

Or is it? I do have my camera on? I can see an image of myself although that image is frozen.

21:02

Okay. I just want to continue, I can hear you clearly. So if you just want to continue for the time being and then maybe you can have a look at that issue when when we move on it.

21:18

So in terms of section one, two to two and dealing with the size well link road, the question is whether the land is required for the development to which the development consent relates. And there's no doubt that the land that is sought to be acquired for the sizewell link road is land that is required for development to which the development consent relates, and they're the size of the road is part of the development for which consent is sought under the order. And as to whether or not the size while link road is associated development. We have provided, I hope, a clear and comprehensive answer to that, in response to the first round question, just sort of briefly summarising it, there's clearly a direct relationship between the link road and the power station, it would support the construction, it would also be used during the operational phase and would have benefits during that phase, it would help to address the impacts of sizewell C, is not an aim in itself. It's subordinate to the main development. And we wouldn't have proposed it if it wasn't necessary to mitigate the impacts. We say that it is proportionate to the nature and scale of sizewell C, and its likely impact. And we've obviously rehearsed that at length in some of the other hearings, I've got Mr. Rhodes ready to go again on that if it would be helpful. But I think it's important, therefore, to, to look at this by reference to section one, two to two very clearly complies with the purposes. It's also very clearly associated development, that the issue that is raised as to the proportionality. There are two points that I want to make about that. Firstly, of course, we say that it's permanent retention is proportionate. But But importantly, when you look at the alternative, which is suggested by Suffolk County Council, that is not an alternative, which as I understand it, would involve significantly different physical development. Otherwise, when you ask yourself the question is the development for which we seek development consent, associated development, the physical differences, I don't understand to be said to be fundamental, which is obviously relevant to the question under section one, two to two. It's also necessary to come back to this question of what is the nature of Suffolk County Council's position on the link road they are not putting forward an alternative which could be incorporated within this order. It is an alternative which, if it were accepted, would require a different order, require a different application. And it's necessary to consider it therefore, against the the tests for alternative alternative set out in MPs. Ian one. I've dealt with these points in some detail in previous hearings. I don't propose to go For them again. But our position is, I hope clear, this is associated development. It is proportionate. Permanent retention is clearly justified for reasons that we have set out that the District Council as local planning authority

agrees with, and which if there's any doubt or if you'd like any further assistance, I have Mr. Rhodes, who can say something more. Now, thank you. Thank

25:34

you. I don't need Mr. Rhodes. For the time being, as I say, we will be touching on this topic again, as we move through the agenda item points. And obviously, you can consolidate what you said in your written submission. But that's that's all I need at the moment. Just thank you. I think that brings us to the end of the consideration of agenda item two A. So if we move on to agenda item to be, that is what consideration has been given to all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition. Now, the dclg guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land paragraph eight advises that the applicant should be able to demonstrate to the satisfaction of Secretary of State that all reasonable alternatives to compulsory acquisition, including modifications to the scheme have been explored. Now the examining authority has already asked a number of questions on the topic of alternatives. And there are some second questions as well, but obviously, we don't have the responses to that. So in response to the examining authorities first question ca dot wander 17. The applicant states that in respect of alternatives, the geographical location of the new nuclear power station, and the type of reactor designed to be deterred been determined through other processes policy or legislation, and therefore the applicant has not considered alternatives for those aspects of the scheme. So perhaps if I could ask the applicant to summarise why considers that is not required to consider such alternatives in this case, and how that approach complies with the compulsory acquisition guidance is a point that has been raised by a number of interested parties. So Mr. Phil, if I could have your summary response on that.

27:39

Yes, when I go into this stage, hand over to Mr. JOHN Rhodes of quad, who the examinee authority in the examination have heard from before, but as I understand it, you want an overview of why it is that we say it was not necessary to consider alternatives to the geographical location of the nuclear power station, and the type of reactor design.

28:07

That's That's correct. That's it and I'd like just for you to summarise the reason for that. Thank you. Thank you.

28:35

Thank you, Mr. Rhodes. Sorry, I can't hear you. Have you have you got your microphones switched off? Mr. Rhodes? I can't I can't see. I can't hear you. Can I just check with the case team if anyone can hear Mr. Rhodes?

29:13

No, I can't hear Mr. Rhodes. No, we can't hear you Mr. Rhodes.

29:57

We're just having a little difficulty with Mr. Rhodes headset, Madam, we're trying to establish an alternative means of connecting him. To you. I'm sorry about the delay. Um,

30:13

I don't know if we, yeah. Give him a few minutes see if we can get that sorted rather than moving on. lost him completely

30:51

fell apart. I think while you are getting that sorted, it's developed what you find here. Well, that's being sorted. And if you can't respond to this on his behalf, I will move I will move on. While that's being we'll come back to Mr. Rhodes. So

31:12

what I would say, if we can just Miss Rose is now connected. Our IRA separate headset. I'll just see if that is working. I believe I can see now my screen. Can you see him, sir? Am I?

