

# AUDIO\_SizewellC\_ISH12\_Session1\_1509202

1

00:12

Good morning everyone. And welcome. It's now time for me to open this issue specific hearing which is being held in connection with an application made by an NB generation company s said c limited for an order for development consent for the construction, operation and maintenance of the sizewell c project. Before I go further, can I confirm that team with the teams is working and I can be heard and seen that the recording and live streaming of the event has commenced? I can confirm I can hear you loud and clearly on teams and the live stream has commenced. Thank you. 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'll 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. My name is Edwin monde, I'm a chartered town planner. And I've been appointed by the Secretary of State was a member of the panel of examining inspectors that together comprise the examining authority for this application. The other members of the panel are Wendy McKay, David Brock, Helen Cassini, and Neil Humphrey, and they will now introduce themselves to you, starting with Miss Mackay.

01:40

Good morning, everyone. I'm Wendy mokai. I'm an examining inspection lead member of the panel. I'll now pass over to Mr. Humphrey. Your microphones off. Thank you. Good morning, everyone. My

02:23

name is Neil Humphrey. And I hope you can hear me now I'm a chartered civil engineer, and I've been appointed to be a member of this panel. I'll now pass on to Mrs. Cassini.

02:34

Good morning. My name is Helen Cassini. I'm a chartered town planner. And I've also been appointed as a member of the panel. I'll now hand over to Mr. Brock.

02:46

Good morning. My name is Dave Brock. I am a retired solicitor and Secretary of State has also appointed me to be a member of this examining authority.

03:02

We're also assisted at this hearing by the spectris case team today we have the Inspectorate case manager Sean Evans, who's also assisted by other colleagues, Jake Stevens, and Edwin Maudsley. If you have any questions or queries about the examination, or the technology we're using for this blended event, they should be your first point of contact. their contact details can be found at the top of any letter you have received from us on the project page of the national infrastructure planning website.

Before I go into the main part of this hearing, I'll ask my colleague Helen Cassini to highlight a few housekeeping and background matters for today.

03:45

Thank you, as explained in the examining authorities will late later annex D the issue specific hearings will be live streamed and recorded. Recordings will be published on the project page of the national infrastructure planning website as soon as possible after each hearing closes to sis viewers and listeners, anyone speaking should introduce themselves each time they speak. As the recordings are retained and published, they form a public record that can contain personal information to which the general data protection regulation applies, who like latter includes a link to the planning inspectors 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. I'll repeat the request made in the arrangements conference. That in order to minimise background noise, please ensure your microphone or telephone is muted and that you stay muted unless you're speaking. In order to avoid fatigue. It's our intention to take a 15 minute break at about 90 minute intervals and a longer break of the lunchtime period. There Fire Alarm testing scheduled for today. Therefore with the fire alarm does sound Please evacuate the building by the nearest exit, which are clearly marked and you'll be directed to the meeting points. The nearest toilet facilities are located just outside this room in the foyer. And now I'll hand it over to Mr. Humphrey will outline the purpose and conduct is issue specific hearing.

05:21

Thank you. The issue specific hearing provides an opportunity for the issues raised by interested parties and in particular the differences between them to be explored further by the examining authority. The purpose of an issue specific hearing is set out in Section 91 of the Planning Act 2008. It is held if the examining authority decides it is necessary for the examination to hear oral representations to enable adequate examination of the issue or to ensure that an instant interested party has a fair chance to put their case, 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 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 of hearings to ensure they are carried out as efficiently as possible, whilst remaining fair to all parties. And throughout our in our examination of the evidence. We have identified the matters to be considered at this issue specific hearing, and those on which we require further information. And these are set out in the agenda published in advance of this hearing. participants should note that written summaries of your oral submissions to this hearing should be provided to the planning Inspectorate by deadline eight, which is Friday the 24th of September 2021. I'll now hand back to my colleague, Mr. maund, who will continue with the introductory matters.

07:03

Thank you. At this point, I'd like to ask those parties listed on the detailed agenda to introduce themselves, starting with the applicant.

07:13

Good morning, sir. My name is Harry would fill up our QC. I'm instructed by Herbert Smith freehills on behalf of the applicant, and I'll be assisted today by a number of speakers and I'll introduce as we go along.

07:26

Thank you. I can come next to Suffolk County Council.

07:35

Good morning, sir. My name is Michael Bedford Queen's counsel. I'm instructed by sharp Pritchard on behalf of the County Council. There are various offices of the county council I may introduce at appropriate points of the agenda. Thank you.

07:49

Thank you. And who's speaking for East Suffolk council today.

07:57

Good morning, sir. Andrew Tate QC for East Suffolk Council. And I'll be speaking together with Mark camp who's the council's environmental protection officer.

08:08

Very good. Thank you. And can I come next to Suffolk Constabulary.

08:16

Good morning, sir. My name is Ben Stansfield. I'm a solicitor at gelding wg and to my left is detective Chief Superintendent David Cutler.

08:30

Thank you. And is anyone present from the local access forum. Okay, welcome. Next two together again. sighs We'll see. Yes, good morning. So my name is Pete Wilkinson, line chairman of together again slides. We'll see. I'll be joined today by Jenny curtly. Nicola Pilkington. I'm sorry, I didn't catch that. It wasn't me asking anything. Mr. Wilkinson. I think someone spoke across you if you'd like to complete your introductions. Thank you.

09:11

Yes, thank you very much. The third person that they will be joining today is Chris Wilson, but I'm afraid he's having computer problems at the moment. He will be joining us as soon as he's fixed those problems. Thank you.

09:24

Thank you. Come then next to stop sighs well see. Good morning, Paul Collins from stop sighs well see. Alison downs will hopefully join us this afternoon as well. Thank you. Thank you. And I assume Mr. Collins, you're also here for the parish council February in a nice bridge. Indeed. Thank you. So thank you. And the AONB partnership

10:00

Morning Sir Simon Amstutz from area of outstanding natural beauty manager and I'm here representing the eo MB partnership.

10:10

Thank you very much and the National Trust okay. And Is anyone here from the RSPB? Thank you sir. Good morning. I'm breezy sutherlands appearing on behalf of the RSPB and Suffolk Wildlife Trust, I am accompanied today. Bye bye, colleagues. But if it's okay that they could just introduce themselves when they speak. That's absolutely fine. Thank you.

10:52

I also note there are people in attendance today who've requested to speak at this hearing, but are not on the list of invitees set out in the detailed agenda. I won't at this stage ask you to introduce introduce yourselves. But the first time you're invited to speak, please can you introduce yourself by giving your name and the name or names of the organisation or people that you represent? I hope you've had the chance to read the detailed agenda for this hearing. And during the hearing today, I have questions for the applicant, and other interested parties. I'm aware there are a number of interested parties who may wish to speak on some of the agenda items. Once I finished my direct questioning, I will ask if interested parties would like to make any submission relating to that end agenda item before moving to my next questions. I remind you this is not an open floor hearing and submissions made orally should relate only to the agenda items, which we will be discussing. I want to reassure you that the previous submissions have been read and noted. I understand there may be other issues not on the agenda that parties may wish to raise. But submissions on those matters should be made in writing by deadline aid, which is Friday the 24th of September this year. Thank you in advance for that, cooperating with that approach. A list of the documents that you intend to refer today has been made available in the notification of this agenda. Please note that any page numbers I make relate to in this hearing will be the electronic version of the documents, not the paper versions. So if I come now to the details, agenda item number two, community amenity and recreational impacts on start, obviously, with the Community Safety Safety in the concerns identified by the police got obviously issues set out in deadline seven. And it's in paragraph 2.3 point 14 and relates to earlier deadlines and subsequent written submissions relating to community safety. It's clearly a major local concern. Now Constabulary it, rep 6047. And the subsequent deadlines seven submission have obviously reiterated their ongoing concerns. And what I need to understand from the Constabulary is Is that still the position today? And are we likely to be in a position come to the end of examination where matters are likely to be resolved. So perhaps if I can come to the Constabulary first, and if you can clarify your position for me, thank you.

