

AUDIO_SizewellC_ISH12_Session3_1509202

1

00:06

noon everyone welcome back this issues specific hearing. Now resume, I just confirmed that the recording and live stream is now recommends not can be heard and seen clearly.

00:33

Okay, so we'll move on to item three Roman to Saturday working the associated development sites. Now, as far as I can see, it appears to be accepted by the applicant in the D seven submissions, that is not a necessity to meet the construction programme, but it provides additional flexibility and the potential to bring forward the associated development size earlier. So, can I hear from interested parties on views as to whether in light of this the potential harm to residents which may result from Saturday afternoon working on Saturday working is considered justified or whether the mitigation currently offered would over any overcome any concerns that may arise? So, if I can come to a Suffolk Council, first please. Thank you, Sir

01:28

Andrew at Suffolk council lead to the cicp rep 738. And in part C of that, which deals with the ad sites, paragraph 116 construction activities will be limited. And then it says where possible noisy works will be avoided on Saturday afternoons between one o'clock and seven o'clock. So, we welcome that as a starting point. Turning to rep 754 which is the applicants response to your second round questions on noise at nV 2.1. That is repeated and then it says this means that Saturday afternoons would generally be limited to maintenance activities. So we think that should be reflected in Part C of the cscp that that is the starting point. And that one then departs from that only where it can be justified under which whatever mechanism it is that is to be adopted the bespoke or section 61 process. So that's our current position that the Part C of the cscp should be adjusted to reflect what is said in Rep. 754.

03:06

Thank you, Mr. Tate. To Suffolk County Council have any additional concerns are points that wish to raise.

03:16

So Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council, no, we just echo those points by Mr. T. Thank you.

03:22

Thank you. So I'll just see if there's any additional interested parties who have any particular points? I don't see any hands up. No. Okay, then I'll come to the applicant please.

03:36

Thank you, sir. So on this question of whether or not the restriction, which is in the Part C of the code of construction practice should be changed to reflect watts in Nv RS two nV 2.1. I'm going to ask Mr. Hanley Langley from Sizewell C, to respond to that, but also to put that more broadly into the context of the role that Saturday working plays in terms of accelerating the delivery of the associated development. So Mr. Lang is to my left and you've heard from him before in this examination

04:30

graph known underlying underway on behalf of the applicant with regard to Saturday working and the flexibility that achieves many construction activities suits Saturday operation and it gives us significant advantages which Mr. Tate points out in terms of maintenance and other works. The CSCP as issued that deadline seven that Mr. Tate's referenced Does point to the Saturday afternoon reduction, when we've added that in response to trying to control activities that are of a nature, as well as the other claims in the CSEP around asking for permission from the local council for activities that would attract noise in that same paragraph. In our response to envy 2.1, we talked about the hazards that could be undertaken in that guy's, but we wouldn't want to limit them to just maintenance but want to limit them to a set of activities that are of less noise generating, but not to general maintenance. Some of that might relate to change the traffic management, erection of changes of hoardings and other things on the point of acceleration. Currently, our plan uses the Monday to Friday, with parts of Saturday to deliver the current implementation planets programme. By using the Saturday mornings and some of the Saturday afternoons, we could envisage beating that programme or making it less onerous for local residents during the Monday to Friday, and we see that being an advantage in this regard. Thank you.

06:28

Are you able to give more detail about the amount of shortening of the programme that would result from the Saturday working

06:41

at this time, due to the interest distances of the programme would probably have to take that away and come back with something in writing that will give you more granular information around what that duration is a barometer just come up with a number of hell? No, that would be helpful. No problem.

06:59

Thank you. So so so I hope that explains why. Although in the answer to N v. 2.1. It said that this means that the Act was a generally be limited domains and its activities. The generally is important there, because there are other types of work that might appropriate be undertaken on a Saturday, and they're not confined to maintenance. And that it is where possible that the noisy activities to be avoided on a Saturday afternoons, we think that the combination, there is a fair balance. But we'll obviously continue to talk to a separate counsel outside the examination relation to master that sword.

07:47

Yeah, that's appreciated. I think. The bottom line, as I said, is making sure that the soul is avoided on those Saturdays and some of the occasions where it appeared that those could be exceeded, appear to correspond with the lower thresholds for Saturday working. So it was it was trying to find a mechanism that would meet that and gave certainty to residents and others that that was going to be the case.

Thanks, I've got I've got to mate at that point. We'll take that away. Thank you. Okay, so next, Roman three, whether the extent of the construction period and the rural nature, the location is properly assessed health impacts of construction and associated activities, including traffic. Now interested parties have consistently set out how their quality of life in this rural area, largely accessed by a local rather than national road network, if I can put it in those terms, would be significantly altered by the construction activities and associated transport. The Council's and the local impact report considered the effects had been a thing underplayed and further metric mitigation needed to be provided. And so what I'm trying to understand is, what the current position is, from interested parties on that, particularly with regard to how it might have adverse effects on health and mental health, and whether the mitigation is now seem to be appropriate in resolving those potential impacts. So if I can come to I think it's Suffolk Council, county council first in this instance, hopefully, no doubt, they'll tell me if I've gone the wrong way around.

09:49

Sir. Well, I'm not sure to what extent you've put it the wrong way around in terms of any detail. I mean, obviously, we have already had the The discussion in detail on noise and vibration issues terrific hearing aid which covered the traffic transport implications of that. And I assume you don't want to revisit that. Essentially, we are continuing to press in terms of the controls on traffic movements, and the delivery of the HGV HDV caps is obviously a critical part of that. We're also pressing the applicant further on issues as to the levels of frequency of monitoring and of traffic in terms of vehicle movements. And also, it's not just the overall cap. They're also the questions of quarterly caps. And so, so those matters are obviously being the subject of continuing discussion. We don't at present feel that we have achieved a position whereby all of the effects have been adequately addressed. But we are making progress on those matters. And we'll see if you want to hear specifically on any of the particular matters that relate to traffic, I asked Mr. Mary, if there's anything specific to update you on. But that's the overall position.

11:34

And we'll be interested to hear your inquiry, I don't want to rehearse the traffic position again. But it would be helpful to understand if there are specific locations or items where you remain concerned,

11:49

work best for that purpose, then I will bring in Mr. Mary, so that hopefully he can help you on that. Thank you.

12:02

Hello, good afternoon, Steve, Mary Suffolk County Council. Most of the information you require will be in the deed of obligation, which is the latest addition is rep 7040. In terms of those areas that cause us as a residual concern, particularly is something that has been picked up in the Ice Age meetings previously, is a b 1122, particularly the early years. So to two specific factors there is firstly, the controls in terms of the caps, the applicant has proposed a 600 HTV cap and that came forward in is h eight and we're just waiting for confirmation that is the case. It was something that I thought we were going to come on to slightly later in terms of rights away as well in terms of 1122 it is a specific item within the deed of obligation, but as yet it is not. So flashed out to speak is that he doesn't have a source scope.

We have been in discussions with the applicants, and we have provided our thoughts and where we see specific issues. And that is both in terms of highway. So in terms of Tibetan village itself, there are proposals potentially to improve the pedestrian crossing, to sort of reduce the risk that they severance in the road safety issues. And we did have a meeting between

13:27

Mary, I'm sorry to interrupt you is are all your comments in respect of the B 1122. Because you're quite right, it is a later agenda item.

13:37

Okay. They were specifically to do with the 1122. There are also there's the live bill and 22 repurposing, which is how the 1122 is considered beyond that, in terms of residuals, specific issues that are coming up in the property rights way to do with the East Bridge Road. Another residual issue is the treatment of Abbey Road, which is the road that goes from the main site into licen itself. And it's the concerns we have which we did put in the local impact report about how that will behave through the construction period because it's a narrow roadway, narrow footways and it is the main link between the main site and the licence itself would also say that we have agreed a lot of the rights way and highways improvements around the lased an area. They are the main issues I can think of in terms of health, there are residual issues on the to village bypass, particularly to do with noise mitigation and low noise surfacing. There's some issues we're still working through with the applicant about what will be provided where and what the impacts are. And again, we may touch on that in the right way conversations. And the same applies particularly in the forwardly road area of the size or link road. So in the high level terms, they are the major concerns that I can think of on the spot. Thank you. I've got Julian cusec.

