

# East Anglia\_ISH2\_2ndDec\_Session 1

Thu, 12/3 12:06PM • 1:29:32

00:06

Good morning and welcome everybody to issue specific hearings number two for East Anglia, North and East Anglia to offshore wind farms.

00:18

Before we introduce ourselves and commence this IP sets pet set of hearings, I'll just deal with a few preliminary matters. Can I check with the case team that you can hear me, and that the recordings and live streams have now started?

00:36

I couldn't confirm we can hear and see you and the recordings in livestream have started. Thank you very much. Let's hope well, so, two introductions. My name is Rynd Smith. I am lead member of a panel which is the examining authority for East Anglia one North offshore wind farm, an application and have another panel which is the examining authority for the East Anglia to offshore wind farm region. Both panels are made up of the same members, and both are sitting together. This hearing is

01:09

onshore site, design and construction issues. Today, we will focus on context and strategic issues in a nutshell, reviewing applicable policy and related matters, as we have a policy framework, important elements of which are under review as we speak. And we will also be asking how the land for cable corridors and transmission system connection points were chosen.

01:39

Tomorrow, we're going to move into a more local localised and detailed set of issues around the siting of individual elements of the proposed developments. Engaging in the detail of design and impact mitigation, and whether design and impact mitigation are satisfactory responses to the setting in which they find themselves.

02:00

I will be in the chair today and my colleague, Mr. JOHN Hockley will be in the chair tomorrow.

02:08

I'm now going to ask my fellow panel members to introduce themselves starting with Mr. Hockley.

02:14

Good morning everybody. My name is John Hockley. I'm a member of these panels. And after introductions, I will be chairing the main elements of this hearing tomorrow. Thank you.

02:29

Come on now invite Caroline Jones to introduce yourself.

02:35

Good morning everyone. My name is Caroline Jones, also a panel member and I will be mainly observing and taking notes in this hearing, but may ask questions today if they arise.

02:46

Good morning, everybody. My name is Jessica Powis. I'm also a panel member and I'll mainly be observing and taking notes today.

02:56

Hello, everyone. I'm Guy Rigby, also a panel member and are mainly be observing and taking notes in this hearing. And if I've got questions, I may ask them also as they arise. Thank you.

03:11

Thank you very much, Mr. Rigby. If I could also just reintroduce our planning Inspectorate colleagues working with us on these examinations, some of you who you will have spoken to already, and Emre Williams as a case manager leading the planning Inspectorate case team for these applications. He led the arrangement to conference and is managing the team today. He's accompanied today by three colleagues, Kj Johansen, Caroline Hopewell and to make a whole. Shortly I'll be running through our list of participants and ask them to confirm who will be leading their contributions this morning. Before I do just a few things to note, as I'm sure you'll be aware, today's hearing is being live streamed and recorded. The recordings that we make are retained and published. And therefore they form a public record that can contain your personal information, and to which the general data protection regulation applies. Does anybody have any questions about the terms on which our digital recordings are made?

04:06

Okay, I'm not seeing any raised hands or hearing anybody. So we'll move forward on the basis that this is all understood. Thank you,

04:14

Tony, for this meeting, excuse me in a moment.

04:18

Mr. Hockley, we do actually have a telephone call waiting in the lobby. And I think before we get too much further on in introductions, it would be useful to actually have that person admitted so that they can then be drawn in and hear the rest of the opening remarks. So could I ask for the person who's waiting in the lobby to be admitted please? Mr. Smith, I think what we're asking is for a member of our case team to call that person back and for them to be admitted that way. Excellent. No, that that that makes eminent sense. Okay. Apologies for the interruption. Mr. Hockley. Thank you, Mr. Smith, and thank you, Mrs. Powis.

04:55

Okay, so turning to this morning's meeting. I'll now ask the participants to introduce your

05:00

themselves. If organisations attending today have a number of representatives attending, could I ask that you nominate a lead representative to introduce your team on behalf of your organisation? Because I know that for a number of organisations here today we'll have several different individuals that may wish to contribute during the course of the proceedings. So firstly could have checked the neighbour domain speaker that we have representing the applicants today, please.

