



Event Transcript

Project:	Sea Link
Event:	Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) - Day 2 - Part 4
Date:	29 January 2026

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above event. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the event.

File Name: SL_29JAN_ISH2_PART4.mp3

File Length: 01:43:13

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:06 - 00:00:41:24

So now welcome back. Can I just check with the case team that everyone can hear and that the live stream is running and the recording. Thank you. So to carry on with shipping and navigation, which is item 19. Um, I would like to now talk about, um, cable crossings. Um, so the Maritime and Coastguard Agency has said that they expect the applicant not to exceed the 5% maximum depth reduction at cable crossings within the north east spit.

00:00:42:18 - 00:00:59:28

Um, and if not achievable, um, there must be consultation with the MCA to confirm that the risk to safety is as low as reasonably practicable. I just want to check how that can be secured. Is that a DML, um, condition.

00:01:01:15 - 00:01:36:01

Uh, Andrew, I would for the applicant. Um, so the principle of the 5% rule. The 5% rule is secured in the DML. But the key point is that where the applicant exceeds the 5%, it triggers a conversation and consultation with MCA. Um, in discussions with MCA, um, we've, uh, socialized that we do indeed have crossings within the northeast, but area of interest. Um, and ultimately we would be looking to safeguard the 12.5m, um, level.

00:01:36:15 - 00:01:47:24

Um, that may mean exceeding the 5% water depth rule, and that would be picked up in a discussion with the MCA and agreed in writing as per the DML.

00:01:48:04 - 00:01:51:03

Okay. So so that's secured through the DML.

00:01:51:05 - 00:02:22:18

That process that that is correct. So in the hierarchy of um requirements, the 12.5 is the key requirement in terms of safeguarding navigable depth. But the MCA is seeking to limit how, um, um, how high we build a structure off the seabed so we don't take up the full, uh, water column, um, up to the safeguarded level. And that will seek to minimize the design. And that is what we intend to do.

00:02:22:23 - 00:02:26:09

Okay. Does the MCA have any comment on that?

00:02:28:27 - 00:02:37:21

Helen Croxton Maritime and Coastguard Agency I agree with what has been said there. Those discussions are ongoing and we would expect that to be secured in the DCO, DML.

00:02:38:25 - 00:02:48:01

Okay. Thank you. Well, I look forward to getting an update on that. Um, at deadline for if that's feasible or deadline five.

00:02:53:01 - 00:03:04:06

Andrew I would for the applicant. So the the mechanisms of securing the 5% is already secured in the DML, so that is written into the ML currently both for construction and operations and maintenance.

00:03:05:03 - 00:03:07:17

Is that including the cable crossings, though.

00:03:07:29 - 00:03:16:18

That would cover cable crossings? So all works of that particular order, I'd have to get the exact wording in the demo. I think it's work. Number six.

00:03:18:15 - 00:03:25:01

Okay. Does anybody want to say anything else about, um, about that particular question?

00:03:26:27 - 00:03:42:03

Okay. I can't see any hands. Um, so I'm still on cable crossings. Um, there's reference in, I think, deadline three documents about moving the cable into deeper water to accommodate a future crossing with Grid Link.

00:03:43:24 - 00:03:46:04

How will that be secured?

00:03:49:27 - 00:04:25:00

And removed for the applicant. So that the mechanism for securing would be signing up to the safeguarded water levels. And we are discussing how to secure that, whether in um, in a requirement in the draft order. Um, but we're taking that one away. Um, that would be the mechanism for securing. Um, we have met with Grid Link, um, and are working on co engineering, which includes agreeing to the crossing location and have agreed to cross in deeper water, which means that we have adequate water depth, uh, to safeguard the 12.5m level.

00:04:25:02 - 00:04:58:00

But the mechanism for securing uh, as we see it would be through the, um, through the requirements that are currently in the PPE. And we're taking it away to consider in the in the draft order. Um, there is an emerging clause which has been added to the PLA piece, which deals with the grid link crossing specifically. So that would be, um, that would be the specific mechanism in terms of grid link that's currently in peace. But, um, we've agreed to take that away and, uh, review.

00:04:58:02 - 00:04:59:09

Okay. Thank you.

00:05:00:27 - 00:05:07:25

But the deeper water is still within the, um, order limits and limits of deviation. Um.

00:05:08:13 - 00:05:12:11

And for the applicant. That's correct. The crossing locations within the draft order limits.

00:05:12:13 - 00:05:18:24

Okay. Thank you. Um, does anybody want to say anything? I can see a hand up. Um. Vicki Fowler.

00:05:19:27 - 00:05:52:05

Yeah. Vicki Fowler, on behalf of the Port of London Authority. Um, I think we were wondering whether there needed to be on on the area of interest plan effectively. Um, an area marked where the cable wouldn't be laid. Um, going back to your comment about the, um, sorry, about about, um, sorry. I've just been distracted by a note that's come up. Um, sorry. Um, yes. So I think I think I think the sort of concern is that depending on.

00:05:52:07 - 00:06:24:25

So depending on who goes first. So if um Sealink went first then effectively where they put their cable could prevent grid link happening unless that particular route is fixed. So I think we were thinking it was more there would need to be an area marked on whether it be the area of interest plan that basically said you wouldn't be putting the cable here. So so the parameters would change. So there's, so there's certainty because even if the crossing locations agreed with with grid link, unless that's secured somewhere, there's always that risk.

00:06:24:27 - 00:06:28:25

That grid link can't happen because of the water depths. So.

00:06:29:13 - 00:06:32:07

Okay. Would the applicant like to respond on that.

00:06:32:10 - 00:06:52:11

Andrew home for the applicant there is an emerging clause dealing specifically with uh grid link and uh depending on who goes first, um, ensuring that we cross in a location that allows the future crossing party to meet the 12.5m safeguards. I think that's an appropriate mechanism for security.

00:06:52:13 - 00:07:05:04

So the PLA suggested putting something in the areas of interest plan, actually excluding an area for ceiling to to put there cable.

00:07:06:06 - 00:07:13:04

And for the applicant, we think the wording, the emerging wording of that requirement does do that. We can take that away.

00:07:13:06 - 00:07:16:08

So this is a requirement rather than a protective provision.

00:07:16:10 - 00:07:33:18

It's in protective provisions at the moment. We'll be taking that away to agree how best to secure that. But the the wording in that PPE um does what the PLA suggesting which is ensure that we cross a location that allows the 12.5 to be met.

00:07:33:26 - 00:07:43:27

So the protective provision would be with the PLA rather than with obviously with grid link, because the they don't have anything there at the moment.

00:07:47:09 - 00:07:50:12

So that may not give grid link much comfort.

00:07:51:20 - 00:08:12:13

And run for the applicant. So we notwithstanding everything I've said, the emerging clause and which is in and securing potentially in the draft order, we would sign a crossing agreement with Grid Link, um, that ensures we abide by the DCO and cross in a particular location that is acceptable to grid link as well.

00:08:12:24 - 00:08:22:24

But would that be done after the sealing? Essentially after sealing, cable had already been laid. So as the PLA was saying that it could be too late at that point.

00:08:22:26 - 00:08:24:07

That would typically be.

00:08:24:13 - 00:08:32:22

If there's nothing in the DCO to actually say, you can't put a cable here because of future requirements and future development.

00:08:33:00 - 00:08:43:01

Let me take it away and come back to you. Um, in terms of how the requirement, the emerging requirement and protective and crossing agreement might work.

00:08:43:07 - 00:08:57:17

Um, sounds like there needs to be a discussion On that with the relevant parties to make sure there's an enforceable provision that goes beyond just a protective provision.

00:08:59:17 - 00:09:00:27

We'll take that away and come back to it.

00:09:00:29 - 00:09:04:01

Thank you. Does anybody want to say anything else on that?

00:09:04:18 - 00:09:33:12

Uh, Alice Maynard for five estuaries. Um, just to say that we have the similar we're crossing, we're likely to cross. Well, we have to cross Sealink. And we also it's in an area of, you know, with the corridors cross, uh, you know, fairly shallow water. So we also have a similar discussion, but we're in

discussions with Sealink and it will be within the crossing agreement, will agree a location so that, you know, they can route in a deeper, the deeper area of their corridor. So we have the same thing for five estuaries. But yeah.

00:09:33:24 - 00:09:54:12

Thank you. That's helpful. Um, okay. So moving on now to cable crossing agreements. There's been discussion about whether they should be included in table Point one of um document app 01A, which I think is the consents and agreements document. Um,

00:09:56:06 - 00:10:06:18

is it sufficient to include them in section 1.5? Is that the appropriate place? I know this is a fairly minor point, but there have been various views.

00:10:07:21 - 00:10:27:12

Robin Jones, on behalf of the applicant, um, I think in our initial response, we said it wasn't necessarily included in the table that you've referenced, but it is in the wider document. Um, we can take it way to see if we can expand on the existing text that's in within the document. I think that's fine. Um, but it's not that we've excluded them. Uh, they are there, but, um, we might need to elaborate.

00:10:27:18 - 00:10:33:04

It's just getting them in the right place, isn't it? Um, so is that for the deadline for.

00:10:34:12 - 00:10:35:29

Yes, we can review that for deadline for.

00:10:36:18 - 00:10:37:11

Thank you.

00:10:39:03 - 00:10:47:21

Okay. Um, just moving on now to the vessel management plan. So the Maritime and Coastguard Agency. Um.

00:10:52:18 - 00:11:09:21

Sorry. Um, I've got a question for the Maritime and Coastguard Agency. So if, if a vessel management plan is not provided or not secured. Would you still be able to conclude that navigational risks are as low as reasonably practicable?

00:11:10:24 - 00:12:02:07

So at the present moment in time, the version of the navigation installation plan, there are gaps for our areas of interest. It doesn't cover, um, areas where we would like to ensure the safety of navigation in order to confirm that the risks are reliable. Example um, the east of North ship. Ship wash. Sorry. The sunk out precautionary area and the long sand head two way route. So there are improvements that are required to the navigation installation plan to bring it up to standard for the full cable route, we would expect a vessel management plan to give us that full picture to ensure that the risks are a flop, but we

will continue to work with the applicant on the updates required to the navigation installation plan to see if that as a package can cover our concerns for the entire cable route.

00:12:02:13 - 00:12:17:07

Um, and equally would like to ensure that the port who I know are also looking for the vessel management plan to make sure that their aspects are addressed as well. So we're not there at the moment and further discussion is required.