15:21

Thank you. I'm doing cusec chairman and middles income for the parish Council. And I too wish to speak on the implications for health and immunity of issues related to the B one, one to two in the early years, but also in relation to the roads going south from Middleton more from the one month's who's who, so in the direction of Cal Salar Saxmundham. And I would seek guidance for Well, I should address those issues. Now under this agenda item or whether I should address them under item four, little three. My reservation about for level three is it seems to be dealing only with public rights away and non motorised use, there's a sudden my comments also extend beyond that scope.

16:13

So what should I do, please? I think if they're broadly related to the B 1122, if you if you bring them in at that point, I'm quite content if it goes beyond just the highway uses if if that's the way of putting it because it is about understanding the broader health issues today. So if you can hold back for the moment. Thank you. Edwina Galloway, please.

16:48

Hello. This is Edwina Galloway on behalf of Cal cell comm Colton parish Council.

16:55

We feel no progress has been made at all in terms of any work to try and avoid rat running through our parish and the effects there on likewise, a number of our properties have come off the a 12 There seems to be no progress in insurance, they will still have access and there any kind of noise etc will be mitigated which we are concerned about residence health that will be near that area. Thank you very much. Thank you. Pete Wilkinson. Thank you. So

17:32

people will concern Chairman together against size will say I'm also looking for direction, please. I would like to address timing mitigation and health effects using the B 1122. Would you like me to speak now? Or would you like me to wait until item number four? level three?

17:50

I think has the later agenda item Mr. Wilkins, if that's okay.

17:56

That's fine with me. It is about health effects. And that's why I thought it would be appropriate here. But I will wait Of course. Thank you. Andrew tight.

18:14

Thanks, Andrew at Suffolk Council. So there are two matters, we'd like to dimension first relates to the noise thresholds, the construction noise thresholds which are relevant to this point. And the second relates to the mechanism in relation to noise mitigation and controls generally. And asked Mr. Kemp to come in very shortly, but on the mechanism. So in relation to the noise monitoring and management plan, the version that's been produced rep set as rep 748. That proposes bespoke no noise plans, and although we welcome the provisions in that document, which relate to approval of the composition, the plans and the dispute resolution in the event of that not being agreed. We do think it should be a more blended product and include the what is currently lacking, which is those aspects of Section 61 section 61 process that are of considered to be a value by the Council. And those are twofold. The first that there is a well tried route to enforcement, which doesn't involve an injunction in the high court or criminal offence for breach, but instead the section 61 process and secondly, that involves a The power to impose conditions. We think, therefore, that either section 61 should be reinstated, or the bespoke noise plans need to have that made into into even more hybrid approach, which has those aspects of Section 61. And that's one of the questions that you've asked, what happens if that's not agreed, and we will address that, but it will require some amendment by way of requirement if that isn't accepted. So I was going to turn down to Mr. Kemp briefly to do festival noise thresholds. Secondly, mechanism, Mr. Kemp.

20:48

Good afternoon, sir Mark camp, each Suffolk environment environment protection? Firstly, I'll just address the question you had about assessments. We've accepted the initial assessments of the applicant. Now on on the basis primarily that these are going to be significantly refreshed down the line as further information comes to light in both whatever process for for the control of noise is chosen for process like the noise mitigation scheme. So it's certainly going to be a lot more detail coming forward. And to inform the mitigation of noise in terms of construction, particularly in terms of the noise

thresholds, where we're looking still for the noise thresholds in annex c five of BS, five TTY eight primarily because of the the evening levels that are provided by that part of the standard. And the recognition of the highest sensitivity for that that part of the part of the day in, in what is a rural environment, residential environment. Now, the noise specials we're looking for in the cicp maybe probably put into context of what we're actually looking for is to pose opposed to the the definitive kind of implementation of a five, the noise threshold we're looking for NCC cicp are in more indicative target levels rather than hard levels not to be exceeded. Apart from Sol, obviously, which is which is point to be avoided. It's more something we're looking for the applicant, the site, and especially the contractors to do their best to comply with within the bounds of best practical means, indeed, would say more forming a part of best practical means it means in justifying why they need to exceed them at the times they say that they need to using the evening noise threshold example, we expect them to justify why they needed to exceed that particular threshold. And why they couldn't reasonably undertake this work at another time or in another way where the noise level to be created would be be less of an impact. This is not to say that we would object or not approve a plan that stated an exceedance. But we would be doing so if they had not displayed BPM or justified adequately why they needed to do that activity at that time, at those levels in that wild. For example, if they came forward with a critical concrete pour that was going to take seven days, seven nights, and it was justified, that they were using BPM to get to the lowest possible levels, then then that would be necessarily acceptable in the delivery of this project. If they were trying to do wanting to do an excavation on a part of the site that wasn't going to be used for another week, and it could reasonably do and another time, that's the sort of thing we'd be looking forward to them say, Well, no, that's not that's not we can you can do it at a better time. It's it's more because it's kind of an indication to people working there, you're planning this work that they need to be more sensitive to parts of the day. And to inform them how they should be surprised trying to avoid impact where it's possible to do so. I mean, ultimately, we're accepting BPM as the means to control noise, and expect that to be controlled to an absolute minimum irrespective of thresholds. So if you can do better than the threshold, you do better than the threshold. If you've got to exceed the threshold, then that's the absolute minimum exceedance that you can get away with in terms of the section 61 or bespoke process. As Mr. Tate said, we've got some stills and reservations about the bespoke process. Maybe just to put some of those in context or the whole process in context. Now we accept that the the approvals process in The bespoke mitigation plans are broadly equivalent to to Section 61. We don't have an issue with the with the approvals process. Indeed, the the dispute resolution process they've come up with is arguably better than a section 61. And something we'd probably like to see retained. on the basis that magistrates courts are difficult to negotiate through things like BPM, and point out, you know, why we've refused an approval or what and why there is a dispute, magistrates aren't necessarily the best place to handle that particular side of things.

25:42

The areas that we have concerns more around the the ability to enforce if necessary, I use the term SSL because obviously, it's a last resort. And currently, with the bespoke mitigation plans, they don't have as as easier or as as recognisable process to the, to the contractors, and to the people that are going to be working on under these under these things. Now, a section 61 the magistrate's court with a section 61 I think would be a simpler process Administrative Court is perfectly set up to deal with with enforcement in that case, there'll be a simple matter of looking at what was approved, and then what actually occurred. If that didn't match up, then obviously, the there's the The problem is is clear to see.

Finally, in terms of the noise mitigation scheme, and construction noise, we'd like to see the implementation of the noise mitigation scheme, a point below sole recognition of the the duration, size, magnitude and location of this project. Where we're, we're moving away from from hard thresholds as control points in favour of a BPM approach in order to reduce the noise levels from from the NDS to an absolute minimum. And we just feel this would be well supported by a more generous noise mitigation, same scope below so and perhaps make us a bit more comfortable with the situation of not having hard levels, which were obviously easier to enforce against. But that's that's all I've got to say on that.

27:40

Thank you, Mr. Kim. Is that everything from your team, Mr. Tate?

27:46

Yes, it is, sir. On this item. Thank you.

27:49

Thank you. I come next to Mr. Scott.

27:52

Thank you. Can I can I return to the natural agenda heads which are health living conditions? And the question I want to raise is, again, what the assessment methodology is because I'm very concerned also about the the assumption that the living conditions are rural, which obviously many of the of the key issues are rural. But we've also got the 12 spine, there are many people live on that. And one of the living conditions I thought it would be useful to bring to your attention. If I can show you that's the local newspaper headline from the Knights. By the 13th of September, Mr. Scott at the moment, I can't see you so Oh, I'm sorry. I'm not getting I'm enjoying a lot of interference. Sorry, I want to show you a headline for the local newspaper The Anglian which just raises a different dimension, Visa v the assessment of living conditions and effects of the project. And I note the rubric is also to do with the longevity of the construction period. And also the rural nature. And I think a lot of the effects are not well considered for the rural nature because the a toll of itself in in crucial areas is the first in urban spine. And I note that previous narratives we'll talk about talked about the a 12 corridor. And in particular what do I want to raise was the the baseline of the living condition as experienced at the moment. visibly, the assessments the longevity of the project and a short example is what was in the newspaper The headline reads Carnage on the a 12 as overturned, lorry sees an eight hour road closure. That happened last Friday, I think. And a single lorry going fast round around about at martlesham blocked the whole area for eight hours. We have neighbours who couldn't get to work. That is quite a common experience. It's not the it's not a rural road inadequacy question. It's, it's, it's the question of what the living experience is at the moment. And I think it is actually quite stressed. The car ownership is now I think the the metric for car ownership is 2.5 per family. And there is a lot of housing development planned, where there are spaces for for cars. So there's a huge strain coming from traffic as a living condition. So I think, you know, I understand obviously, that there are areas that are need professional exploration like noise and vibration and so on. But there has to be some sort of sense of proportion, about what that baseline is. And the the the baseline is that there is a lot of stress attached to ordinary living here at the moment. And that's the point wants to make and I will look carefully at the assessment base for the living conditions to the extent that that has been carried out. Thank you.

