

AUDIO_SizewellC_ISH8_Session4_25082021

00:08

Good afternoon, everyone. And welcome back to this issue specific hearing. Now wish to resume on the air quality section of the agenda. Can I just confirm with the case team, that camera and microphone are working properly? And the recording and the live stream was re commenced?

00:38

convinced chair with a case team. everything's working. Yeah, that's fine. Thank you. Right. So the first point, the methodology of assessment, and whether the methods used are appropriate to ensure the proposed lobby will meet the highest environmental standards, both during construction and operation. Now, from reading the statement of common ground between the Council, the applicant, there seems to be significant levels of agreement on this. So if I can turn initially to the other interested parties, if I start with task, please up who, from your team wishes to speak on this? You'd obviously raise some significant concerns in I think it was ready to for a tea and then I'll come on to the other interested parties.

01:39

Yeah, sorry. Yeah. Chris Wilson from Tascam. Ashley, Emma, Emma Bateman, who have just noticed has her hand up. Speaking on our behalf. Thank you. Hello.

01:58

Hi. Yes, we do outside Mr. Bateman for task. We do have quite a lot of concerns over this. Firstly, they would like to say that we can report prepared for task by air pollution services, called sizewell c review of planning inspectors questions on air quality was not added to the examination library. And it's not been seen by the examining authority. We submitted it on June the second, but we only realised it wasn't in the library yesterday. And so I want to draw your attention to that and hope that you will look at that, at some point. We're very concerned about

02:41

I don't know what's happening. Can I ask that you resubmit that as part of your deadline, seven submission? And then obviously, we will definitely have it and it gives it? Hopefully everyone an opportunity to have a look at that.

02:54

Yep. Okay. Yeah, we're very concerned about the monitoring strategy of a Suffolk Council. with, you know, he suffered counsel regards monitoring as a backstop. And we don't really understand that, and we're very concerned, there's not going to be a comprehensive baseline monitoring, we think it's imperative that there's baseline monitoring, so that, you know, we have some we have baseline levels to then measure the subsequent increase in pollution. And I would say that it's but that's particularly concerning, you know, as the environment bill is coming in next year, which is going to set levels for

PM, 10 and 2.5, which is going to be lower than current levels. The World Health Organisation quality guidelines also recommends lower levels for Pm 2.5 and pm 10. And we think without monitoring them properly, how are you going to know that those levels are going to be, you know, kept under and now, especially as UK has consistently breached EU obligations on air quality already, and down at Hinkley, when looking at the figures from sophomore District Council, it showed in 2019, that Pm 10 was exceeded on some of the roads 16 times in eight months. And so, you know, we're really concerned about the health effects that's going to have on residents and on the environment. And looking at the sampling done by EDF indicates that there have been frequent problems with collecting accurate data in Volume Two, Appendix 12, the baseline monitoring report, it appeared that some of the samples were discontinued, many of them could not be included because the particle trap was blown off the equipment. And in one of the tables there, for example, it appears that 13 out of the 29 samples were invalid. So how will the quality of the applicants monitoring be assessed and how will it be checked because I'm Afraid that there is not a great deal of confidence in in that at the moment. We also think there's insufficient information on the monitoring of particle matter provided in the outline dust management plan. Because how this is done a monthly mean dust deposition will be used and site action level. But by the time that deposited dust has been collected, analyse the data centre site management that could be many weeks after the dust event occurred. And also the monthly mean aggregate disguises occurrences of high concentrations in specific areas. You know, due to the environmental conditions or intensive works, we also note that there's a lack of receptors in the accommodation campus. And we would like to ask about that, why that is. And, and the other thing I wanted to talk about was the use of mobile plants, including diesel or diesel generated generators. So now it says that the applicant would avoid this word practical, and then limit the diesel generators to temporary functions of less than six months. But we would like to know, is the term of less than six months guaranteed even during Operation overruns? And does it mean that a generator could run for six months? He turned off for a day and then run for another six months? You know, what, what exactly does this mean? And what does? Where practical will mean? How is it quantified? And what are the indices and who decides on them. And this is particularly relevant now, we are looking at the plans for the desalinization plant, which as I understand it, is going to be run from diesel generators. please correct me if I'm wrong about that. But that's how I read it. So if the desalinization plant is going to be run from diesel generators, how is that going to then impact on the air quality, that's obviously going to be one for longer than six months? So we're not quite sure how the applicant comes to the conclusion that that's going to have very little impact on the air quality on the air monitoring, etc. So, let me have a look. And finally, will there be a requirement to use only generators that are modern and have low emissions, because as I, as I understand it, some generators are much more efficient than others. And this will obviously have an impact on the particulates that they admit, thank you.

07:47

Well respond initially with regard to the desalination plant, because that currently isn't before the examination, it is an indication from the applicant of a proposed change. But that is yet to be formally submitted, or to be considered and accepted by the examining authority. So that's really not before us as we stand. So I think, whilst I can understand people's concerns about it, we can't really go into any detail about that today. Can I come to Mr. Moss next is provided a number of detailed responses during the examination, and ask if there's anything in addition, you would wish to add regarding the methodology of assessment? And whether you consider it appropriate.

08:39

Hello, there? Yes, I did send you a report on some including some feedback on some baseline monitoring that I've been doing over the last nine months. So I have a series of readings and my readings are from modern digital device. It goes to media results, not like the ones that East suffered use the diffusion tubes, which you leave out for several months, and then you have to have it analysed in a laboratory in a 20% of them are, all the readings are 20% out. So it's rather inefficient. The number of the data monitoring devices, let's be generous in calling them that tend to be limited to a near the site whereas I've been monitoring where people live, because pollution is going to affect people and not you know, the local Defra monitoring site is in the middle of the field, you know, three or four miles away from any houses. I monitor where people live. Monitor outside the Oxford school, quite frankly, I'd be worried about sending my child to that school. So, can we have more monitors? Could we have digital monitors. Now, what I noticed very much in the responses to the difference between pm 10s and two point fives is that it's in the interest of the developers to include everything in with Pm 10pm chance that they use the word dust a lot. Now it's in their interest to use the word dust because as every good house husband knows, that can be swept up and collected and put in a bin. Whereas 2.5 I don't call dust dust is usually visible, and you can filter it out. Whereas Pm 2.5 are visible, they're more like poison gas than dust. They are poisonous, and lead to many illnesses of children and older people. And you'll notice that a child born at the start of this project will spend the first 15 years of their life breathing in this polluted air at time when they should be maximising their education. And of course, at the other end of the scale, a retiree just leaving will be facing the enhanced Alzheimer's possibility is connected with breathing in 2.5. So that the dust example in the literature is to cover up the fact that two point fives can't be mitigated. They can't be filtered out, there's not much they can do about them apart from reducing them. So it's in their interest that Oh, yes, anything we do about dust, it will sweep up, you know, it will sweep up. If we do something to reduce the 10s, then we will end up reducing the two point fives. But it's the 2.5 to small particulars. They're particularly dangerous. And anyone if you would say there's a very significant chance of this happening. And of course, the literature use words like anticipated problems, and we don't predict anything's going to happen. But anyone who's got a health problem, and 2.5 are associated with all known medical problems, even a 1% chance of making it worse