00:12:17:16 - 00:12:22:03

Thank you. Can the applicant, um, respond to that?

00:12:22:22 - 00:12:39:14

Robin Jones, on behalf of the applicant. Um, just to confirm, uh, just for clarity, uh, we're referring here to an outline vessel traffic management plan. And it shouldn't be confused with a vessel management plan, which would be submitted post consent with regard to mitigation for red throated diver. Um, I just wanted to make that go.

00:12:39:16 - 00:12:41:05

Yes I understand. Yeah.

00:12:41:07 - 00:12:52:07

Um, and, yeah, we can completely confirm that we've been discussing with the NCAA on the requirements, and we are updating the outline navigational installation plan, which will be submitted at deadline for.

00:12:52:09 - 00:12:58:26

Okay. So that will then cover a wider area than just the areas of interest that it covers at the moment.

00:12:59:01 - 00:13:02:07

And, um, yeah, we'll look forward to having comments back from the MTA.

00:13:02:09 - 00:13:26:15

Okay. Thank you. Thank you for that update. That's helpful. Um, okay. We're nearly there. Um, so exclusion zones again, this I know you the applicant has said there won't be any, um, as that's a commitment that you've made. It seems appropriate to me that that be included in the risk as a commitment. Could you comment on that?

00:13:27:06 - 00:13:31:27

Andrew Homer of the applicant, we're going to take that one away. And we are considering a commitment in the Reac.

00:13:32:06 - 00:13:37:19

Okay. Thank you. Does anybody have anything to say on exclusion zones? Otherwise

00:13:39:08 - 00:13:41:23

I can't see any. Hands up! Um.

00:13:42:20 - 00:13:43:08

Madam.

00:13:43:28 - 00:13:45:17

Hello, Francis.

00:13:45:23 - 00:14:21:24

Francis. Just, um. Um, I just wanted to. I think we've noted on the agenda we had safety zones and then exclusion zones. Um, we just had one thing to flag on safety zones, but just before we do. Okay. On it, Susan. Zones. Um, uh, just to reiterate the point made earlier. Really? The reactor doesn't secure anything. No. So I'm happy to see it referenced in the reactor. But as I think we suggested on exclusion zones in our document rep 3093 uh, that perhaps this the exclusion zones point could be secured in the NEP or in another document to be approved under the marine licence.

00:14:21:29 - 00:14:28:02

Um, uh, madam, I don't if you were intending to turn to safety zones as well or not.

00:14:28:04 - 00:14:34:27

I'm happy to hear from you. I haven't got that as an item, but if it's something that needs to be said, I'm happy to hear it.

00:14:35:16 - 00:14:36:11

Any further? Just to.

00:14:36:21 - 00:14:38:20

We've already has been raised before.

00:14:38:22 - 00:15:07:13

Or it's just to reiterate in rep 3093 further to your questions in terms of that, which is question one and 13, uh, you asked about the, um, comments on safety zones in the reactor, in particular SN 29. Um, we just wanted a flag that we think, uh, there needs to be some practical expansion as far as more work in terms.

00:15:07:15 - 00:15:15:28

Of sorry, I'm losing you again, I think maybe if you're maybe turning your head slightly away from your microphone, it's making it difficult to hear you.

00:15:16:13 - 00:15:51:14

Sorry. I'll move forward. Um, um, the point was, in relation to safety zones, uh, and Sion 29. Uh, I just wanted to flag that we have asked that the applicant, uh, improve that commitment at a practical level in terms of the degree of communication with LGPL so that they can mitigate the effects on vessels actually entering or exiting from London Gateway. Uh, because the safety zones will function as a sort of a temporary blockage to the channel.

00:15:52:05 - 00:16:19:18

And obviously vessels move into the gateway port frequently. And if we're out together, we can manage this and manage the impact on the port. But at the moment, um, there is nothing set out for how that will happen. Uh, so we've made our suggestions in rep 3093 in relation to one SM 13. Uh, and I'll leave that there with you, madam, to consider and obviously just to ask the applicant to consider that and revert on that point.

00:16:19:26 - 00:16:22:25

Thank you. Would the applicant like to respond on that?

00:16:24:07 - 00:16:27:12

For the applicant we will do as required and revert in writing.

00:16:27:14 - 00:16:31:06

Thank you. Thank you for deadline for. Okay. Thank you.

00:16:37:13 - 00:16:43:07

Just one point now on the, um, cable burial risk assessment. Um.

00:16:47:01 - 00:17:00:22

I think the PLA has questioned whether the document is taken on board the findings of the Integrated Geophysical and geotechnical report that was submitted at deadline two is that can the applicant just advise on that?

00:17:00:24 - 00:17:31:15

And for the applicant. So indeed, the CRA was uh, um, commissioned and delivered at a point in time. Um, and that was prior to receiving the integrated report. Um, but I can confirm that the current Seabra does use the preliminary geophysical data from that um, supplementary survey, which was um, which has now been delivered in the integrated report. Um, it was also tied back to BGS regional mapping data.

00:17:31:17 - 00:17:44:02

And so we don't believe there'll be a meteor. Well, we are saying we're confident they won't be a material change to the CBRE. Um, when reviewed against the Integrated Geophysical and Geotechnical report.

00:17:44:23 - 00:17:50:21

Okay. Thank you. Does, um, the Port of London Authority want to say anything in response to that?

00:17:52:22 - 00:17:57:02

Vicki Fowler, on behalf of the Port of London Authority. Um, I don't believe so.

00:17:57:21 - 00:18:38:10

Okay. Well thank you. Obviously, if you do, then please submit that for deadline for. Thank you. Um, post ley cable burial survey. So this has been raised by the MCA to confirm whether target depths have been met. Um, so I think we've got GM, O2 and also in the DML part two, schedule 16,

condition 14. I just wanted to know whether that makes the MCA requirements in terms of a post cable burial survey or is it something? Um, in addition that that you are asking for.

00:18:39:27 - 00:18:52:12

Helen Croxton on behalf of the MCA. So I would need to go and look at those three documents and to be able to confirm whether or not that would meet our requirement, if that's okay, and we will report back by the next deadline.

00:18:52:19 - 00:18:53:15

Thank you.

00:18:55:16 - 00:19:06:20

Um, right. Does anybody else have anything they wish to say in relation to shipping and navigation matters? So that's the end of my item.

00:19:12:14 - 00:19:18:28

Oh, is that Helen? Um, no. Yeah. Sorry.

00:19:19:08 - 00:19:50:24

Sorry. Thank you. Um, it was just a point that I started to raise in the opening. Um, question. Um, just to pick up on it. We may have touched on it slightly, but not all of it. So we are also interested in securing a defined area for Sealink to avoid concurrent activity with the other projects where vessels are restricted in their ability to manoeuvre under ram status, and also when visibility is reduced to two nautical miles or less for non-stop operations. So discussions are ongoing on that as well.

00:19:50:26 - 00:19:55:29

And we've started to work with the applicant on what that area may actually look like. Thank you.

00:19:56:01 - 00:20:00:17

Okay, that's really helpful. Can the applicant update me on that?

00:20:00:21 - 00:20:43:06

Andrew Homewood for the applicant. So we have been in discussions with the port authorities, including the MCA, sunk Pts well over a year ago. This included North Force five estuaries in determining the um, areas where we would limit concurrent working activities. Um, that is the the, um, sunk, uh, area of interest. Um, the area that the MCA are referring to is a new emerging area. Okay. Um, and, uh, we are in discussions with the NCAA on the requirements for that area and why we why they are seeking, um, an additional area into what in terms of what was already agreed.

00:20:43:22 - 00:20:48:07

Okay. Can we hear from the NCAA on that about the additional area?

00:20:48:18 - 00:21:24:04

Yes, and thank you. So, uh, Keith Bennett will be able to talk about the actual detail. Apologies, Helen Crookston Maritime and Coastguard Agency Keith will be able to go into the actual justification for the requirement for that extended area. Um, but we believe that this would just apply to the Sea Link

project, putting aside whatever may have been agreed, um, for other projects. So as each new project comes on, the need for those change, it's a it's a highly dynamic environment. So we believe for this project that what we're asking for is, um, suitable on this occasion.

00:21:24:06 - 00:21:39:27

And we are seeking legal advice to find out how the existing arrangements may actually impact this new requirement, but we can certainly provide more justification on why that area has it has expanded, and we can provide that by the next deadline.

00:21:40:00 - 00:21:42:00

That would be really helpful. Thank you.

00:21:43:17 - 00:21:46:17

Okay. Does the applicant want to say anything about that?

00:21:46:19 - 00:21:53:11

Andrew Homewood for the applicant, we note the MCA's requirements and we will pick that up in further discussions in writing.

00:21:53:13 - 00:22:01:03

Okay. Thank you. Does anybody else have anything they want to say about shipping and navigation before we move on to the next item?

00:22:03:04 - 00:22:12:24

Can't see any hands up. Thank you for your contributions. I will now hand over to Mr. Rennie for the next item on the agenda.

00:22:15:27 - 00:22:16:22

Thank you.

00:22:16:26 - 00:22:27:07

Um, so this is going to be socioeconomics and tourism. Um, I want to I'll just wait a couple of minutes just for people to move around.

00:22:31:15 - 00:22:34:21

This is item 15. So this was delayed from yesterday.

00:23:02:05 - 00:23:34:25

Well, first of all, I got some questions for the council. Um, so this obviously affects I think district councils came to councils as well. Might want to comment. Um, so the applicant is submitted visitor and tourism assessment technical notes for both Suffolk and Kent. Reference rep 3065 and Rep 3066. Both notes calculate that there would be spare capacity under a worst case scenario for both Sealink workers and tourists at peak times for accommodation.

00:23:35:00 - 00:23:53:21

Can I have the council's response to this? And is it accepted that in terms of accommodation workers that, well, sorry, the accommodation workers would not displace potential tourists by taking up all the accommodation? As for any of the councils.

00:23:57:12 - 00:23:58:24

If I go first Michael Bedford.

00:23:58:26 - 00:24:36:05

Suffolk County Council. We've seen those studies at deadline three and we are in the process of absorbing the information provided. We intend to provide a response at deadline for. But in short, and no, we're not persuaded that there is a sufficient surplus that there would not be accommodation pressures. Uh, and we do see, uh, worker accommodation for construction workers potentially competing with and therefore displacing, um, accommodation that might otherwise be available for the tourism sector.