31:28

Thank you, Mr. Scott. Unfortunately, for whatever reason, we weren't able to see you during your presentation. You could hear very clearly though. So perhaps when you put in your written submission, you can let us have a copy of the newspaper article that you're referring to that would be appreciated. Yes, of course. Thank you very much. Next, I'll come to Christopher Wilson.

31:58

Thank you, Mr. Mosely. Christopher Wilson from task is just a quick point. That's as the extent of the activities on the land east of the business industrial estate have slowly emerged, tasks with concerns that there's been no real direct consultation with residents directly affected by those 24 seven activities. Listen include obviously not limited to assessment of the air and dust from the spoil heaps the noise and lighting from the car park and bus journeys, the HGV movements and also not to forget and when we spoken about round noise, and I'll see the Lee will be served by the rail line in the early years. And a lot of the residential houses around there are young families with children. And all of this I think has got health and wellbeing implications and just concerned as to how well this has been assessed. And because the the story from the ground basically is a lot of people don't even know what's gonna be happening really estate, even though they live right next door to it. So just something I wanted to flag up. Thank you.

33:20

Thank you, Mr. Wilson. Mr. Baker's

33:29

afternoon counsellor grant, because I'm not sure when this would be appropriate time to bring this up. But however, we're going to bring it up at this time because it relates to decision making over health issues in our community. Can I ask as promised if the applicant has sent to you the details of their proposed property price support scheme for size we'll see to you the Inspectorate. We sent our evidence regarding the unfairness of this scheme. Hinkley vs. Size war prior to deadline seven, we are very very concerned that EDF continue to run away from their obligation on this matter in our meetings on common ground. And therefore feel that given this in transient stance on this, it should be brought within the framework under the over decio under the deed of obligation which we intend to speak about on Friday. But however can we do need to establish that the applicant because we can't seem to locate it has sent this information to you and it's in your hands.

34:49

I don't recall seeing it but I'm sure the applicant will respond when I come to her them shortly. I've got a number of hands up but I think Mr. Middleton, Miss Galloway, Mr. Wilkinson, they may all be legacy hands from earlier. Hopefully that's correct. But if not, you know, come to Mr. Wilkinson first. Is there an additional point?

35:18

No, I do beg your pardon. Chair, I'll be waiting for the item to come up in my session. Thank you.

35:24

Oh, thank you for clarification. So as there's no further hands if I can come to Mr. Philpott on behalf of the applicant?

35:37

Yes, I'm going to start with just a general query, if I may, that when you introduce the item, and that reflected our understanding of the way it was framed in the agenda, it was concerned with whether the assessment of health impacts had properly taken account of the rural nature of the location and the extent of the construction period, that being a theme in the concerns that have been raised by residents, and anticipating that that was what was on the examining authorities. Mind. I have Dr. Bahraini ready to respond to that. And although that didn't appear to be a theme of the interested parties representations, I wonder if I might start by inviting him to address the point that you've asked us to consider? Yes, that's obviously fine. That's Bernie.

36:48

The short answer is yes, the scope and focus of the health assessment was agreed during formal scoping with statutory consultees. And then further through the establishment of health working group that we've been engaged with from the outside the project. There was an a second scoping exercise, which again, tested the approach process methods, outputs, and also risk perceptions that were to be addressed. And that's, that's also built on these stakeholder engagement, all the outputs from the concerns raised. I think, the closest we've had to the interested parties responding on that was Mr. Wilson, where he raised his concerns for air dust, noise, transport, and air from road and rail, and a potential disproportionate impact upon children. Well, that's fully scoped in within the assessment. The eh O. Two didn't actually raise health as an issue. It was more going beyond what is a regulatory requirement to the joy to address daytime noise, which is limited to annoyance. There is no adverse health outcome from that other than annoyance. So, yes, the scope of approach process methods, outputs have all been agreed and delivered. Nobody's found any gap that was found on the floor and the assessment. No one's presented any countervailing evidence to the contrary. So I think that's that's probably the response I would have offered for the question that you've you posed to us. So if you have a further question,

38:21

now, I'm not going to say the closest thing I'm grateful for your response, and I just wanted to hear whether there was anything you wanted to say in addition, in light of what was said, albeit it was perhaps slightly off the agenda.

38:34

So yes, I realised that then we had a mixture of comments, some of them related to particular stretches of road, others related to noise and then impacts on particular areas and the property price support scheme is a bit of a mixed bag. And what I'm going to do is I'm going to deal with the East suffer. Council points. There were two questions raised. One was about the process within the N MMP, and the other was about thresholds. And then I asked Mr. res to deal briefly with a matter of process. First, recognising that the detail draft, the mechanism to this sort is probably better dealt with offline. And if we can't agree, the precise wording will obviously we can put in written submissions about that. But

alas, Mr. Rose to deal with the matter to high level first, then I'll ask Mr. brownstone to deal with the question of noise thresholds.

39:44

JOHN Rhodes for the applicant, as far as the process is concerned, I don't think there's very much between us at all. And Mr. Kemp's description of the bespoke noise monitoring mitigation plan. are exactly our view of how they should work as well. In fact, we've said to Mr. Kemp, if we could write him personally into the deed of obligation, we'd quite like to do that, because we've had a lot of good engagement on this. And we do have, I think, exactly the same view about how the bespoke plan should work. And the shared purpose is to ensure that the project can be constructed with least impact where well with least impact, but having regard to the practicality of need to construct a major, a major project. And we did agree at the previous deadline in the noise monitoring mitigation plan to reduce the thresholds at which the bespoke noise mitigation schemes would kick in. That's different from the noise thresholds relating to the noise mitigation scheme. But the point at which the forecast noise would trigger the need for bespoke plan is agreed. And that's lower than the threshold that we had originally proposed. And that brings in the large majority of the construction process for the main development site, and Mr. Brian stone did some assessment for us. And it's probably at least 50% of the main construction sight words will be subject to bespoke plans through the different phases, and we have no difficulty with that, or with the process has been described in relation to them. So what Mr. Kemp was explaining to we would also have explained that that's the way in which we imagined that they're working, there's no difference between us in terms of the specific process that we put forward relating to them. And we don't have detailed feedback yet. But it was helpful to hear the feedback today from Mr. Kemp and Mr. Tate. And what we've tried to do is just to design the process that works best for the project. So it was helpful to hear that the approvals process. And the dispute resolution process is not only acceptable, but probably better than the section 61 alternative. And that was that was his purpose. So far as the concerns in relation to enforcement are concerned, we've not seen those written down. So we need to engage with the council to resolve that. What we have said, though, is that we weren't disallowing section 60 of the control and Pollution Act, those enforcement powers are still available to the council. So whether it's genuinely necessary to do more work on that process. I'm not sure but we'll certainly look at that. If it is there's no resistance from us, we recognise that the plans need to be fully enforceable in a way that's expeditious and using the best process available. We think that's potentially already available within the drafting that we've produced. But if we fail to achieve that, then we will revise the plans and the process relating to them. While I'm speaking, can I just also pick up a point in relation to the property price support scheme was raised?

43:04

Yes, I was going to deal with that. But if Mr. Rose is able to do that, that's absolutely fine.

43:12

Just as either not so far as I'm aware, a document that's available to you in front of the examination. There's no secret about it, we could provide it if it was a document of interest. And it's not a document that we're committed to within the deed of obligation, but it is a document that we have committed to. And it's a document that is already has been shared with the properties to which is applied and has been running for more than 12 months now as a process. We took the view that providing some

compensation for value wasn't wasn't clearly a planning consideration, not something that we were going to ask you to attach weight to in the decision making process. But and that's why there's any reason it's not within the deed of obligation. But it's something to which we are completely committed. I wasn't aware of the criticisms that were mentioned of it that are said to have been raised before we will certainly track those down and review those against the scheme but it's at the moment we're operating it as a voluntary scheme is meant to be comparable with the scheme operated at Hinkley. But there is a distinction in the link the scheme is referenced in the deed of obligation from memory but that's not what we thought was the right thing to do.