13:49

Thank you, David Cutler, Detective chief superintendent. So since the Constabulary's deadline seven submission, we'll continue to engage with the applicant and there has been positive progress from a number of areas. There's still some areas some key issues that we continue to discuss that we will need to agree on that the engagement is positive and we are making steps forward. It first we'll go through the various key points. So in terms of overall funding for community safety issues, we have agreed the quantum of funding. We're currently working together to profile the payments across the bill

period. But at this time, we've had a limited but we have had discussion as to the pre commencement period or years zero, where community safety issues facing will start to increase and also discuss how the Constabulary be able to build reserves for funding security. We've discussed contingency We've agreed a contingency fund of 1.5 million pairs. What was referred we've have referred to this as a contingency. So if you this needs to be viewed more, as an accessible fund to address increases in demand that the construct a model is likely, the mechanism for how this is accessed has yet to be agreed. This fund needs to be dynamic and accessible within the conservatives control and needs to be treated differently to the contingency funding that can be accessed through the community safety working group. The other area that we continue to discuss is the movement of abnormal indivisible loads. were provided the costings in relation to the resource required to escort ELS. And the applicant has agreed to requirement for aibl escort teams. And the costing model that we outlined in deadlines seven, Appendix A, we have made clear the significant leading time required to deliver these resources due to the need to recruit and train to ensure there aren't a gap in in frontline resourcing across the Constabulary. audit is an area we are in discussion. The funding received by the Constabulary we used both provide a dedicated resource, but also use more diffusely across the organisation to provide support from a number of teams and disciplines. So providing detailed information required for the applicants may be difficult in practice. And we will therefore need to work towards a practical solution. The last area that I wanted to raise was that of governance, the concerns we've raised previously, and that the examining authority has acknowledged in respect to the governance or governance arrangements. Under the control, the applicant has in both the community sector working group and transport were few groups still being named. These aren't new new points. And we'll put them in writing to remind both the examining authority and the applicant of their importance to the construction. So as I said, right at the beginning, we have made positive progress, we have had considerable dialogue and engagement with the applicant. And we do appreciate the recent momentum in addressing many of the issues that were outstanding, and we look forward to continuing on that progress. Thank you.

17:44

Thank you. That's helpful. Can I just clarify with you in terms of the lead in time for training of staff for AI ELLs? Are you able to indicate what that is likely to be? And are you in a position to say that you would have the appropriate teams in place in fourth in time for the potential start date that the applicant is hoping for?

18:13

I think if we can if we can absolutely reach agreement and move forward very quickly, then then yes. But obviously, the the officers would escort these loads are experienced traffic officers. So they're already been trained above that about of a frontline constables. So they moved into specialist post, especially driving courses, both in terms of cars or motorcycles and escort. So it's not it's not a case of being able to take a you know, a newly recruited constable. It's a matter of clicking experienced officers and backfilling those with less experienced along the chain, really. So it's in terms of our recruitment periods, and then our trading period. So we've sort of indicated that sort of 18 months is the period that would we'd be able to work to anything less than that would be a significant challenge for us.

19:11

Thank you. I note, my colleague, Mr. Brock, would like to ask you a question. So if I can just invite him to come in.

19:21

Thank you, Mr. Moreland. You mentioned not us to want a separate Constabulary that you had concerns about the governance arrangements. Could you briefly summarise what those are for me?

19:39

So when you look at the makeup of those groups, and the numbers of what both sort of parties the African side and and the partnership side, there's equality there. So we still remain concerned about how voting rights are for decision making in a dynamic

20:02

way,

20:05

we we recognise our escalation processes. But, but there's no easy decision making potentially at that working group level. And we believe that could be a potential area of concern for us.

20:22

Okay, that's very, very helpful. I think you will have noted that there is on Friday, and I sh devoted to the decio. And we may, we are likely to look at those sorts of issues. You might I don't know if you've said you're going to come along on Friday, but you might want to consider that. Thank you.

20:49

Come to see if there are any other interested parties who would wish to raise anything on this particular agenda item? Yes, thank you used to introduce yourself and then Tim, Tim beach, Snape parish Council, I

21:04

should say. I was a police officer for 30 years. And constable to Chief Superintendent in Suffolk. So I've got some knowledge. But I'm here to represent snow parish Council. With both the issues that have been raised by Mr. Cutler. We've tried to reinforce the snow parish Council and we solve the governance issue, the central particularly in relation to the transport review group, and then the police having the ability to and communities local communities have some level of control of the money funding and speed of reaction. And we reinforced it in a recent meeting with EDF. So we would just like to reinforce the fact that that's really fundamental to the agility of local communities, through the police being able to address issues which will which will arise.

22:00

Thank you, Mr. Beach. I come next to Mr. Soto.

22:06

Good morning, John, several on parish Councillor for Oxford. And also, I'm the police liaison officer for the council. Can I clarify one point is whether the police are now formal members of the traffic review group or not. I know this was something that was discussed in previous meeting. Because I think that was important. They were only there as a sort of advice as well as being members. That's the first point. Secondly, I would very much reinforce the point was made by the previous speaker about importance of this governance issue to us as residents and and parishes. Thank you very much.

22:48

Thank you. Any other interested parties? Now, I'll come then to the applicant, and I'm sure that the applicant will be able to respond to your question, Mr. So they're all in their summary. Thank you, sir. Um, yes, I'll do that. Straight away. One

23:06

thing I would say is that the date of obligation that's gone in it. Deadline seven, has incorporated a number of changes as well as including sums of money, as we'll be picking up during the course of today. And one of those is in schedule 16, which deals with transport and public rights of way. And the members of the transport review group are identified there is meaning Sizewell since, he suffered Council, Suffolk County Council suffer Constabulary and national highways. So those are members of the transport review group. And the other changes in Clewd changes to clarify the governance process, both to allow for an acknowledge the need for speedier decision making in some cases, and also to clarify the escalation procedure available in the event that the individual groups can't reach agreement. And it sounds like we may need to go into that on Friday, and we'll be happy to to do so. And if there are particular concerns, which are new concerns, things we haven't thought about an address, then obviously we've got an opportunity to take those on board. But certainly we think that we've set out what is now an improved and enhanced process there. Am I going to just invite Andrew Hunt from Quad who sat merely to my left you've heard from him before in a previous issue specific hearing, just to respond to where we are more Generally with the Constabulary, as you've heard, they've been and continue to be positive discussions, but it might help us to hear from Mr. Hunt on those matters. Thank you, sir.

