

# TEXT\_ISH4\_Day2\_Session4\_20012021

Wed, 1/20 5:50PM • 1:30:46

00:04

Good afternoon again, ladies and gentlemen, my name is Rynd Smith, lead member of these examining authorities. Can I just check with the case team that the livestreams have commenced, the recording is started and that we can be heard.

00:21

Mr. Smith, I can confirm we can hear you see you the recordings have started and the live stream is live. Thank you very much. Let's hope well, which case with no further ado, I will transfer back to Mr. Rigby who is partnered on his agenda item Mr. Rigby. Thank you, Mr. Smith. Welcome back, everyone to item five be on the agenda. And I'm at the point where I would like to hear from the other councils that are not heard from, in other words, Suffolk County Council, East Suffolk Council have already heard on the local issues and effects which have been raised so far.

01:03

And who am I seeing here?

01:06

Let's just quick look and see who's

01:11

I can see Mr. beaches, hand rose. Mr. Beach, would you like to go first?

01:18

Yes, sir. Tim beach for on behalf of snow parish Council. I've made the point to some extent, so I won't rehearse it too much. But it is the issue about the junction of the B 1069. With the 1894. It's no common.

01:35

And Mr. Mary made the point that the vehicle assessments and the traffic assessments were done on an average basis, as I understand it, and we have been told that as well in the past. And the point I would like to make

01:51

and have done a few times, I think, is that there is frequently higher levels of traffic on that junction, as I said, and the wider point is, if I can, if you will indulge me for literally a minute, is that the overarching point I'm trying to make is that the road structures on the 1069 for Melton and the a 12 and 1094. Do divert traffic onto the 1069. And that has never really been taken account of. And and Mr.

Ross earlier and I was going to make this point on behalf of the the applicants said that if there are traffic lights at the Friday street junction, and it does cause some form of tailback then all that's going to happen is people will queue because they're not going to divert because there's no easy road to take. My point is in in the in this day and age with sat navs and more particularly Google Maps. People don't wait till they get to the queue. People look at the maps and divert off well before so the congestion on the a 12 frequently moves traffic onto the B 1069. And it's an issue that remains outstanding. I know, in the clarification paper that was put out in mid December, there was talk about work on that junction and a temporary buffer zone, which would be welcome and could be a good permanent addition. But I don't understand yet what the rationale is for making that junction easier. And how that would work in terms of traffic, as you picked up earlier this morning, turning left and right from the beat and 69 on to the 1094 Okay, thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. beech. If I could now move on to see no other hands raised if I can now move swiftly on to the applicant. to please, by all I do apologise Mr. Turney has just put his hand up there.

03:58

Sorry.

03:59

Yes, Mr. Attorney, bridge attorney for today's is local impacts. So there are there are two points that I'd like to touch on. Obviously, there are more in our written representations. But two points I'd like to touch on. For the purposes of today. One of them is just in respect of the scale of the HGV movements and in particular, the impact of the proposals to reduce the ground levels at the site, which potentially result in the extraction of various significant amounts of spoil, and the impact on the resulting HDTV movements. And whether those fall within the scope of the assessment contained in the ies

04:43

in respective HGV movements. Obviously, there is a vast number over the construction period of each of the projects which may be sequential or may occur simultaneously giving rise to cumulative impacts. And there's there's a significant

05:00

degree of concern about the overall quantum of HGV movements and the impacts on the road network in terms of

05:08

users, in terms of delay, in terms of noise, dust and so on. So I raised that point generally, but also specifically, the impact of proposals to alter the topography of the site and any increased HGV movements that result from that. And that's the first point. The second point is is rather more involved. And it's a focused point on what's referred to access point 30.

05:39

And it's the new access road which is supposed to be constructed as part of the project, as you know, so of course, the issue with access road 13 is that whilst it is proposed impart, as I understand this is an operational access, it is also a construction access for the purposes of the

06:05

of the projects, and in particular, the National Grid substation works.

06:11

So the consequence of that is that

06:16

access point 13 is only capable of being accessed through routes, either through Friston or through stern field, that that route is incredibly constrained. And the route through sternfeld is particularly constrained, it's a single lane in places. And there's a humpback bridge with

06:40

properties immediately adjacent to the road. And, and we have expressed a concern about the use that we made of that road. And clearly, that there is an intention that that road will be used in part, firstly, through the National Grid works, and the access to the site by national grid, construction traffic and construction employed traffic. And in terms of the scaling of the access road from access 13. The proposal is for a road of up to seven metres in width, which clearly is substantially in excess of the of the size that would be proportionate to an access road that was only used for maintenance during the operational lifetime of the project. So

07:43

as we see it, there is a likelihood and scope to use access point 13. Firstly, for the construction of the National Grid, past the project, or projects, the National Grid and CIP. But secondly, that it can be used for future expansion, which of course is a high likelihood given the intention to create a connection hub for other projects in this location. And so it's it's that particular concern about the use of that access, it's proper regulation. And if it's not properly regulated, the obvious impacts on traffic both within Friston but also on the road through stern field, which has these these very obvious and significant constraints. So that those are the key local impact points that I wanted to raise. Obviously, there's more in our written submissions. Thank you very much. I can see Mr. Beach's hand is still raised. I presume that's an accident.

08:52

And I don't see another hands raised

08:56

on Oh, this be inappropriate. Would this be appropriate time for Tim for me to speak? I'm here on behalf of EDF energy nuclear regeneration limited. I was understanding you probably want to speak on cumulative effects, which tends to focus on your project. We're simply talking about the the East Anglia projects. That's that's not actually correct. I'd actually like to speak about, about the effects of construction. I'm here on behalf of the size will be entity and not the size. We'll see entity. Yes, I am. Yes, I understand that. In that case, that's fine. We did have sizewell b also in the cumulative effects. So if we could take it there, and that will be appreciated. It's not just sighs well see, we're dealing under

cumulative effects with all the projects which are not the standard projects. Okay, that's fine. If that's a preferred, that's fine, as long as I have it.

09:50

Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much indeed Miss Abraham's.

09:54

So if I could move on to the applicant, please. If you could, please.

10:00

To address the points which have just been made in relation to local issues and effects, in particular, I think what is of concern really is the nuts and bolts of how you're going to get all your bits of kit into the substation sites along the dinky little roads that we have here. If you forgive me for the expression, some quite small, narrow single carriageway, and sometimes single track roads. It over to the applicant, please. Thank you.

10:36

comments from half the applicant? I'll call on Mr. Ross to respond first, please.

10:47

Thank you, Colin. Thank you, sir.

10:52

I think on

10:54

I think I need to first just discuss the general approach to HGV routes because there's there's a bit of a misconception that a lot of the routes are

11:09

are constrained single carriageways and could just cut it down to assessing reports that have been made rather than going too wide with it. We'd appreciate it in the interest of time, Mr. Ross, if that's okay with you. Okay, I think

11:25

that locations so we could perhaps focus on those.