44:29

And it may be helpful for Mr. Because another's if you're willing to share it with them. Now, it's clearly up to you whether you wish to submit it to the examination it's as view but there's obviously some people have concerned and you're saying you open about it. So that might be a way around it.

44:54

Thank you. So I know speak for the the applicant inside I'll take those concerns seriously and certainly address them. Thank you.

45:02

Thank you so well, yes. That stolen my thunder. I was getting Vegas into the same point. It's voluntary. It's not something that is dealing with a planning impact. It's dealing with property prices. But there's no, there's no reason why we can't put it in if it is thought important. Noise threshold is going to ask us to Brownson just respond on that, and then I'll pick up a couple of other points that be raised.

45:32

Thank you, Mike brownstone on behalf of the applicant. There were two points, I just wanted to pick up from what Mr. Kemp said. The first was with regard to evening noise levels, or noise thresholds in relation to annex e point five of British Standard 5228. Part One, we set out our position on that particular aspect of the standard in two places in response to your second round of questions, and V point 2.0, which is I believe, rep seven DASH 054. And then in our written submissions arising from is height, which is rep seven DASH 071. And it's only electronic page 13, which is the easy part plus in Section 1.6 be Roman numeral three. And we set out their opposition on the evening thresholds with respect to effectively its guidance from minerals extraction sites, it relates to background noise levels. Our view is that is overly restrictive. On the other point, Mr. Kemp raised in terms of noise mitigation scheme, and the thresholds at which installation would be offered on the main development port, where the main development site is the dominant source. In recognition of the the length of the construction programme. We are due to have a conversation with Mr. Kemp in the next day or so. But in essence, the applicants position is subject to getting clarification on on two specific items. One of those is that any any changes we make to the thresholds for the noise mitigation scheme for the main development site only relate to the main development site, the associated development sites are not long construction projects in the same way the main development site is they are more typical construction projects. And we don't feel there's a need to alter the thresholds for that, or for those. And similarly, the thresholds for temporary housing. They will generally apply for short periods. If we don't think they're going to apply to we don't think we're going to reach the kind of thresholds where temporary housing

would be appropriate but they are generally very short periods. So consideration of the duration of the overall project doesn't doesn't come into it. Notwithstanding agreement with the Council on those two points. It is reasonable I think that we will revisit the thresholds, the noise noise mitigation scheme for the main developed site. I need to take instructions to exactly what level will arrive at but I imagined the thresholds in the ABC method from PS five two to eight are probably about right. So there are about 10 decibels lower than the current thresholds in the noise mitigation scheme. But that that will be subject to discussion with with the council. Thank you.

48:25

And then so there was a point raised by Mr. Wilson about consultation and assessment in relation to residents near the land east of Eastlands industrial estate. If I may says rather than a generalised point if there are specific criticisms of the extensive, repeated consultation exercises that have been undertaken, and the assessment that has been undertaken and reported, half Mr. Wilson, put those two words in writing and we can consider what they are but not really possible to respond meaningfully to a generalised point of that sword. There were some points raised in relation to transport rat running and also a 12 impacts. I do have Mr. Mullen able to she's participating remotely but able to deal with those briefly if if that will be of assistance.

49:26

If she's able to give a brief response, then yes,

49:29

thank you. In that case, I ask customer Mullen, who who well known to the examination she spoke implored us to deal briefly with those two points.

49:42

I sat cast him at mom to half of the applicant, and said of one point with regard to rat running in particular with reference to Cal sail that was mentioned by Mr. Cusack and Miss Galloway and this being dealt with in a number of Through the proposed mitigation, and the the transport, construction transport, travel plateau construction worker travel plan has a parking permit system in place for workers whereby, obviously we've got workers within the a 12 corridor, and it's only worse within the HL corridor and outside of lased. And that would be eligible for a parking permit. And that the purpose of the park combined with postpartum guys is to intercept workers from further afield and to consolidate those trips onto buses. And the buses would not be routing through Cal sail, they'd be routing on their on the size building code on the a 12. So the embedded mitigation within the assessment already reduces the the trips on that local network within the a 12 corridor in the parking permit system is meant to control and provide a further control of that. And in terms of potential rat running within the and against the use of rat run its and its use of those rural roads effectively by workers. And as opposed to running the contingency fund that's been agreed with Suffolk County Council, which is available for the transport review group to draw down from does have consideration of all roads within the area, and any potential unmitigated effects that may arise from those communities. So that's that that sum of money has been agreed and is in the latest deed of obligation that was submitted at D seven, that we'll deal with that in addition to the control mechanisms that we've got in place in terms of the a 12. And that was raised by Mr. Scott. This has been assessed in detail both in terms of traffic modelling and

committed development has been agreed with the authorities as well as the traffic growth to allow for housing and other growth along that corridor. And there's obviously improvements being posed along that corridor for highway uses intensity Ridge bypass to New York's around about another junction improvements, as well as a contribution within the latest deed of obligation for a 12. improvements and other pedestrian improvements along that corridor. notably in little Glen and miles furred, and New Oxford that's being progressed and designed in consultation with Suffolk County Council would be delivered by size we'll see and in terms of incidents on that network, at deadlines seven we provided an update on scenario planning that forms the basis of the temp the traffic Incident Management Plan and that has been discussed and agreed in principle with the stakeholders and the updated temp will be provided at deadline date. Sir. Thank you. So that that completes our response. Thank you.

53:14

Come on to the next item. Roman for in terms of how regard has been paid protection of residential gardens from construction activities and then the subsequent operation of the sites. It was obviously touched on at the issue specific hearing on noise and air quality but I'm just seeking clarity on what standards have been applied, if any to protect residential immunity at people's homes and particularly their gardens. And therefore, what can the public expect as a minimum standard during the construction period, then subsequent operational period and whether that has been agreed by I guess he suffered counsel in the first instance that so if I can come to them to start with

54:04

Thank you sir address at Suffolk council dealing first with the noise arising from construction and operation. The position is that there is there are new construction noise mitigation options for gardens and therefore that reinforces the need to have lower noise thresholds or targets in the cscp. And to ensure that the bespoke or sexual 61 approval process is as robust as possible with Brett's best practical means. So that that's all we have to say on that first point. In relation to construction, noise, operational noise, so, you know there is that was a matter that was discussed, I think there is agreement with the applicant that there should be a noise limit. But the precise level of that is still under discussion, there was some further information provided at deadline seven. And we are looking at that, at present. The next aspect of this is quality in relation to gardens. And the council is satisfied with the methodology used to estimate particulate matter concentrations at human health receptors, including gardens and also dust nuisance through dust soiling, the applicants now agreed to provide a dust monitoring and mitigation plan, which will be agreed with ese prior to construction. So, I should just add in that context, the cscp hasn't quite caught up with that commitment that be approved prior to construction. So there is some redrafting of that to be done. But the commitment from the applicant is is clear to reflect the wording of the noise, monitoring and mitigation plan. And then, finally, in relation to quality, and perhaps it arguably comes under the previous item three, three. But it's the same point that more widely, is suffered cancela content with the overall measures in the cscp and outline task management plan, supplemented by the dust monitoring and management plan. And on that basis, we are satisfied there'll be no significant risk of air quality objective exceedances or dust nuisance exceedances at human health receptors during construction, that includes residential gardens. As I've mentioned, there is some further consideration about the quality impacts at proposed pedestrian crossings. But that's a separate strand of discussion which I went elaborate on. Thank you.

57:35

Come down. Come down to interested parties. Nicola Pilkington your hand it up.

57:48

I just wanted to follow on from what was said by Suffolk County Council at the hearings, open floor hearings. A couple of weeks ago, I raised the issue of pm two fives. And and it was discussed on the Wednesday. And it was actually inconclusive at the end of the discussion as to what was going to happen about monitoring of PMT five, where it was going to happen, and who is going to be responsible for it. So I was wondering whether the gentleman from suffolk county council had anything further to say by that within the comments he'd already made. Thank you.

58:51

Thank you, Miss Pilkington. I don't think there are any further hands upon this particular point. In terms of the Pm 2.5 monitoring, examiner authority has asked a question or third round. And so we're expecting an answer from the applicant deadline aid in respect of that, but so whether I'll now come to the applicant see whether he wants to say anything further in response to that point, but also to the other points raised. Thank you. So

59:25

we'll deal with the PMT, point five point through the written response. I don't have my air quality witness here with me today. I will just ask Mr. brownstone to just briefly deal with the question of noise in residential gardens. We've heard what's been said on behalf of the subject about the air quality aspects but I don't think there's anything we need to respond to there that that seems to be a rolling welcome message. So just in terms of the noise issues, Mr. Burns tend to respond.