25:10

Andrew Hunt for the applicant? Yes, I think Mr. Cutler is pretty fairly summarised where we are, I think we have now agreements on the core elements of funding, including for the additional facility that the police are seeking. And for an element of contingency, I think we are in discussion about how we profile that we recognise that it needs to broadly follow the non home based workforce, and there will be some lead in time as well. And there needs to be an element of kind of smoothing, including the the year zero issue. And so we're in agreement with the police that we we need to resolve that. And we do need to work on how the contingency will be drawn down. I think the governance arrangements of the working group provide a framework within which that can happen. The police in their deadlines, seven submission provided some potential performance indicators about how monitoring might take place. I think they're in there the right sorts of things. I think there are some questions about how they're tied into project effects, that we need to discuss further with the police so that we understand clearly how those KPIs could be used effectively, and how that can relate to that contingency fund. But I think we're we're in clear agreement about the main elements of the of the mitigation. And there's no significant

difference I can say at the moment between those on that contingency. We just need to agree the the methods and the monitoring for drawing that down. Thank you. Mr. Souther,

26:53

all your hand is still raised. Is that a legacy from earlier? It was a legacy I apologise attention from the applicant. Thank you. Okay, I'll move on to item two, Roman two, and the issue of progress on community cohesion and community safety, which was identified in the local impact report and subsequent statement of common ground. So if I can come to Suffolk County Council first, please if to understand what the latest position is, and whether progress is made in resolving the differences that had previously been set out?

27:45

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So the short answer is yes, progress has been made. Through discussions and helpful dialogue with the applicant, we have been able to reach broad agreement as to the level of potential impacts, and an appropriate scale of mitigation, which would allow for preventative, as well as if needed, reactive measures. that's reflected in the drafting that's now come forward in the draft deed of obligation. There are still some aspects on the detailed wording, which are subject to ongoing further discussion and consideration. But it's all moving now in the right direction, so far as the public services resilience fund. And I said, we're very much reassured and grateful for the useful dialogue that has taken place with the applicant. And obviously, I've got a community safety lead if you want to hear more detail. But if you just want the overall position, that's the overall position.

29:05

Now, it's obviously up to you whether you feel that the community safety lead has got anything to add, that would assist us. So I'm happy with the broad overview that you've provided. And clearly progress is being made. But that

29:24

we're content with that I say it was only if you had a specific question from something you'd read that you wanted some more information, we'll obviously seek to assist you on that. But if you've got no outstanding matters, you want further information or at this stage, I say I think the overview is sufficient.

29:43

Thank you. So can I just come to Isa for counsel then see if your position is similar.

29:53

It's similar, sir, but I just like to make four points if I may. One. We have agreed the necessary funding with the promoter, just over 1.6 million. And that set out in shedule, five of the deed at 2.2. point one, two, that funding will be applied to the purposes specified in paragraph 1.1 of shedule. Five. And those purposes are consistent with the necessary mitigation measures, which were identified by a Suffolk in annex n of the Li R, that's 159. So there is a match between the two. Thirdly, in terms of governance, the measures are to be approved by the community safety group set out in schedule four, and we're

satisfied with the composition of that group. as set out in the deed, at deadlines seven, there may be one or two minor drafting tweaks, but there may not be but we're still looking at that. But they'll be minor. Unfortunately, that position will be reflected in the statement to common ground with the promoter to be provided at deadline aid.

31:15

Thank you very much. Now, just now then turn to other interested parties to see if there are any additional comments or concerns that they would wish to raise. Now, having come back to you Mr. Philpott on behalf of the applicant.

31:35

Thank you. So I do have Mr. Mike Humphrey here at the end of the table on the far right, who can answer any questions you've got. But clearly the contributions you've just heard on behalf of the two councils are reflective of position, which is now largely agreed. And obviously, we welcome the confirmation about and what you've just heard, but it reflects what we uphold is understood from the discussions. So although I'm happy to ask Mr. Humphrey, who's got anything to add, it's really only if you wanted to delve beyond that and have any questions for us.

32:11

No, I haven't got any specific additional questions. Thank you.

32:14

Thank you very much. So in that case, I can stand Mr. Humphrey down for this item.

32:21

I'm sure we'd be delighted. So okay, we'll come on to Roman three, then. We've obviously been here before on the timing of the provision of the accommodation campus. I don't want to rehearse what was been discussed previously, but I just wanted to understand from a Suffolk Council, whether their concerns about the delivery mechanism mechanism remained. And then I'll go on to just cover potential about the accommodation fund after that. So can I just hear from me, so for council first on the potential delivery mechanisms for the accommodation campus in the caravan park staff please.

33:12

Thank you, sir. Andrew Tate is Suffolk Council. If I could make three points on this, because you will have seen the reference to agreement as to financial provision. The first point is that the current delivery strategy is governed by a schedule three with the provision for reasonable endeavours which relates to the indicative timetable in the implementation plan. And you know, sir, from our earlier submissions, that we do not consider that to be sufficient. Secondly, financial provision has now been agreed to deal with the consequences of delay in delivery as a last resort, and shedule three sets out a figure for the housing contingency fund, but at present, it doesn't populate the deed with any mechanisms around that. So, that has been agreed. And likewise, there is agreement as to the triggers, that is events, not dates, events to which that should relate and that set out in the agreed housing fund approach appendix three be to the responses to questions. And that makes it clear in relation to the caravan park, that one 518 that the applicant promoter will accept a requirement in the deed of

obligation to have completed Did the caravan park within three months of the workforce survey reporting more than 850 non home based workers. And there is also one five to 28 and 30 similar event events, which relate to the provision of phases one and two of the accommodation campus, I won't read those out. But still, under the second point, the financial provision is a last resort or temporary remedy in the event of delay. beyond those mechanisms, those events are not a replacement strategy. So therefore, thirdly, what is still missing at present is one articulating a commitment to delivery by the trigger dates that are set out in rep 757. But it is approaching. It's made more explicit. In the case of the caravan park, it's only implicit in the case of the accommodation campus. And then secondly, the second thing that's missing at the moment is that if there is delay, then there needs to be sufficient mechanisms to ensure that that is planned for as early as practicable. And that's built into the housing resilience fund. So as I mentioned, 3.3 point one is a placeholder in the deed not yet populated. So that's the position. The reasonable endeavours isn't that a quit, there is the fallback of financial provision. But there needs to be an intermediate position, which has commitment to the trigger events that are specified in rep 757. That needs to be articulated. And just finally out to make clear that the payment of money as the last resort doesn't discharge the obligation to deliver by the date of a specified event. So that's not its intended purpose. It's intended as a temporary remedy in the event of failure to to meet the deadline, and thus addressed the problems that arise from such delay. Those are the three points.

37:34

Thank you. And obviously, you're still have reservations about the reasonable endeavours. method of delivery. Have you formulated an alternative form of words that you would consider satisfactory and put that to the applicant?

37:56

Yes, so Well, that's the intermediate position the that I mentioned, the my point three, the first point of that, that there needs to be set out more more clearly, the commitment to delivery and

38:16

we don't object to the reason when David's remaining there, but it's just not not enough on its own, particularly tied to an implementation plan, which is itself indicative. So we've got the commitment, I think already set out in rep 757, which is the applicants document. And it's, as I say, it's explicitly set out at one 518, they will accept a requirement to have completed the caravan park within three months of the work for survey reporting more than 850 nhB workers. So if that is that is set out in a binding form, albeit with the cascade down to the financial provision in the event of delay, then we will be satisfied with that. So we're in discussion with the applicant, and we will continue to discuss that but we hope that we're going to be able to come forward with a form of words, which will supplement the provide an effective supplement to the reasonable endeavours provision, which is not adequate.