00:24:36:10 - 00:24:40:12

Okay. Thank you. And I can see, uh, I think it's East Suffolk.

00:24:43:00 - 00:25:22:18

Thank you, sir. Mark Westman Smith for East Suffolk. We're in a similar position in that we are reviewing that information and will respond in due course. Um, we're also, uh, commissioning some of our own work to look at this question, and we'll present that at deadline for, um, and the early indications are that we don't agree with the applicant's, uh, assessment. And I have next to me Simon Charlesworth, who is our, um, Sector development and trade lead.

00:25:22:20 - 00:25:29:06

And I'll just hand over to him just to explain the parameters of the work we've sought to commission.

00:25:29:15 - 00:25:30:09

Okay. Thank you.

00:25:30:11 - 00:26:11:25

Hello. Simon Charlesworth for East Suffolk Council. And, uh, in the matter of accommodation, um, the east of the council agrees with Suffolk County Council that we're not persuaded that that there is sufficient accommodation, um, for, um, for non home based workers and visitors. Um, we have um we have commissioned a study which looks at the available, um, beds or room space within a 60 minute drive time of the construction area.

00:26:11:27 - 00:26:39:24

And we currently have conflicting views in terms of for our, our view is that there's four 4000 odd rooms available, and that compares to 7000 rooms presented by the applicant. So this report has only recently been published. It will be available for submission deadline for. And we are currently analyzing the results.

00:26:41:06 - 00:26:55:12

Okay. Yes. I think obviously if the councils are contesting what the applicant submitted, um, so to have those sort of alternative figures would be very useful. Um, can I have a response from the applicant to what you've heard just then?

00:26:55:24 - 00:27:11:07

Thank you, Sarah Shaikh, for the applicant. Um, so to answer that, I'm going to pass over to, I think, Mr. Wieger, who's sitting there to my left, and he's supported by two other members of our team who may, may join and will introduce themselves when they do.

00:27:11:09 - 00:27:11:24

Great.

00:27:11:26 - 00:27:12:11

Thank you.

00:27:13:15 - 00:27:17:22

Thank you. Dave, would you, on behalf of the applicant? Um, yeah. No.

00:27:17:24 - 00:27:19:07

Noted that the.

00:27:19:25 - 00:27:25:16

Comments from both councils and also noted on the study that's been undertaken. So.

00:27:26:15 - 00:27:27:00

Uh, yeah.

00:27:27:02 - 00:27:30:15

We look forward to receiving that and reviewing that as well.

00:27:30:17 - 00:28:05:12

And just to follow that up, because it's sort of similar questions. And I know there's there's some hands up and we'll come back to those hands just a minute. But um, for Suffolk, considering the potential cumulative pressure on local accommodation, Suffolk in particular, um, from Sealink and other projects, um, would this at its sort of peak require basically all hotel, say, B&B accommodation as well, but also maybe some private sector accommodation, sort of rental accommodation.

00:28:05:14 - 00:28:17:10

Also I think there's I think I saw something about, uh, 1700 or so rooms in Suffolk available at a time, but maybe over 3000 workers Sizewell, etc..

00:28:21:08 - 00:28:32:08

Dave Wager on behalf of the applicant. Um, yeah. As per our findings, there's a significant amount of capacity available for both construction workers and tourists.

00:28:32:10 - 00:29:01:12

But but in cumulative terms, yes. Um, even it seems from my reading of the information that when you cumulatively add that sort of years, although 2028 sort of year, if you put all the Sizewell staff and all the staff together, there might be an extent where the basic sort of hotel, B&B sort of accommodation would all it would, it would surpass that amount of accommodation that was available. Is that not right.

00:29:02:15 - 00:29:17:06

On behalf of the applicant. So our assessment accounts for hotels, B&Bs and private rental accommodation. Right. And on that basis in relation to cumulative? Yes. We believe there is sufficient capacity.

00:29:17:18 - 00:29:32:24

Would there still be sufficient capacity without the private rental accommodation? Would you need that private rental accommodation to reach that capacity? Yes, yes. Okay. And what would that likely do. Do you think for rental costs across the area with that uplift of demand at that time.

00:29:33:13 - 00:29:42:14

Dave, would you on behalf of the applicant, that level of analysis hasn't been undertaken as part of the scope of the work. So, um, couldn't answer that particular time.

00:29:42:21 - 00:30:06:12

Okay. And on those rental properties available, I would imagine that's quite a changeable figure. Um, how would the applicant be sufficiently sure that there would be enough rental properties available? Is there a sort of backup plan for some sort of temporary special accommodation, like a sort small or maybe some sort of small campus type arrangement or something like that if necessary?

00:30:06:18 - 00:30:21:00

Thank you. On behalf of the applicant. So obviously, on the basis of the work that's been undertaken, we believe there is sufficient capacity. Um, if something else was being considered, as you suggested, we'd need to take that away. Um, okay. Yeah.

00:30:21:16 - 00:30:40:28

Sorry. On behalf of the applicant, if I could just also perhaps ask Mr. Widget to deal with the question of, uh, Sizewell and potential sharing of accommodation and those sort of issues. I think those have been discussed as well. And if you could also perhaps just assist the Tsar with details of the sort of numbers we're talking about and the distances.

00:30:41:16 - 00:31:13:16

Yes. Dave, would you on behalf of the applicant. So, yeah, I mean, in terms of the scale of the projects, this is a quite a small project in compared to, say, Sizewell C, um, we've got a peak workforce of 327 workers on one day. Um, in the peak year 2028, there's 164, and then it becomes, I think it goes down to around 80 per annum. Um, in comparison, Sizewell C's peak, the last peak that we saw was 7900 workers.

00:31:13:20 - 00:31:33:20

So hopefully that gives a bit of a scale of comparison in sort of the context for part of the assessment that we've done in terms of tourism accommodation. Yes. So as we'll see, has obviously provided accommodation given its considerable numbers of construction workers. Whereas as I said, Sealink is relatively small in comparison.

00:31:33:23 - 00:32:05:00

Yes. I mean, I think that's my point of asking about the cumulative impact within Suffolk, because with size, where a lot of the accommodation could already be taken up. And from what I understand that, you know, you have to then look at the rental accommodation as well, potentially at sort of peak times to address that. But would that be on the basis that the, the would there be the likelihood then that that's because a lot of the hotels or other forms of accommodation was already at capacity.

00:32:05:04 - 00:32:38:13

Yeah. So in terms of sorry, David, you're on behalf of the applicant. the. We looked at all the peak construction hit by the peaks for every cumulative scheme uh, and looked at availability looked at considered seasonal variation. So I'm particularly looking at, say, July as the sort of peak month. And yeah, as I said, the conclusion was that there was available capacity and that, yes, you'd make use of the private rental sector, as I said, haven't done analysis of changes in prices or anything like that.

00:32:38:21 - 00:32:39:06

Okay.

00:32:40:03 - 00:32:46:08

Um, okay. I've got a few hands up here, which I'll go to, um, a Helen Johnson.

00:32:49:12 - 00:32:57:18

Thank you. Good afternoon. Ben Johnson from Saanich District Council. I just wanted to just clarify that we're in a similar position to the other councils in that we've got the technique.

00:33:00:25 - 00:33:02:24

Sorry. Just froze there for a second.

00:33:08:21 - 00:33:09:27

It's going to come back.

00:33:13:08 - 00:33:18:18

Um, maybe I'll come back to, uh, Miss Johnson. If you go.

00:33:19:18 - 00:33:27:24

I'll just. After the meeting. Sorry, I didn't have much more to say, honestly, just to say that we're just working with our tourism colleagues, and we'll come back on deadline for. Thank you.

00:33:28:09 - 00:33:32:15

Yeah. Thank you very much. And, uh, Timothy Rowan Robinson.

00:33:37:13 - 00:34:08:10

Yes. Good afternoon. Um, I'm Tim Robinson, a resident of Aldeburgh and past chairman of the Suffolk Tourism Partnership and the Suffolk Coast Demo. I'm concerned that the applicant believes that as well as the development having no effect on traffic, there will also be none on tourism. They appear not to value the results of consumer surveys, such as the one commissioned by the DMO, the results of which are supported by Suzuki's own survey.

00:34:09:09 - 00:34:48:17

The applicant seems to rely on information that size will be, and Hinkley Point developments have not had a detrimental effect. I'm not sure of the applicant has provided evidence to this effect, but it would be very interesting to see it into individual developments such as size will be and Hinkley and Hinkley Point do not are obviously totally different in nature to the creation of an enormous energy hub, which is serviced by very small rural roads and must impact tourism in both the short and long term.

00:34:50:09 - 00:35:10:12

Unlike many seaside towns, Aldeburgh has a lively high street catering for both day and overnight visitors. Feedback from retailers suggests that there is already a significant reduction in footfall and at least two restaurants are reporting approximately 40% reduction in midweek covers.

00:35:10:21 - 00:35:29:15

Sorry, sorry. Mr.. Mr.. Roland Robinson, we're at the moment we're talking specifically about accommodation, tourism, accommodation and I'd like to be able to stick to the agenda. I understand the points you make and I think a lot of them have been made already in writing to us. Um, is there any point that you would like to make in regards to tourism in particular.

00:35:29:17 - 00:36:12:26

As far as accommodation is concerned, that limited capacity will mean that the cumulative number of construction workers will definitely displace staying tourists at peak times. Construction workers spend far less than tourists, not only on accommodation but more importantly on their discretionary spend. I would urge that the applicant be required to be less dismissive of this issue, and to reconsider its approach to quantifying the effect on tourism and therefore the economy of this local area, which is totally dependent on maintaining our visitor numbers.

00:36:13:15 - 00:36:19:24

Okay. Thank you very much. And can I switch to the Suffolk hub now? There's a someone wants to speak there, I believe.

00:36:22:04 - 00:36:25:10

Um, yes. Marianne Fellowes, Aldeburgh resident, very quickly.

00:36:25:12 - 00:36:26:06

And then my colleague.

00:36:26:08 - 00:36:29:21

Councillor will follow on. Um, so.

00:36:29:24 - 00:36:32:13

Two points to assist you on what the applicant.

00:36:32:15 - 00:37:05:06

Has said, sir. Thank you. So, um, July is not the peak in this local area. It is a year round destination and many thousands or millions of pounds have been spent to achieve that, both public and private sector funding. Secondly, um, the existing size of B power station currently has an outage where it has an increase of 1500 workers for three months every 18 months, and that is on a calendar that will coincide with peaks of sealing.