05:25

Thank you, sir. Good morning. My name is Colin Innes, and I'm a partner with the law firm shafter Wedderburn, I'm instructed by the applicants in respect of the hearings both today and tomorrow. And I'm instructed by Fennec oil of SPR legal. In terms of introductions, again, what I propose to do is perhaps see who's likely to be speaking this morning, and probably introduce the second team as it were, later on. Otherwise, it becomes a rather long list. And perhaps people forget who's who the people are. In terms of like the speakers this morning, I've got Paolo pezula, who is the technical director for offshore wind at rather scheming and project director of for EIA, in respect to both projects. He gave evidence yesterday before you we also have Brian McCandless back again, and he is the Senior Project Manager and will be the and as the offshore consensus manager for East Anglia two and he's staying via one north and he's responsible for the interface between engineering, environmental and consenting and as and is placing with a lot of external organisations as well.

06:35

As well as those two project individuals. We've also got a technical specialists on the electrical side which given the agenda we thought it was appropriate to bring. The first is to meet shatters who is a principal engineering manager with scottishpower renewables offshore engineering. He responsible for engineering management of the projects. He's had a dedicated career in New Moon bioenergy, and has been with the patroller group for more than 15 years in the technical development and construction of onshore and offshore wind farms across Europe.

07:14

I also have Gavin green, and he is the engineering department manager with Scottish powers renewables offshore engineering department. He is responsible for the cross project engineering design and management across the Iberdrola scottishpower Global portfolio of offshore projects. And he's previously been responsible for scottishpower electrical grid department got over 23 years experience in the power sector, and also is involved in a number of cross industry technical working groups, including initial drafting of the European HVDC grid code, the offshore wind accelerator grid group, and off jam expert working groups relating to the UK ofto regime.

07:56

And those are likely to be the key speakers this morning. And there's likely to be further speakers this afternoon. When we get into other aspects of site selection. I will not at this stage I have one plume of

matter to raise but a presumed that that should be raised after the other introductions have been made. In the back.

08:14

Thank you, Mr. Ellison. Good morning. Okay, if we could move on to our parties today starting off with Suffolk County Council please.

08:26

Morning, sir.

08:29

My name is Michael Bedford Queen's counsel. I'm instructed by Suffolk County Council. And with me today, although I will be the the lead. Graham gumbly who is Development Manager for growth and highways and infrastructure here. I think you've already heard from earlier sessions,

08:51

Mr. Phillip Watson, who is the strategic energy project lead, and then Mr. Peter Bradshaw, who is a consultant with fry solutions, a multi engineering

09:06

multidisciplinary engineering consultancy, I should say, and he has been providing technical energy management advice to the county council. I wasn't proposing to give more details but we can obviously in the post submission note we can provide more CV type details if you would find it helpful. Now that's very useful. Thank you very much Mr. Bedford and good morning.

09:29

Okay, good. Now move on to a Suffolk council please.

09:35

Good morning, sir. And Madam, my name is Isabella four, and I'm a barrister assisting the Suffolk Council. And I have with me today, Naomi Gould, who I think you may have heard from yesterday, who's the senior energy projects officer. And Nicolas Newton, who's the arboricultural landscape manager is Suffolk Council. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Fuller.

10:01

Do we have Friston parish council with us today?

10:08

I'm not seeing them in our on our list at the minute but I just thought I'd check.

10:14

Okay, so if we move on to Old Town Council, please.

10:23

Do we have old per town council?

10:26

Yes, um, just a moment to unmute everything. Of course.

10:35

Can you see me gardening?

10:40

Okay, so, good morning sir panel members, colleagues, fellow representatives of organisations and groups and individuals. Now, after hearing the applicant very eloquently introduce his team and their credentials, I'm tempted to go through mine, but being 60 years, having lived in this area born in this era, 60 years ago, I think I probably the CV would last too long for the hearing. But just to say that I've been a community representative across a range of projects for many years. And today I'm currently representing over town council, where I've been an elected member on and off for 10 years. Thank you. Thank you very much.

11:25

Okay, I think just during the start of MS fellows introduction there, we first and parish council joined us. First in parish Council. Are you here? Could you confirm who you are, please?

11:42

First, the parish Council, I believe it's Mr. Caplin, are you with us?

11:48

Okay, well, we'll come back to Friston in a while hopefully. Okay, so if we can move on now to historic England please.

11:59

Good morning, panel and madam M. Can you hear me? Okay. Yes, I can. Thank you.

12:06

My name is Dr. Wolf Fletcher. I am the planning lead for etherion north into and as you as you say, representing historic England.

12:15

Good morning. Thank you for that.

12:18

Okay, if we can now move on to the office and gas electricity markets. That's off Jim, please.