31:31

Yes, that's better. Thank you. Right, good. Thank you. If you thought if you'd like to continue, Mr. Rhodes.

31:47

Thank you, John Rhodes for the applicant. I'm so sorry about that. In terms of alternatives to the site of the nuclear power station itself, we've set out opposition in the statement of reasons as you know. And there is of course, a very unusual situation, which pertains here, namely, that the site itself is identified as a potentially suitable site in national policy. And we know that the national policy was arrived at as a result of a very detailed investigation of alternative sites. And appraised for its sustainability in those terms. And we also know that national policy identifies that it's not appropriate to consider alternatives to the identified sites, and that each of the sites identified is required, either by itself or as along with all the other sites which are identified. On that basis, there are no alternatives in the context of the way in which we were advised to address this through national policy. And that's the reason why we have not considered alternatives we have, as you know,

33:01

Mr. Rose, when you say national policy, do you need the N six? Which

33:10

is Yes, ma'am. Thank you. I mean, n six, the appraisal of sustainability in the siting assessment that sat behind dn sings in its production, and the annex D and six annex C, which explains the position in relation to Sizewell C. Thank you.

33:37

And then you were you were going to say also about the type of reactor design? And and, again, you haven't considered any alternatives to that?

33:49

No, I wasn't invited, again to say about the type of reactor design, but you're right, we've not considered alternatives to that. I'm not sure the extent to which that impact on the use of land in terms of national policies

34:06

is simply covered by that particular first question that I was referring to ca dot one dot 17. So appropriate point, but but Point to Point taken on that. So in terms of the geographical load location, and you're saying there's no need to consider alternatives for that, and reliance in that respect is placed on ESX and what sits behind it? Thank you. Right. Thank you, Ken. Thank you, Mr. Rhodes. So, if I could just check if there are any other affected persons who wish to comment on this matter. Mr. Mr. Bedford, I see that you do have your hand up, do Mr. Something you wish to say.

34:58

Madam Thank you. Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council madam Actually, my hand was raised as earliest stage while we were still like right and to a, which we've obviously moved on from calculated the only point I wanted to make and we'll make it in our written submissions to avoid distracting matters. We don't accept Mr. Phillipotts proposition that in order to make the sizewell link road a temporary feature rather than a permanent feature, it would be necessary to start the process again, in terms of the developer consent order, we consider that there is sufficient flexibility within the proposed development, consent order draft, and particularly, obviously, shedule 17, which are the temporary possessions, they will clearly have to be redrafting of the terms of the order, if what is presently proposed as permanent lamp take word to be downgraded to temporary lamp take, but we don't accept that you would need to start the process again. But we'll cover that in our written remarks. So far as item to be is concerned, I can simply confirm that although we have raised certain issues about the design of the reactor, particularly in relation to the power export connection, we don't say that that has any land take implications. You'll be aware that we've raised an issue about pylons, and suggested that gas insulated lines could be utilised. But we don't consider that if our preferred power export connection was adopted, that that would have a land take implication. So we're not raising an issue in relation to the compulsory acquisition of the footprint of the power station site.

36:49

So clarifying that that's helpful. Right, thank you, Mr. Bedford. Mr. Phil port, did you want to respond to that,

37:00

just very briefly, it's helpful to have the clarification about the connect the connection and the implications. But I understand Mr. bedfords case on behalf of the County Council, to be that the change from the size while link road being a permanent feature to being a temporary feature could be accommodated within the scope of this application. And that that's going to be put in writing, I should just say, by way of fare advanced notice, we would expect, if that is going to be said that there would be a sufficient particularization of everything that would need to change and the timing implications of that change, if that submission is to be made good. So for example, if that has implications in terms of transport, assessment, environmental impact assessment, the any matters of consultation, we would expect all of that, to be identified in sufficient detail so that we can respond to it. Also, in terms of the

timing of when any such application for change would be made. It also therefore necessarily presupposes that the county council has a sufficiently developed alternative in terms of what a temporary road would look like. And therefore, the the nature and qualities of such a development that allows it too, and to set out the alternative for your consideration. And for us to respond to it. At the moment, I have to say our position is we don't consider that this alternative is sufficiently precise or well developed, all the implications of it have been sufficiently considered to enable it to be treated as a serious alternative that can be accommodated within the scope of this application. And certainly within the scope of this examination, without giving rise to significant delay, and falling foul of the guidance on alternatives in MPs II and one. But I've set out my marker, I'm anticipating the county council will have all of those matters well and Hamlet will see the output of their efforts in due course.