39:27

Thank you, Mr. Tate, before I come to other interested parties and then back to the applicant has whilst on the line when I was reading the funding solution that's being promoted. The way I was reading it was that there's potentially up to a nine month period where the accommodation might not deliver the numbers that you might need to avoid adverse harms that might occur Because of the lack of

accommodation, and the reason I'm getting to a nine month potential gap is that you have a survey once every six months. And then a further three months for the delivery of the accommodation, if that survey shows the figure in the case of the caravan park, exceeding 850. And so potentially you have a nine month period where you might have more than your 850 trigger. And are you content with that not causing the harms that might arise from a shortage of accommodation? Well, I

40:44

think that does depends on the the way in which the the mechanisms are expressed, because there does need to be clarity about the provision for advanced planning for that contingency, which we hope won't rise. That's why we do need to have something stronger in this intermediate step between reasonable endeavours and fallback to the last resort. I don't think I can answer it more specifically than that at the moment.

41:19

Okay, thank you for your assistance. I come then to other interested parties. Are there anything additional any anyone wishes to raise? Mr. Mon?

41:31

Could I just ask something or? Mr. Tate? I don't know if you can see me. everything's working at this end. But I hope you can hear me. We can hear you, Mr. Brown. Mr. Tate. Thank you for that explanation. Let's be clear about the the interim solution. I've got rep 7057 up on my other screen. And you've referred us to the caravan park solution at which is a paragraph 1.5 point 18. Doing the standard that that is that if you get that that you are happy that was an inter inclusion? Or are you also seeking an interim for the accommodation campus? And if so, is it there? I think I didn't see it immediately.

42:27

Thank you, sir. No, it's not? It's not. I think I indicated that. One 518 is explicit. And in relation to the accommodation campus, it's implicit, well, that obviously isn't satisfactory to be left, implicit, and at five to one 528. And also one 530 are the two trigger events. So we think that one 520 815 30 should be converted into language, which is comparable to that and one 518. But we're content with the trigger event, but not with the wording, which is only related to payment, rather than initial compliance with that event. trigger the trigger of that event. And the advanced planning, which you've been speaking about, is that separate? Well, yes, certainly. Yeah. Yes. So, those are the two things that we think need to be improved. One is the explicit commitment to delivery in the form of one 518 but not not sitting in a document like this, it needs to be brought forward. And second, that we need to have better structures and mechanisms to ensure that the planning to which will indicate whether there is going to be a delay can be can be addressed early. Thank you very much.

44:00

Thank you, Mr. Brown. Mr. Bedford, if I can come to you next.

44:08

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. Obviously we defer to a Suffolk Council in relation to the details of the accommodation, housing issues, but you will be alive to the fact that there

are there knock on consequences for the transport issues and clearly we are therefore very concerned to ensure that it works, as it were. We are still reviewing what has been submitted in relation to that at deadline seven. And we'll make particular comments at deadline eight. Just I know we're going to come back to reasonable endeavours on Friday. And that's obviously the probably the better place for further discussion, but really, we just don't see a role for the reasonable endeavours. provision. In the sense that it's clearly intended by the applicant to be a limitation on the extent of their obligation. And that's something we cannot accept. Because it doesn't go far enough. And therefore, in a sense, if they need to do more than that, it would serve no purpose to leave reasonable endeavours in there. Because it cannot, in our view, be the as it were the ceiling or the limit of the extent of their obligation. And what we would wish to see, or tangible triggers by reference to events, which may need to be expressed by reference to as it were long stop events, in order to give the applicant some flexibility. But it is not going to be acceptable to limit it to no more than reasonable endeavours to seek to do things.

46:05

Because I should say, we're also grateful that you have highlighted absolutely that timing point in terms of the six monthly monitoring the three month gap. And that was something again, that we were concerned about, but you're already alive to that. Thank you, sir. Thank you. Just check them there's no other interested parties. Okay, but to fill pot.

46:37

Thank you. So I'm in a moment, I'm going to hand over to Mr. Hunt, again to just explain where we are in terms of approach to this. But just to preface it with two points. The first point is that, as you look picked up from what Mr. Tate has said, this is the subject of ongoing active discussion between ourselves and the capitals in order to arrive at what we hope will be, if not an agreed approach, one that is closer to being agreed than it is at present. And therefore, I although I think it will be helpful to have Mr. Hunt, explain what we're seeking to do and the approach we're taking to that. I don't propose to go through every element of what's been said Not least because we're gonna have a session on reasonable endeavours on Friday, but nevertheless, I want you to hear what we're seeking to do. The second point is this. I don't think it can be right with respect to Mr. Bedford to say that, in the event that trigger events are included, that reasonable endeavours serves no purpose. And it's put forward for a particular reason, we've explained the nature of the obligation. But of course, reasonable endeavours is something which goes above and beyond trigger levels as a fallback, it can be enforced and is imposes obligations which arise before any trigger level is reached. So, when you are under an obligation to use reasonable endeavours to do something, and that is operating before you reach a trigger level, you either are or are not in fulfilment of that duty. And therefore, even if trigger levels are agreed in relation to particular items, whether it's the caravan park or the combination canvas or anything else, they do not take away the benefits and the importance of the reasonable endeavours obligation, because you have to demonstrate that you are actually using a reasonable endeavours to achieve the implementation plan. And that is something which for reasons we've explained and I won't go over in detail here is of utility it is a benefit is imposes actual and meaningful obligations on the applicant. So I don't think it's right to say that the reasonable the need for reasonable Nevers would fall away. In those circumstances, it does serve an important purpose. And that purpose would remain even in relation to anything which tells the fallback position. So against those two points by way of background, I just pass

over to Mr. Hunt to explain the approach that's being taken in relation to the accommodation campus and the caravan park.

49:40

Thank you. So Andrew hunt for the applicants. And what we have attempted to do and what we set out in appendix three B of rep 7057 is to address the concern that local authority raised with ALS which is about ensuring the campus was delivered before the workforce reached 7000 But obviously, as you can see, we've gone beyond that, with very much more specific triggers. And additional mitigation. We have agreed those triggers, I think it's the impact arises from the non home based workforce. So it's right to tie the triggers to that. And, you know, we've agreed well, that additional mitigation would be, and although it was described as a temporary solution, in effect, it is full mitigation it is it is the same kind of per bed space costs as the housing fund in its entirety. So it would provide for additional mitigation. What we are aiming to do is ensure that the provision grows in line with the workforce that we can ensure that there is accommodation available project provides accommodation available for workers as they arrive and that we get that timing right. So we do need a kind of degree of flexibility. So the triggers are aiming to kind of align with that and ensure that we have a smooth growth of the project provides accommodation and of the use of existing accommodations, you don't get kind of wild swings of demand for, for existing commendation. And as we've said, previously, it's an important part of the delivery of the project we want, and we need this accommodation. There are financial implications for us of not delivering it in terms of having the workforce more dispersed. There's no transport costs, payment for travel time, those sorts of things, productivity losses, so we have a very strong incentive to deliver the accommodation and to deliver it in a manner that I've set out, I aligning it with the growth of the the non based workforce. The point about the the kind of the lags. I mean, I think we acknowledged Mr. Tate's point about advanced notice and understanding where we are. And we will, of course, be monitoring our workforce through the induction process. What the induction process doesn't tell us is that home based non home base splits will, we'll be understanding the buildup of our workforce, and we'll be understanding how we're getting on with the construction. And we can certainly have further discussions with the authority about what sort of information we would be able to report on that would give that, that kind of advanced warning. And we are of course, front loading the main housing fund. So there is just over 2 million pounds that gets paid kind of in the first year to get projects kind of up and running. And so we're come with confidence that the housing fund can be delivered effectively and delivered early and start to build in that mitigation and can be supplemented through these contingency trigger payments, and that those payments will also allow the authorities to deal with any consequences. One of the concerns, particularly on the caravan site was around licencing and enforcement so that funding can be the intention is that funding can be used flexibly to, to kind of deal with those issues. So I think there's there's a lot that's kind of built into what we're doing that will allow us to a understand what's happening and be to have got the mitigation in early. And with respect to the trigger, the monitor, it's the monitoring that will pick up when we hit the the numbers that are set out in a non home based workforce, and therefore we've gone for a payment that's tied to as soon as that trigger is, is hit. So in theory, it could be as much as nine months. In reality, it's likely to be significantly less than that. And as I say that the other measures we've got into into the front loading means that that kind of mitigation can be delivered, but there is the trigger has to be tied to the monitoring, if you see what I mean and three months seems to be a reasonable period within that monitoring identifying where we are.