00:37:05:21 - 00:37:39:00

Um, if and when size or see is generating, that will have two reactors again that will have a three month outage. So every six months for three months there'll be additional 2000 workers in the area requiring accommodation. Um, the the applicants figure of 327. Yes, 30% of that. So you could say about 90 people may commute on a daily basis, but workers habits are that they prefer to stay near to site, especially with long working hours.

00:37:39:02 - 00:37:39:24

Thank you.

00:37:40:07 - 00:37:41:08

Okay. Thank you.

00:37:43:09 - 00:37:43:29

Hello.

00:37:44:01 - 00:38:14:17

Uh, Julia Ewart, east from East Suffolk Council. Just wish to discuss accommodation as you, uh, are highlighting the challenges with regards to accommodation. Could you please ask the applicant what Mr. Widget has based his budget upon with respect to hotels and accommodation. Please. That is really pertinent. I think at the moment that the budget for Sizewell is around £60 per evening, it's fair to say. Do you have a question? One 4040.

00:38:14:19 - 00:38:42:24

Thank you very much. And therefore our hotels are of a high calibre and quality. They wouldn't be able to accommodate with that budget. People wishing to stay. What I would suggest might be useful, as I would, is that maybe a community asset should be looked at within the Saxmundham area, where there could be a high volume accommodation, because we don't have the likes of Travelodge or anything that you would have in a commercial basis. Thank you. Could I have the.

00:38:43:28 - 00:38:56:13

Code just followed that point up? Are you therefore implying that, um, the workers for, uh, Sealink might not be using local hotels because of the, the higher cost for them.

00:38:56:15 - 00:39:13:00

Because we don't actually have them. We don't have block accommodation, which is why Sizewell is building what it's building. But I can't actually say. I would say maybe in Ipswich and Lowestoft there may be something like Premier Inn, but there's certainly not the block volume that you're looking for.

00:39:13:09 - 00:39:21:12

Okay. Thank you. Um, can I return to the applicant on those those points? Um, particularly that last one about the pricing.

00:39:25:01 - 00:39:27:13

Would you, if you want to talk, comment on the price.

00:39:29:18 - 00:39:37:13

On the price that hasn't that sorry, that hasn't been set up on behalf of the applicant that that hasn't been part of the accommodation capacity analysis.

00:39:38:13 - 00:39:46:18

So at the moment you've you've looked simply at the amount of rooms available, not necessarily the type of room cost of room, anything like that that doesn't go into it.

00:39:47:01 - 00:39:48:20

On behalf of the applicant. That's correct.

00:39:48:22 - 00:40:19:03

Okay. Um, for the applicant again, um, just just moving on slightly. Um, is there a benefit in monitoring the tourism impact of Sealink, both in construction and operational phases, following what could be a pre-construction baseline review to understand the actual impacts of the development on the on tourism, or maybe even wider for social economics in general in the area of the areas um, and then provide adaptive management if necessary.

00:40:22:21 - 00:40:36:06

Which on behalf of the applicant. Um National grid is continuing to liaise with local authorities on tourism accommodation capacity. Um committed to discussing concerns around that with the appointed contractor for the proposed project.

00:40:38:20 - 00:40:47:11

Okay. Um, can I just see if the council's got any response based on what you've heard so far? Uh, East Suffolk Council.

00:40:50:15 - 00:41:30:13

Uh, some Charlesworth on behalf of East Suffolk Council. Um in in response is if a council recognizes that the number of ances either consented or to be um, developed over the next decade is unprecedented and potentially without comparison. What that means is that, um, it is extremely difficult to forecast ahead in terms of the, um, potential, um, socio economic impacts, particularly those around tourism, with sufficient confidence and certainty in terms of the expected results.

00:41:30:15 - 00:41:58:18

So we would welcome ongoing monitoring and adaptive management of construction process that recognizes changes as and when they happen to suggest and as, um, to suggest that, um, there is unlikely to be any adverse events on the visitor economy is is is not something that we can subscribe to at all.

00:42:00:00 - 00:42:00:18

Okay.

00:42:05:06 - 00:42:53:01

Thank you sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council just briefly, we would endorse those comments, though we also consider it somewhat of a concern that a quantitative assessment of accommodation that the applicant has undertaken has apparently not included as a measure, the cost of accommodation across the different types or indeed the knock on cost in terms of private rented sector accommodation, which is being drawn on as to if you have an influx of demand for that sector within that, what the consequences that are on that sector, which obviously serves not only the, um, needs of the tourism sector and also the needs of construction workers.

00:42:53:03 - 00:43:25:01

It also serves some of the local populace, so there's a wider community impact there. So yes, we would like more dialogue and discussion with the applicant, but in a sense, I think we need to see a bit more movement from the applicant and without banging your drum. Too much of a point I've been making during the course of today, you will have seen from part of the applicant's assessment in relation to the tourism issue. It is we haven't found any significant impacts. Therefore there's nothing to mitigate. That's the mindset we think needs to change.

00:43:25:19 - 00:43:26:04

Okay.

00:43:26:06 - 00:43:29:01

Thank you. And, uh, Fiona Gilmore.

00:43:33:14 - 00:43:34:03

Hello.

00:43:34:26 - 00:43:35:11

Hello.

00:43:35:13 - 00:43:36:13

Yes, hello.

00:43:36:15 - 00:43:44:13

Good afternoon. Um, my background is as a strategic advisor to governments all over the world on tourism and economic development.

00:43:44:15 - 00:43:45:20

And, um.

00:43:45:22 - 00:43:50:11

I'm most concerned that there is not a quantitative.

00:43:50:20 - 00:43:51:05

Up's.

00:43:51:07 - 00:44:21:07

Up to date attitudinal survey amongst regular visitors and first time visitors regarding these projects. The last one was in 2019. We cannot rely on this anecdotal evidence, and the idea that Hinkley Point is a benchmark is laughable. We cannot rely on that. Why is Hinkley Point not a benchmark one? It is only one energy project. It is not seven and two.

00:44:21:12 - 00:44:51:21

Hinkley point only has Quantock landscape near it, and that is not worth £693 million, which is what the annual revenue for coastal Suffolk was in the last year. So what we do need is we want DMO to sit down with National Grid, the applicant, and formulate two quantitative attitudinal surveys. And the second thing is that they need to do economic modelling on the forecast for the future.

00:44:51:23 - 00:45:25:23

I disagree with East Suffolk Council when they say that you can't quantify the impact. We believe you can. We've done it in other countries. What you have to do is know how many people will be deterred and you find that out from quantitative attitudinal surveys. So our recommendation please X is that you mandate a full location specific quantitative audit and that this project cannot proceed until we have a quantitative evaluation of this.

00:45:25:25 - 00:46:04:14

Because I want to just finish by saying the Suffolk coast is a brand and it is a fragile brand, and it is based on the proposition of tranquillity and nature heritage. And in 2025, research shows that 50% of our visitors are country loving traditionalists who are escaping from urban and industrial environments. So by failing to model this impact, we are in danger of ignoring a reputational brand tipping point that threatens 14,600 local jobs.

00:46:04:22 - 00:46:05:26

Thank you sir.

00:46:06:17 - 00:46:11:16

Thank you very much. Um, and I've got a councillor. Austin.

00:46:13:04 - 00:46:13:22

Hello.

00:46:13:24 - 00:46:16:22

Hi. Um, I'm Tricia Austin, I'm a councillor in.

00:46:16:24 - 00:46:18:02

Fenit, but I'm not speaking on.

00:46:18:04 - 00:46:58:19

Behalf of the council. I'm speaking on behalf of Ramsgate Town Team, which is a voluntary group concerned with the economic prosperity of Ramsgate and the surrounding area. And I'd like to agree wholeheartedly with the previous speaker in terms of the sort of visitors that we attract and the sorts of damage that these projects will, will do. One of the things that we had hoped out of this project are silver lining, if it's foisted upon us, is that we might actually get some employment for local workers. So I'm really concerned to hear these large numbers being projected of people who are going to be bussed in, brought in on the train, whatever, and require accommodation.

00:46:58:21 - 00:47:08:25

Obviously, we understand there's a lot of specialist workers who will need to come in, but we were also hoping that there might be some contribution to our local economy in terms of a few more jobs. Thank you.

00:47:08:27 - 00:47:12:21

Okay. Thank you. Uh, does the applicant want to come back on few of those points?

00:47:12:23 - 00:47:20:24

Thank you, Sara Shaikh. Um, for the applicant, I just come back on a few points and then see if anyone else in the team. I don't know, sir, if you wanted to take, um.

00:47:20:26 - 00:47:24:14

Yeah. Sorry. I didn't see that one. Mr. Mackey, do you want to make your point?

00:47:26:04 - 00:47:29:10

I want to put the microphone on the button on the front there. Yeah.

00:47:30:07 - 00:47:57:03

So if I may, the statement that the statement coming from the applicant that the assessment of the cost of rooms does not take account of the cost of hotels, so that the Brudenell Hotel on the front at Aldeburgh is, according to their assessments, suitable for the

00:47:58:18 - 00:48:43:11

skilled workers who will come and work. That project is, I'm afraid, an indication of yet another example which has been given to you on a plate of what appears to us to be a total failure to get to grips with the realities of what, in this case, the town of Aldeburgh is up to. When in 1919, when in 2019, at the Jubilee Hall, we were doing our stuff and one day we got a call from EDF and this is in 2019.

00:48:43:16 - 00:49:21:27

And we had a visit from people at EDF, including very senior people from France. And it turned out that what they were doing was making a good faith evaluation of the town. They were looking at the pressure points in the town and things of that kind. Now, I'd be the first to criticise some of what's happened since. But what then happened was they didn't even put in their application for a DCO until

May of 20. So there has been there was a proper getting to grips with what the problems of our town are.

00:49:22:21 - 00:50:09:22

The position is that we've had no. As far as I'm aware, until very recently, no dialogue as a community, but with the national grid. A national grid is to be commended for telling us on its website that quotes. We welcome the government's guidance on community benefits, which supports our view. That's National Grid's view that communities should be rewarded for hosting new transmission infrastructure. But there's been, so far as we're aware, no talk whatever of mitigation contribution or anything else, just them grinding on on the basis of the points they've been making about these surveys, uh, which we've sought to refute.