39:33

No, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Phil Potts, that your positions be made clear. My next I did have some more questions to us actually on the consideration of alternatives for the size for link road. And they were firstly for you. So just on the consideration of the alternatives for the size will link road. We have asked first question ca.one.ca And team. And you have provided background information on the principle in route selection for the size one link road. The route selection paper is at appendix five D. And that refers to further appraisal work, which includes an a comp 2021 and LDA design report. So paragraph 2.1 dot one to six of the route selection paper explains that as a response to the stage for consultation, a decision was made to propose the link roads as a permanent facility rather than a temporary one. So really, I was just wanting the applicant to explain the full justification for permanent acquisition as an alternative to temporary possession. You know, I understand there, that reference has been made to outages that three to four months intervals and traffic would be generated by reinstatement works to move material back from the N MDS to the size will link quote, but perhaps you could summarise your position as to why those activities justify permanent acquisition. Yes, I'm

41:13

going to hand over to Mr. Rose to provide a summary of this, but if the road is to be a permanent feature, and then of course, permanent acquisition is required. And therefore that really the question is, as I understand it, why is it said that it should be a permanent feature as opposed to a temporary feature? And that's the question, I'm going to hand over to Mr. Rhodes to address. Thank you.

41:51

JOHN Rhodes on behalf of the applicant, Ma'am, I hope you can see and hear me now. I can this time, thank you. Thank you very much. Um, there are a number of reasons for this. And as you would expect, it's not a conclusion that was arrived at lightly, I was a conclusion that arose through assessment and also through consultation. So as we explained in our paper to which you referred, this was the subject of consultation at stage four. And the majority of opinion from those who responded to the consultation, particularly local community was the balance of benefit lay in favour of retaining the road as a long term road and the long term bypass relief. So it'd be 1122 and the communities along that road. And we know that that position is supported by the District Council, who is, of course, as you would expect, closely tuned in to the expectations and desires of local community and district councils identified. What in their terms are hugely significant benefits in terms of the legacy for the 1122 communities of the permanent use of the size of the link road? We think there may be some confusion potentially, on the

part of the county council in relation to this, there appears to be some suggestion that it would be some sort of different road if it was a temporary road or some sort of haul road that could be easily laid out and removed. And we don't think that's right. We think a major construction routes such as this, which is also going to bypass to be 1122 for at least 10 to 12 years, needs to be constructed very much as we propose to high physical and environmental standards, we think it will be essentially the same road, there will be significant environmental consequences of removing the road at the end, which we did identify in our stage four consultation, which helped to inform that community view. And there are complexities as you've alluded to that we've identified involved in simply thinking it can be removed, including the way in which the road and its materials balance has been designed as part of the overall scheme and the materials balance on the main site that was discussed at the previous issue specific hearing. We think that the B 1122 is not suitable as a long term access road to that which it serves including sizewell C, but not just sizewell C. The existing size more complex the communities and sidewalks that are served by it, the ongoing maintenance of the galloper and green covered wind farms. And we identify in the paper. The traffic count estimated at the close of construction after the close of construction of 7000 vehicles per day, which we say is not suited to the V 1122. It may sit within the physical capacity technical capacity of the V 1122. But we identify links in the submission that we've made to you The way in which to be 1122 is substandard as a road in terms of visibility and safety, certainly immunity in terms of cycling, for road, which would continue to carry heavy goods vehicles as well as significant car traffic. But we also identify what a significant benefit, the retention of the B of the size holding road would be for the B 1122. And the way in which it could enable the transformation of the B 1122 into a quiet road, a rural road in the way that it should be to serve those communities. And I think you know, that we're working with the County Council and others to identify commitments to, in order to enable that to be the case to the BLM. 22 could take its place as properly as it should be as a quiet rural road, bringing forward the sort of legacy benefits and relief that communities have been seeking for a long time. And which sits behind the District Council support for that. It's also the case, as Mr. Philpott explained that you simply couldn't decide I think that it would be temporary rather than permanent because of the knock on consequences for that there are many knock on consequences of trying to make that change at this stage.

46:26

But apart from trying to think through what the design consequences would be the transport assessment, or the environmental assessment, or the rights of way, or the drainage consequences of that, there is the consequences for the community. So the community have an application before them that their communities are going to be permanently bypassed by the side holding road. And the consultation and environmental implications of changing diet. It's certainly not something that can be achieved within the timescale of this application. And we think would involve very substantial additional work. And so it's partly for that practical reason. But more importantly, for the reasons that identified and particularly I'd say, the two principal reasons would be the benefit of having a proper access road for the future that's designed for that purpose, to serve sizewell c sizewell b and the communities that it serves, but also the very significant benefit that would be achieved the BLM 2020 1122 communities over relieving traffic. We've identified in our submission, that traffic would be reduced by something like 90%, on the 1122 with the permanent retention of the sysvol link road. And that would enable that route to be transformed the way in which we want to assist that to bring it back to the sort of rural roads that it should be to serve the communities that it serves. So those are our principal reasons. We've set them

out previously, Buddha very happy to set them out again, and very happy to respond to any submission that's made to the contrary.

48:04

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Rhodes. So we do have Mr. Grant, who wants to say something I believe on this topic, Mr. Grant.

48:19

Thank you, madam. Just in brief response to Mr. roat. And just really for the, for the information of Inspectorate.