54:26

So I was also going to ask Mr. JOHN Rhodes from quad come in at this point as well just say a little bit more about I think some of the points that Mr. Tate raised about the drafting

54:42

and John Rhodes for the applicant So Mr. Tate's absolutely right. There's currently just a placeholder in the daily obligation of paragraph 3.3 point one, and that placeholder needs to be filled and it needs to be filled using the principles set out in the documentation. Types been referring to. And I don't think there's any distinction between is on the intention at all in relation to that. So just to say that, as Mr. Hunt just explained, the combination discussion arose from the suggestion from the District Council on our previous issues was fair hearing, there should be some fallback in relation to the campus. And that's the discussion that that you've just been hearing about. And the document which explains that it clearly isn't a legal document. But the expression and the waves committed to in paragraph 1.5 point 18. In relation to the caravan site, the campus at Le Il, there's no distinction intended in our pa between the waves described there for the caravans and the waves described subsequently, for the campus. And we will make sure in the drafting of the, of the deed of obligation that that commitment is clear as a commitment. So it's intended to be an absolute fallback, firm commitment to delivery. But goes further than that in the event of default, then you've seen what the consequences that was intended to be expressed as a commitment. And in response to the similar points raised by Mr. Bedford in relation to transport infrastructure. So we've been exploring those issues as well. And you will have seen in our response to your commentary at The previous deadline in our Rep. 7052, we said that we've been looking at ways in which we could commit to the transport infrastructure. So that's rep 705 to add electronic page 115. And that explains that we've been talking with the delivery team to do exactly what Mr. Belford has just described. So recognising that some flexibility is necessary. Notwithstanding the continuing obligation for the reasonable endeavours commitment, what's the long stop for the provision of the key infrastructure. And we've identified long stop milestones within the construction programme. For the size welding road, the two village bypass, then a separate milestone in relation to the rail infrastructure and a separate milestone in relation to the temporary beach Landing Facility. And it's our intention of those are written up in exactly the same way as fallback commitments exactly in the way long stock commitments exactly in the way that Mr. benefits just described. We can explain those a little bit further on Friday, perhaps, but I don't think there's any distinction either between our intentions or the two components of the accommodation, or our intention in relation to the key transport infrastructure. So we hope that's a proper response to the concerns have been raised about the implementation plan. And we can discuss further on Friday in relation to the implementation plan, and how that might be applied. But in terms of, you know, whether it's enforceable or not, and people have different views about that recognised that there needs to be an absolute commitment to the key elements of infrastructure. And that's the purpose of our response to your previous commentary, which we need to work up into drafting very quickly now, for submission of the next deadline.

58:23

Thank you, Mr. Rose, can I just clarify the rep 752? Is that referring to all of these long stop points? Or is that just the transport? Or are they spread over different documents? And can Are you going to be able to point us to the individual documents where each of these long stops are set out?

58:51

So the reference I gave you to rep 7052 is our response to your commentary on the previous submissions, and the draft documents, including the implementation plans, and that is the single reference where we said at this point about long stock for transport infrastructure. And the best reference for long stock for the accommodation is the appendix three B, that you're aware of, which is Rev. 7057. A page 432. So those are the two places in which you see the commitments expressed. They need to come together within the deed of obligation. And we're drafting that amendment. Thank you very much.

59:34

Thank you, sir. That is the essence that position is helpful and give some forewarning of what's intended ahead of Friday, so the thought can be given to that. But as I hope it is apparent what when one considers those questions of long stop dates, we're gonna see the distinction between that and reasonable endeavours to To deliver in accordance with an implementation plan, which is much more detailed and specific, but recognising, as we've discussed before, the difficulties involved in making an absolute commitment to all elements of that, and we've articulated that and also identified the recognition of some of those practical difficulties by the council's in the local impact report. And that is why I say the commitment nevertheless, to use reasonable endeavours to achieve that, together with long stop dates is more than simply having the long stop dates, it's clear that there is something over and above that, which is of value to the public interest.

1:00:44

Thank you. Okay. I'll move on then to Roman four. Again, this is an issue that's overlapping with other topics. And I'm not trying to look at the HRA implications of the discussions about displacement of visitors but the recreational and amenity side of things. And I've seen obviously the rep 7087 which is the discussion about displacement figures between the National Trust RSPB and suffer Wildlife Trust and beyond. So if I can come to the RSPB first to understand your current position with regard to the potential effects on recreation from either additional or displacement of visitors.

1:01:54

Thank you, sir. We do appreciate your your steer on what should be focused on today. However, we we do think this is an important opportunity to just to just to flag a few things very, very briefly is if that's okay. Just Just double checking with my colleague I apologise. But to save time, it was really to not focus on the HRA, but also to focus on if we describe them as EIA issues and just whether there is a full understanding and therefore full coverage of all potential effects, when as you say, so we are particularly focused on the protected sites and therefore HRA. But But I but we did just want to briefly raise this, including that species and important habitat outside of those those protected sites. And just a very quickly repeat, we do consider that alternative green space to provide social and sporting recreation opportunities for the construction workers should be developed. And and and believe that that will reduce impacts outside of those predicted sites, as well as in appreciating that we that we have raised this this point before. I will stop there, because I appreciate that I am slightly covering things you specifically suggested we didn't. But thank you for letting me come in. And my colleague Bismillah is available for any detailed questions.

1:03:33

Thank you. No, no, that's helpful. I don't believe the National Trust present in the discussion today. So I just ask if any other interested parties have any other additional concerns about amenity or recreational impacts from the proposed development? Mr. Scott?

1:03:58

Thank you. I don't have my access button. So I have to raise my hand. Can I raise an issue about the assessment base of amenity and recreation, and I've been looking through, I'll send it a written contribution. Obviously, it's at 267, which I've got as document six three, Volume Two. And what I'm concerned about is and there is a flag in the agenda formula of Roman four, which is assessment of displacement of visitors and additional visitors. And I've raised this as a principal issue before that. I'm the resident and I'm an additional visitor but I don't count as a tourist in the sense I don't stay overnight other than my own home. And I'm looking at Amina tea in a broad sense. I'm aware I think of the background of immunity as a matter of loss damage and taught and so on. But there does seem to be a broader concept coming into into legal cases. So, I'm concerned about the study base of the assessment. And when I read it very carefully, you will find in that document at 1515 630 that actually the two study bases are visitor numbers to the size will be Visitor Centre and minsmere visitor numbers. So, there is no scope for if you like the the the the impact of the development in particular transport on on the loss of immunity by other people. So, I would suggest that the relevant receptor group would be at least one of the zones or possibly the zone plus the a 12 corridor. So that we can get some some adequate assessment. When you look at the results of the methodology chosen, which are in table 50, and six. That's page 54. There's a whole list of areas where people who can't get to the study areas or known tourist centres are displaced too. And the displacement numbers are in Woodbridge is our local town. The assessment produces the view that the number of people who would be displaced from Woodbridge is one person, I don't know whether it's one person per day or what it is. So I'll look at that in detail. But I do think the whole concept of immunity has to be approached more broadly that then appears to be there. And I note and thank the inspectors who are picking up that the displacement of visitors it's also a matter of the displacement, displacement of additional visitors. I the residents here. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Augustus.