13:00

is a worry. And I'm concerned that the two point fives are being ignored and being included in with the dust of the 10s because they know there's not much they can do about the 2.5. So that's what allows you to concentrate on is to try and ignore the the greenwash about, we're doing something about the big dust which we can wash and spray down. And I'd like you to concentrate on the very worrying problem. The vast amounts of poisonous 2.5 particulars, which you're going to be spread over suffered. And of course, all the literature aims at is focused on this site, this site where it's all going to happen, and very little on the areas around the site where people live. And unfortunately, sighs realising the location surrounded by lots of people. Thank you.

14:12

Thank you, Mr. Ross. come next to Francis chrome quit. Missing you would wish to add?

14:21

Yes, there is. Firstly I'd like to endorse the comments of Mr. Bateman. And Lord Smalls in particular about particulates. I think that's absolutely crucial. They're monitored and measures are taken on this it's been grossly underestimated. I particularly want to bring the issue of ozone pollution in this area to your attention here. I submitted a written representation on this. The deadline to air quality standards frozen are currently the most widely exceeded of any pollutant in the UK with so far perform exceptionally bad. Late last year Sympton exceeded government guidelines on 29 days 28 the previous day, the previous year 37 in 2018, that's about three times higher than the government target. These exceedances cause very widespread health problems. It's not just limited to the vicinity of a particular road or area. So the impact on population can be huge. These some region also fails the ozone eot 40 long term objective protection of vegetation in the most recent UK compliance assessment issued by Defra in September 2020. I am really perturbed at the applicants and he suffered Council's refusal to consider this pollutant seriously, which I believe may be in contravention of paragraph 5.29 of em one. Moreover, it can't be said that the proposed development will meet the highest environmental standards is this important pollutant, which is a particular problem this area is ignored. The applicants response to the planning inspectors first written questions on the subject shows an absence of any in depth analysis, and a total unwillingness to engage effectively with the issue. The UK government doesn't appear to agree with the applicant's claim that most ozone pollution precursors affecting as part of England emanate from France. The Defra for September 2020 report on air pollution states that by tackling all sources of pollution, so all the ozone precursors, we will continue to reduce formation of ozone in the UK. Yes, ozone is typically wide ranging. But where specifically is the applicants evidence that locally produced ozone precursor pollutants, which will certainly be generated by size we'll see construction and traffic will have no adverse impact on ozone pollution in this area. The onus should surely be on the applicant to provide this detail. It's furthermore very misleading for the applicant to imply that nitric oxide emissions will serve to reduce ozone pollution. Here in Suffolk as this is a highly localised roadside phenomenon mentioned in my own submission, which is specific to urban areas. The applicants refusal to consider his pollutant properly, just one throwaway paragraph, and that only in response to the inspectors question, I think demonstrates a reckless disregard for the health of local people, and are very precious habitats here. Even if the applicant refuses to examine the impact that construction would have on ozone levels, they should nevertheless have an effective and convenient clearly communicated plan to mitigate the impact of their operations when an ozone pollution event is forecast, especially as these are already common, and likely to become more frequent and extreme due to future climate change impacts.

18:16

Moreover, it's known as I outlined in my written representation, those own pollution episodes are often accompanied by increased levels of particulate pollution, presenting even more hazards to vulnerable people. Ozone pollution episodes can be predicted some days in advance, and for protection of local population, particularly elderly children, people spending most of their time outside, it's critical and action plan and trigger points are established now, setting out how the applicant would respond, for example, by restricting number of vehicle and shipping movements, earthworks diesel generation, etc. worryingly, I've been unable to find a proper response to the sound was first written question from the Suffolk council either while the council may not have any statutory duty relating to ozone pollution, would nevertheless be looking after their constituents interests in their dealings with the applicant. On

this pollutant given its prevalence here and our exceedences is Suffolk council confirmed to me in March 2019 that only deal with pollutants which they're responsible for under the local Air Quality Management regime. I've tried on numerous subsequent occasions, to raise my concerns with the Suffolk Council and my elected representatives to find somebody to talk to about these issues, but I've had a complete failure to get any response to my request. So I asked if the applicant will not take ozone pollution seriously. And these Suffolk council are not interested in holding the applicant to account despite paragraph 5.29 and em one Who then is looking after local residents interests on this? Nobody as far as I can see, do children have to die here and our pollution episode for people to wake up and realise this is a real, very real issue for local residents and visitors. We had to take my own son to a in a in a pollution incident and ozone pollution. It's an asthma attack. When he was a toddler, we didn't even know he had asthma and we were visitors and over at the time, this is a very, very real issue. It seems that the applicants and council councils review their policy may be guilt guilty, quantification bias that's giving more importance things that are easily quantified a month monitored like matches oxides and pm 10. And ignoring those or not giving enough emphasis emphasise to those which can't like ozone and particularly Pm 2.5. I urge the planning inspectors to ensure they're properly researched and scientifically based assessment is urgently carried out of the cumulative impacts on ozone air pollution. of size we'll see conjunct that construction in conjunction with the other major infrastructure infrastructure projects that will be taking place at the same time in this area. And additionally to make sure it's effectively clear strategy put in place. Responding to the measures. I won't repeat the already outlined in my written representation, including halting activities during pollution episodes. Finally, maybe this should be under another agenda point but I don't know whether it'll be a chance that I also reassures the proper 24 hour emergency medical facility will be set up east of the a 12. Throughout the construction works. When we had to take our toddler to a&e we were very lucky to be seeing quickly and easily all over hospital but that a&e facility no longer exists. Although the absolute claims journeys 20 will only be a few seconds longer during construction works. I certainly wouldn't gamble a child's life on this calculation. Should there be an extra wide load of construction new round about an accident, or just routine roadworks to repair all the wear and tear from the volume of HTV is a delay could be catastrophic. I urge you please to take my concerns seriously because I don't feel they have been so far. Thank you.