1:00:04

He might brownstone on behalf of the applicant. I think there are broadly three points I wanted to make. The first point, just in general terms regarding gardens and in particular construction is the British Standard that sets out how one assesses construction was pretty standard five to eight, part one, which I'm sure you're quite sick of hearing about. It defines what it regards as a noise sensitive premise, or premises as any occupied premises outside of site used as a dwelling including gardens. So, gardens are already taken into account when it sets its criteria. So it is, in effect already taken into account. In our view, that that is the normal way of assessing construction noise in general terms. Mr. Tate mentioned that there were no mitigation options for gardens. I assume he's referring to the noise mitigation scheme, which is clearly a scheme for controlling internal noise levels. But I don't think we accept that there are no mitigation options to go to construction practice. And there is monitoring manager planner exactly set up to deliver appropriate mitigation for the construction process. And that will have the effect of controlling noise and vibration. Indoors outdoors, you know, beyond the site boundary, it's an outsource effectively, mitigation control, and therefore we say there are mitigation options. That is not documented in the noise mitigation scheme, which is clearly an internal document. Mr. Tate also mentioned that he would like to lower noise thresholds or targets, we would just draw zoning authorities attention to the smoke management, sorry, smoke mitigation plan as part of the noise monitoring and management plan process requires SMC co to discuss and agree mitigation with the council with really suffer council where the noise levels are above a level of 55 decibels. 55 decibels

is broadly widely quoted as one or two values that are assigned to guards not necessarily in relation to construction noise. And it generally tends to be the context of when you're bringing a new residential property to a noise source. But generally 55 is regarded as an appropriate limit for garden kind of noise exposure when one is building a new house. So we say that we are providing me se with with an option to control mitigation or influence mitigation at an equivalent limit, where gardens kind of hit that sweet spot if you like. The other point I wanted to pick up on that Mr. Tate said he said that there was agreement that an operational noise limit was appropriate, but the precise level was under discussion, it is not a position to dance agreed. As we set out in Section 1.7 of our issues arising from IC h is h eight documents a rep seven DASH 071. And it's section 1.7. We set out there the reasons why we don't think an operation noise limit is appropriate. And in any event, if such a limit is appropriate, we're only discussing nighttime noise limits, not daytime wear by guards would be occupied. And the level that we were discussing was substantially lower than that 55 decibel threshold that I mentioned is often applied to gardens, we were talking about an internal effect effectively. So we were talking levels between hitting the council wanted 35 decibels we were talking 40 to 45 depending on the exact metric, but that's comfortably below any level that would be an issue for a garden and as I said it was a nighttime threshold.

1:03:47

So I although I said we will be dealing with Pm 2.5 issue in writing and of course we will be Dr. Brown, he says indicates to me that he may be able to provide Mr. Pilkington with some comfort in terms of the potential health implications whether it's a health issue or not. So I just asked him to deal briefly with that, if I may. Thank you.

1:04:11

That's Brian again. Yes, Mr. Wilkinson is very well read. There is significant health evidence base on the health effects of Pm 2.5 exposure that's developed by the committee for the medical works for air pollution, and actually underpins our air quality objective thresholds that are protective of health. As part of the health assessment, I have been fully integrated within the air quality as well as the noise, the transport the socio economic teams, and the change in air quality from construction and transport emissions will remain within these objective thresholds that are protective of health. We've gone a step further what to see what the relative change in concentration and exposure would mean. And in both cases concentration and exposure are orders of magnitude lower than is required to quantify any adverse health outcome to put down to overcome So we looked at the loop. So that's the loss of onsite power generator which is the most significant source of emission from any activity. And you will have to have half of the Suffolk living in a single garden exposed to the highest change at any point before you will see any manifest health outcome. That was a hypothetical assessment just to put the risk perception to context and to prevent the situation where the known hazard a Pm 2.5 is misapplied to infer a risk. So I just wanted to make sure that Mr. Pilkington was aware that we have looked at this we have assessed This is not an issue and he said a council don't raise as a health issue either.

1:05:41

Okay. So that completes our response. Thank you. Thank you. So then go on. I think we're now on to item for public rights of way. And for non motorised uses an understanding of implication for people, for people with protected characteristics. We start with the Suffolk coastal path. I want to look at the

construction period and then the operation period if we can. Now in rep 7024, which is the revised rights of way and access strategy submitted a deadline seven, there appears to be a positive move forward in the coast path, and the publicly accessible wider coastline would be subject to temporary disruption. But then there's a rewording, as I said, thinking response to some of the concerns that Suffolk County Council have, have raised. So I really need to understand now from the county council, whether they're now content with the approval of the diversity policy right away pursuant to requirement six a has now drafted or whether there are still concerns that remain. And I would then also wish to now say this now, so the applicant can be thinking about it. In that document at the subsequent paragraphs, I think it's paragraph 1.27. The way I read it appears to sort of walk back from this county council agreeing the line of the path to reinstate what you'd said, the line of path would be on. So I'm I may be Miss reading now. So I just look for your clarification on that. So if I can come to the county council first, please.

1:07:44

Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So you, you alighted or highlighted the first point that I was going to raise, which is one of needing some clarification, because there's not only the two paragraphs that you've identified in rep seven, dash o 24. Which, as you say, raise a question there is then I'm afraid, I've been unable to identify the correct rep seven reference number from the examination library. But it's it's the applicants comments at deadlines seven on the submissions from earlier deadlines and subsequent written submissions to I sh One, two, IFH say, six, that's the document using the applicants numbering just Pro Tem, if I can document 9.73 all of the dependencies to that document do have examination Library Reference numbers. And it may be this should be part of them. But I see a reference number has been deleted, which I think is rep 7059. On the basis, it was a duplicate, and I'm not sure whether this might have been rep 7059. But in any event, the reference then within that document is at paragraphs 12 sorry, two, point three and two point 12.4. Because they seem on the face of it to say explicitly that the county council will have to agree the location of footpath 21. They say in accordance with requirement 12 b they don't refer to requirement six a but that's a drafting point that the intention seems to be that yes, the location will be the subject of agreement to the county with the County Council. And if that is what's now intended it, then obviously our concern is likely to be allayed because if we have to approve the final location, then our concerns and considerations obviously be brought into account. But if the position is that that is not intended by the applicant location reverts to what is said at paragraph 1.2. point seven of rep 724. And so yes, we do still have an outstanding issue in relation to the proposed rerouting of the coastal path. It's probably helpful if I just bring in Mr. Andrew woodin, who is the rights of way and Access Manager just to explain since what the essence of our concerns are in that regard, and if in particular, you can consider as well as any other comments, the implications, persons with protected characteristics, this would in that would be helpful to the agenda, right.

1:11:08

Thank you. Yes, sir. Andrew, wooden for Suffolk County Council. On the matter of the coast path, our main concern centres on footpath 21. The term coast path is used in a generic way but the county council is the Highway Authority is responsible for footpath 21. c alignment that is proposed to be east of the coastal defence and lower than the top of the defence. And the county Council's contention is that footpath 21 should be on top of the defence. That is the most resilient route for the public highway.

At the moment, it will be lowered down the defence and the intention is that the top of the defence is an informal roads and will be within the costal margin. But there will be a footpath there. That's an informal route. The camp's Council is seeking in effect the swapping of those rooms have so that the highway is on top, which gives it the greatest protection from erosion. And the informer can still share the alignment on the seaward side.

1:12:51

Does that have any implications in terms of treatment and design in terms of access to the coastal path for people with protected characteristics? Or is that not a particular issue in relation to this particular right of way?

1:13:04

I think it's less of an issue with this particular item away. The council will expect the gradients to meet the normal standards, and that the path is wide enough to cater for the legitimate users of it. And that the surface will be engineered in such a way that is smooth and commodious for users, I think that should cover most protected characteristics.

1:13:44

Thank you, Mr. Warden. Was there anything in addition you wanted to raise at this point, Mr Belford because I think I would also like to hear what the county's view is on the temporary diversion because during construction, albeit, I think looking to minimise the time is when the coast path is not available. There were additional issues that the county had raised about the length of the diversion I think around five or 5.5 kilometres and also his subsequent route. So if there's any additional points on those two matters, and also the protected characteristics, consequences of that and appreciate to hear from you on those.