11:29

Yes, I will in due course. But it really is important that I just mentioned that the HGVTV access strategy applies a hierarchical approach using the Suffolk Laurie road network. For the majority of journeys 90% 6% of peak HGVTV demand is on the suffered glory road network, the a 1094, a 1069 and b 1122 are classified as design distributors.

12:03

This means they are suitable as distributors to link the local delivery routes to the wider highway strategic network. We're not

12:17

talking about local local routes here. Just picking up on

12:24

on specifics.

12:28

Hopefully, I'll catch everything that's suffering refer to that was very efficient.

12:35

And

12:37

so

12:39

if you don't have time to address it immediately now then please do so deadline five, and give it some consideration that would be of great help to us. But the main point really, is that

12:55

the concerns are over what's left over, because in the end, the vehicles are making trips on local roads. And some of them are going to be quite narrow local roads. So I think that's probably what's concerning people. Now, if I may indulge you, I've just noticed that some old town council, Councillor fellows has got a hand up. It may help you if I take her submission first, briefly. And that may just add to what you need to address. Would that help you?

13:30

Yes, sir. Service minded? Yes. Happy to thanks very much. In which case counsellor fellows I apologise your hands only just appeared?

13:41

on my screen. Apologies for that. And would you like to speak to the local effects and issues topic? I would say I would like to say that. I think today we've had a bit of a disconnection, I don't know if you are able to have more support in either listing the people because we said at the start of today's session, we told you which items we wanted to speak to, or whether you could have assistance to look for the hand because I know it is difficult for yourself, as well as listening and taking notes. Whilst there's no criticism at all. I want to understand the issue

14:17

or want to speak to various items. I just have a look each time I'll wrap it up. I'll wrap it up under community of impact. I think that's probably

14:25

you know,

14:27

I saw I could see that at one point. There was four other hands up as well. So, so but I'll stop now. And I'll speak under community of impact. Thank you. So okay, if it's easy for you, then that's very much appreciated. Thank you very much. Thank you for that and apologies. Back to the applicant, please, on the issues that we've just heard. If you could respond on those please.

14:58

Thank you Sir Andrew Ross on

15:00

Half the applicant.

15:04

I think

15:05

it might be useful just to go through the mitigation mitigation strategy very quickly set the context. And I can skip over things or just quickly reference things that we're we're very much in agreement with. Yeah, I just I just want you to address the issues that have been raised today if that's okay. Okay.

15:27

So, in general terms, mid approach to mitigation was multi layered. The use of Suffolk Laurie road network as I've outlined 96% of peak HGV. deliveries are on this network. utilisation of a whole road and optimization of access locations which picks up on some Steve's particular points, which we'll come on to,

15:53

and minimises the number of HGTV movements on the local network

16:00

commitment as embedded mitigation to routes that the project HGTV traffic will not be permitted to use. This includes the B 1121, through Friston stern field and bangle green,

16:15

the B 1153 to four ness, the B 1121. Through Saxmundham and any pass through HGV movements, at least and all routes. And

16:30

there was also a reduction in haich D the demand by refining the construction schedules post

16:40

preliminary environmental information and this is secured by the ctmp and Steve's comments around

16:49

the tables are noted i'll come on to that. And finally physical mitigation in the form of road widening amenity and road safety measures. And I welcome

17:04

Steve's confirmation that the mitigation is accepted for the construction phase and this is reflected in the respective parties statement of Common Ground rep 1071.

17:21

So very, as rapidly as I can go in over specifics.

17:28

Yep. Miss Mr. Murray's correct.

17:31

In his appreciation of the access strategy for the lung full site

17:40

following psi, psi

17:43

accessoires was moved to size well gap and access to to one provide that

17:54

oberer Road access access is six and five yet again, correct as a very small section of free be very low, low HGV demand.

18:12

recognise Steve's comments around traffic management and

18:19

holten vehicles and discussions are on ongoing with Suffolk County Council on that that detail.

18:30

Be 1121 a 1074. junction?

18:37

Yes, the geometric constraints are there for everyone to see.

18:43

It has to be reiterated that operational demand

18:49

is not

18:51

has been scoped out of the assessment and it's not anticipated there will be a even a notable HGTV demand for that junction. And we've already covered the issues of of aisles and they're certainly not anticipated during Operation

19:09

a 1094 B 1069.

19:14

Again, Mr. Murray is quite right in the best practice adopted for the assessment assumes

19:23

neutral periods when assessing driver delay impacts on the network. This was not a junction that was identified as having significant capacity problems.

19:39

Any planned or unplanned events outage was mentioned quite a bit this morning.

19:49

On managed through the construction traffic management plan, the outline construction traffic management plan and rep three

20:00

Oh Three, two, which sets out a section on how these planned and unplanned events will be coordinated and unmanaged

20:18

Grove road.

20:23

Again, Suffolk County Council's comments about adequate skate space to stop and pass are noted and we will

20:32

discuss that that that further

20:37

speed limit at access 13 and the speed limit is proposed as a

20:49



construction safety requirement not a highway safety visit adequate visibility splays

21:00

have been demonstrated

21:02

this is more recognition of the intensification of turning movements during during construction.

21:18

The recent deadline for comments on traffic management in general unnoted. And again discussions are ongoing on those.

21:31

Guess all I can say at this stage is there is scope to accommodate additional widen to for pedestrian access and within the order limits for the majority of these

21:48

access and crossing locations. Excuse me.

21:52

Thank you trenching methods.

22:00

Again, discussions are ongoing on the methods. But note sccs

22:08

comments,

22:10

controls?

22:13

Yes, the updated construction traffic management plan did change the tables. That was

22:21

that was

22:24

too dense demonstrate the number of HDTVs go into each access

22:32

point to enable HGV movements to be managed at source.

22:41

However,

22:44

we acknowledge sec

22:49

wish to see it reinstated. And again, we'll do we'll discuss that during statement of Common Ground discussions.

23:00

Is there anything else on which you want to make a substantive submission at this stage? Or will you do that at deadline five?

23:11

No, these are all pretty much clarification.

23:17

items.

23:20

I've feel

23:28

because in which case in in view of the time I really want to move on and finish off this item

23:35

if at all possible. I think that does does in terms of clarification. So I would just like to hand over to

23:43

my colleague, Mr. McGraw is just to outline the strategy for engagement with sizewell. See if I may, that will come under the next item, cumulative effects, if we could leave that to them, but be okay with you. Anything to do with other projects we're going to deal with in Part C. Okay, effects.

24:06

Thanks very much. In which case, without more ado, let's move on to item five C which is cumulative effects, which is basically dealing with other projects, and particularly with the integration of mitigation proposals for all the various projects. And that's not just proposed projects, but that's existing projects. So, really what I want to cover here is

24:33

this the size well projects cumulative impact assessment, which has been put in by to this examination.

24:43

There are the size while being packed, including the emergency evacuation routes and impacts of this project on what's going on at Sizewell B at the moment as well as what may be planned for that site.

25:00

There's the temporal overlap issue we saw as well be as part of that.