12:26

Hello, my name is Neil Copeland. I work in the offshore coordination team in origem. Good morning, Mr. Copeland. Thank you for joining us.

12:34

Okay, the next on my list we have is National Grid ventures.

12:41

Wanting sir, panel members and my name is Stuart Andrews. I'm a partner at eversheds Sutherland. And the offices we're in today I'm joined by Alicia Dawson, who's the return consultant to national grid ventures from peacock Smith. And we are both instructed by Liz wells who's senior consensus manager then National Grid ventures is also with us today. Thank you. Thank you very much. Good morning.

13:13

If we could move on now to EDF energy nuclear generation limited please

13:19

give one morning Sir Madam. My name is Katie Abraham's and I'm here on behalf of EDF energy nuclear generation limited who are the owner and operator of size or B nuclear power station. And I've got my colleague Nick Cofield with me as well. Good morning. Thank you for joining us.

13:34

Okay, now we move on to the office of nuclear regulation. A Winner please. worldlink Colin Potter here representing the office nuclear regulation. we regulate both the size of the insides of a nuclear power station site so I'm the project inspector for the proposed station at size. We'll see. Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Potter.

13:58

Okay, now if we could move on to Sases, please.

14:03

Good morning, sir. Graham, keen Queen's counsel. Morning panel. So I'm instructed on behalf of substation action savy sauce equal spaces and instructed by Lightfoot West Coast. And so with me today, I've got three

14:19

people, Mr. Michael Marnie of spaces I think has been before you on previous occasions, Mr. Christopher Wheeler, again of space this and Miss Shelton, this is Michelle Bolger landscape architect. I don't anticipate Mrs. Bolger speaking this morning, but she's on our list for the day. Thank you very much. Mr. Kane. Thank you.

14:40

Now if we could move on to CS please.

14:47

We have an on with us today from CS. Hello. Good morning, sir. Good morning panel. My name is Fiona Gilmore from Suffolk energy action solutions and I represent thousands

15:00

Have campaigners, local community members who are fighting for a different solution. And I have with me today Georgina King, who is one of our younger members, who is a specialist on air quality. Thank you. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. And welcome. Okay, if we can move on to our next representative who are save us handlings

15:29

Yes, good morning. Good morning final.

15:33

For Chandler. I represent save our samplings with me today are also Peter Chadwick, who is the chairman of say var sanderlings. And also Richard Reeves, who is a local resident, also a member of save our sentence. Thank you very much, Mr. Chandler. Okay, now we move on to Suffolk energy Action Coalition. We have anyone with us from siac please.

16:01

Okay. siac anyone?

16:05

Okay, thank you. We'll move on now then to the Suffolk coast dmo

16:11

Oh, good morning, everybody. My name is Annie Willie. I'm the brand manager for the Suffolk coast dmo which stands for destination management organisation. And I'm joined by Harry young who's actually going to join us in about 510 minutes who is our chairman of the organisation. We are the official tourism organisation for the Suffolk post area from Felixstowe up to Lowestoft and all the areas in between and we have a membership of over 220 tourism businesses. So we will be representing those businesses listening and speaking when appropriate. Thank you very much.

16:53

Okay, if we move on now to the Suffolk Preservation Society, please. Good morning. I hope you can hear me My name is Andrew Fane. I'm the chairman of the Suffolk Preservation Society. The Suffolk Preservation Society is exactly what its name suggests. We made a particular and landscape and heritage and I'm here alone today to represent the society. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Fane. And yes, I can confirm we can hear you and see you. Thank you for that good.

17:24

Okay. The next name I have is the NMB generation company.

17:31

Good morning. I'm Karl events. I'm the chief planning officer for EDF energy representing the size or C project. And I'm joined today by Richard bull, their programme manager for the size we'll see project. Thank you very much, Miss Vinson. Thank you for that and welcome. Okay. I believe Friston parish council may be with us now. Is Mr. Kaplan with us today?

18:00

Do we have Friston parish council?

18:06

No sign yet. So we will. We'll keep an eye on that. Thank you. I also have is a bill hallford here with us today.

18:20

Good morning, sir. And ma'am. Yes, I'm Bill hallford from old ringham.

18:26

I'm here in case my local knowledge. In particular the old p 1122. River hundred cable crossing site might conceivably abuse during IOC h two. Thank you very much Miss Hill for the thank you for joining us.

18:43

Okay, that's the end of the list I had.