48:28

They I'm interested to know the volume of responses that were received by the applicant on the stage for

48:37

questions to retention off the road, the actual volume when he said there was a majority in the certs.

48:45

Secondly, I would inform the meeting that the bacon and grand family carried out an informal questionnaire.

48:54

And we had over 200 respondents from the villages of Surbiton, Middleton and Cal sell all affected communities. And in excess of 90% of the respondents were in favour of removal of the road at the end of the project. Because our view was that basically a haul road would serve would cause less, it would lift severance, less less detrimental severance of communities, as currently proposed by design, I think we must also not forget the fact that a couple of weeks ago, one of the justifications for the selection of the route was relating to backfill of 70,000 loads, which I think is about a million tonnes which is required at the principle construction site, which I gather was covered by Mr. bulls comment that it was purely for churches, and obviously nothing to do with the design of the road or the selection of the route. And finally we by retention of those rate of the link road We'll be left with two parallel roads from the Oxford to list and, and current levels of traffic on the B 1122. I could stand in the middle of that road at 10 o'clock at night for half an hour and not get hit by a car. So two roads, and I'm not sure how many cyclists cycle at night, but two roads are a complete

50:21

waste of money and upkeep time probably why the County Council. I gather footing the bill for upkeep are so against retention. We would also regain considerable acreage of good arable land.

50:40

Thank you, Mr. Brandt. I just check. Mr. Bedford, your hands up. Is that to make a new point or was that up from before?

50:52

Thank you, Madam microbead. For suffolk county councils it was to make a new point. Certainly, we were not under the as it were misapprehension that Mr. Rhodes referred to, of thinking that the size worldlink road on a temporary basis could be equated to no more than a haul road. I think the phrase that it could be a haul road actually came from the applicants during the STS dvir hearings. But we don't need to get distracted by that we have perfectly well understood that a road which is to serve a construction period of between nine to 12 years would have to be constructed to a specification capable of fulfilling that function. And that would be more than something that you might describe conventionally as a haul road, whether it would necessarily need to be precisely the same specification as a permanent road is perhaps a matter of fine detail. But I say we have not sought to suggest that there would be as it were some radically different construction process involved. We have spelled out in our earlier submissions, which

52:17

have

52:19

in some returns in rec 5173, rep 308 for responding to your question x q 1.92. And rep 2189. We have provided quite a lot of detail on our position on the sides worldlink Road, including providing the comparative traffic data showing the limited traffic benefits in terms of the operational period. We do consider that there there may be some design savings if you were to provide it on a temporary basis in terms of the fine detail, terms of design speeds, gradients and bends. But they would fall within the parameters of what's already been assessed. So there would be letter effects rather than any greater effects. But again, we can cover that in our written submission and noting as to Phillpotts remarks as to what he would wish to see. And obviously, we will look to what the applicant has proposed by way of the level of information for those features of the scheme which are proposed be temporary, including the park and ride sites and the green rail route. And we will obviously look at that to see to what extent the information needs to be provided at this stage. So the overall position is that we have raised this issue about the size of our link road repeatedly throughout the consultation stages. And for the applicant, as it were at this stage to now say are well, procedurally, we might have some difficulties in engaging with the issue, and that's a reason why you shouldn't engage with the SU is in our submission completely wrong headed. The applicant is known for a considerable period of time that this is an issue to be addressed. And we maintain our view that it should be addressed and it should be preferably addressed in the context of this examination. So those are the points we wish to make at this stage.

Thank

54:40

you. Thank you. Um, can I just check if this if the applicant wants to come back on that before we move on?

54:49

Yes, madam briefly. There are just two points I'm going to make before I hand over to Mr. Rhodes. So I think also has some points on this. First of all, Mr. Grant made reference to an informal questionnaire. And he didn't identify where in the examination documents, it is that one goes to find that forgive me if

it's my fault for not having pick that up. But I'd be grateful if we could be given a document reference for it so that we can just check that, make sure that we look at it and respond to it. That's the first point. The second point is simply this. So far as the county Council's position is concerned, on the alternative, and it has to face up to the consequences of its position and be clear with you and with the examination as to what it is asking the Secretary of State to do with it. The applicant has a scheme which it believes is appropriate, and which involves a permanent sizewell link road. That is what it is asking the Secretary of State to approve, it is not proposing a temporary link road. And therefore the county council has to be clear as to what it is asking you to recommend the secretary of state should do in respect to this alternative is the county Council's position going to be that it invites refusal of the development consent order, or partial refusal on this basis. And if it does, it has to deal with the policy consequences, the consequences in terms of the public interest benefit associated with the urgent delivery of the nuclear power station and matters of that sort upon which we rely as a key part of our case. So whether or not these the alternatives were raised at an earlier stage doesn't actually affect that. It is of course relevant to note that the counter counsel has raised these points before and we've responded to them before. But now that we get to the crunch point of recommendation and decision making, it's essential that the county council makes its case on this clear, so that we know what we're responding to and that you know what you have to deal with when you're making a recommendation report to the Secretary of State. So I made those points by way of prelude to now what Mr. Rose is going to say. So I'll hand over to Mr. Rhodes,