25:05

And

25:09

really, then after that it's the integration of all the mitigation proposals that there are. Now one of those was a 12, a 1094. Friday Street. That remains an issue. But we've bottomed that out today, I think for the time being. So it's really a Gen more general thing. I want to hear from the council's and from interested parties about these issues. So if I could go first with Suffolk County Council, please.

25:42

If you'd like to just run through the list again, I'm happy to do so. Because we're kind of fast tracking things here about?

25:49

Well, thank you. So what I was going to I've got a brief comment I want to make and then I was going to bring in Mr. Mary, and it would probably be helpful. Before Mr. Murray starts, if you could perhaps then run through your list, just to make sure he is able to address the points. Very helpful. Thank you. Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, for Suffolk County Council, the preliminary point I just want to make and it's really to ask through effectively you if the applicants can give some clarification. And it's in relation to a subject matter, which relates specifically to Sighs Well See. And it's traffic effects and cumulative impact assessment. And we understand, in a sense that there's a little bit of a moving target here, in the Sysvol see itself is still an evolving project. Yeah.

26:44

And the position is this at one stage, it certainly appeared to us clear that we and the applicant were in agreement, that if further information came available from Sizewell C, because of changes to their scheme, the applicants would consider that and then with a view to updating their cumulative impact assessment, then we seem to part company with the applicants in some of the deadline, three submissions where it seemed to be suggested that wasn't going to be done. But now we think that the current position is that we're both back on the same page through what the applicant has set a deadline for, which is that if information in relation to Sizewell sees changes to their proposals become available, the applicant will review that information with a view to updating as appropriate, their cumulative impact assessment, if that's correct, and that can be confirmed. We don't have anything further to say at this stage, other than to draw to your attention because it is in the public domain that Sighs Well See through EDF have published as it were on their own press release website, pages, updating the public on their project, as of the 13th of January, this year, they have indeed made an application a changes application to the planning Inspectorate in relation to their current

28:10

sizewell c decio application. So that application and the material that supports it is presently with the planning Inspectorate. Except it's not in the public domain. So clearly, I'm not expecting that the applicants could have dealt with it as yet. But certainly, it's in the wings. And that's the context in which I say we would welcome some clarification from the applicants that it is now their intention, that if the information becomes available, they will then review it with a view to updating as necessary, their cumulative impact assessment on traffic matters for size. Well see, that was very helpful. I love shot, the applicant will cover that when we get round. So at the end of this item, thank you very much. Indeed. That was the blue point. And then if I can turn to Mr. Mary, and if I say it asked before, you could perhaps just repeat your list. So yes, there is a way to address it. Thank you, sir. Absolutely. Thank you very much.

29:08

Mr. Mary.

29:10

Hello, sir. Good afternoon again. Yes. Steve Murray from Suffolk County Council. Thank you very much, Mr. Mary.

29:18

My hit list if you like my sort of subject topic list here is firstly, the sidewalk projects cumulative impact assessment, which

29:28

Mr. bedfords just highlighted briefly,

29:32

then, I'm interested in the sizewell b impacts as emergency evaluation, emergency evacuation, and as the temporal overlap with activities of sizewell B, both current and proposed.

29:48

Then we had the integration of the mitigation proposals, which

29:55

is

29:57

the next topic. I think we can safely

30:00

Friday St. Probably out of that discussion for the moment on the basis, there's been a junction improvement and that we've spoken about the issue of synchronising the various mitigation proposals there because obviously that junction is going to be replaced by around about.

30:18

And then that's it. Yeah, that's it. That's a lot. Okay. Thank you. So it is, although 30 seconds, just take the liberty of just also mentioned something else is the in terms of cumulative impact. It's the holistic impact of the scheme. It's worth noting that within the scheme, the onshore construction impacts, yes, we accepted that the assessment has that has been made, we have and we accept the fact there is a transport travel plan that assesses the port construction. And as part of the requirements where offsite highway work needs to be done, they will also go through a checking and Assessment Procedure. But there are already three items there. So just a comment from the highways authority is very different difficult to see this project holistically as a whole, with these coming through in bite sized chunks or not as the case may be. So thank you for humouring humouring me on that one. So that's a valid point. Thank you very much. It's helpful.

31:18

In terms of size, we'll see Mr. Bedford has already mentioned the size will are going to provide a trophy assessment update, and we do look at a boon appreciate if scottishpower would also update documents have impacts on that. There has been through both likely impact report and various written responses to deadlines or concentrating on float throwing in terms of cumulative impact, particularly to resize we'll see,

31:48

unless you want to go into details, in which case, we will have to ask one of my colleagues to go through the details. Maybe you could put the detail in your submission Mr. Mehra, that would be helpful. But in terms of helping you to show where the differences are, the issue we have is that there do appear to peer impacts, or from the combination of the two, three projects. And what we are looking for is proportional mitigation from all concerned, I think that's a summary of where we are, in terms of size will be. And this also mentioned that it also something else we've mentioned is the actual cubes of synergy at a local spot. So where we have different impacts, it's what is the overall impact. And again, that is written representations, local impact report and updates on the deadlines. And in terms of size will be in emergencies. One issue that we can control is Highway Authority. One issue we control as a county authority is in terms of the emergency access, I'd have to defer to the software resilience team. Afraid that they would deal with that, from a highways perspective, it is fairly obvious that we would not want to close that road. And from our perspective, we've just started using a permit system and through that we are allowed to put reasonable conditions on issuing any permits to for street works. So as part of that, it was almost impossible to say that we wouldn't put a restriction on not closing that road.

33:19

And then in terms of the the integration of the various mitigation, that is something causing us concern

33:27

in terms of timescale with their sizable programme to start before scottishpower. The last thing we would see as a hiring authority is to then see freshworks starting up on any of the haul routes to site or otter scottishpower. So from our perspective, early delivery of this mitigation and thoughtful delivery, this mitigation would be really useful. Scottish, sorry, EDF have provided an implementation plan, which is very basic. And we would To be fair, it's not something I've suggested to scratchpad. But as we

progress, that is something I think would be useful to all concerned to see when in in what timeframe are these measures going to be delivered?

34:09

Hopefully that's answered your broad points. Yeah. Thank you. Thank you. That's very helpful. Thank you very much, Mr. Mary. If I could move on now to East Suffolk Council. Do you have anything you wish to add on cumulative effects relating to traffic and transport?

34:30

No, thank you. So we're aligning ourselves again with Suffolk County Council on this and support what they say. Thank you very much indeed. In which case I'll pass on to all the town council Councillor fellows, please.

34:50

Thank you, sir. I will be very brief and succinct as you requested.

34:56

You've you've highlighted many of our concerns, but to do

35:00

Need to point out that the geographic area from the landfill through to the cable runs through to the haul roads. And the substation size is actually a very small geographic area. It's like a fan to the north of obrah. And we only have three roads in a mountable Britain, they all transfer through those areas. So there is significant harm that's going to be caused by these projects. These roads provide vital access to services and businesses in the area, including 25 to 30 bed hospital.