22:43

Now before I go to Isa for Council, are there any other interested parties that would wish to make any additional points? Mr. solara?

22:57

Thank you, Mr. Moore, and John several, your Oxford parish Council. Mr. Moss happened to mention the Oxford school. I would like to register here, both with the Inspectorate. And also with the Suffolk Council and Suffolk County Council, we do have a concern about the impact of air quality on this school. We've already registered it actually on the in the current situation because the school sits on the a 1120 we're expecting the volume of traffic on that to go up considered. But that is only 100 yards from the junction with the a 12 near the Oxford roundabout where obviously vehicles particularly in early years, are going to be turning up onto the 1112.

23:48

And we're very concerned about the impact of air quality on the Oxford school and we just like to register that please. Thank you very much. Mr. Collins.

24:03

Thank you, Mr. Moreland, to follow up actually on what John Sutherland has just said. It's notable that in PDFs, documents and let me just pull up the reference app for eight seven, that they are actually saying that concentrations of Pm 10pm 22.5 will actually reduce during the early years compared to their baseline, which quite frankly is unbelievable. How can increased traffic in this area which create these types of pollutants actually exactly end up with a reduction. I could understand a reduction once the SLR has become operable, but certainly not in these early years when some of the traffic levels are at their highest. Thank you. Thank you

25:00

Come now then to a Suffolk Council and hear your comments on what's been said so far.

25:09

Good afternoon, sir Isabella 440 Suffolk Council. So as you all have noted from the local impact report, the council is satisfied that the project won't give rise to a significant impact on nitrogen dioxide or fine particulate matter. There were certain concerns that were raised at the time of the Li are particularly in respect of the Stratford sun and drew Air Quality Management Area. Since then, further controls have been proposed and are set out in the code of construction practice. In particular, controls on emission standards for heavy duty vehicles and for nonroad Mobile machinery have now been agreed and included in that document. There is also a provision in the document for the production of a dust monitoring and management plan, which will need to be approved by East Suffolk Council and the detail of that document is on the discussion between the council and the applicants. There is just one point to note on that which I'm sure can be picked up in discussions with the applicant, but in respect of the equivalent provision for the noise monitoring and management plan, there's a provision for that plan to be agreed before relevant construction works commence, whereas there's no equivalent in terms of the dust monitoring and management plan. It doesn't say when it has to be approved, and it doesn't preclude anything from taking place before it is approved. So that, I hope is something that can be picked up in discussions outside of the examination, just in respect of some of the concerns have been raised in terms of monitoring. It's anticipated that that DMP will include details or proposed monitoring locations and frequency. And that will be the subject of approval by the Council in terms of the monitoring of Pm 2.5. That's not currently monitored as Mr. Brim Dr. Rubinfeld explained earlier by the Council. And the council haven't specifically asked for that monitoring as part of the wider project monitoring, and the reason for that is that the IQM guidance of 2018 on monitoring the facility of demolition and construction sites makes it clear that the emissions of dust from construction sites are predominantly in the coarser fractions and monitoring a Pm 2.5 should not normally be required. And we'll include that extract in our written summary following following this hearing. But that's that's that's the rationale for not having asked for it. Now we understand the number of local residents have concerns about that. And if that's something that the applicant were willing to countenance and funds, then we would welcome that. But we haven't specifically asked for it. I'm just going to ask Dr. Broomfield if there's any other points that he wanted to address you on Friday.

28:16

Okay. Yes, thank you. Mr. So Mark Broomfield on behalf of the Suffolk Council. So I just wanted to pick up a few of the, perhaps the more the more technical or science based comments that were made. A few minutes ago, I particularly wanted to discuss the question of ozone pollution that was raised by Miss Crowe. ozone is very important pollutant, and it does have effects on health has misquote indicated, you can predict when ozone episodes are going to happen. And that's because they happen on a regional basis. So the atmospheric chemistry mechanisms that form ozone take place over an extended period. So what that means is that air pollution, ozone levels evolve over a period of time. And that means that ozone is a regional pollutant. So for example, the South of England or in the case of Suffolk, very often influenced by emissions from continental Europe. So what that means is that is that there is the effect of the proposed development on OHS Dane would be would not be significant in this area. So there's no benefit or need in setting additional requirements on the applicant in respect of ozone because they wouldn't be effective in addressing any ozone issues that arise. And that's why it's dealt with. at a regional level, you need a strategic approach to reducing emissions of oxides of nitrogen and vo C's. So I think while I understand the concerns don't. Our view is that it's not for for this development or this application to deal with ozone. I also wanted to just comment on some of the questions around monitoring devices. So it is possible to use digital devices to measure air pollutants. Some of these devices are quite good. And lower cost effective equipment has been developed all the time. But some of it particularly the lower budget, end of the market is extremely poor quality and uncontrolled uncalibrated instruments. And the results they give are unreliable. So that's really why I wouldn't be advising a sub accounts to rely on the findings of such instruments. You know, we do need to use robust data and methods. I think, yeah. And they, and then just to, I think Mr. First covered the question of why we're focusing on on Pm 10. And dust. It's not a it's not a cover up. In any sense. It's focusing on the pollutants that are relevant to this development. As I said earlier, pm 2.5 is a crucially important pollutant. In no way would a self a counsellor myself seeks to under underplay its importance. But it has been assessed as part comprehensively as part of the work that's been carried out, we've secured additional mitigation of emissions from nonroad Mobile machinery and heavy duty vehicles. We continue to liaise with the applicant on those. But monitoring is is not number one priority. Although again, as Mr. First said, if it's possible to secure some monitoring as part of this application, then that would be welcomed for for broader reasons of improving air quality and understand the air quality in the power. So I think that's that's the comments that I wanted to make. I'll just see if if there any other comments that Isa council wishes to, to raise? Thank you. I'll come back to the point. But if you want to ask your colleagues if there's anything further, and I think that's that's it, I think from so thank you. One of the points that Mr. Massad made, and I think others have made in representations is that having a digital metre allow, it gives you a result straightaway. And one of the concerns, obviously, is that monitoring may happen, but over a delayed time period. So if you had appropriate calibrated devices, would it overcome that problem? And would that be a sensible? suggestion? Yes, if you had a suitable calibrated device, that could be a valuable tool to help you manage pollution impacts.