1:14:33

Thank you so much. So I sorry, I probably my mistake I had I had taken your question too simply looking at the alignment along the coastal path. But obviously if you bring into account the diversion around sanctuary, the temporary periods are okay, bring Mr. Wooden back in so he can comment on the county Council's current assessment of that position. Thank you.

1:15:00

The diversionary route on those occasions that the coast path will be closed is, I think clearly a lot less satisfactory than the alignment that present. It's a Securitas route that involves road crossings. The counts council accepts the inevitability that there may be occasions when the correct path has to be closed. progress has been made with the applicant to engineer a route to bridleway standards that will be suitable for cycling. And I think that in itself reflects the kind of standard we would want as a Highway Authority for those with protected characteristics. There is an outstanding issue with a gap between the diversionary route which is off road and the point at which it comes back onto the highway at East Bridge Road just north of bridleway 19. Weather has always come back onto East Bridge Road. The council would have liked to have seen the opportunity taken to make the whole room off road. As the as East Ridge Road is narrow. The carriageway takes up most of the highway there's very little stepping off route defending along there. That's been a subject of discussion with the applicant. Until

very recently. There is a backstop, within the deed of obligation that the council would be able to attempt to creation order to deliver the off road section is a distance of about 750 metres from bridleway nine teams, Northern termination and the village itself. That is still a work in progress.

1:17:30

Thank you, Mr. Warren. I'll come then to Australia interested parties to see if there's any additional concerns that we wish to raise about the coastal path either during construction or operation either in terms of the route along the coast or the diversionary route. Mr. Wilson.

1:18:01

Thank you very much, Chris Wilson. For task, you're just short point it was not necessary at the formal cost path whose use of the beach I just had to show point with regard to use of the beach by horse riders during the development to understand it's very popular router on the beach. But with the temporary polling, or the polling that will be in place with the temporary flood defences. Imagine that authorizers will share a much narrower area between the users and the task grasping really whether in view of the anticipated loud and potentially sudden construction noises. Where there's been a risk assessment, the danger of horse riders themselves, what they face, as well as in respect of them sharing the beach with other users during construction. Thank you.

1:18:57

Thank you, Mr. Olsen. Come now to the applicant. Thank you.

1:19:05

Thank you, sir. So I'm going to deal with this in two parts. So far as the Suffolk coastal path is concerned. I'm going to start by asking the Bay Shore to deal with two matters. First of all, to explain why in the applicants view it would be right for the permanent alignment to sit east of the hard coastal defence landform In other words, why that is situated spine as it is within the the plan that went in at deadline seven was the thinking behind that. And they get who asked him to deal with the question of closure and also to pick up the points about bye When 19 the use of the beach by horse riders. And when he's finished that, I'm going to come back to the question of the extent to which the precise alignment is or is not fixed at this stage in the way that the order deals within to ask Mr. brayshaw to set the scene and deal with those other points first

1:20:21

Phillip ratio for the applicant. So, so the coast path has been located and finished right away used to the artsy defence. Doctors make an opening comment that more recently some more work has been done on coastal processes and the coastal processes monitoring mitigation plans submitted rep five oh dash oh five nine has led to regicide that the coast path will not know that there's any risk of erosion during the lifetime of sizewell C. Because of the the replacement programme that would have to happen about every 10 years and it won't ever erode back to the coast path. So that can be submitted in writing. But we hope that would alleviate Suffolk coast. Suffolk County Council's concerns about potential erosion of coast path picks that we understand is why they wanted to be on top of the artsy defence because they have legal duties for the definitive right away and it causes them difficult difficulties apparently, if ever the coast path was eroded the defenders right away they would have a

process to go through to diverted onto the top of the sea defence on our explain why we propose it to run along with flatter that east of the artsy defence is because the along this section of coast it'll be the same same as the existing coast path. Growing class size will be where you have the coast path on the flatter coastal landscape and then you've got the landscape cedar fence to the west which screens the old structures within the power station. So that allows people to enjoy the coastal landscape and minimise intrusion by the power station. And the design approach is described in paragraphs six point 12.7 and illustrated in figures 6.14 and 6.15 of design design and access statement that's rep five dash oh seven oh, which explains the whole design process along with the whole you know approach to the design of the power station obviously, and that the location of the coast path and the coastal experience is an important part of trying to retain that coastal experience that people have rather than having views directly into a power station as they walk along the coast. Nevertheless, site size or sea co will provide an alternative informed footpath along the top of the hard cedar fence in any case, which will be within the permanent coastal margin, which is the permanent accessible coastline being established by natural England which will be available for use at all times. The other point is that the pros right of way and Coast path east of the hotseat offence will be at a higher elevation than the current elevation of the right away and Coast path runs through that where the main development site will be in its current position and also higher and more resilient to erosion and the right to coast part of the Northern south of the main development site. So an extreme storm events, is it right is slightly the right of way and Coast path to the north and south will be eroded when a proposed permanent coast path within the main development site would not.

1:23:47

In addition, the size we'll see co has committed to Well, we'll update the coastal processes monitoring which may mitigation plan to confirm the commitment to retain the coastal footpath, which will demonstrate the size of seeker will ensure an accessible coastal path is maintained on the size of a foreshore. So that's the first point never move on to the closure. closure the closed path which at the additional submit January's submission, the S addendum. And in subsequent representations that has been made, it's been you know, it's been confirmed that the coast path will be kept open at all times except in the end. It's potentially for short periods when it's unsafe to do so. Which is a large improvement compared with when the DCR application stage when it was assumed it could be closed for up to for six months. So there won't be many closures and they are that they'll be finished. Or periods, but nevertheless they could potentially be inland diversions which counts was quite right would go inland for that longer route and for approximately 740 metres along section of East Bridge Road.

1:25:20

The coast path will be inspected and maintained weekly during any activity which could affect the condition of the footpath and thereafter annually to identify areas of repair when no works are taking place. And this would inspection would also occur after significant storm and flood events. This could impact the surfacing of the path. If ever inland diversion is needed, low numbers of people are likely to follow the inland route onto East Ridge road closures occur an advanced notification of any closures and all the alternative inland route will be publicised in advance through a number of means which will be agreed with stakeholders so that people can choose if they wish to walk on this section of the coast path during closures. Some people are likely to choose to walk a different route section of the coast path instead. And some people who are aware of the diversion and continue to walk on this section of

the coast path will be aware that they need to walk on East Bridge Road and choose to do so. walkers would be diverted onto a section of East Bridge Road which is already a promoted long distance walk the soundings walk Sonny's walks is 96 kilometre long distance route between intuition Southwell, which links the remaining fragments of sanding he's following public rights of way local roads and accessible coastline. For the majority of the construction phase, the size of our sea project is likely to lead to fewer walkers on this section of East Bridge Road. Because use by walkers of Sandy's walk would cease for majority of the construction phase for the duration of construction phase, except when the coast path within the main development site is temporarily closed. sailings walk would be diverted northwards along the coast of the main developed north of the main development site and then west along probably right away 22 East bridge avoiding this section of the speed road as shown on figure 15 I point one volume to chapter 15, Appendix 15 I that's AP dash 270. So the safety to pedestrians on each Bridge Road is low. There'll be no recorded accidents on his Bridge Road in the last 20 years. Likewise, there's not forecast to be an increase in traffic on this road or the size of our sea project. And our conclusion is that there's no need to mitigate for this low risk which is now you know, for short periods for safety reasons. And however, fossil cycle seekers agree to monitor pedestrian use offs East bridge this section of East Bridge Road and identify if temporary closures of the coast path during construction lead to an increase in walkers on East Bridge Road. And if this leads to risk to reset pedestrian safety and to implement mitigation measures, which would be put in place should this occur. And in addition, size or siko has identified the off road footpath as an improvement within the public rights of way Fund and the deed of obligation which has been agreed with the County Council. Therefore should Suffolk County Council seek to create this link. Whilst we do not think it's necessary? We noticed Suffolk County Council's legacy wish. So that's the closure of coast path and the East Ridge Road issue and bridleway nine scene and the use of force riders. I'm not I'm not aware. I would have to come back to you on the risk assessment whether risk assessments Don't be done for horse riders. I'm not aware of that in relation to Mr. Wilson's question. I will just answer one thing about what questions on the coast path visit there's a question submitted your exam your third round of questions about the use of mounting blocks and whether questions have to dismount when they go on to the the permanent beach Landing Facility when the deck is in place. Well, the date the coast path won't actually go under the BLF it goes it goes above the baseline facility. So horse riders who used the coast path will not have to dismount at all because I'll just ride straight across the the access roads in the basement beach Landing Facility is only those that choose to run a lot to go along the beach itself. But they can then go up a ramp above Same link facility said there is no need for them to go under the baseline facility if they wish to do so. But nevertheless, we'll answer that question by their line eight. Thank you.