35:34

We've talked about some things but there's lots of things we haven't talked about today. But I'll try to wrap them up in a written representation. But the things that I think are vital that have been touched upon not considered yet that still outstanding, is it's not just hgvs. It's LG vs. Workers cars to and from work also at lunchtime, going to get food. I'm going to the cash machine, fly parking,

36:01

pedestrian crossings which cross some of these roads, pinch points, areas with no no pavements, restricted visibility, existing and proposed projects. And under community impact. It's not just the community of impact of size or see potentially, it's also the elephant in the room, again, that we haven't mentioned today very much. But the actual agreed connection points and the offers that have been accepted by other projects coming into this area. And unfortunately, the strength of precedent. So precedent is set with these roads being used for these two projects, then there is precedent that they will be used for continuing projects into the future for many, many years. And I disagree with the fact although it's accepted in industry, that things should be based on an average, surely it should be Rochdale envelope, the highest peak should be the thing that we're looking at. And also times that by the number of years that it goes on for.

37:05

Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you very much indeed. That's very helpful, counsellor fellows. And if you're able to put that into your deadline five submission that would help us a great deal. Thank you very much. If I could move on with counsels to Mr. beech who has his hand up.

37:26

Yes, I will keep this very short. I would I would endorse everything Councillor Fellowes has said. And the other point I would like to make is that originally, EDF had proposed or there was discussion about a four village bypass, which is now being taken off the table altogether. And again, to come back to one of my original points by doing that. And that effectively means that the V 1069, which runs through Ike, Rendlesham Tunstall and Snape effectively becomes the full village bypass.

38:06

Thank you. That's very helpful submissions to beach. Again, if you can make sure that all in your submission for deadline five, that would be very helpful. And I next want to move on to miss Abraham's from EDF, who's been waiting patiently, I know. But now we're at the cumulative stage with sizewell B and sizewell C.

38:31

Thank you, make your submission Thank you. Thank you. So as I mentioned, I'm here on behalf of EDF energy nuclear regeneration limited who are the owner and operators the size will be new nuclear power station size will get road provides the sole means of access to size will be power station for staff and it forms a principal access route for emergency services and for mobilisation of assets from the emergency response centre or the railhead enlisting and yells position is any development making use of the size of that road therefore needs to demonstrate that it will not compromise the safe operation of current and future nuclear power generation at size will be size will gap road needs to be available for uninterrupted use for size will be on a continuous basis.

39:15

There are services inside will get road which serve the power station. The promoter has confirmed that there is no intention to connect into these services which is welcomed. However, ngl is concerned to ensure that damage these utilities are not caused by works 1011 and 15 are in there hopefully unlikely event the damage is caused that it is rectified quickly to address these concerns and to ensure the safe operation of size will be is not adversely affected. And Yale is seeking a commitment from the promoter that prior to carrying out any works 1011 and 15. The promoters will carry out survey surveys to establish the location of all utility operators within these areas.

40:00

And shall secure approval from ngl have the details of the proposed method and timescale for working within these areas.

40:08

We are also seeking a commitment that in the event of any damage to any utilities within the area of works 1011 and 15, that the promoter shall immediately inform ngl and shall secure the repair of any damage within 24 hours.

40:24

In the event that these points are agreed by the promoter, which we are still waiting for confirmation of, then as I said yesterday, NGLS seeking that these be secured through the inclusion of protective provisions on the face of the order of NGOs benefit, and also through amendments to requirements 1622 and 28, to ensure that consultation occurs with ngl in respect to the access arrangements, the sosele gap construction method statement and the construction traffic management plan in respect of works 1011 and 15.

40:56

outlined the protective provisions cover a wider package of measures and Yalla seeking to protect the past. Sorry for just interrupt there. If you're talking about protective provisions, we can cover that in the hearing relating to the order itself. Am I just on the shotgun transport issues at this stage? I would appreciate it just one more minute of your time. So if you don't mind. And so we heard yesterday from the promoter that we'll be updating the draft outline documents to cover a number of our concerns. But these wouldn't be submitted to the examination until deadlines six on the 24th of February. And the promoter said yesterday, it wasn't minded to agree protective provisions, which we were obviously disappointed with. And we're willing to continue to the discussions regarding the protective provisions in the amendments to requirements that we're seeking with the promoter to reach satisfactory conclusion in respect of our concerns, but if conclusion can't be reached, and we'll be submitting our preferred form, protected revisions to the examination that deadline five, and as as he said, I appreciate we do have time at specific hearing next Friday to speak about this further. But given the deadline five is just a couple of days later, and if possible, so we'd like to understand from the promoter today, please, if and why if some or all of these points can be agreed agreed in principle through amendments to the outline documents, which has been suggested that it can be for example, yesterday in respect to the Coraline crag, then why can the promoter not commit to including these points in a transparent manner on the face of the order through protective provisions and amendments requirements, which would give certainty to ngl that these points have been legally secured, won't be emitted from any final certified document will be delivered and are enforceable, which obviously will focus the promoter and its contractors during construction and operation of the projects.

42:46

Focusing moment on traffic and transport issues. And issues relating to other things really need to be addressed in the hearing about the order itself. This is really just traffic and transport cumulative effects that we're trying to nail down here. We hear what you say please put it all in a deadline five anyway. And we can take it from there. Does it is that is that okay for you? Yes, thank you. We're just trying to put things into the into the right sort of compartment as we go. So if you've got particular problems with protective provisions, then we should perhaps be addressing them at the next hearing.

43:26



That's something we will decide obviously, but if you put it in a deadline five that will help us. Okay, thank you, sir. Thank you very much indeed. Is there anything else you wish to

43:36

Speak to about traffic and transport issues? I have nothing further. I didn't if my colleague Brian McLeish has anything additional, additional to add to my submissions? Right. We're just we're hoping just to have one person speaking for each organisation today.

43:52

Thank you, sir. There's only one small point. I wonder whether the promoters could tell us what their proposals are in respect of AI ml, which we were talking about just earlier on. During the AI or movements during the temporary closure of parts of the carriageway on sizable gap road test, they could just pick that up at some stage. Thank you. I'm sure they'll pick that up at the end. Thank you very much indeed. Now we've got other hands up here. Mr. Cooper is next. I think as Mr. Cooper

44:30

just dumb into jack,

44:34

because I'm just conscious of the fact that the hands have been giving us a certain amount of electronic trouble this afternoon. And just to save the hands that I have been seeing at this end are Firstly, Mr. Cooper who is representing miles with parish Council, so I think he comes in order next. And then after Mr. Cooper, I have seen Richard Turley five by Mrs. Fiona good

45:00

More. So that's what I already have. Yes, yes. Right. We're all in same place, then I'd like to be able to hear them if possible before I go to the applicants like to you,

45:12

obviously conscious of the time. Thank you very much, Mr. Smith. Mr. Cooper, you able to speak briefly? Yes, I will. Thank you, Sir Richard Cooper representing malford parish Council, thank you to reiterate. We are very conscious in Mulford and in Liberal government as well, of the cumulative impacts of HGV traffic going through the village. We're working closely with Suffolk County Council at the moment to try and work work up a set of mitigations which we hope to talk to EDF about but I'd like to make you aware that we will be looking for mitigation in the form of safe pedestrian crossing of the a 12 in March with little burden, and improvements to footpaths. And we're working with

46:11

Steven Mary on on that. And I'd also echo Mr. bedfords. Comment right at the beginning of this section, that we'd expect to see an updated cumulative impact assessment from the applicant in light of the

46:29

new proposals coming out of EDF. Thank you, sir. Thank you very much indeed. Thank you, Mr. Cooper. If I could move on now to Mr. Turney, please.