00:50:09:24 - 00:51:01:19

And when we sought to refute them, you get the situation which you get in the last round, where instead of points being addressed in reply, we simply get a reiteration, almost literal reiteration, of points that were made in the application itself. That is a little bit incoherent because I wasn't expecting it to come at this moment, but I do on behalf of the town, and I see the town council Express our very great concern about the abject lack of preparation for a project of this kind, which is going to so deeply affect the lives of many, many people, including large chunks of UN and underprivileged people who don't have an opportunity to present their cases in a form of this kind.

00:51:01:21 - 00:51:02:20

Thank you very much.

00:51:02:23 - 00:51:22:07

Okay. Thank you. So across to the applicant, particularly when you hear about some of the things that were mentioned, like the, um, attitudinal survey and uh, again, that point about um, any post consent monitoring and adaptive management to do with tourism and the impacts of that industry.

00:51:22:09 - 00:51:55:25

Thank you, Sarah, for the applicant. Um, just to pick up a couple of points. The first is that we have noted that East Suffolk Council are doing that, commissioning their own studies, and will, of course, take those into consideration once we have them. We also note that Suffolk haven't yet reviewed our surveys and studies, so we'll have to see what they say about them as well, whether they agree or disagree. Um, insofar as the monitoring is concerned, um, we, I believe, um, have told both these councils that we will be in touch to book a meeting to discuss monitoring.

00:51:56:00 - 00:52:18:27

Um, we haven't at the moment got any detail of what sort of monitoring? We've heard something today, obviously, but we haven't got any real understanding at the moment of what they would have in mind. Um, but we would want to sit down with them and work out what they think would be useful. Um, what sort of factors they'd take into account and how that would be done? Um, so I can't comment at the moment on adaptive management and so forth, but that's part of the discussion.

00:52:18:29 - 00:52:20:12

I think that discussions are taking.

00:52:20:14 - 00:52:26:13

Place now take place. Mhm. Um, I think that's all I can say. But if anyone's got anything else to add.

00:52:28:19 - 00:52:29:25

Go ahead Tom.

00:52:30:13 - 00:52:31:22

Thank you. Tom Bickford, on behalf.

00:52:31:24 - 00:52:32:09

Of the applicant.

00:52:32:11 - 00:53:09:10

Just to cover a couple of the points that were raised there around some of the kind of local jobs and skills and community benefit, um, as well. So, um, outside of examination, we have both of our two main works contractors, um, in contract, um, they have, uh, social value commitments that they are signed up to as part of those, uh, and of those, um, they include a commitment, um, to where they can, um, for source subcontractors, for local businesses. So where those services can be procured locally. So specialized services, obviously, you know, potentially including the kind of installation of the converter station and those specialized works wouldn't be applicable.

00:53:09:12 - 00:53:39:19

But the works that can be they are being encouraged contractually to place those locally. And we will be holding, uh, meet the buyer events in both Kent and Suffolk for local businesses to meet them to periodically when at the right times for those opportunities so those local companies can benefit. We obviously can't say at this stage what exactly they are, but that is something we are doing and normal practice as part of business is concerned and it's done on other projects. Okay. Um, in respect of community benefit, we I touched touched on it slightly in our response to written question one Gen four.

00:53:39:22 - 00:54:10:00

Um, so while government guidance clearly sets out that it's not a material consideration for DCO, nevertheless it's something we are looking at. Um, we are planning to consult with the local authorities and the community widely. Um, beyond those of just engaged in planning examination, um, this year to understand their key priorities. Uh, and from that, we will generate a list of priorities and assess kind of any applications that come in, um, against those. Um, I know that kind of drops into item 15.4, so I'm happy to discuss it a little bit later, if that's helpful.

00:54:10:02 - 00:54:10:21

Okay.

00:54:11:09 - 00:54:42:21

Um, just sorry, Dave, would you, on behalf of the applicant, just coming back to you on the survey point? Yes. Um, so we believe we've done a robust assessment with regards to surveys. I think they provide interesting insights, but they do face a number of challenges. So you do need to you need to

be very clear about the robustness about doing a survey. There's Particularly things around. Is it a representative sample? Danger of answering or asking leading questions? Consideration of the counterfactual. How you attribute impact.

00:54:43:06 - 00:54:57:20

Um, and then ability to apply an appropriate control area in comparison to the impact area. So there's a considerable amount of work that you would need to do to ensure the robustness of a primary research piece. Mhm.

00:54:58:01 - 00:55:01:05

Okay. And East Suffolk Council.

00:55:03:06 - 00:55:54:11

Thank you sir. Mark Smith for East Suffolk Council. Um just in terms of attitudinal surveys as mentioned by Mrs. Gilmore. Um, we accept their importance. Indeed. Um, we have commissioned alongside the accommodation Survey and Attitudinal Survey, and indeed it goes further than that, and I should say we'll be able to report on the first of those at deadline for. And it goes further than that. We we are putting in place a programme of attitudinal surveys, um, in the area because of the number of nips, um, in the locality, that will enable us to see the change in attitudes over time and then seek to react to those.

00:55:54:16 - 00:56:20:07

And that links back to the sort of monitoring and managing that we are hoping we can persuade the applicant to enter into. Now, can I just hand over, um, to Mr. Charlesworth, just to explain why there isn't any material difference between Mrs. Gilmore and ourselves? Um, she referred to some disagreement between themselves, but I don't think there is. In fact, Mr. Chilton.

00:56:20:10 - 00:56:56:19

Yes. Sam Charlesworth, on behalf of East Suffolk Council. Um, yeah. I don't think there was a disagreement between ourselves and, um, Mrs. Gilmore's, um, uh, response. Um, our our issue, I guess, is the council's issue with the applicant is that there's, uh, it is so difficult to predict or look forward and, um, based on current assessments. So hence the reason that we've commissioned a, um, a longitudinal visitor perception, um, study.

00:56:56:21 - 00:57:30:01

So baseline data is available now and, and should be submitted um, by deadline for. And we will be repeating that exercise over the course of the next 14 years. And to understand and and it will have to develop over time. But that will help us to understand, you know, the perceptions, the expectations and the expectations of visitors and where, um, rather whether we have met the expectations of visitors and to react accordingly.

00:57:30:03 - 00:57:41:06

The applicant makes a good point in that these attitudes and surveys need to be well constructed and and need to be, um.

00:57:43:13 - 00:57:55:15

Well thought out and developed and, um. Yes, developed. Um, um, appropriately. But, um, that's not, that's, that's something that we've already, um, taken into account.

00:57:57:05 - 00:58:47:15

Okay. Thank you. Well, it looks like there's going to be a nice amount of information coming in at the deadline for from everyone. So thank you very much. Um, a few questions I've got now for the, um, for the applicant, uh, based on what was submitted. So we had the submitted visitor and tourism assessment technical notes for both Suffolk and Kent, which I've mentioned before. Um, which included a review that was conducted into the various NIPS. Um, it stated at 3.4.4 of the Kent. Note, though it might be duplicated in both that the headline from the survey from the I think it was the Sizewell C survey was that the majority, which I think was 53% of respondents, said that the construction of Sizewell C would not make a difference to how they would visit, or they didn't know how it would affect them.

00:58:47:17 - 00:59:05:05

I think 8% of respondents said they were more likely to visit. But however, does that suggest that a the sizeable remaining percentage, which I think is something like 39%, um, maybe put off from returning if I from those results.

00:59:07:03 - 00:59:48:15

Which are on behalf of the applicant, um, in their conclusions. Um, so they said, um, there is limited empirical evidence that the project would lead to a quantifiable reduction of visitor numbers, a change in visitors behaviour, expenditure or business viability in the sector over and above the normal variation. The tourist economy is subject to substantial volatility year on year and is affected by externalities beyond the effects of size. We'll see. Um. In addition, the Hinkley Point monitoring concluded the same thing that there was no impacts or no material impacts in relation to visitor perception.

00:59:48:24 - 00:59:51:23

Indeed, I think they saw they suggested there was an upturn.

00:59:52:20 - 01:00:10:10

But on that on that survey for Sizewell C, it still suggests to me that even though the majority would still return, it still suggests that there's a sizable percentage that would think again when it comes to returning. Is that not right?

01:00:12:17 - 01:00:29:28

Dave, would you on behalf of the applicant? I mean, in terms of the conclusions that were reached, um, they said they concluded that there would be limited empirical evidence that the project would lead to a quantifiable reduction in visitor numbers. So I think our conclusion is that exactly, exactly what they've said themselves.

01:00:30:00 - 01:01:02:15

I'm just sort of pointing out that it does still suggest, even though the majority would still say, that they would return, that there is a still a percentage, um, and a significant percentage which would, which may be put off. Um, just following on from that, then, um, the survey related to Sizewell C, this

survey was related to sizeable sea. Since then, obviously we've got other developments which have been consented. Um, some have commenced since sizeable sea was proposed. And now we've got the proposed sea link and possibly lion link to follow.

01:01:03:07 - 01:01:13:16

Um, does the applicant think that if the survey was conducted again now, it would show that more people would be put off returning to this part of East Suffolk.

01:01:15:13 - 01:01:43:24

Which on behalf of the applicant, I think it's fair to say that whilst they undertook a survey, their ultimate conclusions. That was one factor in terms of how they determine their conclusions. I completely understand your point, but it's not the only. The survey was not the only consideration in terms of how they reached their conclusion. Um, in terms of whether the survey would come up with a different response, I think it's quite difficult to give you a response on that at this stage.

01:01:43:26 - 01:02:05:29

Yes. I think the point I'm making is that there's been other developments which will happen since and, um, it might be a change in picture since that survey because of the other developments which have followed. Um, but um, it would be interested to hear from, um, the councils on this and also I've got a few hands up. So if I go to, uh, Helen Johnson.

01:02:09:18 - 01:02:42:07

Thank you. Um. Yep. Helen Johnson, Valley district council. Um, just to say that we do note the applicant has undertaken their own review of the NIPS and their potential effects on tourism and visitor activity, and we consider the comparison with Sizewell C doesn't really reflect the position of the Sealink project, as it's located on the primary road network and one of the main routes into and out of Thanet. And so and also it's our main tourist destination, roads in and out. So this is the potential to deter visitors and create a negative perception of Thanet as a tourist destination, particularly when combined with additional construction traffic, which might be actual or perceived.