32:49

I think the, for this application, what we found is that the the key issue is annual mean, concentrations, that the short term peak concentrations of nitrogen dioxide don't approach the levels that will be of concern. So in the context of this development, we're interested in ensuring the annual mean concentrations stay at a suitable level. And because of that, diffusion tubes were there, they're they're

cheap to run, they have some uncertainty. There's the delay in getting the results as as Mr. Moss mentioned, but they do give you information that is of a suitable quality for managing the impact of the development. So they do have a diffusion tubes, you have a role to play in managing the air quality impacts. I think any additional techniques may be useful, I think you'd have to be really careful with the techniques that you chose. We're finding that even equipment that cost say 5000 pounds is difficult to get into work reliably. And then you're getting towards the level of the more standard monitoring installations that are quite a quite well established. So I don't have all that out. certainly something that we could perhaps continue to discuss, see if that could play a role in a monitoring strategy. And that might be appropriate for consideration as part of the dust monitoring and management plan. If we can extend that to include nitrogen dioxide as well. Okay, thank you. Now, note, some hands come back up. I don't wish to do a sort of ping pong. But are there any new points that have not already been raised? So if I can come to Mr. Haley?

34:43

Yes, thank you. There is currently infusion tube monitoring the traffic lights in Saxmundham and given the probability of some sidewall traffic going through the town, combined with the new Well, a garden neighbourhood development through the District Council intend to carry on with that and perhaps provide enhanced monitoring. And additionally, the random road junction with the a 12, which is likely to see a large increase in traffic. Is there any proposal to introduce monitoring, please? Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Francis Crowe, you've obviously already had your say. So it was a very quick point.

35:38

A very quick point just to say on particulates. The Council's justification for not looking at pm 2.5 is it's not generated by contract construction in a significant way. But it is by road traffic, not just from emissions, it's from tar and break where and road where. And Lawrence moss has pointed that in the past, I was in my written representation, that is not a justification for not looking at pm 2.5. And I also as you probably would expect, I I would like to know, the evidence for the count for Mark Bloomfield brownfields statement that local ozone precursors are not significant. It's easy for them to say that, where's the evidence? Thank you.

36:30

Rather than going back to the Suffolk Council, I would ask that you assist the examining authority in your written summary and perhaps giving us some response to that fact and then come back to the applicant, then if that's alright with you, for them to respond formally to these various points.

36:56

Thank you. So yeah, so the points that I can deal with briefly the point about the dust outline dust management plan, and if it isn't there at the moment and provision that it needs to be agreed before construction commences, take that away and make sure that there is such a provision on Pm 2.5. I think you've already heard from Dr. Lowe earlier today. And the position of the applicant is that I think in agreement with Dr. Green coming really that we don't consider that Pm 2.5 monitoring is justified for this application. And on the data points, I'm then going to ask Dr. Lowe, who you heard from earlier to respond. Sir, you're right, there is a significant level of agreement between the applicant and the Suffolk Council on this. And indeed, I think it's been more agreement since and there's going to be a revised

version of the statement of common ground to be put in to set that out. So in light of the fact you've already heard from Dr. Green, but it may be that it's a it's enough, Dr. Lowe to indicate his agreement on certain matters, rather than setting out those points again, but the points I'm going to ask him to deal with it in some way or another is Miss Bateman's points about monitoring strategy. Insufficient detail alleged insufficient detail in the data management plan, diesel generators in the six month point desalination plants in light of what you say so I'm not going to ask him to respond on that other than unless it would be useful to you and perhaps the public attending this examination to set out a headline response. I think it was a shore point raised there rely on diesel Reliant diesel generators. Is that right or not? You sir. That's Miss Bateman. Mr. system. Moss points about the adequacy and numbers of monitors. And his concerns about pm 2.5. Ms. Crow, about ozone. And also, again, pm 2.5 from traffic in particular. Mr. sutherland, about your Oxford school. And then finally, I think Mr. Collins, about pm 2.5 and pm 10. So can I hand over to Dr. Lane to address those please? Good afternoon,

39:17

sir. So yes, just to reiterate, the position is substantially agreed with the local authorities. And as you've outlined through the statement of common ground. Further update of that is going to be submitted at deadline seven, which further points have been agreed in terms of the approach to control and mitigation of air quality effects. But in summary, through the measures proposed, we don't see any risk of exceedance of National Quality Strategy objectives or standards. We see no compromising of air quality in the existing air quality management area. And also, we see no significant effects across air quality from the different pollutants that are potentially emitted from the different sources in terms of the specific points raised relating to the monitoring. So in addition to the monitoring that we're proposing for dust, which will be deposited dust, we will also be monitoring for Pm 10. As we've already previously discussed, pm 2.5, we haven't identified as a pollutant that's at risk of exceedance of the National Quality Strategy, objectives. Nor is it a pollutant that we see substantial emissions associated with the proposed development. Now, we recognise the community concerns around pm 2.5. So I think what we will do is, after the hearings, we will further engage with the local authority and discuss internally and provide a written response on the approach to bm 2.5. Because we recognise that there is some community concern around that pollutant. So we'll come back on that point. In terms of the other monitoring, we've have done baseline monitoring, to support the application itself. And we're committed to doing further baseline monitoring prior to the start of construction. So the monitoring will be at various locations around areas where we perceive there would be a potential risk of emissions. So around the main development site and the strategic road network, some of that monitoring would be undertaken by the applicant. And that was is going to be confirmed through the dust monitoring and management plan. And is also confirmed through the code of construction practice relating to no to diffusion tube monitoring, that we're going to undertake the monitoring that's undertaken already by Suffolk Council on the strategic road network at various locations, the commitment has been made that the applicant will continue to financially support the provision of ongoing monitoring at those locations. The reason that we're doing that is that it allows the council to retain a body of monitoring evidence, and therefore BIOS supporting that, rather than taking over that the same protocols, the same monitoring methods, the same monitoring locations, and the same consistent data set can be developed and supported. So by doing that, I think that captures any potential areas of concern on air quality, such that we can use that data. In terms of the reporting of the results as Dr. brimfield outlined, it's the annual average results that would be of potential concern from an Air Quality Strategy compliance perspective. And that's why

the longer term monitoring methods are being proposed. And indeed, that monthly evaluation of those results through the various search channels that are being developed. However, the Pm 10 monitoring that we're proposing would be a more instantaneous results. And therefore, we will be using that and the contractors would be using that to inform the approach to dust mitigation and management of just activities on the site, such that there will be action and trigger levels agreed. And that data will then be interpreted and responded to much more readily. So that's the more of the real time monitoring that we're looking to adopt. And again, that's being secured through the dust monitoring and management plan, which From now on, I will call the de m MP, because it's a bit of a mouthful. terms of the other points raised apart from the monitoring, and the Oh yes, so the dust management plan itself, the outline dust management plan, and I do apologise for the different terms that was included within the code of construction practice. I think working with the council's we recognise that because the contract has hadn't yet been