1:07:17

Thank you, Sir Simon Amstutz from the area of outstanding natural beauty partnership. I recognise that you're not looking to rerun the HRA debate. But I'd like to say that I recognise and support the natural England and National Trust position in Rep. Oh 145. An odd further I haven't seen an assessment of displacement on the amb defined features of landscape quality, scenic quality, but also perhaps more personal here. tranquillity and natural heritage features. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Tate.

1:08:19

Thank you, Sir Andrew at Suffolk cancel. Very briefly, just two notes, as you will have observed that the payment of 150,000 into the Rams the recreational disturbance avoidance mitigation strategy has been agreed with the promoter that set out in shedule 11 of the deed, the figure at 1.1. And the trigger at 7.1. On it relates to the first occupation of the accommodation campus and the purposes of the contribution of NAB and special to Biden the deed at seven two. So that again, is a matter that will feature in the

statement of common ground at deadline eight. So separately, there is of course, the European cites mitigation measures reduce the impacts of additional recreational disturbance associated with sizewell C. That's a matter that principally involves natural England, of course, so I'm not going to comment further on that.

1:09:27

Thank you. There's no other interested parties are just then come to the applicant to see if they wish to respond.

1:09:37

Thank you, sir. Unless you particularly want to I was going to suggest so far as matters of ecology and HRA are concerned. I'm not sure we've got anyone here who can deal with those. And I don't think that's really on the agenda.

1:09:50

Now. It's not what I was looking to try and understand it was more about the consequential immunity and recreation issues is as opposed to the

1:10:00

ecological, that's as we understood it, and that's that that is reflected in the lineup of contributors I have. So if I can first I got to first turn to Mr. Phillip brayshaw, who's to my right to deal with the concerns raised by Mr. Scott, about the assessment base and the extent to which it is or is not adequate to deal with the matters that he raised. And then having done that going to go to Mr. Alister kratt, who is who is shortly be joining me to my left, just to pick up the point made by the AONB partnership about the extent to which the impacts on the AONB in terms of the defining features and tranquillity have I have not been properly assessed? And then I think that should cover the matters that are specifically related to this agenda item. So I'll turn to Mr. brayshaw. First to pick up Mr. Scott's points. Thank you,

1:11:22

I thought would be first useful just to explain the method within the s by which displacement and additional construction workers was used to inform the assessment. And that will explain missed some of Mr. Scott's queries. So the potential for additional people was factored into the chapter volume to chapter 15 of the environmental statements. And the dependencies were PCs 15 G. And the, as explained in paragraph 15 3.7, of Volume Two, Chapter 15 of the ies changes to the experience people have, when using resources due to increases in numbers of people using them as one of the factors considered and reaching a judgement on the effects on recreational receptors. The other factors were physical changes to resources, Eg change to public rights of way through diversions, or temporary or permanent closures and changes to views, noise, air quality and traffic movements. So all those all those factors were brought into the balance when making a judgement on the significance of effect on a particular recreational resource. And not the changes the numbers of people were informed by two surveys that were done by EDF energy cycle siko. Now in 2014, and 15, in 2014. Surveys would honour seven locations within the vicinity of the main development site. And in accordance with a method consulted on with a number of key consultees including RSPB National Trust, county Council's you Suffolk Council, and others. And one of the questions asked in that survey was when people would

go elsewhere and be displaced. And so those people gave us number of locations where they would be displaced to. And also, following that survey RSPB also wanted a survey done in the core of the minsmere reserve. So a method was agreed with them, which is the same methods used in 2014 surveys. And, you know, the same question was asked, would people be displaced And where would they go. So those were used to inform the assessments. And in the, in the ies, those locations where they said to be displaced a show shanell figures 15.9 and 15 point 10 of Volume Two to chapter 15. And that's the, the sort of the top the figure was that approximately 29% of people who've completed questionnaires said they would stop using the area around sizable seizure and construction to avoid disturbance. So that was all weighed into the assessment, including and Mr. Scott says you know, one person would go to all bro that's because one of those people in table 15.61 of those people surveyed. One of that 29% named orba is the location they go to so that is why one person that isn't that isn't only one person per year and think it's one person if those people surveyed and then we're done him surveys were done in summer 2014 and winter 2014 to get a representative of busy time of year and and winter winter usage. And then when it comes to construction workers, this information is explained in paragraphs 15.6 point 40 to 15.6 point 52 of Volume Two of chapter 15. And the potential for construction workers to visit in formal outdoor recreation resources is influenced by a number of factors which were weighed into into the assessment including whether construction workers were additional to the area or existing residents. So only additional people were factored into the assessment because existing construction workers who've been fired from existing population one on one won't create additional impacts the red really sharp peak of construction when the greatest numbers of constructions additional to the area will be will be present, which is about two years of the construction phase. And the worst case was assumed for the for the assessment I the maximum number of construction workers whereas in fact, it would be much lower either side of the peak. The fact that construction workers would favour formal organised sport and gym activity used to outdoor and formal recreation activities. The work amendments are a significant reason for not undertaking recreational activity.

1:16:17

proportion of shifts will be during the daytime or off period now as the darkness so will during the four hour shifts will be during the day with time off during the hours of darkness when outdoor and for recreation will be less attractive. The majority of non home based construction workers will be living alone and not with families including those staying within the accommodation campus and caravan site. Majority of non home base construction workers were returned home on weekends, the end of their working period when they're more likely to, for example, go for walks and cycling during their work working periods. And the majority of non base construction workers would not have dogs including all those in the accommodation campus and caravan site and therefore not undertake regular daily dog walks. And the those 2000 construction workers in private rented in tourist accommodation who had additional to the area not in the accommodation campus will be spread over a wide area which would diffuse a face. Nevertheless, the assessment assumed that there would be an increase in construction workers at locations and that was factored into the into the judgments. Now numbers weren't calculated for the purpose of that. Yes, we didn't say that. Because it's it was his judgments in the ies are based on the evidence available and professional opinion. So for the HRA, because it was deemed more scientific approach was needed. We we have tried to estimate numbers and that has been the subject of the HRA discussions, but the ies no numbers have been used. Although apart from referring to the 2014 survey, for example, if one person said they go to Woodbridge that is reflected in the ies chapter,

where Woodbridge or the receptor group area around which is assessed. More would go to areas, other areas such as South world or Uber. But it hasn't been a scientific approach. And thanks very much, Mr. Scott's points, if anything else I've missed. No, I think that's what I want to say at the moment. Thank you.

1:18:35

Thank you. So then just before I pass over to Mr. kratt. And I think Mr. Rhodes wanted to say something about the way in which the mitigation measures that are designed to cater for the potential ecological impacts also have relevance when considering the impacts on amenity and recreation. So I just pass over to him just to cover that point.