18:48

We should just double check again. Just briefly check. Sorry, Mr. Hockley. I believe we should have Phillip North here who is representing countries coffee MP? Is that I think we have. Thank you, Mr. Smith. I just unmute my mic and put my camera up to say exactly exactly that Teresa has made a verbal submission previously and submitted written paperwork, but I'm here to chip in on her behalf today. So my name is Phil north and I work in her parliamentary office. Thank you very much. Thank you counsel north and apologies for that. And thank you Mr. Smith.

19:29

I should just just do their last double check for Friston parish Council in case there's some technical issues.

19:37

Mr. Kaplan, can you hear us at all?

19:46

Okay.

19:50

We'll keep a watch on that one. So thank you for that. Is there anyone else here today who I haven't mentioned or their organisation

20:05

Okay,

20:07

thank you. I understand that Mr. Caplin Alfriston parish Council is here, and you can hear us, but he's just having technical issues in struggling to mute. So that's Mr. Caplin from First Parish Council.

20:21

Okay, so anyone who is not participating directly in the session, but is observing, it is welcome to set out any observations about what they hear this morning in writing by deadline free, which is the 15th of December. I remind you to issue specific hearing to for both the East Anglia, one North and East Anglia two projects in parallel. There is a single agenda for both hearings, which was issued on 24th of November 2020.

20:46

Whilst the agenda is designed to enable us to hit all submissions for the two applications in parallel, we have the discretion to break out and consider each project individually during the proceedings if necessary. Although we have to do two days, today and tomorrow for discussion, the agenda is a full one. And we are conscious that we have a large attendance with many interested parties wishing to contribute on multiple items, Mr. Smith and I will need to keep on pressing to a certain extent, so that we can hear as much as possible. Any matters are raised by a previous speaker with which you do not with which you agree, sorry, do not need to be repeated. Any matters

21:22

that are raised by a previous speaker with which you do agree, sorry, to not need to be repeated as I've just repeated myself, do apologise. Any matters that require more detail submissions and allow for today can be made in writing at deadline free, which again is the 15th of November.

21:38

And I'm just going to get back now to Friston parish Council. I believe, as I mentioned before, can hear us Mr. Caplin, if you can hear us I believe if you press star six to unmute, then that should work. Could you if you can't hear me, could you try that now? Please?

21:55

I've done that. Can you hear me? I can hear you. Thank you, is it Mr. Caplin? You're just coming up. My screen is anonymous.

22:07

Hello, Mr. Caplin? Hi, I just just confirmed that you're with us today. Mr. Caplin. And that you're representing Friston parish council? Is that correct? Yes, I'm the chair of Friston parish Council. Now say thank you very much.

22:25

If you just press star six, that will meet you again. Thank you. Okay.

22:31

Okay. You may also wish to know how the order of the days will run, we'll aim to have four sessions in each day. And these will roughly run from 10am to half past 11. From Around 1150 to 1155. From Around 215, after lunch break to about 345. And then from around four or five to five o'clock roughly. We're going to get the business of each day done. And each day matters that cannot be covered orally, can be dealt with in writing at deadline free. Just to confirm again that's that that that is a 15 for December. And if necessary recorded in the action list that we will keep timings will however be flexible will aim to ensure that session breaks, do not cut the speaker off in mid flow, or disrupt a line of questioning. We're conscious that some speakers have raised particular time considerations for the case team. And where we aware of these we weren't we may take some specific questions to individual interested parties out of agenda or turn it out of agenda order to respond to these requests where it can be done. So without disrupting the wider discussion.

23:32

Okay, before we move on to the next domain business and the next item on the agenda of this morning's hearing, does anyone have any questions have a preliminary chat about how today's hearing will run? I believe you did miss miss.

23:49

corners, half the applicant, um, I have one plumbing matter which I was proposing to raise at this stage. And I the purpose for doing so is to give advance notice of material that's going to be launched at deadline three, and the timings of certain material that flow from that, as it has some bearing on the matters to be discussed over the next two days. It is not the intention of the applicants to turn up with additional evidence over these two days without prior notice. But equally, I think, given those parties have expressed an interest in these issues now have been appropriate time just for me to set out what in broad terms. These matters were. And I would ask whether you'd want me to do so I'll just set out what it is. And at issue at deadline to the project update

24:40

intimated at a reduction in the footprint of the onshore substations for both projects.