1:30:16

Thank you, then certify. Me may just briefly dealing with the question of the alignment as the document to which Mr. Bedford made reference, this is the document has a sizewell reference number nine point 73. I haven't managed to track down the deadline seven document reference, but I'm sure we can get that to you. As that explains. When one looks at the relevant right away and access plan for the coastal path, there is an annotation on the plan, which as I understand is unique to this particular sheet. And it's tells us that the precise alignment of the permanent footpath commencing at PCF one four, and terminating at PCF, one five, will occur to the layout and scale details of the hard coastal defence feature to be submitted and approved pursuant to requirement 12 B. And so whereas for the other

public rights away in their permanent alteration, their locations are fixed by the relevant rights away plan. This one is different. And it's different. For reasons that have been explained, which is essentially that the hard coastal defence feature will not be fixed in its location at this stage, the location is to be determined in due course, pursuant to requirement 12 B, which requires details of amongst other things, the layout of number of works and marine infrastructure, including the hard coastal defence feature to be approved in due course. And that's because the nuclear site licence includes consideration of the hard coastal defence feature. And so it would be premature to fix its location at this stage when the process with the r&r is ongoing. And therefore, until the precise design of the hard coastal defence feature and its precise location is fixed, it's clearly premature to constrain and fix the precise alignment of the solid case path. And because the two effectively need to move in tandem, and under requirement 12 B, these are matters that the layouts, the parents or the Hardcastle defence feature managers have to be approved by East Suffolk Council. Now, in tandem with that. The requirements six a main development site public rights away, explains that no new or diverted public right of way maybe carried out until public rights of way implementation plan for that project right away then submitted to and approved by Suffolk County Council. And in the second paragraph, that those must be in general accordance with the public rights away strategy. And according to the right to weapons unless otherwise approved by Suffolk County Council, so the precise alignment the precise language at this stage not fixed, it will follow the determination of the location and design of the hard coastal defence feature. That's a matter secured through a requirement. At that stage, the precise alignment of the coastal path is also to be approved. Now, at that point, of course, it's right to note that the implementation plan which deals with the the way in which the public rights of way are to be implemented the implementation details as it were, that has to be in accordance with the general according to the public right away strategy, which is where we have identified in the other reference that was alluded to the intention in terms of the diversion of The coast path, recognising This is not a matter where we have no view that this is a matter where we have a clear view as to what we think would be appropriate in terms of its alignment is not fixed at this stage. But we think that there are good reasons why it should be located in the

1:35:20

location explaining 1.27, which is Easter the hard coastal defence landform, which as that document explains how to screen construction works within the main development site, and in the permanent situation, of course, has quite a different perspective than if you're up on top of the hard coastal defence feature in terms of what dominates the view and matters of that sword. So it's not as though we're we don't have a preference. And our understanding is that that our preference, there is something that he suffered counsel is content with. But the county council has a different view about that. Now, we may be that one of the concerns, and I think it was a concern that was articulated a moment ago, on behalf of the County Council about that alignment, and is essentially to do with whether it can rely on the soft case or defence feature. And therefore, the implications for the longevity of the coast path. If it sat on top of the soft coastal defence feature, as opposed to the hard coastal defence feature, you've heard, there's no issue really taken in terms of people with protected characteristics and the difference between the two. And indeed, it's a perfectly acceptable alignment, permanent alignment for the soft curve along the top of the soft cursor defence feature, we consider that the evidence has been reduced on the sustainability of the soft coastal defence feature, and its viability over the lifetime of the station and beyond shows it is actually a very good place for the coastal path to be positioned. Compared to

the coastline above and below it, it's arguably better in terms of its longevity, because there is active management proposed for it. And we say the evidence shows some difficulty with the permanent location, but on that front, so it's perfectly acceptable in terms of people's ability to use it. It's perfectly acceptable in terms of its longevity and viability, and no difficulty arises over its maintenance for the counter counsel, compared to that which is in the existing position. Indeed, it should be better because third party has an absolute responsibility for maintaining the soft coastal defence feature. There are distinct advantages in terms of its location where we believe it should be. And we've indicated that is reflected quite properly in the way that that's set out in the strategy. However, if in due course, Suffolk County Council wishes to approve something, which is not in general accordance with that aspect of the strategy, it may do so. But we think that it's not right to leave it entirely at large numbers without some steer, because we've given evidence and explained why we think that that is an appropriate alignment for it. And one, therefore, which is appropriately reflected in the strategy, albeit it is not fixed at this stage. So that That's my understanding of how those documents fit together. And why there is good reason why it's indicated as it is in the current draft to the strategy

1:38:55

around understanding correctly, that you're effectively telling me that ultimately, Suffolk County Council would have the final say,

1:39:04

well, they they would, they would have to approve the public rights of way implementation plan. Bart, as I've indicated, the the details under 12. b, are the details that are identified on the footpath sorry, on the public right of way plan. So one of the things which I think we might want to take away and just clarify, is that the under which of those requirements it is to sit, because sitting here today, looking at those two, I think I'd want to take instructions as to the intention as as between the two because clearly the plan refers to 12 B, which indicates is the decision for the Suffolk Council, but I'd want to just play check and clarify that and if there's any other ambiguity we can reflect that in the drafting because clearly, whatever we think is right needs to be clearly expressed in the drafting. Thank you.

1:40:25

Okay, I've come on to Roman two, which is bridleway 19, which was briefly touched on before. But I recognise, there have been some changes proposed, do now need to understand from interested parties, whether those changes now mean that their content with the suggested route during construction and operation or weather concerns remain. So, if I can come to the county council first place.

1:41:03

Thank you, sir. And again in relation to, by the way 90, and if I can bring in Mr. Quinn, as to what we now think in the light of the latest developments. Thank you.

1:41:24

Thank you, Andrew, within Suffolk County Council, I think we need to see the the detail. I'm sorry, I'm not actually quite clear what you're asking me to confirm at this point.

1:41:42

I'm trying to understand what the county Council's latest position is my understanding there has been movement from the applicant since the original submission such that there's been modifications since the original submission. And now I'm trying to understand whether the county and now content with those modifications in the proposed provision of for better Broadway 19 during construction, and then subsequent operation.

1:42:15

Well, the right away 19 refers to the diversionary routes and the the onroad section towards East bridge. We have to accept that the deed of obligation is a backstop to create that route. The county council is in a position though, that it cannot guarantee an off road route because it requires the agreements of the landowner. And if the agreement can't be solved in a order would have to be made to create some rooms that will be open to objection or potential inquiry.

1:43:14

Can you clarify for me, Mr. Wood? In which section are you referring to that it will be might require third party land

1:43:23

cover if we're talking about bridleway 19 and a diversionary route, then the the points I raised earlier was around the lack of off road access on the section between the North of bridleway 19 and eastbridge. And the county Council's prep, strong preference there is for an off road completely off road route, which would include the 750 metres from, by the way, 19 to the village.

1:44:01

But I don't believe that's currently part of the applicants submission.

1:44:06

So it may be probably my fault in terms of cross purposes. I suspect in terms of the modification, it's more the question of the web right away. 19. And the bridge is concerned, which I think Mr. Mary has got some views on. So perhaps if I could ask, Mr. Mary to step in to the place of Mr. Wooden, and it may be that he can help you on what the current assessment is.

1:44:34

Hello, good afternoon. Steve Murray, Suffolk County Council. Yes, apologies for any confusion there. The bridges come to me because it's more of a highway feature and we've been talking to our structures team about this. We did touch on a lot of this yesterday to do with the level of the bridle way bridge 19 which will go over the lace and drain. So wasn't going into the flood issues to do with that. So other than just to say there are ongoing, just go Both to do with the finish level of it and the broad way that approaches it. And also the construction materials. I think where the issue may you may be referring to Sir, is the changes near King George Avenue? There are some minor changes there. And my understanding is they are acceptable in principle, the issue we've raised from a highway design perspective, was that there were some soakaways in the original proposal that drained the bridleway there. And we did question whether they were actually within the order limits or whether they needed

easements and also the maintenance problems from the highways perspective. So I'm not sure if that answers the question you are posing.