46:43

Sir Richard, Tony for says, briefly. We agree with what was said by Marianne Fellowes in terms of cumulative impacts and the need for proper consideration. In particular, the fact that Friston

46:57

is the potentially the subject of a number of further applications with highways, consequences of significance. And just to reiterate the point about Friday St. I know, I know you have in mind, but of course, there's a strong connection between the size well, proposals and the impacts of Friday St. And that's the point of particular concern for the local community. I won't take more time now. Thank you. That's very helpful. Thank you very much. And obviously, deadline five is the time to put all that in writing. Thank you very much indeed. And the last hand, I've got many thanks to Mr. Smith for assisting me on this. The last hand I've got I think, is CS. Mrs. Gilmore. Hello. Good evening, sir. Thank you very much a very brief point. First of all, to endorse Council of fellows comments, particularly about Rochdale envelope and the fact that we must be careful not to only look at the average the mean, as we discussed earlier this morning, for example, 400 vehicles on the A 1094 is the average hour, but it can be much, much higher than that at a peak moment, over 1000. So what we need to do is take into account these very high peak moments, traffic density fluctuations are hugely significant. And at a peak moment, we have tractors, bicycles, cars, white vans, as well as lgds and HDTVs, buses and coaches, all trying to get down that road to Albright on time for their meeting. Have there been full assessments of increased risks to human life, given this kind of modelling that we need to do? And given the cumulative impacts? Not only on the a 1094, but also at these junctions? Thank you.

49:01

Thanks very much. Indeed, Councillor fellows.

49:05

Now, I'm conscious that time is moving on. And what I'm going to suggest to the applicant is that

49:17

the response to the the last little lot of points that has been raised, be put in writing for deadline five, and that will then allow us to forge on with item six on the agenda and complete the business for the day, which I think and hope in the longer term will assist all parties.

49:38

I would defer to Mr. Smith briefly on that idea.

49:43

Thank you very much. Mr. Rigby. Yes, I mean, I'm very conscious of time here and I'm conscious of to critically important matters. Firstly, the applicant vehicle to the fair right of reply. But as you highlight, you know, that is possibly possible to be delivered in writing.

50:00

in circumstances where written submissions are recorded the same way as oral ones. However, we do have people here who have been here all day, who include representatives, the local community who have indicated a wish to speak on agenda item six. So I think, on balance, it is best that we proceed now directly to agenda item six, but I will hear Mr. Ennis, very briefly, if he objects to that course of action.

50:30

comunism half napkins, I don't object to that. So we will follow up in writing. I just wanted to respond to the cumulative matter regarding the sysvol see updated information, which of course, the applicant will consider when it becomes available.

50:47

Thank you very

50:49

clear, seemed to be some doubt about whether we would consider that material. Of course, we'll consider that when it becomes available. And of course, there's room in issue specific hearing six to have a more considered debate about that as well. That's the correct place and time. Okay, which gets Mr. Rigby move on agenda item six. Thank you very much, Mr. Smith. So moving swiftly on, as they say, agenda item six public rights of way. So thanks, everyone so far, for your mammoth effort and all your contributions. so far. We are now

51:27

we are now moving on to item six, which deals with the construction effects on the public right of way network, on users and on the network itself. And also, the effects on the network in the operational period, when it's all been put back together again, except for the bits that haven't been. So I have very quick guideline topics that I would like to cover. Firstly, the extent to which the public rights of way that we're talking about which are affected by the projects are used by people as a means of getting to and from work, or for other day to day tasks, as distinct from their use for recreational and pleasure purposes.

52:14

The second thing relating to the after the operational period, I suppose, is how it will be ensured that sections of the public rights of way network, which is stopped up temporarily, are in a reasonable condition when they're reopened after the completion of construction and are being used again.

52:37

And thirdly,

52:43

there seems to be some

52:46

doubts between the applicants and Suffolk County Council about weather comments in relation to work number six, talking about the proposed routes of the coast path or the existing public footpath which is below the cliffs. So as before, could I take now submissions from the council's and Suffolk County Council first, please. And we'll then move on to other interested parties, as we have done Henceforth, and eventually to the applicant. Thank you.

53:23

Thank you. So Michael Bedford for Suffolk County Council. And I will bring in in a moment,

53:32

Annette Robinson, the right of way manager on the specifics. So just in terms of as it were an overall on the subject of rights of way, by way of a sort of precis of our position.

53:48

Broadly speaking, we've welcomed the further moves that the applicants have made in our direction to address a number of our concerns. And the latest iteration of the outline public rights away strategy meets many of those points.

54:07

The there is a wider issue that we feel has not been fully engaged with, but it's already been rehearsed. And it really relates to the adequacy of the assessment in forming the environmental assessment of community impacts, and whether the assessment of the impacts or rights of way has fully been taken into account and properly weighted in that exercise. But you have that rehearsed in what we said in our local impact report and in our subsequent representations, that still stands in a sense as an overarching concern that we still have. But when it then comes down to what, notwithstanding that concern, if this project were to happen, have the applicants done what they can to address the effects I say we think that through the latest iteration of the outline right away, strategy has moved a long way in our direction. There's nothing special

55:00

Pacific, we've now identified that we are saying that further needs to be put in place. So that's the overarching position. And then if I can then turn to miss Robinson, and specifically ask if she's got comments that she wants to make on all it is. So this is a, you've raised about the extent to which we have information on the nature of user of the rights of way as opposed to recreational users compared to workplace users or other day to day uses. Secondly, the issue about reinstatement or restoration. And then thirdly, the particular point about work number six. So perhaps Miss Robinson, comment on that. And obviously, if there's anything else that she thinks I've missed, no doubt she'll pick that up. Thank you.

55:49

Thank you, sir.

55:52

Thank you, Mr. Bedford. And good afternoon, Mr. Rigby.

55:56

As regards information of the type of user,

56:00

I do not have data on the type of user on this whole piece of network. Nor has any information been supplied by the applicant on the nature of the use of any of the rights of way that are affected by the development.

56:17

My intuition would say that it is very heavily recreational use. However, I do suspect there is roots to to work being used, but I could not give you any data on that I'm afraid.

56:34

As regards the restoration plan, the outline public rights of waste strategy does talk about the restoration of rights of way with pre and post construction surveys.

56:47

And routes been restored to similar or better than before.

56:54

I think it's actually similar Yes, to the same standard, we're not necessarily expecting a higher standard.

57:01

But if it were the Crossfield path at the start that was ploughed when they have to do the work, we wouldn't expect them to leave it ploughed. On restoration,

57:10

I can comment from the East Anglia one experience where that restoration did take place and the rights of way, staff did go out with representatives from Scottish power to certify that the restoration had taken place to our satisfaction.