24:49

And that was part of a further refinements of design, which we've got further detail which came out and last week and that has some bearings

25:00

On two particular matters, first at the finish ground floor levels of the proposed substations and secondly, the height of certain equipment associated with those onshore substations, these will have a ultimately a bearing on the potential extent of visibility of the substation. And, therefore, I thought it fair to give advance notice that the information will be coming in at deadline three, we will be able to submit some material at deadline three to give an indication of some of the effects of these changes. But it is

likely to be deadline for before we were in a position to provide the full material to reflect those potential refinements in the onshore substation.

25:53

I'm happy to give you the broad thrust of those refinements now, if that would be helpful. Or if you're satisfied that I've given the fair notice of what's about to happen at deadline three and the timescales for that further material and you're satisfied. I'm happy to leave it to that. It's really up to you as to whether you want me to actually give some detail and colour to what I've just outlined.

26:16

Okay, thank you, Mr. Dennis. I'm aware obviously, thank you for that. And I'm aware, obviously of your deadline to submissions, where you raise various issues that will be brought in at deadline free as well, as the issues you talked about the most of stuff substantive that we've already been flagged to deadline to

26:33

they are substantive insofar as commitments is to finish brand levels, particularly in relation to the eastern of the proposed substations, and reductions in equipment types may be of

26:49

Well, the fact is, we've yet to assess the precise implicate full implications of these reductions in equipment. But given them we've got engineers turning up today, if you ask the question, Can we do more? They will respond with Yes, our refinement is ongoing. And we have been working hard to try and see if we can give greater certainty around equipment times. Mr. Hartley, can I just test a point on this?

27:17

I mean, I think critically here, what we need to ask you at this juncture in Australia is whether these are anticipated to be changes that would broadly fit in with a description of non material, and critically would rest beneath the existing assessed envelope Rochdale envelope for the projects. Now, if your broad position is yes to both of those. And then there is prospectively a much simpler way of accommodating these as you're already be aware then if your answer were not to be so you've immediately spoken about reductions in effective height. So my sense at the moment is that in broad terms, you are talking about something that is a yes to both of those is that would that be correct? Yes, indeed. Sir. Enough for the applicant? Yes, indeed, sir.

28:11

Okay, right. Well, look, I'm

28:16

Mr. Hockley and I will obviously

28:19

deliberate on this point, but

28:24

you know, my immediate observation would be that, you know, they are then things that are accommodated by that those deadlines. But Mr. Hockley, do you have any observations that you would wish to raise?

28:36

Now? I don't think I don't, I'd agree view Dennis Smith.

28:39

Okay, now I note that we have two hands raised.

28:45

We have first counsellor Marian fellows and counsellor fellows can

28:55

come on morning, sir.

28:58

Good morning, council fellows on this point.

29:02

Yes. So I wanted to and I have said when I previously been before you the time amateur in terms of planning, expertise versus a representative of people that live in this area? I'd like to just ask Mr. Ennis, on behalf of the applicant there has said that they're proposing a reduction in the footprint rent in the substation grant and the height of equipment. I'd like to ask why this is being introduced to this point. And if it was possible previously to make these changes, why they weren't offered in the spirit of transparency and honesty at an earlier station, we might be able to be engaged in that. Because only yesterday I'll be very brief. Only yesterday, Mr. Ennis said that because of the significant in adverse impact of this project in the area, that there needed to be more land owned permanently and substantive landscapes.

30:00

response needed. So if this project is so detrimental that He only said yesterday there was more needed. And yet this morning, less than 24 hours later, he's saying there's going to be changes and reductions. It is really difficult to have this uncertainty upon uncertainty. Thank you.

30:26

Thank you, counsel fellows, I believe, Mr. Smith, there is a

30:31

frozen for a second. So we also have

30:34

our Thank you, sir.

30:36

We also have a hand up or for Mr. Keen. Yeah, cranking to see, I believe. Thank you. So just very briefly on Mr. And Mrs. Point, and obviously, we can only deal today and tomorrow with the information that the applicants have chosen to put before the examination to date. And it may well be therefore, that there's there's inevitable rehashing of matters that will have to be looked at, again, because the goalposts move, but we wait to see what what comes. But so the main thing I'd ask at this stage is that the danger with this process, which is inevitably an assertion is that things are pushed to the next horizon. And I would urge the panel please to encourage the applicant to submit anything that it is going to submit by way of further detail by deadline three, there was mentioned there a deadline for which takes us to a further stage more time lost and harder to deal with the detail. And so I note that in the responses, the written responses that we've had, from the applicant to other parties, written representations that and certainly my clients representations, a number of matters are said to be will be responded to a deadline three, I think two in particular were flagged for deadline for that was noise and landscaping visual impact. Now, those matters, obviously, are directly related to changes in in the in the design of the scheme or potentially. So. And again, therefore, I would urge that that that sort of detail is provided sooner at deadline three, rather than left the deadline for.