1:45:43

I mean, it's helpful to understand where you consider the shortcomings to be and what needs to be done to fully resolve creating an appropriate Broadway route during the construction and operational phases. I just clarify. Mr. Bedford. Is that all of the county wish to say on on this? Yes, thank you, sir. Thank you. I'm not sure as Sylvia Ballard, you had your hand up. Do you wish to make any comment? All right, in respect to Broadway 19. Yes, please. Can you hear me? I can't. Thank you.

1:46:31

Okay, my name is Silvia Bard. I'm a local resident. I'm a horse rider and cyclist, member of the British horse society and cycling UK. I've been concerned about rightaway 19 for quite some time. horse riders are a minority group. But we still have the right to safe passage on public rights of way. I note from earlier comments about immunity users from previous discussion today that was focused on walkers and cyclists, but horse riders will also be displaced by the proposed development. EDF survey in the past I'm sorry, I don't have the reference to it looked at riding schools from far away as Ipswich but didn't do local horse riders. So you have recently asked about the changes that EDF have put in to the latest proposals at the moment. What I have noted is that on the bridleway plans, they are now saying that they're going to reinstate bridleway 19 whereas before they said it was going to be stopped up, and that there's going to be a an uncontrolled crossing across the access road on the original article alignment of rightaway 19. But that's after the construction period is finished. My concern is that during the construction period, while it's accepted that bridleway 19, the northern section from the Kenton hills carpark up to the east kovich road will need to be closed for safety purposes. The proposed route that goes alongside lovers lane alongside the b1, one to two, across the five lane roundabout and along his Bridge Road is also part of the construction. So my question to EDF has been, how are they going to fulfil their requirements under the development consent order to have the alternative use available on the ground and safe particularly for horse riders to use when in fact, it's part of the construction. It's like a chicken and egg situation, they would need to close the bridle way because of construction. But the proposed route is also part of the construction.

1:48:58

Thank you very much. I'd like the outcome to the applicant shortly so that they can respond to your concerns. Alistair Lewis Next please.

1:49:22

I'm sorry. I don't think I raised my hand at pub on purpose. I will lower it. I'm sorry, sir. I was fine. Thank you, Mr. Lewis. There's no other interested parties to now come to the applicant. Thank you.

1:49:37

Thank you, sir. So, so far as the county Council's points are concerned, I'm not going to ask Mr. brayshaw. To deal with drainage issues. I'm not sure whether there is anything in what Mr. Mehra has said that he is responsible if Mr. brayshaw does have anything to say in response to that. He can, but

obviously Sylvia balart has raised specific concerns with relation To bridleway 19 and so, so nice and Mr. Bayshore to focus on those, please.

1:50:09

Phillip ratio just for the points and by the county council the first point about rather 119 on his Bridge Road. I just just to clarify, by the way 19 stops the northern end stops before it goes on to his Bridge Road. So, we're not proposing that Broadway 19 goes on to East Bridge Road at all because Broadway 19 doesn't go that far that far north. What we are proposing and Broadway 19 currently goes along lovers lane, on the carriageway. We're providing an alternative off road route within the old house farm site, and a controlled crossing at the southern end. So people come out of the understanding lane, across lovers lane, and on a new safe off road route where currently the by the way goes along the carriageway. Second point, Mr. Murray made the drainage King George nicking George's Avenue I'm not I'm not aware of this issue. But I know kings George Avenue, George's Avenue is a long way south, by the way. 19. So I think we'd need clarity on where Broadway 19 relates to King George's Avenue, because I'm not aware that by the way, 19 goes anywhere near King George Avenue. And then the third point about that silver ballad made a question about how the alternative be in place and safe Well, during the construction, there's a commitment so we can provide the reference to it that brought that bridle in that way, by the way, 19 diversion will be in place. And before the diversion before the closure happens. So that is a commitment within the DC to provide a reference to that and if necessary, provide any also an information about how it will be safe as well, because it's in the construction site. And then within the red line.

1:52:01

Will that include the provision of the Pegasus crossing at that point, then?

1:52:06

I will check after that. I'm sure I assume all crossings will be in part of that. That's that is part of the diversion. So all the crossings will be in place as well. Yes. But we'll confirm that in writing. Thank you.

1:52:33

So is just to complete that. Two things, as Mr. brayshaw has said, we'll explain where how the decio ensures that there needs to be the diversion in place before it's stocked up. What we would also do in our written material is set out for you the detail of the public rights away improvements, we've agreed to fund with the County Council because you have I think, at the moment, a sum of money, but not an explanation of what's anticipated to be done with it. And that may be something you'd want to have in any event to understand how the sum of money has been arrived at. But it might also helps give you a better understanding of what it's likely to deliver. And therefore how that will affect the mitigation of impacts and long term legacy benefits. So we'll do that in writing in due course as well, sir. Thank you.

1:53:43

Miss Balala note your hands go up Is there an additional point that you wish to raise?

1:53:53

I am actually concerned about the crossing with Pegasus crossings of the roundabout at the East Bridge Road, which basically is has five exits from it. And in carries the traffic from the B one one to two, as well as the traffic construction traffic on the sizewell access road. And there are going to be two Pegasus crossings over each of those busy roads. Pegasus crossings are Yes, they are designed for horses, but doesn't that doesn't actually mean that they are ideal for horses. And we're talking about crossing two very busy roads, one after the other. And horses aren't like bicycles, they don't have brakes. You can't just sort of stop carefully between one and the next. And my understanding that highways England and the British horse society would actually recommend an underpass at that point because although it's not a dual carriageway. It's crossing to busy roads as if it was a dual carriageway. And I wonder what the applicant might think about that.

1:55:15

I have to pass it on to our highways, consultants who are on line? I think.

1:55:23

So I think we may have Mr. Mark baymont from W. SP. I think that's who Mr. brayshaw is referring to. In terms of the detail of design. Yes. In fact, he's appearing here on the screen, as I speak, pass over to him see if he's able to write nice to that now.

1:55:49

chartered highways engineer on behalf of the applicant, them Yes, there are two signalise Pegasus crossings proposed at the five arm roundabout, which is the main development site access one and one on this Bridge Road, this short section between the two regard to the underpass query out of Galloway and review that, but the underpass is not a proposal as part of the application, the present don't believe it's being considered as part of our proposals. So that's not part of our application at the moment.

1:56:39

I think he's understood is now part of the application. But it was just a question of whether Miss Ballard's query about the standards being applied. That might require a by an underpass as opposed to consecutive Pegasus crossings was appropriate or not.

1:57:00

I'd have to go and look at that and respond in writing.

1:57:05

Thank you, sir. And then just finally, we'll confirm this in writing. But just looking to the DCR I think that it may be article 17 temporary closure of streets private means of access article 17. Six, no street or private means of access specified in column two of part two of schedule 13 streets and private means of access to be temporarily closed, maybe wholly or partly close under this article unless a new temporary street or temporary private means of access to be substituted for it specified in column four, that part of the circle is open for use. In the case of a street, we can be to the reasonable satisfaction, the street authority, or an alternative temporary route for the passage of such traffic as could have used the street or private means of access to be temporarily closed. During the commencement of

termination points, the temporary pleasure is first provided subsequently maintained and when one looks to part two of schedule 13. And those streets or private means of access in column two. second entry is bridleway 19 with substitute provided in column four. So subject to just double checking that that would appear to be the mechanism by which we ensure that it's provided for the new ones. I think Mr. brayshaw wants to just add something to that.

1:58:36

I'll just just the rights away and access strategy which we prepared in consultation with a county council. He suffered Council and, you know, got got this these Pegasus crossings and all the crossings on it have been reduced to county Council's confirm that but agreed, agreed with them. And I've not seen any responses or correspondence from the highways England or British horse society recommending underpasses but so if they have done I'd welcome Miss Ballard to direct us to those.

1:59:19

So so that that is our response. As you as you know, and I think it's been clarified, we're not proposing underpasses we can come back in writing and off on the suitability of what is proposed. But essentially that the proposal is as you have it before you. The question is whether it's acceptable.

1:59:41

Thank you. I don't see any hands up. So it's coming up to five past four, so it's probably appropriate to have a break. And if we can resume at 20 past so we'll adjourn and again, a reminder for those on the live stream. Just a reminder that you may need to refresh your browser when we return. Thank you