43:52

set up to start the construction works, obviously, because we're at the consenting stage of the project. We didn't have the detail available at this stage to be definitive regarding the exact mitigation to be used for disk control in specific locations of the duration of that. So because that detail is available. That's why we've committed to providing the de m MP, and certainly does need to be agreed prior to construction, but we will confirm that in writing. And that is therefore secured by requirement as part of the code of construction practice. And because of all these different plans, what we have prepared and again, that will be submitted at deadlines seven as part of the statement of common ground and appended to it, is we have a flowchart of the different management techniques and the management plans that are being applied and how they all fit together to try and make it a little bit more explanatory. We've shared that with the council's already and they're very supportive. That's inclusion. So I think to reassure people's concern around the dose management plan the DMP will secure the detail that we need. And we've shared the scope of that with the council's and agree the content of the DMP that will be secured by requirement. In terms of the accommodation campus that was assessed in the air quality assessment as a receptor, I think the receptor is L e 42. Again, I think we will have to confirm that in writing after the hearings. But certainly we are aware of the accommodation campus will have receptors associated with it. And we have considered those from a quality perspective. I don't think we'll talk through the desalination plant at this stage of the village, I believe that there will be generators needed for its power provision. So that is one of the aspects that we're considering is the obligation of that location of that just tubes of the generators. It's important, perhaps just to stress that it's been agreed. And this is the approach adopted at Hinkley Point C as well, that construction generators across the site will all be aggregated or added together. And if they exceed a certain threshold, which is the 50 megawatt thermal input threshold, then the average agency are requiring an environmental permit for the regulation and control of the use of those generators. So that's confirmed, and therefore that permitting process will secure the use of those generators, the emission performance of those generators and how they're controlled and operated. Irrespective of that threshold, the generators themselves would be captured under what's called the medium combustion plant directive. And that how that has been transposed into the UK right legislation, I'd say was medium combustion plants, they similarly will require permits for their operation, which will also determine their control. On top of all of that, we'll be working with the council's to agree a position whereby there is an aspiration to limit the use of diesel generators during the construction phase. There's a plan to electrify parts of the

construction site, such that the use of diesel generators is going to be minimised and avoided. There is some commitments relating to that as part of the statement of common ground. And to summarise all of that we have an air quality mitigation summary, which will again sit as part of the same bit of common ground, which sets all these different aspects out.

47:31

I think the ozone points I, again, understand locally the concerns related to that, but I would reiterate Dr. Brookfields points that ozone in the south of England is predominantly from what are called aged blooms blooms that take a number of days to form. And it's therefore the advection of air, which typically is coming from France to reach the southern coast of the UK. And by that stage, the ozone is then formed through the precursors. So local formation of ozone does take several days of an aged plume to take place. So locally to emission sources, ozone is not formed in any substantial concentrations. And yes, large concentrations of CO₂ do or have the effect of reducing or reacting with us and that is present. The point about the ozone precursors is that we are committed to using the mitigation and control measures that we've outlined to reduce the NO_x emissions from the various aspects of the development through the use of electrification of the site, through the use of the Euro six compliant engines for HGVs, etc, such that we are seeking to reduce the amount of CO₂ released. So ozone formation and ozone management is very much a regional issue. It's a European wide issue in actual fact, but certainly what we will do is seek to reduce the NO_x emissions that may contribute to ozone formation much further downwind. I think those are the key points unless I've missed anything. The school so we've assessed receptors on the networks wherever we've identified receptors, and we tend to identify the closest receptor to the road network and the closest receptors to the main development site. So we have a number of receptors in the air quality chapter, some schools, some residential developments and some residential properties. So I know we are assessed at least in school, the Oxford school I will have to confirm but if we have listed it as a specific receptor, that's because we've used a another receptor which is closer to the road or would he receive an even higher potential effect from road traffic, and that would be used as a surrogate for the school. Again, in all cases, what we're finding is that the background air quality in the area is already good. And the concentrations that are being generated by a proposed development and the traffic associated with the development are very, very low, such that we see no risk of exceedance of any air quality, strategy, objectives or standards. Mr. Flanagan, are there any points or is that so?

50:35

Low? That that's it from us? Thank you, sir.

50:37

Thank you, I think it just for my benefit. And I think it would also help the interested parties who have attended and you've heard from when you do your written response to today, one of the things that I couldn't find was your response to their previous representations. And so Mr. Mouse was CRO, and task have all set out in those representations and quite detailed air quality points, which they've referenced, nope. Powerful. If you could point to me, where you've responded to those if you have or, if you haven't, do so. We'll do that. Yes. Thank you very much. The next element on the agenda is the Pm 10pm 2.5. And Knox action levels. And my understanding at the moment is that he suffered council had some have not agreed to pm 10 monitoring threshold, as set out I think it's in table 4.1. So if I could

clarify what it is that he suffered counsellors seeking, whether that has now been agreed, or is it still an outstanding point

52:00

is about a letter for for East Suffolk Council. The Pm 10 action level is now agreed it's 190 micrograms per cubic metre. And that's in accordance with the IQ guidance. The actual level proposed for dust in this in the cscp is currently 0.5. And that's not agreed, we suggest it should be 0.2. But because that accords with the IQ and guidance, but we understand from discussions outside of this hearing, that the applicant is agreeable to replacing that with 0.2. So we think that matters agreed. And there are some continuing discussions which are reflected in the draft statement of common ground and draft dm MP about action levels in respect of nitrogen dioxide on the main development site itself. And we we think agreement will be reached between us and the applicant on that as well. And that will be reflected in the submission that deadline seven.

53:05

Thank you. In light of that positive responses through anything from the applicant,

53:16

led to confirm that the nought point to action level for dust is agreed. Mr. For indicated. So we will confirm that in writing. Thank you.

53:29

Perhaps slightly gone out of turn, but they ought to ask whether the other interested parties have anything in addition to ask on that particular point on the agenda. Mr. Collins?

53:45

Yes, sorry. It's just my point wasn't answered from the last time about the fact that they are claiming that there will be a reduction in in in levels at the Oxford a 12 B 1122. junction. During the early years we've seen contrary to what you'd expect with an increase in HGV movements.

54:11

Thank you for that reminder. And, Mr. Flanagan, perhaps you are one of your team can respond to Mr. Collins.

54:20

Yes, I'll ask Dr. Day to respond if he can. And if he can't then ask him to do so in writing. And over to Dr. Lowe.