32:09

Okay, can I indicate that that's a matter that the entire examining authority will need to deliberate upon so I don't think you'll hear an extemporaneous procedural decision on that right now. And I in saying that also, as the keynote, I'd emphasise that there was a fair amount of discussion at the preliminary meetings for these examinations around the necessity of ensuring that the essential breakpoint in examination was recognised between an early stage in which some measure of sensible flexibility can be accommodated. And a later stage when frankly, if anything is done that requires any additional consultation or engagement at all. And if that is to be taken into account before a recommendation is made to the Secretary of State, then there is really quite a substantial limitation on its scale and scope. So these discussions were raised a preliminary meeting stage, we will give careful consideration to that request about about deadline limitation and we will make a procedural decision into in due course but it will not be extemporaneous. Okay, Mr. Hockley. I'm returning to you. Thank you, Mr. Smith. It was just

33:23

following that submission from the applicant if anybody else has any questions of a preliminary nature about how today's hearing will run.

33:34

Okay, I'm not seeing any further hands going up. So thank you for that. So we'll assume that means we can move on to agenda item two, which concerns the policy and factual context for the applications which Mr. Smith will lead. Thank you.

33:48

Thank you very much, Mr. Hockley. And

33:54

we're now going to move on to agenda item two, and you will have the agenda papers before you and I would foreshadow that agenda item two is likely to take the morning session. And that agenda item three, I would intend to proceed in the afternoon and take the remainder of the day.

34:14

In terms of opening this, I would draw to your attention that this will be a different style of hearing tissue specific hearing one, or indeed am compulsory acquisition hearing one if you attended either of those proceedings yesterday. And those were very much technical hearings, where there was some very specific questions about legal or policy compliance that the examining authority needed to put principally to the applicant and the applicant needed to address and answer those with relatively limited comment and feedback from other interested parties unless they had specific concerns on those points. Whereas here we're conscious of the very substantial presence from public authorities and companies with interests, elected representatives and local community groups.

35:00

Much has been said in writing already about the approaches taken by the applicants to the issues raised by this agenda. And so we need in this hearing to question and test the applicant, but equally to provide a platform for the synthesis of these issues between the other interested parties, and to question and test equally, those who are saying that different processes should have been followed from those followed by the applicants leading to different outcomes. So what we'll do is we'll normally ask for relevant clarifications at the start of an agenda item from the applicant typically, will then seek substantial contributions around the table and then returns the applicants for a right of reply.

35:47

Okay, what I then also need to acknowledge is that there will be one or two out of agenda items. Now, I do note, I'm in relation to the representation for trees, coffee MP, and that the time pressures that were perhaps upon her when she was originally speaking to our office are not quite the same. Now, can I just check with her representative? And whether there are any specific time constraints that you are now subject to or whether we can essentially deal with your engagement in normal agenda order?

36:29

happy for you to do it in your normal agenda order. I've got no time constraints. So not for the morning session, Miss taxman. That's very good news counsellor north, because I think, as you'll see, as we march through this, a lot of the virtue of this is around the engagement of party with party. And so the ability for you to contribute in a free flowing manner to the discussion will be much appreciated. We have heard from off game that they are not able to be with us after the lunch break. And I will foreshadow that we will come what may get to matters relevant to off game before the lunch break.

37:07

I'm also conscious that we have a number of representatives relating to sizewell the nuclear industry in nuclear regulation. And now there will be a clear opportunity at the part at the start of agenda item three at the start of the afternoon session. And to take matters relating to the relationship between the applications and sizewell and the sector, together with a fence around them before we move into more

detailed matters on other stakeholders engagements. So what I'm going to propose for all matters nuclear is that we will pick them up at the very beginning of the afternoon session at the start of agenda item three. So that gives you a very clear target and understanding about where we're going to head to. And

38:00

you will then know that

38:02

you know, if you wish to drop this morning session, you because you don't have specific contributions to make on it. You may do so and equally. If you join us at that point at the beginning of the afternoon. We will hear you directly then.