57:43

John Rhodes for the applicant just to respond briefly to a couple of points made by Mr. Grant and by Mr. Bedford. So in relation to consultation response, the stage for resolve, which we set out in our documents that we've submitted was that 68% of those who were asked the question supported the permanent retention of the site on link road. And as Mr. Phil Bob says, we're not aware of any alternative survey of opinion, certainly not aware of an opinion that comes to a different view than that Mr. Grant was concerned about ending up with two parallel roads, and whether that was the right thing to do. We say it's absolutely the right thing to do. And the benefit of having two parallel roads is the size welding road acts as a perfect bypass for the V 1122. I think this came after the analysis when alternative routes were potentially being considered it was demonstrated and no other alternative route could have that benefit of such significant relief to the BLM 22 minutes because it parallels replicates replaces the function of the BLM 22 said it can achieve that benefit so that whilst the county council may think that there's a different traffic analysis, I'm not sure what that different traffic analysis is. I don't think the principle of very substantial relief to the BLM 22 in the order of 90% or greater, removing into traffic in the long term is disputed and it's that relief is brought about by the parallel nature, the size will link roads that then generates the opportunity and the benefits, which are supported by local community Industry Council, which we're working up whether the county Council's always been consistent about this as a matter for the county council, but certainly we record in our document that it stages three and four when we were talking about potentially alternative solutions such as a separate and bypass. That was something which the county council did support in terms of its long term retention, and we think that was the right judgement to make if one's gone to the trouble of creating a size welding road and it's helpful to hear that had to cancel to say that it needs to be of a similar quality or standard. And I don't personally see how it could be different the road of that length of time and the function that we proposed for the size welding road would, I would expect to be built to the same environmental

standards. If we're once gone to the trouble to do that, and build a high quality road and properly landscape it, for instance, and it generates that benefit communities and the continuing function of serving at the size of our communities, then, I think the judgement made by the county council in relation to establish and bypass extends to the size of building roads. Of course, there isn't a proposal now for justice, Everton bypass, so we had to make a judgement. Based on all of those issues, we made the judgement and we thought it should be permanent, we've designed the scheme on that basis. That's the nature of our application. The consequence is that it would be extremely difficult at this stage to do something different. But that's that's simply the place where we are. And it's a consequence of having made that judgement based on all of those factors. And we have an application which has an integrated proposal for a permanent size will link road together with it with the main development site and the other components of the application. And we say that plainly the right solution.

1:01:23

Thank you, Mr. Rhodes. Thank you, Mr. Grant, you have your hand up. And also I was wanting you to clarify that point for this default pot. The nature of the consultation and or survey information that you've referred to earlier. Is that is that in the examination, and my understanding is that it wasn't.

1:01:50

It was compact, it was carried out earlier this year and completed at the end of April, as a as a local informal thing sponsored by the bacon and grand family and submitted to local parish councils for their edification because, frankly, we were frustrated that, as Mr. Rhodes has just clearly pointed out, 68% of we don't know how many people did respond to the applicant, as 68% of 10 is 6.8. But you know, I, it doesn't worry me terribly much. I don't want to Bandy numbers, I can tell you that as a factual and I'm very happy to share both the questionnaire and the data received back with the Inspectorate in DL seven. Thank you miss out. If you do that, I would also make the point that people talk about the benefit of a permanent bypass that it's formed by the SLR and the BLM 22. You know, and so that project completion in Pearl Harbour light takes,

1:02:59

well wouldn't need to bypass, actually, if another route had been chosen, for instance, route W.

1:03:05

And also for my own personal protection. You're probably aware that we have signed heads of terms, I am not objecting to the project. I'm simply commenting on the applications of DSLR. In that I use personally over 20% of my arable acreage to this project, and therefore I have a strong vested interest. Thank you. Thank you.

1:03:36

I won't ask the applicant to respond. It's just because I have another question that was just on the site will link corrosion. That'll bring us to the end of the question on alternatives for the size. One thing quote, so on the specifics of the route alternatives, the LDA design report, that rejects through w on the grounds that there is potential for significance of several heritage assets to be affected adversely, due to changes in their setting resulting from the roots and alignments. And also it refers to root set. But for both schemes, the report concludes the detailed assessment of the heritage assets along this route,

would provide a better understanding of the significance of effects on heritage assets and the potential to mitigate effects. So I just wanted to check with the applicant because as my understanding is that that detailed assessment hasn't taken place. So in its absence of that detailed assessment of the impact of the heritage assets along the alternatives routes, how can a fair and reasonable comparison between the two alternatives at least on those grounds be made?