54:28

Thank you, sir. And apologies for not responding to that comment before I will have to go through the assessment to understand and double check the numbers are my understanding is that we have a negligible contribution of Pm 10pm 2.5. It may be that the way is reported is showing a gradual improvement in the baseline concentration and that's why it shows a negative but rather than maker

position. Now that turns out to be false. I think I will put that into writing and cough The position on that regard, irrespective the concentrations associated with the proposed development traffic are negligible.

55:09

Okay, thank you.

55:14

Right. So the next element is the dust mitigation. And from what I seen, it's really about whether the standard that would be enforceable and monitored managed, would achieve what we needed to achieve, so that there aren't adverse consequences. Now, we've obviously heard a number of points already on this. We've got the Outland us management plan. And initially, the Suffolk council didn't consider that to be sufficiently enforceable. And also that the coda construction practice needed to be amended to improve dust management, perhaps, let's see a set of accounts whether that position is still the case, or are we now much further on

56:10

is the bellota 440 Suffolk Council, we have moved on with the offer for a DM MP which will be subject to approval by ESC. And we understand that the applicant isn't currently in a position to provide all of that detail without the conductor's haven't been appointed. And so we're satisfied subject for the slight amendment. I mentioned earlier, that that's an appropriate mechanism for dealing with those matters. There are some matters of the subject of ongoing discussion, for example, you'll have heard Dr. Lowe mention. The I think he said the aspiration to keep the use of diesel generators to a minimum. And we're asking for more details on when the main development site will be connected to the mains electricity. And we want to know the steps that that will involve unlikely timescales and that sort of thing. So those discussions are ongoing. But as an approach, we're happy with the use of the DM MP.

57:13

Thank you. And can I clarify with you are a number of points that you raised on detailed elements of it, for example, definitions of what excessive weather conditions might be, I think that was referenced in the local impact report, and also haul roads and hard surfacing where appropriate, and how that was to be decided. So are those issues now resolved to in your is that again, still subject to further discussion?

57:49

Is ability for yourself or counsel, as I understand that it's subject to ongoing discussion, and the intention is that that will be captured in the DMP.

57:59

Right, okay. All right. Well, thank you for that. Are there any other interested parties wishing to make any additional issues in respect of the dust mitigation item on the agenda? No, I shall then turn to the applicant for their response.

58:29

So thank you mean that the position is out as outlined by Mr. Fair, we take the dust mitigation plan is the correct approach is secured via the code of construction practice requirement to turn secures the

code of construction practice and the requirement to has been amended to require in accordance with rather general accordance. So that's been amended. There are ongoing discussions as to the detail. I'm not proposing subjects unless you ask otherwise, to add or to touch lay for further insight into those discussions, given that they're happening offline and progress is being made. So unless you specifically are said, that's our response.

59:13

That's fine. Thank you. takes us to the next issue in terms of the Stratford St. Andrew and Woodbridge air quality management areas. Now again, I think it's lastly an agreed position between the applicant and the council subject to agreeing controls on the number of hgvs which would be my hope I've got this right. Not your oh six standard. Is that correct? Perhaps if a Suffolk council respond, first call me

59:54

it's ability for for a Suffolk Council. That is partially correct. And that we We did what we did want controls, and caps on on the proportion of HD TVs, that were your row six non compliance. But that has now been incorporated into the code of construction practice and there is a cap, and we're satisfied with it. And the same in respect of non road mobile machinery that's under this topic. But those caps are now incorporated into the cscp. And we're happy with them. There's one additional point on this in that Dr. Lowe has helpfully indicated that the applicant is committed to funding esds ongoing monitoring at offsite locations, which is as we understood it, and welcome, but I'm not sure that the deed of obligation has quite caught up with that yet. So I'm not sure that's yet Incorporated. But I understand that the intention is for it to be so Incorporated.

1:01:01

Thank you. And from my reading your initial concerns, it really focused in on Stratford Santander as opposed to Woodbridge. So is that understanding again, correct? Yes, that is correct. That Thank you, on that basis, and I'll just ask Suffolk County Council for their view, because I think from my reading of their representation they had identified in their position, they were concerned about possible effects of Woodbridge, possibly by delays on the a 12. Then resulting in traffic going off as lie in the 812 and consequently, affecting air quality issues in the Woodbridge quality management area. So if I can hear from Suffolk County Council, please.

1:01:58

Thank you. So Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, there's although obviously we've defer to the district council on the detail. You're right, that that is a matter that we had raised. I'll just bring in Mr. Mary, for a comment on our current position.

1:02:14

Thank you. Hello, good afternoon, sir. See most African council? Yes, is correct. In our local patch report, we did raise concerns about the potential of traffic being diverted into Woodbridge. those concerns have fallen away to two degree or you're just waiting to see some of the scenario testing from the traffic Incident Management Plan just to confirm that that is acceptable to us.

1:02:49

Pride, okay, when do you anticipate getting that information through and being able to assess it and confirm or otherwise to the examining authority? It is suitable?

1:03:01

That would be a question for the applicant. And my phrase is we are waiting for them to do the scenario testing.

1:03:08

Okay. Right. Back to the applicant, man. Thank you. Mr. Flanagan, if you're able to respond to those points for me.

1:03:25

Yes. On the final points about Woodbridge, I'm just asking the transport team if they're able to provide a response now. So I'll just come back to that in a moment. The the other points you just heard from from a Suffolk Council on where as to the D potentially needing to include provision regarding aq ma monitoring, I think that is right that is not yet in the deed. So that can be included. The other key points were regarding proportions of non euro six compliant hgvs and also not actually under this heading but mentioned anyway, the proportion of non road mobile machinery perhaps why just very briefly hand over to Dr. Lowe to explain what those proportions are that they're agreed, and then I'll come back on the Woodbridge point. Okay.

1:04:20

Thank you, Richard Lee representing the applicant. So yes, so has been confirmed, we have agreed the proportion of vehicles ATVs and buses to adopt the Euro six Engine standard which is the high performing Engine standard. And, again, we are formalising that through the statement of common ground and also the construction traffic management plan and the construction worker travel plan. More plans and more acronyms. So the Euro six compliance just to confirm The I believe it is that no more than 8% of individual vehicles on an annual basis would be exempt from meeting the Euro six compliance. So there'll be a registration scheme for vehicles. And that's to look for a number of reasons to have an exemption. It may be for the availability of vehicles, but it also allows for local supply contractors to be able to support the project if they can't meet the Euro six compliance. So there are a number of reasons why that was put in as as an exemption. And that exemption has been agreed with the council's so that will be managed through the registration scheme. I think we'll come on to the non rude mobile machinery on a later gender point. So perhaps suggest we'll defer till that. Okay, thank you.