01:02:42:09 - 01:03:05:16

We've highlighted that in the sock, but just to highlight as well, that we were in the process of preparing the Stanhope Visitor Survey 2025, which form what we're just going to say that sorry, that actually one of the things that they found was overcrowding, traffic and parking issues were raised as concerns within that survey. So to think it's important to highlight on top of what's been spoken about already. Thank you.

01:03:05:22 - 01:03:11:29

Okay. And if there's any data from that that you think would help us as an examining authority, if that could be submitted, that would be very useful. Thank you very much.

01:03:12:01 - 01:03:12:23

Thank you.

01:03:13:03 - 01:03:15:00

Um, and at the Suffolk hub.

01:03:16:17 - 01:03:56:00

Uh, Charlotte Fox. Pendleton Stanfield Parish Council. I am speaking along the same lines as the last speaker, saying it's difficult to compare Hinkley Point to Sizewell C because Hinkley Point is accessed by its own road that sits 11km away from Bridgwater, the nearest town. The population in Bridgwater is 64,000. Sizewell is accessed by a constrained rural network that affects travel to all parts of East Suffolk, and the population of Leiston is 5000, so the population of Leiston is half the workforce of Sizewell C.

01:03:56:02 - 01:04:09:06

So we have a considerable problem with accommodation and I know people that have been displaced from their accommodation in favour of landlords, preferring the rent that they get from Sizewell C workers.

01:04:10:22 - 01:04:25:21

Okay. Thank you. I should say we are aware as well of some of the differences between Hinkley and and the size of the location also. Um, and uh, next I have, um, Fiona Gilmour.

01:04:29:20 - 01:04:30:13

Uh, thank.

01:04:30:15 - 01:05:04:20

You, sir. You raised a very good point, which is whether these other projects would have any impact on the Sizewell C survey that's already conducted. That is precisely why we're recommending a quantitative surveys conducted now to take into account all those projects. And it's too late to do surveys in a year's time. Two years time, three years time. Once consent is given to all these projects, yes, you're going to discover exactly what we've been talking about. But it'll be too late because the area will be blighted permanently.

01:05:04:22 - 01:05:29:10

That is why we are strongly urging you and National Grid to work with the DMO, and to do a very carefully thought through so that National Grid's happy with it. You're happy with it as well as the demo. So we can all with the councils look at this quantitative data and say, yes, this is valid research. Thank you.

01:05:29:17 - 01:05:36:05

Thank you. Um, I just got one last, uh, time for one last, last comment. Councillor wing.

01:05:37:15 - 01:05:38:04

Thank you.

01:05:38:06 - 01:05:38:22

I'd like.

01:05:38:24 - 01:05:39:23

To echo the the.

01:05:39:25 - 01:05:40:10

Words.

01:05:40:12 - 01:06:08:13

From the TDC officer, but I live in Ramsgate. One of the things we're worried about is, is the 360,000 tonnes of aggregate that will need to be transported from the port to the Minster Marshes site. Uh, we have a and we have a massive issue if the tunnel is shut. There are issues with the tunnel. The tunnel needs £6 million spending on it, according to KCC. Sadly, they're not here to answer these questions. But when that tunnel.

01:06:12:24 - 01:06:15:21

And if you can still hear me. But you've just frozen. Cancel the wing.

01:06:27:06 - 01:06:28:00

Okay.

01:06:30:03 - 01:06:33:03

So I think we just need to move on. But I think.

01:06:34:10 - 01:07:04:11

It goes to a very. It goes. It goes along a very tiny, uh, road past the harbour and then out on, on on another road through the town centre. And we're also worried about we have issues with accommodation in Senate, the lack of rented accommodation. Now, we already house quite a lot of wind farm workers, and the loss of the loss of the impact on Pequot Bay and Cliffs End, and also the loss of the the hover pool as areas of recreation is very, very worrying for residents. Thank you.

01:07:04:13 - 01:07:06:29

Okay, so we did actually lose you for a couple of seconds in the middle.

01:07:07:04 - 01:07:12:12

I know I tried to get back in, uh, okay, but sorry about that. Thank you.

01:07:13:08 - 01:07:34:19

Um, so I think, uh, on that topic. Um, both from the applicant side and the council side and the hopefully we'll get some more information at, um, deadline for and we can move on from there because, um, obviously there's still some, some questions and issues there which we would like to address. And, um.

01:07:37:27 - 01:08:09:21

If I could move on to the more the economic side of things. Um, the applicant has said that they do not intend to submit a skills and employment plan. However, paragraph 5.13 .12 of the 2025 NPS, N1 National policy states that the Secretary of State may wish to include a requirement that specifies the approval by the local authority of an employment and skills plan, detail and arrangements to promote local employment and skills development opportunities.

01:08:09:23 - 01:08:14:01

Why does the applicant believe such a requirement would not be appropriate for this proposal?

01:08:15:17 - 01:08:49:25

Would you, on behalf of the applicant? Um, so the applicant hasn't committed to preparing and implementing a specific employment, skills and employment education strategy at a project level? It's not considered to be an efficient approach given the total number of construction workers anticipated, and also given there's no likely significant effects identified in relation to construction employment. Um, just reiterating, obviously, the average construction worker workforce required for the Suffolk and Kent onshore schemes is 86 and 67 FTE per annum, respectively.

01:08:50:11 - 01:09:18:22

Um, when considering the scale of employment here in the context of the applicant's wider projects in the region, the applicant believes there could be a more effective approach to leveraging benefits outside of the DCO. The applicant is therefore committed to exploring opportunities for regional interventions in skills and employment. Um, The applicant is already looking at understanding the regional scale of labor and skills demand in the region in order to develop more sustainable interventions in this regard.

01:09:18:29 - 01:10:02:15

Okay. Just a couple of points. First of all, the within the NPS, it doesn't sort of mention the threshold that there has to be some sort of level of adverse impact before a skills and employment plan would be required. Um, and it doesn't sort of mention anything to do with the scale of development. Um, so do you nonetheless, do you feel that in this situation because the scale. So it's essentially the scale of the development and the fact that there's no significant, um, adverse impacts, particularly with the isthe there the reasons why you don't want to come forward with that.

01:10:03:04 - 01:10:15:24

Would you, on behalf of the applicant? Yes. That's correct. However, as we said outside of the DCO, the applicant is committed to exploring opportunities for regional interventions and skills and employment. In addition to that, um,

01:10:17:17 - 01:10:22:16

I'll just pass on to my colleague to maybe touch on the community benefit fund.

01:10:22:18 - 01:10:23:03

Well.

01:10:23:14 - 01:10:23:29

Sorry.

01:10:24:01 - 01:10:38:20

Sorry. Before you do. I'm just wondering, um, those things that you mentioned about those regional benefits. Why couldn't they be part of a skills and employment plan if you're doing that sort of work anyway? Wouldn't that just be something that could be wrapped up in such a document?

01:10:38:22 - 01:10:52:11

So Sara Shaikh for the applicant, that's exactly where I was just going to go. I think bearing that in mind and thinking it through, um, I think we can take that away and, um, reflect on that point in the light of, um, what you've just said and what was going through our minds as well.

01:10:52:13 - 01:11:05:08

Okay. Very useful. Thank you very much. Um, in that case, I want to ask any more questions about that. I think if we could have, uh, maybe either it submitted deadline for some sort of update about when something like that would be submitted. That would be very useful.

01:11:08:04 - 01:11:13:08

Um, there is a couple of hands up here. Uh, first of all, uh, Helen Johnson.

01:11:16:10 - 01:11:42:18

Johnson county district council. Um, just to say we would welcome a skills and employment plan, but we wonder whether you could also they could also include the applicant could also incorporate, um, a plan with regards to local education strategy and local education providers. I think that quite a good opportunity to catch all in that. And the site would provide a lot of opportunities beyond the the employment that's already been spoken about. I think there's a lot more educational opportunities available. So we would welcome that if the applicant would consider that. Thank you.

01:11:42:25 - 01:11:49:10

Okay. Thank you. And I'll just go to, uh, counselor, uh, Austin before I'll come back to the applicant then.

01:11:51:14 - 01:12:22:20

Thank you, sir. And can I back up what Miss Johnson just said? Um, I as I said before, I'm not speaking on behalf of the council, but I am somebody who's worked in skills and training and all my life. And this is an opportunity for an area like planet which has poor levels of education and where many people have not had the opportunities. If we are going to be working in this way, if we are going to be pushed into having these developments, then the least we can expect in terms of community benefit is that we can help to skill up some of our population.

01:12:22:22 - 01:12:23:15

Thank you.

01:12:23:27 - 01:12:26:05

Okay. Thank you. Okay, good.

01:12:26:14 - 01:13:09:18

So can I just indicate from Suffolk County Council's, uh, perspective? Obviously we welcome, uh, the indication from the applicant that it's heard and sense. What? Certainly you have been saying, sir, and reference to the MPs and that it will take that away to look at how it can, uh, um, bring forward what it's already claiming, as it were, are the beneficial aspects of its proposals, but it can translate those, as it were, Nonbinding commitments that it's made reference to into something which would be a secured document, which would be something like a skills and employment.

01:13:09:20 - 01:13:43:12

Yes, um, strategy. And that's obviously something that we've been raising several times in our local, uh, impact report and subsequent representations. Could I just, um, bring in, please? Briefly. Um, uh, the council's, uh, skills for infrastructure strategic lead. That's miss Natalie Mills. Um, just in case there are any particular comments she wants to make in the light of what she's heard. But obviously, I say the starting point is we welcome what seems to be a move of position by the applicant towards what we've been talking about.

01:13:43:18 - 01:13:44:03

Okay.

01:13:44:27 - 01:13:49:27

Thank you. Um, yeah. Natalie Mills, Suffolk County Council. Uh, just to say.

01:13:49:29 - 01:14:25:10

That we would be incredibly supportive of having that skills and employment plan. Um, and agree with the points about, um, the scale, meaning that it would still be a worthwhile endeavour, and particularly with the specialist skill shortages and the requirements for the project. And not just this project, but all of the, um, different Nips that are in this region. Obviously it's very, um, heavily concentrated. Um, we do have a sensitive labour market, and we feel that this would be a really positive way forward to help to support that.

01:14:26:02 - 01:14:52:18

Okay. Thank you. Um, what I would say is, um, in the production of a draft, I think it'd be good to have engagement with the councils. Um, the education aspect, as they were talking about, I suppose that could come under the skills, um, part of things. And, uh. Yeah, I think that would be very useful. Thank you very much. Um, and, uh, uh, Fiona Gilmore.