1:19:03

JOHN Rhodes the applicant, I don't want to misunderstand the question. And I'm clear that this is a different focus from the ecological focus that we've had on on this before. But it did occur to me that the work has been done in relation to ecology is very helpful in relation to understanding potential recreation and amenity impacts as well. So first of all, the assessment of the scale of the displacement and these are these are impacts from your question based on the displacement of people or additional visitors and what's the recreational immunity impact of that. So we know something we know a lot from the work that Mr. brashears described about the potential scale of displacement and that has been expressed within the assessments as a percentage increase in visitor numbers at particularly in the European sites, some of which are several which will In the AONB, and those numbers are, are really relatively small, with the exception of the identification of potential displacement to minsmere and obrah. And it was in response to that, that mitigation management plans with advanced mitigation measures which were proposed there. And I think you're you're aware that good progress has been made on the monitoring mitigation plans, and natural England's suggestions. At deadline six, whether we could do a little bit more in terms of educating workers, and also that perhaps I needed to be more Warden control or resource. And we're responding to both of those issues in finalising those plans. And also in our discussions with stakeholders and award winning resource. We don't think there's going to be anything between us as a result of that those discussions as a question of whether you commit to the ordinance within the monitoring mitigation plans or within the resilience funds, which were separately discussing that the scale of resources is not an issue between us in order to understand and monitor the impact and to be able to respond to impacts that arise beyond those which we anticipate. So we think that that whilst that's focused on ecology, it's also focused on understanding the numbers of being people being displaced, there are triggers in relation to whether those numbers are greater than we expect, and additional mitigation measures can be taken. But if they are taken to mitigate and protect ecology, I think substantially, they'd also be protecting and mitigating immunity. And then additionally, as you know, we've identified or there's a discussion about whether there should be alternative natural green space, that's relevant dollars in ecology, but it may also be relevant in new recreation centres in that its purpose is to provide alternative recreation space and to take pressure if pressure is generated away. And as you know, we have said, Well, we think all house farmers effectively that in fact, it's more than that. And the response, we provided a deadline seven to the RSPB and natural England explained that the scale of all those harmonies, quality and characteristics, were equivalent to a larger sound and might be required based on the normal same calculations. also helpful I think the natural England have very recently revised their guidance in relation to same provision to

identify that space might not just be a block of space, that could be a connection between spaces linear benefits of saying and no new guidance recognises the benefits for recreation of walking and cycling, particularly, and it's just not concentrated by providing a circular walk within a space. And there, we would say that we score very well, you're aware of the I think we're going to examine today, the extent of investment in public rights of way, which we say not only mitigates any impact will actually create very substantial legacy benefits for recreation and community in the area. And then Mr. Tate identified the Rams payment, and that would be the normal way of the District Council addressing whether there's a or how to offset any impact on sensitive areas from ecology, but also with recreation, and community benefits. And just to say that we want to continue that discussion with the District Council because we think there may be ways of ensuring that particular Rams payment we made, rather than just going into part an important part that the District Council administer, might identify specific measures, which are as complimentary as they can reach to the provisions that we're making.

1:24:01

And you're aware of those provisions in terms of reducing pressure that might arise from construction workers, for instance, the sports facilities at the campus and in leisten, and the other provisions that are being made. So the outstanding issues appear to relate to whether or not there should be a saying we say, that doesn't need to be an issue, because there is a saying, but I was we responded at each deadline in relation to concerns. We haven't seen his evidence coming back saying why that's wrong. We're being told that it's not precautionary, although the assessment that Mr. Brasher was identified is precautionary, for the reasons we've explained. We think, very precautionary, but you've asked us a question through this round about whether the issues around the numbers affect the conclusions or the mitigation that should be identified and our response to We're preparing it will be know that it doesn't, because the first of all the difference in terms of numbers, isn't that great. And secondly, the necessary response is the response to which we're already putting in place, we say the range of measures, and the monitoring and mitigation and the provision of physical facilities. So we've not heard back, I think, why in those circumstances, it's thought that that isn't sufficient. We think we've responded to what's been suggested others particularly in relation to ordering resource and monitoring and mitigation plans. And so the understanding question might be the same. But we would be really grateful I think, to fight to see if natural England particularly could respond. On the same point. RSPB submitted a very helpful response at the last deadline analysing the saying that we put forward an old house farm and recognising that it met the same requirements in terms of scale was greater than the saying you might create for this number of workers or if they were permanent residents, which of course they're not. So we'd like to understand further what that concern is to see if we can respond to it. But we believe we've responded to and met the impacts that arise, which not only has effects in relation to ecology, we say it has comparable effects in relation to recreation and community. Thank you.

1:26:30

And thank you, sir. And then finally, I'm just going to ask Mr. Kratz deal briefly with the AONB partnership point which is specifically on the AONB element of this item on the agenda.

1:26:42

Thank you. I'm Alison Krauss on behalf of the applicant. If I've understood the question properly, in relation to the nature and the scope of the assessment in relation to immunity and the consequential

effects on the AONB. The, you'll be aware of the assessment was undertaken within the landscape and visual impact assessment. For ease of reference, the two particular areas to focus on are table 13.4 and table 13.7 which provide an understanding of the anticipated effects on the AONB in relation to construction and operational phases. Those assessments are based on a sound understanding of the natural beauty and special qualities relating to the AONB, as they are defined in the agreed document with the Suffolk and within those special qualities, and natural beauty criteria. The issue of tranquillity or relative tranquillity and judgments in relation to immunity and what is meant by that are detailed and the judgments made are recorded. The judgments made in relation to the AONB are also informed by the technical studies undertaken by others, which are drawn in to help inform those overall judgments on the effects on immunity on the AONB. I would note that the methodology has been agreed with Suffolk County Council and the Suffolk and to a large extent agreement to the outcomes made all the judgments made in relation to AONB effects. So hope that addresses that matter, if I could, perhaps, also make a connection between this and more broad judgments around immunity outcomes, because I think it's important to highlight the importance of the longer term legacy that Sizewell brings was much of the focus quite rightly relates to the impacts and the adverse effects during the construction phase and the sensitivities or otherwise of the AONB and immunity there there in the scheme does seek to bring significant benefits are in the longer term and legacy outcomes. The Nic are very clear in their direction regarding what good infrastructure looks like. And benefits should be made and claimed are through the life of the project. Without taking up too much time, but happy to place it in in our note following. What I would do is just point out maybe three main headings in relation to To these matters that really played to the importance of the issue that then I see abroad. Firstly, the and I'm just going to flick my screen to make sure I stay on. Can I also ask you using the acronym Nic sorry, national infrastructure commission, my apologies. The first one relates to

1:30:27

the importance of what happens during the construction phase, and how the guardianship of the immunity is addressed. There are various management plans that have been put in place for the construction phase to minimise effects and reduce effects as much as possible. And they range from the construction phase management plan through to our lighting management. So within the construction phase, proactive measures to address immunity or during that, in the longer term, I'm still under the banner of management. Longer term management plans for the wider estate as well, which seeks to deliver over time and managed change towards a much more naturalised landscape that's more appropriate in AONB terms in terms of character. But also the relationship that has with immunity experience. The characteristics of the Airbnb as it stands at the moment, within the site area, there's some very intensive farming and whilst that is indeed a characteristic of the wider rural landscape, specific qualities of the rnb are much more aligned with natural grassland and mixed woodland. So there is a significant portion of the project is focusing towards legacy outcomes in relation to placing back a landscape that enhances the immunity of the era over and above what we are doing right now. The other area that I think is relevant relates to design quality. In my role as masterplan lead, and essentially the design lead on the project, it's been absolutely critical to make sure that every part of the project were reasonably practicable, addresses the OMB setting, and then the quality of design outcomes, including the finishes to the building and the flexibility we've been able to exercise where appropriate, have all been targeted to make sure that the best can be done to address both the quality

of the AONB experience and the immunity experience resulting from that. My notes will hopefully detail that a little bit more. But I hope that's been helpful.