1:06:00

Can I now, sir, bringing Kent Miss Garcia, Mike Mullen, who can respond, hopefully on the Woodbridge transport point. Thank you.

1:06:15

The current amount mother's on behalf of the applicants, I was having internet problems. So I'm hoping that I've got the question. Right. And I had Mr. Mary, saying that we are reaching agreement in terms of the effect of traffic and in Woodbridge based on the modelling. And that was updated as part of the ta

denden. And that he's awaiting scenario testing tend to the temp, we've got a meeting on this tomorrow with Suffolk County Council. And this was something that was raised at the the issue specific hearing on on transport. And with regard to if there was an incident in certain locations, what the response would be in the protocol and put in place by by sizewell C, in order to manage the traffic during that incident. And those incidents would be different places and different scenario testing. So the is kind of live discussions, and we will provide that as part of the updated temp based on those discussions in that agreement. We wouldn't be envisaging obviously, as part of that, that there would be any diversions of traffic through Woodbridge as part of an incident. The The purpose of the incident management plan is to manage our traffic and to hold our traffic in the event of an incident. So we can provide further updates on that following the discussions with the council.

1:07:45

When we expect to see that.

1:07:49

And for the tickets like it would be by deadline eight, I imagine. We can provide that we can provide an update for deadlines, certainly in terms of where we've got to add those discussions. eisah. I think that would be helpful. We'll take that away as an action. Thank you. Okay.

1:08:22

So I take it really, apart from that ongoing point, we've really dealt with the air quality management areas, and lease of a council subject to those elements, our content that the policy requirements would be met. So if we can then go on to the item number nine, the mitigation and controls. Looking at the code of contract construction practices, obviously a number of updates have happened already. But there seems to be a ongoing debate between a sort of a counsellor applicant about whether the the sample should be approved by a piece of a council or not. And if not, how would that issue be agreed? There's also the issue, I think, with regards to the baseline monitoring for measuring concentrations during the deployment of the nonroad mobile machinery, so perhaps if the server counsel can respond initially, then we'll go to the applicant. Thank you.

1:09:40

Isabella, for a Suffolk counsel said both of those matters are we anticipate going to be resolved to our satisfaction through the DM MP, the details of which not yet all fully established, but were liaising and positive discussions were contained If we approve the DMP and the applicant is required to carry out construction in accordance with that plan, then we don't need to approve that stamps.

1:10:14

Okay, and are you now contend with the issues that had been raised about the non non road mobile machinery? I think there was some concern about potential air pollutant that you'd raise in natural England and raised.

1:10:35

But we certainly have raised concerns and there's now a limit or a cap of I think it's 15% of nr M's not only a maximum of 15% not compliant with I think it's stage four for in this instance. And so we're

satisfied with that control mechanism. We are still concerned about the diesel generators and the electrification of the main development site. And that's a subject of ongoing discussion. And the crcp now contains a control which requires the nr mm to be located away from sensitive receptors, the those that are non stage four compliant, so the more polluting of them, and we're satisfied with that control.

1:11:35

Okay, thank you. Come to just ask any other interested parties, whether they have any additional comments that wish to make about the code of construction practice? not seeing any hands up, so perhaps the applicant can respond to those points?

1:12:00

Yes, thank you, sir. So it's helpful agreement that via approval by the council's approval of the D MMP, there isn't requirement to approve the sap. So that's an agreed position. You'll see from the opposition as well on non road mobile machinery. Can I just hand back over to Dr. Richard Lowe to pick up where we left off on that?

1:12:28

Thank you, sir. Richard Lowe representing the applicant. Yes, so as outlined by the Council, we agree with the position on the update of the code of construction practice and the use of the D MMP to secure the additional provisions with regards to the non road mobile machinery and AR m m. Yes, we have agreed at that stage for compliance will be adopted, or stage five compliance for the larger units, there will be an exemption of 15%. Again, through a registration scheme. That percentage is based on a number of factors, there is actually a slight shortage of stage four compliant machinery being available at certain times for large construction projects. That's one of the aspects that we are all collectively aware of, which is why that exemption is in place. And that's been agreed with the council's, but again, it's through a registration scheme, and will be managed through that process. So by by adopting those measures, and the other measures in the code of construction practice, we're confident that any significant adverse effects can be avoided for air quality. Thank you very much. Are there any other points Mr. Flanagan knows that response.

1:13:57

So on item nine on the agenda, that is our response, other than to obviously you've got the question as under, as well as under item five noise about this application for defensive statute authority. And our response is the same for the same reasons on that say we don't think it should be to supply. That's it.

1:14:18

Well, we're a couple of other points I had on the item nine agenda before we do close so I don't think I need to go any further into the outline does management plan unless anyone has any additional PRICE WE'VE HEARD quite comprehensively on that already this afternoon. I do have a question on the construction traffic management plan. And it's quite a detail when it says I think that maximum of 300 HD TVs and then it says deliveries per day and being a patent it possibly But does that mean to say hgvs that are Aren't delivering something are excluded. In other words, a lorry arrives to collect something and take it away offside. I wouldn't want that to be a misunderstanding that there's actually

more than 300 hgvs could be allowed to have I can ask Mr. Flanagan, whether the reason the deliveries is in there or just being overly cautious.

1:15:29

So as I understand it, it's that is total numbers. And I think the distinction is between deliveries, which is 300. Rather than counting the two way movements, which would be 600. And the use of the word deliveries to indicate that someone, it's a lorry that goes there comes back, it's the same lorry, as opposed to if you were to count the two way movements, it would be 600.

1:15:55

Now that's fine. It's just obviously, I could see some wonder if arrivals might be a better word. I wonder if it could just ask you to have a look at that. So there's no ambiguity. It might be just the way my mind is working, potentially, and

1:16:11

given Miss McLaughlin is here, perhaps to make sure I have an understand she may have a better answer. Could I just ask them about Mr. Milan to come in and stay with us? Yeah, got it completely wrong. So if Mr. Barton could come in, thank you.

1:16:25

Hello, Sam's. Catamount Mullen on behalf of the applicant. And it was actually to try and avoid ambiguity because often a number is set out and construction people deal in deliveries, and whether they're empty or not, and they call them deliveries. As transport planners, we always deal with two way movements. So within the construction traffic management plan, we've set out 600 to a Maven. So in paragraph 4.4, point six, for example. And it's shooting, we'll go through and double check this, it should always say the two way movements, and then potentially in brackets to kind of clarify what the one way and kind of number of deliveries would be. But you're right, we could we can have a look at the kind of 300 deliveries and see if that could be worded better. But effectively, the cap is 600, whether empty or not. That's it. That's that's included in the cap.