57:28

Works number six on the coast path. This is the England coast path the national trail being developed by natural England

57:38

this section is covered in the

57:42

obrah to Hopton section, and the coast path will run on the cliff top setback from the cliff. So it is close to the landfall site.

57:57

I have had a previous discussion with Brian would relish about this matter, because I had raised it the actual England coast path will not be physically affected, it will still exist.

58:11

The

58:13

cables will be underneath the coast path at that point. Although of course, users off the coast path will be subject to the visual and other impacts of the actual landfall site. Just a little bit inland from the coast path.

58:30

Thank you. Thank you.

58:33

If I could move on. Is that does that conclude that confused? Suffolk County Council? Yes, Mr. eyes? Yes.

58:41

If I could move on to a softer Council, please. Next.

58:48

Sir, again here. We're taking our lead from Suffolk County Council and we agree with their position. Thank you. That's very helpful.

58:58

Are there any submissions from our town council?

59:06

or any of the parish councils on these issues?

59:11

Yes, sir. Thank you, Mr. Rigby.

59:15

I'd just like to mention that again, no consultation is taking place with local residents or local person town councils directly to understand the impact of problems on a public rights away or closures or temporary closures. And I think this is something that needs to happen. When we attended

59:38

public information events, or when the applicant did come to the parish town Council's it was purely just for them to present what was going to happen. It wasn't consultation in the sense of asking us for information or even asking for opinions on things. So it's there is a big disconnection in this process. Thank you.

1:00:00

Thank you very much indeed. If I could move on next see Stacy's very like to make any submissions.

1:00:11

Thank you Sir Richard tourney for say says I want to face if I may on footpath six, which is the footpath that crosses the proposed substation site is proposed to be permanently closed. There is a proposal for a permanent alternative route, as well as some temporary provision. I want to pick those up, in turn, please. The first point to note is is the value of footpath six it's it's a considerable value to the local community. It is the historic parish and 100 boundary. It is a well used or part of a well used walk from the village. And it links a number of historic farmsteads. With the village. It provides, as you would have seen, I'm sure on your site visits views of the grade to star listed parish church, which obviously we've made separate submissions on the permanent diversion is very obviously a vastly inferior route. It runs close to the substations. With a loss of tranquillity and immunity, it's a less direct route, and it is going to be obviously affected by the industrialised character of the substation site.

1:01:40

During the construction phase, the diversion proposals in respect to footpath six are elaborate, as you'll see from sheet seven of the temporary diversions there are, I think, four or five different diversion proposals. And it's unclear the extent to which at any particular time they would work in a joined up fashion.

1:02:08

What appears to occur is is the permanent closure of footpath six very early in the construction phase, it's it's hardly surprising that that that will be the case because it runs through the the main site and the diversionary routes are proposed in a fragmented way, it doesn't appear as though there will necessarily be any proper connectivity across the site, the proposed diversion route will also have to cross the whole road. And they'll have to be presumably provision for pedestrians to cross although it's unclear how that will be managed. And

1:02:54

the

1:02:57

obviously, further point is the length of the construction period. So whilst the applicant has a commitment to put in place permanent diversionary routes prior to the permanent stopping up of the public rights of way, for many years in this location, it's likely that they'll have to be reliant on some parts or all parts of the temporary rooms. And it can be seen from looking at those routes that they are considerably less attractive than the proposed at the current route. And therefore there's a considerable loss of amenity during the construction period. And then of course, there's the additional uncertainties the length of construction period whether there is consecutive construction or whether it's concurrent, which obviously affects the duration of the construction period. So it's a very significant impact on the local community. It doesn't appear as though the temporary diversion the mitigation through temporary diversion has been properly thought through. It doesn't appear as though it provides a coherent

alternative immunity that in any way resembles the immunity provided by the footpath as it stands today. And the final point I make is just really in respect of the overall scale of the footpath, closures and diversions, I think on our calculation 26 separate footpaths affected in multiple locations, and the total length of closures, some eight and a half kilometres of footpaths lost diversions over 17 kilometres of route. So, there is a very significant impact on the footpath network more generally. But but that alone, the impact on footpath six we say is is so significant as to justify

1:05:02

weighing heavily against the use of Reston for this substation, and particularly requiring some much better and more comprehensive mitigation for the footpath network.

1:05:14

Thank you. Thank you very much first attorney that's very helpful and useful to us. I see next, Cisco law from see us, please.

1:05:33

Thank you, sir. Actually, I didn't think I had to put my hand up. But I was going to say,

1:05:39

excellent, quick key make a very brief point on

1:05:46

all the local residents of the whole area, in particular, I would mention all duranium residents.

1:05:58

That people who use these pathways for school journeys, for going to work will not be and I think there has been this advice to use cars instead.

1:06:11

Part of living choosing to live here in the first place is about the quality of life, the fact that you go to work along a pathway rather than in a car. So we just like to endorse that this is a big concern, not only in forest area also. Thank you, sir.

1:06:33

Thank you very much, very helpful.

1:06:36

Are there any other submissions to be made from any other persons who are present? I've seen our hands but my hand indicator is a little defective today. It is on a Friday, because I'm certainly seeing a hand or did see a hand by Mr. Chandler. So yes, I see Mr. Chandler now. Yes, Mr. Chandler, please.

1:07:00

Thank you very much for Chandler save our soundings



1:07:06

to areas that I'd like to discuss one is thorpiness. Between work area seven work area eight. The footpath that passes between those two, which is known as the Holloway because it's a very ancient trackway is one of the what is the main route if you're coming from less than and you want to walk to thought less, and you wish to avoid the roads. So and it is quite heavily used. I was there on Sunday, and it was quite difficult to avoid people there was a number of people on that track.

1:07:41

And I believe that may be subject to a site inspection and I have submitted some further details for you to look at. So that certainly as the proposal is that they want to remove a section of that hedge row. And they'll say that is an ancient headrow

1:08:02

it's primarily so they can get access from work area.

1:08:07

On the map here and small work area eight to seven, I believe it might be the other way around.

1:08:14

I find that rather strange because off the thorpiness common, there is a gateway straight into the field which could be utilised to get access from one area to the other. And you could make a very small or

1:08:31

an entrance into a very

1:08:35

low grade hedge onto the thoughtless trackway for about 20 metres into that field and that would negate the need to a very long footpath diversion. And also to remove an ancient hedge and destroy a trackway. I have a number of people I've spoken to are very distressed over the proposals that this will be lost. Because it will take you could not replace it. So that's the first comment I would like to make. The second is yesterday. I wasn't aware that once area 12. That size was going to change from trenchless to a open trenching technique.

1:09:19

There is a footpath that passes through there. That's footpath 26 that is the main footpath if you're travelling from less than five Grimsey lane

1:09:31

across the fields, down footpath 26 and onwards either tautness taking this through the hallway or two sides on itself that is used by a number of people

1:09:45

both recreationally and also for those who are going to work or those who have sizable far either run or walk through the lanes rather than walk along the the pavement alongside will get road

1:10:01

So that's as far as the work at 12. A, we're very distressed, there's a lot of us and that will be lost that is currently used by

1:10:13

the red deer population. There are foxes there to soar. So where are 19 girls?