1:32:48

Thank you. Thank you. Can I ask that you make clear references to the exam Library Reference numbers in those notes? Because both of you have referred to appendix numbers and your document reference. So be helpful. No, absolutely happy to do that. Thank you. Is that concluding everything Mittal say? Yes, it does. Thank you for your for listening to that. Frankie. Also the next item Roman five is links directly into the immunity and recreational effects on the A and B and where I was hoping to see clarification here is some of the points that I think it was Suffolk County Council had raised within the local impact report about whether there was a sufficiently holistic approach being taken in considering recreational immunity impacts on the record, excuse me, recreation and immunity benefits that come from the AONB. So if I can come to Suffolk County Council first, to see if my understanding of their initial concerns is correct, and whether that still remains to be the case.

1:34:07

Thank you. So microbead for Suffolk County Council. So you're right that we see a need to take a holistic approach. And we have expressed as you seen in the Oakland airport concerns that that hasn't been fully undertaken. However, we are comforted by the progress that has been made in relation to the issues concerning the natural environment fund, in conjunction with and I do stress that in conjunction with the environment Trust Fund, or which I think we received some documentation either late last night or this morning, and we'll see I have concerns in relation to the rights away matters. And again, there has been some positive dialogue on that. But there are still some points outstanding, which we will no doubt discuss later on in the agenda today. So so we essentially take the position that it is possible, as we're moving towards the latter stages of the examination, that the overall package of mitigating, and offsetting measures put forward by the applicant may be sufficient to demonstrate that a satisfactory holistic approach is now being taken. I say we're moving in the right direction. But I think we do still have some residual concerns and matters, therefore that need to be further discussed with the applicant. I mean, I hope that's helpful in terms of an overview. If you want to drill into specific topics, obviously, I can bring in particular officers. But that's the I say, that's where we are at the moment.

1:36:14

What's the timing, Mr. Bedford, that you're hoping that you will be able to talk before the examination, the next set of information in light of the fact that you've just received something additional?

1:36:30

Well, so we will look at that with a view to being able if we can to provide comment deadline eight in relation to the trust documentation. However, obviously, there is given that we haven't yet reviewed it and whether in the light of that it needs some further discussion with the applicant. Before we've reached, as it were the respective parties final position. I can't really say at the moment, obviously, we're aware that there's only there after deadline nine and deadline 10. Clearly, we don't really want to leave things, as I'm sure you don't until deadline 10. But all I can say is we're all the case, we know the applicant drop the case, we will do what we can.

1:37:20

Thank you. I mean, I'm conscious. I think that the next statement, Common Ground is due at airline aid. So if it would assist the examination, if between you, you're able to be precise as to what the differences are, even at this stage.

1:37:38

So we know that and hopefully we'll take that on board.

1:37:44

Thank you. Can I now come to the AONB partnerships to see if there's anything additional? They would wish to add at this point?

1:37:56

Thank you, sir. Simon, I'm representing the amb partnership. Just a point on ramps payments. As I understand ramps payments will purely go to the designated sites and the OMB extends much beyond the designated sites, I think there's a point is worth thinking about. So looking at the immunity and recreational effects on the IRB, one way we can measure that is the value of tourism in the in the OMB and we know tourism is worth 228 million pounds per year support over 5000 jobs. That was a study in 2020 with 920 19 figures. And so we can see the the value there. And that tourism, we believe is based very much on the defining qualities of the MMP. So the landscape quality, scenic quality, relatively well, relative wildness, and relative tranquillity. And I think we can we can point to the tourism study in 2013. That noted that much of the tourism, so much of the immunity and recreational value of the amb is based on those characteristics. I think we're talking about promoted roots later. So I won't go into specifics there. That's all I wanted to say. Thank you. Thank you very much. Adam. Roland, you have your hand up.

1:39:36

Yes, thank you, sir. Adam rowland's representing RSPB and Suffolk Wildlife Trust. And I just wanted to come on on the particular effects in relation to RSPB minsmere. You'll be conscious that my colleague, Rosie Sutherland talked earlier and talked about those broader impacts. We don't want to dwell on the HRA and the impact on the designated sites although we do wish to confirm that we're not entirely agreement with some of the points that were made by Mr. Rhodes and we will bring back further detail that date. But in terms of the effects on our visitors to RSPB minsmere. The the big effects we're concerned about in relation to this item is those visitors that pay for access to the site, visit the permissive paths and visit the areas as in essence guests of the RSPB so different to the displacement into the designated habitats and that issue of risk of increased disturbance that we touched on earlier. We're grateful that the applicant has recognised this potential impact and sought to address it with the provision of the resilience fund as recognised in the deed of obligation. And we are still working with the applicant to get to a common understanding to address that. But we are disappointed in the approach the applicant has taken. So, you know, again, that robust approach that's been described in relation to the monitoring and mitigation plan and the HRA impacts. The applicant hasn't taken a similar approach in relation to the resilience Fund. The studies that Mr. Bradshaw described that were undertaken on RSPB minsmere that indicated a proportion of visitors would not return to visit the site during the construction period. That data hasn't been taken into account because the applicant stated they do not

believe that that is sufficient as an indicator of predictive future behaviour, which is contrary to some of the other assessments they've made where they have considered that to be appropriate. So we again believe on that precautionary principle we should work on that principle of last visits to our paid for protection and the resilience funds should seek to mitigate that we are seeking to get to that but in essence, because of that challenge over quantifying that impact that's and therefore the measures that need to be put in place. It is proving quite challenging. The the applicant has provided a proposed sum of money for that resilience fund in their deadlines seven submission and we had confirmed prior to deadline seven that we did not agree that that fund would be sufficient so that is not an agreed some with the RSPB. We are continuing discussion and hope to come back with more detail at deadline eight, but just wanted to be clear that those impacts on paid for visits to RSPB minsmere are still outstanding and need to be resolved.

1:42:36

Thank you, Mr. rowland's. come next to Andrew Tate please.

1:42:44

Thank you, Sir Andrew at Suffolk cancel, just three matters if I may 1 of all say is Suffolk have negotiated the payment of 12 million pounds as the sum for the natural environment improvement fund set out in shedule 11 1.1. And in relation to this item 2.3 of shedule 11 provides that a minimum percentage of that fund shall be allocated for projects within the a MB and Suffolk heritage coast. Although that percentage isn't yet stipulated so that is a matter still for discussion. Secondly, as Mr. Bedford indicated there is to be an environment trust, which is to come forward that set out in the applicants rep 753 that Li 2.2 in answer to your questions. So the scale of that has been agreed, which will be secured separately to the deed of obligation. So that's going to be running in parallel, but clearly we need to see that and the trust is going to have available to it 1.5 million pounds per year of construct a year of construction and the first 20 years of operation and point seven 5 million per year for the remaining operational phase. And the third point in relation to this is that clearly tranquillity is an important aspect of the immunity of the AONB. And I appreciate this comes under item three, three of the agenda about the impacts of that but it's recognised by the applicant that construction noise is a factor in significant adverse effects. On the tranquillity the OMB. It's recognised there are limited options for mitigation. And that ties into why this council is Suffolk are seeking lower construction noise thresholds in the crcp and An effective enforcement provision but we'll come on to that under three, three, but it plays into clearly immunity in the OMB.

1:45:11

Thank you. I can see that there are still two further Hands up, Mr. Wilson, Miss Pilkington, but I am conscious of the time. It's now quarter to 12. And I think it would be sensible to have a break. And so if we can reconvene and I'll come back to Mr. Wilson, next on resuming at 12 o'clock, those of you who are watching the live stream, I just remind you that you will need to refresh your browsers upon your return. Thank you.