1:17:21

Okay, guys, just just the way my mind was working. I just didn't want there to be some confusion. Someone's just asking me a comment. Yeah, I used I wonder if perhaps the simple phrase of arrivals and departures might clarify it. But I'll leave that with you to consider. But also, I think on the question of approval or not of the stamps. I think we did comment on that. And the concern about possible issue of external controls and checks in the review of the decio. So that is likely again, I think, to arise art is age 14. So if you can bear that in mind, it will be something that will need to be considered. I think the only other point I had again, it's linking back to the construction worker, travel plan. Table within that document rep two zero 55 refers to the park and ride I I just simple clarification, I assume that's the park and ride at the land east of eastland Industrial Estate. So I don't think it could be anything else at that point. So I'll ask Miss Valente.

1:18:58

I'm assuming you're meaning everything to table sorry, test out Milan path for the applicant. So I'm assuming you're referring to table 3.1 in the early years, and the reference to park and ride buses? Yes, Yes, that's correct. That's the landais to face them. So we can we can make that clearer within that table. I think then,

1:19:21

that's all the questions that I had for everyone. So just check to see Mr. Ferber from the surface. You have your hand raised.

1:19:34

Thank you. So yes, just a couple of points on the construction worker travel plan. If I may. You'll be aware that the both of the council's have been pressing the applicant for increased electric vehicle charging points in the car parks. And the applicants initial proposal was 5%. And we understand that that has increased or they're willing to increase it to 20% which we welcome Although we really defer to Suffolk County Council on whether that 20% meets with their policy requirements, but we certainly work on the increase from five. And the other thing is we have been asking the applicant to confirm that all of the buses will be zero or ultra low emitting. So we hope that we can reach agreement with them that that will be the case. Thank you,

1:20:28

perhaps if I can come into Suffolk County Council and hear your views on that before I go back to the applicant.

1:20:38

Thank you. So Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council are bringing Mr. Mary to Blayne our position on the numbers of electric charging points that our policies expect.

1:20:53

Hello, good afternoon, sir. St. Mary's ever gonna cancel? Yes, the certificate parking guidance does request or Well, I asked for 20% Electric charging points, and also provision for the operators for an additional 20%. So that is what we put in our previous responses. You'll have to forgive me that I haven't seen a response from size or so. And we're not aware that they've increased it from the 5% they offered to the 20%. But if that is the case, that would be acceptable. Okay, perhaps the applicant can. Okay, just Yes, I'm gonna hand over to doctor later. So those two points, firstly, electric charging points 20% or not? And then also buses as well, please. Thank you, doctor. No.

1:21:46

Thank you, Richard Laird representing the applicant. And yes, so we can confirm that the 20% provision of electric charging points can be agreed. And that will be secured through the update to the construction worker, travel planner, and the design principles document, I believe it's the location that that will be secured in. So that 20%, with the infrastructure for further to the present, is agreed by the applicant. With regards to the buses, we have confirmed through the use of the term HDV rather than HGTV that the Euro six compliance would still apply to the buses. So that's our position at this stage with regards to the emissions performance of the buses. So it would match that of the hgvs.

1:22:38

Forgive me, is an ultra low emissions bus equivalent to the Euro six or are they slightly different terminologies meaning different things?

1:22:49

And that's a very good question, sir. And that's what I've been trying to think about how I can answer before coming to this discussion. So I think we need to take that specific offline as to what we agree with the council's in that regard. But I think the Euro six provision based on the air quality effects that we are predicting, and based on that as a mitigation measure for all of the HDX V's reaching the site and accessing the site to and from the site, we consider that to be appropriate. But we will confirm with the council's their understanding of ultra low emissions and whether that differs. Thank you.

1:23:29

I think just one final point on the electric charging points. You've made reference to a 20%. I think he's active. And then potentially an additional percentage, which are, I think, described as passive. They're there, but they're not immediately available. What what's the trigger that would move it from from passive to active? Or are they just gonna sit there with the cables under the bar?

1:24:02

And it's a good question, sir. So I think that the way that they would be applied is that that allows for expansion as the electric free gradually is replacing the existing petrol and diesel fleet, we think it will be to support the demand as it grows for car parking spaces. So the expectation is that the fleet will gradually move to an electrified fleet over the next five to 10 years. So as to allow provision for that to support that safeguarding.

1:24:34

I understand the philosophy and it seemed like a good idea, but what I don't understand is, what would make the extra 20% actually become active. What, you know, what, what happens to make that happen?

1:24:49

That's a good question, sir. I think I'll have to take away that question as to how we can formalise that and what the trigger would be for that.

1:24:57

Okay. I'm on guessing that there may be a slight distinction between the park and ride sites which are temporary, and the main develop site, which would be permanent. I think your rights here will need to understand that. Okay. I know Mr. Bedford has his hand up. Sorry, Mr. Flanagan. I'll come back to you in a moment.

1:25:28

Thank you, sir. It was only on that last point. Certainly, we would expect to see some mechanism for translating potential into reality. But the monitoring under the CW TP provided expressly said it could

provide the vehicle for doing that. So obviously, we can discuss that with the applicant as to whether that's the best way or there's a better way of doing it. Thank you. Thank you.

1:25:55

Sorry to interrupt you, Mr. fleiger. Just thought to be best to get Mr. benefits view. Before that, allowing you to conclude

1:26:04

that's useful. So thank you, I was going to actually miss my balance suggested she can perhaps explain. And so we're going to just deal with this point on moving using the passive 20%. So head over to this place.

1:26:23

And so kotak model on behalf of the applicant. So as part of the quarterly monitoring reports, the transport coordinator would need to set out what the demand is for the active electric vehicle spaces and the passive spaces, you're correct in terms of the ducting is provided, but not the actual charging point. So as the demand grows, and in addition, so there's there's also a workforce survey that will be undertaken. And that can also establish use of the electric vehicle charging points. So through the construction traffic management plan, so construction work travel plan, and we can monitor them on a quarterly basis, the use of those, and the passive ones can be then turned into active as the demand grows. And it could also be the TRG can instruct that as well, based on that monitoring data.

1:27:25

prize. Okay. That's helpful. Thank you. Okay. Just see. No one's got their hand up. Right. So I think then, just before closing, just check with anyone, there are no other matters that are relevant to the agenda that they would wish to raise. I'm seeing no hands up. So that's Mr. Lewis, and now, okay, so on that basis, we just like to thank everyone for their participation and contributions and close today's hearing. Thank you.