1:10:20

I've been inhabiting during the summer, and various other birds and small, small mammals and birdlife. So say I was very distressed to change from a trenchless technique to open trenching. And I must admit I missed that submission.

1:10:39

We've had 356 submissions,

1:10:44

since deadline three, and trying to read them all and trying to make sense of them all, is

1:10:51

quite a quite a difficult task, but you're a non technical person like me.

1:10:56

May I just make one further point going back to cumulative effects on traffic and transport. Please not forget that sizable a is going to or is planning to do plant their turbine Hall at some stage, it will be in the near future.

1:11:15

And to quote Donald Rumsfeld, this is one of the unknown knowns because we don't know when it's going to occur, but it will occur at some stage. And sods law says it will occur when all these projects are running together. So the cumulative impact on size

1:11:30

could be immense. Thank you very much.

1:11:36

So you're muted at the moment Mr. Khan, who?

1:11:45

Who is that? There we go. Sorry about that. Thank you very much. Mr. Chandler. If you find out anything about the the Rumsfeld, II and aspects of this, do, please put it in your submission at deadline five. Thank you very much indeed.

1:12:00

I don't see any more hands up for this one. So I'm going to move on. swiftly. I'm not being told as anybody here swiftly onto the applicant, please if you could address the points briefly, which should be made in respect of public rights of way. Thank you do bear in mind that anything you want to make a more considered response on? Please put it in writing at deadline five. Thank you.

1:12:29

colonists on behalf of the applicant, I'm going to hand over to Mr. McGregor has to deal with the public right of way matters. Thank you. q

1:12:39

parameterless. for applicants, I will keep it very brief, we would refer to the draft decio in particular requirement 32 articles 11 and articles 12. To deal with a temporary and permanent stopping of public rights away. It requires such measures such topping up to be

1:13:00

prepared precursor to that is for adequate diversions to be put in place both temporary and permanent diversions prior to the stopping of the Republic right of race. The pipeline public right away strategy itself does indeed identify 26 public rights of way. But we'll be affected during the construction of the of the projects. Each and every one of those public rights away will have a temporary diversion associated with it. And a fast majority of those temporary diversions will be short term during the construction, the initial construction period of the project.

1:13:37

In essence, the way the public rights of way into Federation's will take place if we have for instance a cable Carter and a public right of way interaction, we will construct a cable Carter up to the public right away, we will end there for the public right away on to the section of the cable corridor that we have already constructed. And we will then proceed with the construction of the cable corridor through the public right away. Once we have established cable they onshore cable grid under the public right away, we will then return the temporary diversion back to the permanent public right away. So that that operation itself is typically lasted a few weeks at a time

1:14:18

we would do it at the start of construction. So say from construction up to Hollywood or onshore cable grid. And then at the end of construction when the reinstatement operations are being undertaken.

1:14:30

Very briefly in terms of the the permanent

1:14:34

diversions that are in place around the the onshore substation locations, it was referred to that there's little attention to conductivity within those public radio red spray which we very much dispute. conductivity is at the heart of the public right away strategy we have identified at the substation site. We have identified short, medium and long new public rights of ways that will interact with people

1:15:00

Existing copyrights way to replace the loss of footpath six, which does indeed, clash with the onshore substation locations. We have also extended the public right away proposals more recently, to provide connectivity with an existing public right away, which could lead into natural requests of these Suffolk County Council.

1:15:24

And finally, in terms of, again, the operational phase of the projects, our deadline for submission.

1:15:33

The noise clarification note does include a section on the assessment of

1:15:40

the assessment on non residential amenity, and I'd very much focuses on noise impacts within the public credit rating network at the substations. And the conclusions of that study, is that the predicted impact on non military receptive locations IE public, the new public rhetoric and existing public rights away, as a result of the implementation of two projects have been deemed to be of negligible significance, not as in line with the methodology are also present within that same clarification.

1:16:12

That's all from me.

1:16:14

Thank you very much, indeed. And we'll look forward to receiving your submission deadline five, and do include anything that addresses these issues, which you haven't taken the opportunity to elucidate just now. Right, that comes to the end of item six. So thank you, everybody, for all your submissions. It's been a long day. But it's been very useful for us as the examining authorities for these projects. I'll now hand over to Mrs. Jones for item seven on the agenda. Thank you all very much.

1:16:53

Thank you very much, Mr. Rigby. Turning to agenda item seven, which is any other business, there are no other matters, which the examining authorities which wish to raise during today's hearing, I'm aware that Mr. Bedford would like to raise them up with us. And I will come to you in just a moment. Mr. Bedford. As the time remaining in this hearing is limited, I am going to suggest that if there are any matters relevant to the topic of these hearings that participants considered should be examined by the examining authorities. And if they could put that in writing by deadline five, so we can take it into consideration for further hearings, given what I've just said, Does anybody else have any other business that they consider must be raised in this hearing?

1:17:36

Is to attorney as well?

1:17:40

Can I add you to my list? If I go to Mr. Bedford? Yes, of course. Yes. That's probably a very sensible, thank you. Thank you.

1:17:48

And I can see that Mr. Tate also has his hand raised. So I will come to you as well, Mr. Tate after Mr. After Mr. Turney. So I'm sorry, could you have to Mr. Bedford and then to Mr. Attorney, Mr. McHugh.

1:17:59

Thank you, Madam

1:18:01

Mayor, have been overtaken by events because I think the point I made as an earlier stage before lunch was performance to Smith had indicated your thinking about matters. What I had been concerned about was, as it were interrelating the deadlines as they come up with the further information that was going to come in response, particularly to the drainage information, and obviously, if we didn't see what the applicant was saying in detail until deadline five, and we responded to that at deadline six. That was after the dates that have been earmarked for the potential reserve date in February. But I think Mr. Smith said that you would keep an open mind as to whether in the light of obviously, the further representations that come in, there may be a need to use the eighth of March, reserve dates for further hearings. And all I can say is that yes, if you keep an open mind as to whether that may become necessary. I don't ask obviously for any kind of decision at this stage. And we will see, it may well be that the exchanges are deadlines, five and deadline six, close off, satisfactory, all of the drainage matters, but if they don't, we've got that reserve possibility. So that was all I wanted to say. Thank you. Thank you very much. Mr. Bedford. Mr. Tate.

1:19:24

Thank you, Madam

1:19:27

Chair I wanted to raise relates to the noise discussion.

1:19:33

plainly given the constraints of time it was necessary to tread fairly likely over those issues.

1:19:40

There are still some substantial matters that

1:19:44

need to be looked at we would suggest and we would ask that consideration be given to having a further issue specific hearing on noise which will clearly need to be looked at following deadline five to see whether there are certain

1:20:00

Actually shoes still still left. So we would ask that consideration given to that at that stage. Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Tate. Yes, the examining authorities will take that on board and we will consider that further hearings later on in the examination. Thank you. Thank you,

1:20:15

Mr. Turney.