1:04:52

But um, just before I had lived materials, I lost connections slightly during the course of your question, you identified that the report made reference to detailed heritage assessment and then I lost the last part of the question, would you mind I'm sorry, repeat

1:05:13

the root size that for. So not the root thi design report says that fair route w in route said you should have a detailed assessment of the heritage assets. So the question was really, my understanding is that there hasn't been such a detailed assessment. So how in the absence of that detailed assessment of heritage assets along those alternative groups, can a fair and reasonable comparison between those two alternatives be made?

1:05:44

Thank you. I've now got that I'll pass over to Mr. Rose to deal with that.

1:05:55

JOHN Rhodes for the applicant. Well, in relation to heritage issues, the response paper that we've submitted at an earlier deadline contains a detailed appraisal of the heritage critique that was submitted by others in relation to the root alternatives, and clearly concludes that the sysvol link road route and selected is the best in heritage terms. We're happy to elaborate on that.

1:06:24

Point, Mr. Rhodes, it's it's used, we've put in the LDA design report, which as I understand it, is your latest reassessment as at work of the alternatives? it's referring to the benefit of carrying out further detailed assessment. As I understand it, you may correct me that that detailed assessment hasn't happened. So it's, it's quite a simple point, really. It's not withstanding what's gone before, that seemed to be your latest assessment, which didn't seem quite complete, but perhaps you can correct me on that or, or explain on that I'll provide a response in writing at the next deadline.

1:07:04

Perhaps I'll try and do both the latest that the LDA assessment was one of a series of several assessments are undertaken, including subsequent air commerce assessment, which covered the full range of environmental issues, which is referred to in our response paper. and subsequent to that, we've also responded on the heritage issues raised by others and reached the conclusion that we have the balance of judgement in favour of the size modelling road, which we reported in the response paper was very conclusively in favour of the route that we adopted rather than W. In fact, room w isn't really, I think, unavailable alternatives that anybody has either developed in detail or is no supporting in any detail. We're not sure there are really are alternatives. And certainly the route w route has been

mentioned by others isn't isn't a deliverable route and isn't a design group. But we'd say you have before you the heritage information you need. And I'll confirm in a written response, following this hearing, to how that's identified and the extent to which those issues were taken into account through the decision making. I'm understand the point you're making about the LDA report. There have been further assessments undertaken by the applicant since the LDA report. And if those aren't clear in the response paper, we'll bring them out.

1:08:25

All right, that's helpful. Thank you. Right, Mr. Grant? I do see your hand is up. Thank you, if I could hear from you on this.

1:08:39

Thank you, David grant for the whole fall. In earlier submissions, we put forward to the landowners group affected by the routing of the ASR chosen router, the SLR, employed Dr. Richard hoggett. And he prepared a heritage assessment survey. And I think it was made abundantly clear in there that it's necessary to in order to look at the number of properties affected, listed properties affected, you have to actually regard the Oxford roundabout development as an integral integral part of the SLR routes, because that is actually diverting traffic from the north and the SLR roundabout, diverts traffic from the south, that's it all feeds into the SLR. Now, if you include the properties contained in the Oxford catchment, they have the numbers also drastic and I would ask you please to cross refer to that. And at that stage when the route when the assessment was carried out, route w was the principal tend to have and I have to take issue with the words as isn't deliverable. I still none of us understand why it isn't a deliverable. Well leave that to your good counsel.

1:09:59

Thank you, Mark. Thank you, Mr. Grant. Just check with the applicant if there's anything they want to come back on before we move on.

1:10:11

Madam, I just see if Mr. Rose wants to come back on the question of the inclusion of the roundabout, I've got a feeling we may have responded to this already in writing. Always has to say.

1:10:24

So john john wrote to him, just to say, Mr. Grant is absolutely right, that one would need to consider the heritage impacts of the Oxford roundabout, as well. But that's something that hasn't been considered as part of our assessment. Again, I can point that out in the written vote that follows these submissions. And taking into account impacts that you Oxford, we say there's an overwhelming case in support of the SLR on heritage grounds as well as general general Brian's in terms of the deliverability of the W two route. But I don't I'm not sure you even have a route before you apart from a single line on an historic plan as to whether or not there is in fact, an alternative based on what was called D two and the W. Route. It's not a route that's been designed in detail. It's not a route that is in fact, I think presented as, as an alternative in the way that we would understand an alternative, something that you can understand and consider in place of the size welding road. And we say also, of course, that it conflicts now with land use designations in the adopted local plan, which means that it's physically undeliverable

quite apart from the practicalities of delivering it, which we did identified some length in our response paper. So we say you don't have available to you any information really about the deliverability of an alternative? And whether in fact, there is an alternative to the size welding road. Thank you. Thank you.