01:14:56:08 - 01:14:56:23

Uh.

01:14:57:10 - 01:15:41:05

The benefits discussion, of course, is much wider than just skills. And it comes back to what is the loss that we are quantifying over 10 to 12 years of construction in this area of seven energy projects. Now, our quantification of that loss is up to half a billion sterling. What I'd like to know is, how do developers propose on compensating small businesses and medium sized businesses in coastal Suffolk for closures, the loss of their jobs? How is that going to be, if you like, compensated and that discussion has never taken place? Thank you sir.

01:15:41:18 - 01:15:49:09

Okay. Um, yes. If you if the applicant would like to make some brief comments on that before we move on from this topic.

01:16:04:03 - 01:16:06:19

I think we'll just take that away and come back.

01:16:06:21 - 01:16:35:06

Okay. Thank you very much. Um, in that case, I will close that item and move on to item 16. Um, where I want to just raise some questions. This is health and wellbeing. Um, I've just got a few questions left. Um, what will be the end of the day? And, uh, it's to do with the poor working hours.

01:17:00:21 - 01:17:31:09

Okay, so, um, for this topic, uh, I want to discuss the matter of the proposed core working hours, uh, which are for most, most construction activities that may take place between, uh, 7 a.m. 7 p.m., Monday to Friday, or between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. on Saturdays, Sundays and bank holidays. So these are known as the core working hours. That is, unless otherwise approved by the relevant planning authority. Uh, this is an issue that's been raised by people and organizations.

01:17:31:11 - 01:18:13:07

And to be honest, it goes beyond just health and well-being. It also transfers into topics like noise and traffic, etc.. Um, so just a couple of points on this, um, the examiner authority acknowledged that there that if there was more of a restriction on, on work on, say, Saturday evenings and Sundays, then that would stretch the construction period. We understand that. However, requirement seven of the draft DCO already allows for some work outside of these core hours, and there is also the facility for the relevant planning authority to allow for work outside of those hours, again, for any other sort of construction work.

01:18:13:25 - 01:18:41:04

Um, as such, even if the core hours were restricted following, uh, further than currently proposed, um, could the applicant still be able to do the works necessary? Um, out when it comes to being able to use that facility of requiring the council for permission to do those works if and when necessary, thereby maybe potentially minimising the additional construction duration.

01:18:41:14 - 01:18:46:07

So for the applicant, um, so I'm going to ask Mr. Buckley to deal with that specifically. Okay.

01:18:47:04 - 01:19:26:26

James Buckley, on behalf of the applicant, um, the difficulty that we would see in taking away these core hours and putting them into that sort of process would be the time that it would take to get permission to carry out that work. Mhm. The dynamic element of the program, the flexibility of the program, uh, to work around some of the local constraints, some of the other Nsic projects, without that as a, as a flexibility, having to go back every time through a process that would potentially take a couple of weeks and months to say, we need to work these hours, why do you need to work these hours? That would then have the effect on the program that we're trying to avoid.

01:19:27:06 - 01:19:42:19

Mhm. But it's it's a better situation than just restricting like restricting the hours completely. It does give that provision for other works take place. If that can be programmed in uh maybe some way in advance.

01:19:42:21 - 01:20:14:21

It does. But what we have already committed to is restricting HGV movements, restricting pilot movements on weekends. We are not asking to work every single weekend, every single bank holiday. Um, we are looking for the, uh, the core hours as they are on every National Grid project to allow us to have the flexibility to meet the program demands. Um, and obviously, we put down the potential impacts in the response to your question of extending the program by up to six months. Um, by restricting the hours.

01:20:15:01 - 01:20:33:09

And can I come to the councils on that particular point? Um, about the fact that if it was left to a situation for councils to agree to any works outside of more restrictive core hours, then that would reduce the flexibility and could take a lot of time. So.

01:20:35:05 - 01:21:06:03

Well, if I go first, I'm sure Mr. Westmoreland Smith has got some comments on the point to sir. It's, uh, Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. The issue is obviously one of Balance with all of these things. But the purpose of, uh, the, um. Restrictions on working hours, uh, are clearly, uh, to, uh, um, reduce the impacts on the local communities.

01:21:06:16 - 01:21:57:08

Uh, as proposed by the applicant, there is no real respite to local communities, whereas the more restricted core hours that the local authorities wish to see will provide periods of respite. We recognize that there will be some circumstances where there will be operational reasons why it's not appropriate to adhere to those restrictions, but this is if I put it in very simple terms. This is a massive project with a massive amount of project management going with it, and we don't think that it is beyond the wit of competent project managers to Anticipate when particular elements become critical elements, and therefore need to be potentially the subject of a departure from the norm.

01:21:57:19 - 01:22:35:24

And obviously, yes, every restriction is in one sense a reduction in flexibility. But it's a question of why are you doing it? And therefore is there a good justification for doing it? And we think in the point of providing respite to the community, there is a good justification. Could I just add two points which relate in part, I think, to the answers that have been given to iron 49, which is the applicant's response to sorry one Jen 49, in your first round of written questions, which bear on this point, and the applicant has sought in part to make two points.

01:22:35:27 - 01:23:06:17

One is they say there is a criticality to hitting the 2030 deadline, which means that, um, temporarily, they can't afford to allow for any slippage in their timetable. And the second is that if they were to slip in their timetable, there is a question of constraint costs through the payments that are made to others who could otherwise use their system, but it's not available and just on those on the first point. And it may be a pedantic point, but it's a point that we would still welcome some clarification on and we haven't seen it.

01:23:06:19 - 01:23:49:26

I think so thus far in what the applicant has provided at the moment in the project description, it still proceeds on the assumption that the development consent order will be made at the end of quarter

two, 2026, at which I think we all agree is not correct. What is not clear is if you put in a more realistic date for the likely date of the development consent order, what impact that has on the project, because you've got a series of timelines and a series of bars, but it's not articulated as to what if you took a more realistic date, which presumably would be at the end of quarter four of 2026.

01:23:49:28 - 01:24:25:06

What effect that would have on the other steps in the sequence. But we think that it's likely that it means that effectively, the 2030 date for energyization of the scheme is not realistically achievable in any event. But we would welcome some clarification on that point. The second point, just to point on the constraint costs as we understand it. That's a reference to some figures in the Niso report on um, uh, achieving uh, 2030.

01:24:25:16 - 01:25:02:07

Uh, but obviously what the applicant has done, uh, is present some figures we haven't seen where the arithmetic that leads to those conclusions that whether it's 33 weeks, it equals so many million pounds, it would be very helpful if the applicant could provide a supplementary note, probably at deadline four, which just explains the working of how they've achieved those figures. And the last point we would just make is that in any event, they presented you with a global figure to all consumers. Obviously, it goes to individual consumers bills, and I'm sure each of us as individuals don't like the idea of our bills going up.

01:25:02:09 - 01:25:32:08

But the in terms of a point that we've sometimes made in these DCO contexts, there is a balance between, as it were, national gain and local pain. And it's a relevant factor that this burden is being imposed on the local communities of Suffolk. And when you're then looking at, well, what are the costs? Those constraint costs ought to be, as it were, capitalised to per capita, rather than just the global figure that the applicant is given. Thank you.

01:25:32:10 - 01:25:33:21

Sad. Okay.

01:25:33:24 - 01:25:38:19

Thank you. Um, and there's a hand up in the Suffolk hub.

01:25:40:04 - 01:26:15:27

Um, Charlotte Fox, Doctor Charlotte Fox, in fact, Ben Stanfield Parish Council and also East Suffolk community's energy partnership. Um, I don't specifically want to talk about core working working hours or noise and light pollution or traffic disruption, because to me, mental health and well-being cannot be reduced to a discussion about these simple things. Indeed, mental health and well-being is a highly complex issue that relates to where people sit on the mental health continuum, and it's well recognized that the overriding factor pushing people towards the wrong end of the mental health continuum is stress.

01:26:16:05 - 01:26:48:28

We've talked a lot about planning implications with regard to environmental and animal populations, but we're missing the elephant in the room here in relation to what is happening to the human

population in East Suffolk. The stress being caused by concurrent development of so much infrastructure in East Suffolk is already impacting both our physical and mental health, but the applicant has not carried out a specialised mental health and wellbeing assessment that properly addresses what is happening to our local community in the face of such unprecedented cumulative impacts.

01:26:49:00 - 01:27:30:01

Instead, it has carried out an extremely narrow assessment in isolation and has described impacts as not being significant. It also cites health and Wellbeing document app 058 as rebuttal of relevant representation challenges to that very same document. At what point does the human impact of our infrastructure burden progress to health issues that reduce our life expectancy? Several of my colleagues have suffered strokes recently that might possibly be related to infrastructure strain, and there have already been a couple of suicides locally that have been attributed in part to infrastructure imposition.

01:27:30:03 - 01:28:02:02

How do we stop more of these events happening? Working hours, local disruption and noise and light pollution obviously need to be addressed, but the only thing that will really help reduce our stress levels and protect our mental and physical health is to address the cumulative impacts of the disproportionate and unreasonable infrastructure burden being faced by our local community at the moment. Infrastructure development should not be allowed to proceed at the expense of the health and wellbeing of the local community.

01:28:02:04 - 01:28:32:28

And if we carry on imposing more and more major infrastructure right next to the local population, we risk paying too high a human price tag. Can the applicant reassure us that it will address this important issue in the context of all the other assets being proposed for development in this tiny area, and acknowledge that if suitable balance cannot be achieved, then a less harmful site for Sealink will have to be identified, thankfully.

01:28:33:16 - 01:28:48:01

Okay. Thank you. And also just to mention, I think cumulative impact will be now discussed tomorrow morning. Um, so I think we think we could maybe discuss more of that matter then. Um, East Suffolk Council.

01:28:49:16 - 01:29:20:00

Uh, thank you, sir. Mark Smith for East Suffolk Council. Um, this is a key point, but I will be, um, very brief, uh, for two reasons. One, uh, you're well aware of our position. Um, it's summarized in our pads. Rep 3080, pages 29 to 30. And secondly, um, Mr. Bedford has made a number of the points that I would have wished to have made.

01:29:20:02 - 01:30:07:02

So I gratefully adopt his, uh, submissions. I just say that it is a matter of balance, and it's important to note there is an existing, uh, balance in the local area. There are currently consented projects being built out and their core working hours do provide some respite. They don't seek to be across and they aren't across seven days a week. These proposals obviously do propose at the moment core working

hours seven for seven days, and that would upset the existing balance in an area where residents are having to live alongside numerous major construction projects.