1:20:18

Madam, similar points, although I think, perhaps a bit more forcefully, less confident than then Mr. Bedford, these matters can be closed out through further risks and exchanges. And I have to express the degree of disquiet about the process to date, for example, on noise and flood risk. There's further information which is now to be provided by the applicant, for example, the noise report on EA one that deals with an issue, which has been at the forefront of our submissions, frankly, since before the application was put in. And it's very surprising that this sort of materials held by the applicant, but not shared, in respect of flood risk, a similar concern that we really haven't received answers to a whole series of points which were made to Mr. carpenters submissions, and in the very short submissions made on behalf the applicant. We had no answers to them and Mr. Carpenter's points were put in our written submissions a deadline for they do need to be addressed. And

1:21:23

the applicant today has provided very scant answers to the points being made. That's been justified on the basis of time. But what we've seen before is that the applicant is not prompt in responding to points that are made in later written submissions. And that's a real concern that we're not going to get the proper answers to these points. And it does make us concerned about the overall scrutiny of these issues. We've received a lot of late information from the applicant to deadline for, for example, the response to our deadline board noise submissions, which included substantive changes to their proposals, that's necessitated further expert input and further costs on behalf of the local community. The same is true of other matters, such as landscape masters, for instance, and flood.

1:22:15

And Madam in light of the really significant impacts of this project at first, and I have to make a very direct request for a further issue specific hearing to revisit environmental effects at first and to ensure that these matters are properly examined, because to be frank,

1:22:32

it is not my clients position that they have been properly examined to date. And this is a constraint of time. And I don't put that in a way which criticises but simply to say, we haven't had the examination that we need. And I hope, I hope you'll be understood that, as I explained at the preliminary meeting, those instructing me have done a vast amount of work to marshal local support behind faces, such that, for example, Friston parish council don't attend these hearings, but endorse the SE C's position, and to focus local concerns through a single spokesperson. And then through deploying experts evidence in a proportionate manner where necessary. But that does mean that there's a lot of people who are listening now or later, you need to be confident that these local issues have been addressed in full and they're facing what on any assessment is a very profound change to their village, and in our

assessment is one with serious adverse effects. So I put those points rather than more forcefully than Mr. taser Mr. Bedford do on behalf of the local authorities, but we do feel there's a need for further examination on the impacts of that nature. Thank you very much for indulging me on that point. Thank you very much, Mr. Attorney. I did ask the applicant to deadline five to respond in detail to the points raised by Mr. Carpenter and by Mr. Williams today. So hopefully we will get that at deadline five, but we do take your points on board and it is something that the examining authorities will consider very carefully. I'm very grateful. Thank you.

1:24:10

Miss Gilmore.

1:24:16

A very quick point, please item we would like to endorse everything that Mr. Attorney has just said. And also we would like to ask you to consider very seriously whether there is an opportunity for a proper consideration and examination of health issues, both the physical and the mental, both the direct and also the indirect, as well as the impact on health services. This is regarded by our followers and supporters as being a critical issue where there is evidence already concerning mental health and

1:25:00

physical health issues. So please, would you consider that in your discussions? Thank you. Absolutely. We'll take everyone's points that have been raised today on board and consider them more carefully.

1:25:16

Okay, that brings us to the end of item eight of our agenda and I'm going to hand over to my consent item seven, sorry, and I'm going to hand it over to my colleague, John Hockley, to deal with agenda item eight.

1:25:31

Thank you, Mr. Jones. The purpose of agenda item eight is to provide us with an opportunity to review any procedural decisions or actions that have arisen during this hearing. In terms of procedural decisions, we haven't identified the need to make any such decisions either yesterday or today.

1:25:49

In terms of actions, we have a list of nine reasonably detailed actions arising from these hearings. These have been flagged as we progressed, and we'll aim to publish these on the national infrastructure planning website, as soon as practicable after the close of this hearing. We'd advise all participants today and those not in attendance, but with an interest in the matters covered by this hearing, to review this action list when published and act accordingly. Thank you. We'll now move on to Mr. Smith. Please.

1:26:16

Thank you very much, Mr. Hockley. I will now briefly refer to next steps in the examination This is being a pair of issue specific hearings number four. Our next hearings and these examinations will be issue

specific hearings number five on social economic, land and sea use of facts which start at 10am. Tomorrow.

1:26:38

This week of hearings will conclude with open floor hearings, open floor hearing six, which will start at 10am. On Friday, I'll remind you that we're holding site inspections on the 26th and 27th of January but flag that attendance at these has now been limited to those who are essentially required to provide access to the land. And this is a step that has been taken with much regret but is necessary to comply with Coronavirus, regulations and guidance currently in force. Anyone who is required to attend and the site inspections should have received correspondence on this from the case team. So if you're expecting to be involved in those and you don't have an email, please use the email contact on the website to get in touch with us as a matter of urgency, and you will receive your package of information about those and moving them to next week. We're holding open for hearings seven on the 28th of January and issue specific hearing six on the draft gcos. On the 29th of January. On this last event, I would flag that this is a place in which we're going to hear parties without prejudice to their in principle positions on planning merits. And in a nutshell, what that means in plain English is if you object to the grounds of development consent, you can still make oral submissions on the content of the draft orders around for example, matters such as requirements, which set the terms and conditions on which development might proceed without conceding your overarching objection to the planning merits of the two applications. So I just thought it was useful to remind everybody about the terms on which that event will be held.

1:28:28

So let us then move on to agenda item nine, at closing today's hearings.

1:28:37

I would like to thank all of our speakers today for your attendance and contributions. I'm very conscious that there has been a measure of frustration and forbearance around the fact that we've sometimes been moving faster than many would like through some matters of great detail and complexity. And Firstly, I would remind everybody, we have set out substantial opportunities for additional material to be put in in writing. And I can only emphasise again, Mrs. Jones, please to the applicants there to make sure that full and detailed responses on outstanding items are put in in writing deadline five that is really critically important on this occasion.

1:29:16

But again, we will be giving very careful consideration to the potential need to open up additional hearing space. That's something that's I'm not going to speak about here now because we need to think about it further. But nevertheless, the submissions that have been made and noted and we will give them a very careful attention. So thank you, everybody for your contributions. I will again thank our case team led by Mr. Emery Williams for supporting these hearings. I'm going to have a final check of the virtual room to see if there's anything that anybody else would like to raise.

1:29:51



And I'm not seeing any yellow hands on my dashboard. So I'm going to ask all of my colleagues here present to

1:30:00

say my goodbyes.

1:30:03

Thank you very much, everybody. for your contributions today. Have a good evening.

1:30:09

And it's goodbye for me to Mr. Rigby here. Thank you for all your contributions. It's been quite a marathon. And thanks a lot. That's good buy from me.

1:30:20

Thank you very much all just to reiterate their comments to my colleagues. Thanks, everybody.

1:30:26

And finally, Richard Smith speaking lead member of these panels, it is now 5:25pm. And these issues specific hearings number four, on now closed