1:12:08

I'm just moving on my last area that I was wanting to ask a question about on the on alternatives is the Pakenham I hope I pronounced that correctly. Fenn meadow, and that is the applicants response to ca dot one dot 23. And that refers to the consideration of alternatives for the additional land required arises as a result of changes to the application and that includes 32.782 hectares of land for the establishment of an additional fan Meadow pay can mount the consideration of alternative sites highlights the need for further detailed studies to be undertaken to determine with certainty the potential afforded by those sites. So if the applicant could respond, could I just check if those further investigations have been carried out? And if not, please explain how the consideration of the selection of the Pakenham site and preference to other alternative sites can be regarded as reasonable prior to the completion of those detailed studies.

1:13:19

Thank you. I'm going to pass over now to Mr. Alan Lewis. Mr. Lewis is, again someone who is known to the examination, and he's the technical lead on ecology from a calm so I pass over to Mr. Davis who can deal with that question.

1:13:40

Thank you. Hello, ma'am. Can you hear me? Yes, thank you. Um, just to confirm that the details you're seeking are found in the fen Meadow plan, which was submitted recently at deadline six, and the reference for you is rep six hyphen o 26. And that profile provides details of our updated proposals, which still involve all three of the sites so battle halesworth and Pakenham. It provides updated details on the target to be provided for each habitat at those three sites. But I think for the from the panel's perspective, the most important point is that all three sites are still included. Within our proposals. We have recently met I've recently met with our lands team, all of the landowners in respect of those three sites. We're working with landowners those three sites to Try and acquire the sights on leasehold basis and others within the land team could explain those arrangements as necessary. In terms of the the size of the compulsory acquisition areas, and I think you mentioned a figure of 3032 or 32 Hector's for Pakenham, that has now reduced a considerably and we will take the opportunity to try and reduce those areas and submit refreshed plans if that would be helpful to the examining authority and simply in relation to Pakenham. The new proposed order limits at that site have now been reduced to about 10 and a half Hector's, but we'll confirm that figure in writing so substantially, substantially less than the headline figure in the in the application and in the existing fan Meadow strategy, which we submitted in January this year. Does that help? I think sorry, your question also touched on alternatives, I think. And

1:16:08

yeah, it was very much an alternatives and it was consideration of, but when in the selection of Pakenham, there was a consideration of alternatives. And, um, you know, this is this is in your own response to question ca dot one dot 23. And it's talking about further detailed studies that needed to be undertaken. And that's in relation to consideration of alternatives not in the consideration of alternative

sites. So it's that the alternative, select it at the selection process stage. So when you refer me to the rep six document, does that compare Pakenham with other sites that were under consideration at that selection stage?

1:17:03

No, it doesn't mom. So the reports, which do that are already in front of the examination, and I don't think I've got the reference numbers to hand. Those are the wood site selection report from 2018, which was the phase one study of our fan Meadow site selection report. And then in 2019, the second would report which covered the stage to evaluation of alternative sites. And I think in that stage to report that is the report, which reduces the long list from 60 sites across Suffolk down to a shortlist of five and then identifies the chosen sites on the basis of their characteristics. And I think I've probably already mentioned in issue specific hearing what seven what those those characteristics are, and they relate to things like the presence of upwelling groundwater, the proximity to existing femto sites so that you can natural colonisation can be used to create the habitats on those sites. So those sites have are typically very, very limited. And I think that's explained comprehensively in the in the word 2009. Teen report and I will get the reference.

1:18:24

So, if those those references it will do I will do one written summary and also can you share with us the reduction in area that you're now seeking? We will all right, is that available now or going to provide

1:18:43

madam if I if I can jump in at this stage? Because of course what is being described is a proposed reduction in the extent of acquisition that is proposed in the order which will involve change to the application. I understand that this is an instance there are I think, two other instances where there will be some reduction in the scope of acquisition as a result of further work and further engagement with landowners. We will obviously provide will need to provide a full explanation of those and also to deal with the mechanism by which that is to take place. It's relatively straightforward in this these instances because these are reductions, I understand that they are agreed with the relevant landowners or will be as opposed to extending the scope of what is proposed. A suitable point during the course of this week, we can deal with those, this is one of them. So those matters. And not before you at the moment, but it seemed it seemed to was that it would be preferable to provide you with chapter and verse on those matters in terms of identifying the plots, providing, obviously the replacement plans, dealing with the mechanism for achieving those matters. That they are, as I said, All reductions. But obviously, you're going to need to be provided with a full and clear explanation of what they are and how they're to be achieved within the scope of the order. Thank you.

1:20:39

Thank you, Miss Philpott. I see now that Sally watts has her hand up. So if I could hear from Sally watts.

1:20:53

I'm sorry that Kim I'm speaking on behalf of Mr. Cyborg Miss Hall. And so Whitwell and company. Yes. I mean, we worked with Alan Lewis last week, and he advised us at that stage that they had reduced the

area that they wish to take from our clients. Having said that, they still wish to take some land, which our clients are objecting to. We, you mentioned in this section that we're talking about alternatives. I don't think I would necessarily, I mean that they it appears that they identified this land at the very outset. Natural England in their representation recently at deadline six said that they wished EDF to look further afield for alternatives should the site's at peak not be successful in delivering the thin Meadow throughout all the paperwork that I've read 232 pages of which I'm not necessarily sure if it gives me any more, because Vince said it will be successful. Yeah, I think our clients are still very much concerned that alternatives haven't been looked at. I think that's all I need to say at this stage.