01:30:07:09 - 01:30:49:14

And can I then just pick up a point that Mr. Bedford made about timetable and the 2030 ambition? The other way the applicant has sought to justify the core working hours is, relatedly, the what they described as critical need for this um, proposal and putting aside any debate about need as a separate topic, and assuming that need is demonstrated here, that is simply not a good enough reason for core working hours that extend across all seven days of the week.

01:30:49:18 - 01:31:36:16

Why? Because if you look, for example, in NPS, n1, which establishes a general need for energy type projects, it also goes on to require mitigations. And for example, if you take noise as a subject and look at the Secretary of State decision making advice. So this is paragraph 5.1 5.17. It says that development consent should not be granted unless the Secretary of State is satisfied that the proposals meet certain aims through effective management and control of noise, and that includes avoiding significant adverse effects.

01:31:36:18 - 01:32:10:03

But more pertinently for this point, mitigating and minimizing other adverse effects on health and quality of life. So it's not good enough just simply to point to need. You have to, by means of national policy, go on and mitigate and minimize and a reduced core working hours that provides some respite, that sinks with other projects in the area is extremely important mitigation in our view.

01:32:10:21 - 01:32:11:20

Thank you. Okay.

01:32:11:22 - 01:32:15:06

Thank you very much. And, uh, Helen Johnson.

01:32:18:04 - 01:32:53:23

Thank you. And we've made our position clear on this matter within our local impact report and our comments within the Statement of Common Ground. But we would just comment that we do agree with the with the points made by Suffolk County Council with regards to the respite with the seven days a week, and due to the duration of the construction period, um, over a number of years. I think that's really important that for the local community to enjoy, especially where that area is. And we have um, recreation areas as well, but they have an opportunity to enjoy those spaces as well during that period. And we'd also highlight that there's been no assessment of the impact of construction over Sundays and bank holidays.

01:32:53:25 - 01:33:29:18

And obviously we have, um, peak periods within our network and our economy being heavily reliant on tourism means at certain times, particularly bank holidays and weekends. Um, you know, congestion reaches, um, quite extraordinary levels. Um, with regards to the point made, um, about the weekend and bank holiday working being sort of more sporadic, our concern would be that there would be no control over that. So whilst there's goodwill, you know, in the beginning and that's what's

being proposed now, the councils would have no control over work on Sundays or bank holidays if that wasn't restricted in some way.

01:33:29:29 - 01:33:30:22

Thank you.

01:33:31:07 - 01:34:02:10

Okay. Thank you. Um, I just want to ask one more question before I'll just come back, because it's linked very much with what was said there. Um, so for the applicant, um, for both Kent. Well, East Kent and East Suffolk, these are tourism areas. Um, bank holidays are important to the UK tourism industry, particularly in the summer months. I think there's only around five bank holidays if you include Easter. Um, throughout the summer months. Um, outside of winter time.

01:34:02:23 - 01:34:23:13

Um, given that you're only talking about maybe five days, and given the importance of tourism in these areas and, and also for people's wellbeing and enjoying some rest and relaxation time on bank holidays. Um, could proposed work on bank holidays be omitted without significant impact to the construction programme?

01:34:24:19 - 01:34:55:12

Uh, James Barclay, on behalf of the applicant. Um, we had considered this, um, as part of the last round of questions. And yes, you wouldn't expect us to work. Christmas and New Year. However, we are working near Network Rail assets. Network rail positions are often over Christmas and bank holidays because of less use on the network. So we didn't exclude bank holidays because of that. We have Network Rail processions in Kent to put the overhead lines in and use the level crossing, and we have the conversation around the whole bridge.

01:34:55:26 - 01:35:16:20

Um, which is why, um, we haven't excluded bank holidays. Again, I don't want to work a bank holiday. Not many of my staff want to work bank holidays. So the intention is not to work bank holidays. Yes, but we do need that flexibility, as I say with the programme, to be able to do certain works around, um, certain times.

01:35:16:22 - 01:35:41:14

But again, if that's such a relatively infrequent and something that you could, I would imagine you would have to program in, wouldn't that be a situation where, um, you could have it so there's no work and bank holidays except for when agreed upfront with the local council to allow you to do those works where the council, when you can convince the council it's necessary to do them. Then.

01:35:41:27 - 01:35:46:06

Uh, James Booker, on behalf of the applicant, I'll have to take that one away and confer with the rest of the team.

01:35:46:08 - 01:35:52:06

Okay. Thank you. Um. And, uh. Yes, please. Burton.

01:35:52:14 - 01:36:30:21

Thank you, sir James Burton, on behalf of seas. Uh, sir, we endorse, um, uh, gratefully endorse everything said by Mr. Bedford KC and Mr. Westmoreland Smith KC. Um, only this, um, of course, the applicant's criticality point on which it relies for this and others, as Mr. Burton has said, comes ultimately from the Niso Clean Power 2030 report, as you know. Um, could I just, um, perhaps just draw attention to, uh, I'm sure you've seen it, but there's been so much, um, our rebuttal to the applicant's response to your question.

01:36:30:23 - 01:37:03:00

I, Gen 49, which causes at the heart of this, this issue. And that's, um. Rep 3144 where we do actually do, um, I was going to say a deep dive. It's really a shallow dive, actually, into the annex to, um, um, Clean Power 2030, just to show that, of course, the reason that Niso say this project is critical has, um, largely dropped away. I mean, I quote required for connection of five estuaries and firm connection of Grampian extension. And there's another bit that's less obvious, but we deal with two.

01:37:03:02 - 01:37:06:05

But it's not the case. Um thank you sir.

01:37:06:07 - 01:37:07:26

Okay Mr. Mani.

01:37:08:20 - 01:37:40:05

Yes. Michael Mani for Friston Parish Council. Uh, I also very much agree and I welcome the comments of Michael Bedford KC and, um, and his Suffolk Council. I just make a few points. Um, and I acknowledge there's been some change for the National grid. Works acknowledged that there are a detailed point in that which I'll deal with tomorrow, but I think we need to remember on this there's all the 7 to 7 weekday hours and 7 to 1 on Saturdays. They all are already very extensive hours in terms of impact on the local communities at that point needs to be taken into account.

01:37:40:07 - 01:38:15:00

I also very much agree with Mr. Bedford in relation to project management and workforce management. I think this is a classic issue for better workforce management, and I would have thought there are significant savings to be made because premium rates will be paid on Sundays and bank holidays in particular. So there would be savings by not having those dates. Um, so I just from practical experience, I mean, some of us are already living with the works going on from Scottish Power, and even if there aren't piling works or HGV movements, there has been a constant low rumble during the summer months and worse, very piercing reversing alarm.

01:38:15:02 - 01:38:28:15

So, you know, this is not a this is a real point. It is severely impacting people. satyrs aren't great. I mean, we argued at the time, that should be weekdays, but 7 to 7 and 7 to 1. They are extensive hours already. Thank you.

01:38:28:17 - 01:38:36:11

Thank you and good time for one more, more question, Geraldine Parker Baker. So I can't quite read it.

01:38:37:10 - 01:39:09:09

Sorry. Good. Yes. It's Geraldine Barker from Saxmundham town Council. I, I, I commend the comments from Mr. Bedford also. Um I have a point. Um, the quantity of, uh, thumb the national grid, uh, actually put on to the damage that would be caused by not working on Saturdays and Sundays. Um, obviously saying this will go and then go on to customers bills eventually.

01:39:09:20 - 01:39:52:19

Exactly how much per head would that be? Are we talking a pound a year? Are we talking Are we doing £100 a year? I think this has to be put in perspective. Um, and the other thing I need to say is it is not only the, uh, Mr. Michael Mahoney said the actual construction vehicles, it's the traffic that is coming on a Sunday. We all suffer in Saxmundham from traffic, the ones that live along the major routes, which is B1 1119 and the double one, two one, as we talked about earlier, that go through the town, which are particularly congested.

01:39:52:21 - 01:40:23:25

We have already suffered a 20% increase of traffic coming through early in the morning. Um, for workers going to Sizewell. Um, it will be it will affect just more than the people that are right on the doorstep. It affects everybody. So there is an effect from traffic. It's an increased traffic, shall we say. Sundays is the only morning where you might be able to have a little sleep in the morning without being woken up at seven.

01:40:23:27 - 01:41:02:27

And we also should think about that. We might have working hours 7 to 7, but you've got to remember that there also have an hour each side to start up and to finish for arriving and finishing. Now this could actually result in cranes being assembled, ready to work at 7:00 in the morning, and noisy works. So the whole thing is wrong because of the proximity of this project to a very to to the, to Friston, to Bennell, to Stanfield and to Saxmundham.

01:41:02:29 - 01:41:11:21

It is very, very close and therefore hours on Sunday should be stopped. Thank you. Sorry.

01:41:12:04 - 01:41:51:09

Oh no. Thank you. Thank you very much. Um, what I'd say is there's there's quite a lot there for the applicant as well. Um, so rather than getting you to respond now, if you could put that in your response, um, post your response for deadline for that would be very useful. Um, and, um, that's all the questions I've got on that particular subject, other than I was going to ask. And again, you don't have to respond now. Um, but, um, considering the time of day and everything, but I was going to ask the councils whether there is any particular concern with regard to light pollution from a mental health perspective.

01:41:51:20 - 01:41:52:11

Um,

01:41:53:29 - 01:42:14:18

that you can let us know about. There's a lot of talk about light in regards to ecology and suchlike. Um, but that would be good to know. And if anyone else wants to comment on on light pollution, I know a lot of people have, but I particularly would like to hear the council's opinion on that one. Um, by deadline for if possible. Um.

01:42:17:15 - 01:42:50:04

So that's all I've got. And I think it's time for the end of the, uh, hearing today. So it's been a long day. So, uh, so we've concluded our agenda for today. Um, I remind you that the timetable for this examination requires that all parties providing post hearing documents on or before the deadline for which is Tuesday, the 10th of February 26. Uh, may I also remind you that the recording of this hearing will be placed on the inspectorate website as soon as practicable after this hearing.

01:42:50:21 - 01:43:07:14

Um, so before we adjourn, just like to say thank you to all the participants today, um, for the time and assistance. Uh, the time is now 523. And this issue specific hearing for the proposed ceiling project is adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning. Thank you.