1:22:15

Yes. Thank you. And I have to have read your points on on that topic. Thank you, Mr. Phil parks.

1:22:22

Yes, ma'am. Just briefly, one needs to distinguish between two things which we've discussed before. First of all, there are alternatives to individual sites that are proposed as part of the order. So there is that issue and whether or not the sites that have been selected are appropriate having regard to potential alternative sites. There is the second question which we've dealt with, in a previous issue specific hearing, as to what happens in order to seek to deliver mitigation in the event that the habitat establishment of an individual site is not successful. And we discussed the concept of where one looks within the country, or as we say, within the region, in order to find alternative sites where such mitigation recreation of habitat can be achieved. And you'll recall that Mr. Lewis discussed the availability of sites within broadly the sort of East Anglia and region so I just want to distinguish between those two things. But I wonder if I can ask Mr. Lewis, just briefly, to summarise where we've got to in terms of this particular site, so far as the prospects of it delivering habitat of this sort are concerned because they're, that those matters, I think, is probably fair to say have moved on to some degrees since the issue specific hearing so I think it might be helpful to hear Mr. Lewis on that matter if I may. All right, thank you.

1:24:19

Hello, mom. I'm just in relation to Pakenham. Then, the fen Meadow plan which I provided the reference for earlier confirms that we are confident of generating 4.73 Hectors at fen Meadow at Pakenham that split across the southern and northern parts of that site. And also an area of wet woodland of 1.76 Hectors are the southern part of that site. And that in the southern part of that site, is the one to which the Recent respondent, Miss watts provided commentary and is representing the landowner so that 4.73 and the 1.76 totals 6.49 Hectors across the northern and southern part of the Pakenham site. In terms of our ability to create fen Meadows at those sites, we are confident were able to do that, as I say the details of our proposals were shallow Excavations of about 20 to 40 centimetres to intercept, upwelling groundwater, those are provided with detailed maps and detailed specifications and the hydrological context in the updated fen Meadow plan submitted at deadline six. And that's all readily available in the front of the examination. Is that sufficient? Would you like more?

1:25:57

That's fine for these purposes. I'm sure it'll be returned to in other hearings that thank you for that. Thank you. Right, thank you. So I'm just saying that Mr. Bedford has his hand up. Mr. Bedford, did you want to make comments? Thank you, madam. Michael Bedford, Suffolk

1:26:24

County Council. Madam Yes, just to note in relation to Pakenham, where you will have seen that we have provided in our clarification notes in relation to this compulsory acquisition, hearing, in Section three, some comments on matters of detail in relation to the arrangements for the delivery of the fan Meadow mitigation statement. I don't deal with those detail points of the arrangement here. But we've clearly got a number of those we are in some dialogue with the applicant. On those matters. We note what's been said today by Mr. Lewis, about the ongoing work in relation those matters. And we would hope that the dialogue that is ongoing, will produce as it were a positive outcome to add queries that can then be picked up in the next iteration of the statement to common ground. So I just wanted to highlight that there are those issues, but I don't think it helps you on the CIA issues for this hearing to really explore or need to explore those. Although we're also happy to help if you if you wanted to. Trade You seem to be getting muted, Mr. Guy. Sorry. It's

1:27:53

it's Yes. Apologies for that. Yes, just so thank you. That's all I need for the moment. And indeed, I have noted the points that you made in that note, which was helpful to have before the hearing. Thank you. Right, just checking that there's nothing else on alternatives. Mr. Philpott? Did you want to add it come back on?

1:28:22

And it's really a question of clarification. But at some point we'd like to provide you and your colleagues with an updated position in terms of negotiated acquisition of property. And what has been achieved what is being achieved in in in relation to that. I anticipate that something you want to pick up at some point in the agenda, whether it's under reasonable alternatives, compulsory acquisition, because of course, that is part of the alternative. Alternatives equation? Yes. What do you have in mind to deal with it elsewhere? I'm in your hands. But at some point, we'd like to provide you with an overview and update on that matter,

1:29:07

as well, perhaps, and I think that would be the last aspect alternatives we would need to look at. So if I adjourn now, for a short break, and then we when we return, if you could provide us with that update, and then we'll move on to the next agenda item. But thank you, madam. Sorry, I'm just saying before that Mr. Bedford, can I just check if your hands up to speak again, or

1:29:41

my apologies, that's a legacy handout. Remember, right,

1:29:44

that's all right. Just checking before we do return, that there wasn't anything pressing that you needed to add. So it's 1130. Now, we'll adjourn now until 1145. So if I could just Mind those watching on the live

stream just to refresh your browser after the adjournment so enable you to rejoin the live stream. So the hearing is now adjourned.