38:19

But we must of course all state very much focused on the matters before us and examining authorities I must flag are not inquiries at large into energy policy. And whilst we must acknowledge that a lot of the agenda through this issue specific hearing will deal with the fact that relevant policy is changing that we are not the agents of that change, we must work with it. We must apply a policy in force, whilst ensuring that we are agile and responsible to that that may be coming before us before the end of this examination, or may come before the Secretary of State before decisions are made. Or if the proposed orders are made and changes that may merge and affect The Undertaker's before any decision to commence development is taken. So it's in that spirit that we're looking at the changing policy environment.

39:11

Okay, I'll now then move on formally to agenda item to the context and update. Now, in the light of time that's elapsed since the acceptance of the two applications for examination, the applicant and other interested parties are invited to provide an update on the information provided to the examining authorities on external changes in the policy environment particularly has occurred since the submission of the applications. Now this element of the agenda has two main purposes. The first purpose is wrapped in agenda items to a through to D and it's to ensure the citing development and project contexts for the applications are properly understood by the examining authorities and to understand which of those

40:00

Are agreed between the parties and what might still be matters of disagreement and why. So this discussion will need to relate to and identify other projects that are also proposed both at sea and within the onshore surroundings for the applications, ensuring that we're in as much agreement as can be obtained about which these are the question of whether they ought to be considered for cumulative and or in combination impact assessment purposes, and whether there is sufficient data and analysis available. So the examining authorities to enable those tasks to be done.

40:36

A key elements of this discussion which we're conscious will be of interest to nearly all attending today will be in relation to agenda item two D, addressing the question of the extent to which other projects and proposals may be seeking or have been provided with grid connection offers at the same point, or the same location as these two applications are proposed to connect to the transmission system first.

41:01

And we need to consider the implications of various proposed connections for the transmission network. And when a connection by the proposed size will see new nuclear power station is also going to have to be taken into account. In this respect, we will be relying on contributions from the National Grid stable of companies for advice. Now, we do clearly have national grid ventures here. And but as I understand it, we don't have national grid electricity transmission and get or national grid electricity system operator. So

41:34

can I just again, check with National Grid ventures or NGV? As I'll be referring to you? And is it essentially mandated to speak for the group as a whole? Or are there essentially matters that we will need to put in writing or separate actions on any of the other group companies?

41:55

Sir, I'm very grateful for the question.

41:58

national group ventures is a separate business entity from the transition and wider national group business, the only point of

42:11

association is by the use of the words national grid in the name of national grid ventures. ventures is a promotional business in the same way as SPR or EDF. And we have no regulatory function and no direct relationship

42:30

with the other national group bodies.

42:34

Okay, well, that that is a very useful initial submission, because essentially, there is a key point that we will need to get to in that agenda item, which is around obviously, the nature of the connect the number and nature of connection offers that have been made at Friston or broadly leisten. And essentially, make taking a count of those such that we, the applicants, and all of the other interested parties are equally clear about what has been committed to and who's been committed to it. Are we able to put questions of that nature to yourselves? Or are they going to be ones that

43:17

you will defer to and get or so on? We would have to defer those questions to those other parties, we can comment in broad terms as to our position

43:34

in respect to the connection agreement, but beyond that, we can't because assist examination.

43:40

Okay, well, what I will then put to you is that what we will need you to do is essentially to address us about those projects of which you are aware projects that you have had carried off or essentially have a promotional engagement with

43:57

that might connect at first and or in the eastern area, because

44:03

we're trying to kind of get as much of a fix on the mobile project environment as we can. And so we'll be looking very closely to your

44:15

state of knowledge on this. But again, and the examining authority will have to deliberate carefully about matters that we might need to put in in writing to the other bodies. I will say at this juncture this it is a measure of disappointment that the other members of the energy stable are not present because they were invited to this hearing. And there is a degree to which others will have come armed to this hearing with points that may need to interact with their interests.

44:46

And

44:48

there is to a degree, a potential concern that we don't waste the time of the applicants or indeed the other interested parties.

45:00

parties who may have come with points that they wish to test with those companies, there is in guidance and the proposition that if time is wasted where entities have been invited to a hearing, but have chosen not to attend, we cannot compel attendance. But if they choose not to attend once invited, and there is at least potential for applications with costs to be made. So I'll place that on the table so that if we find ourselves in an intractable position, later on,

45:34

it is clear that there are circumstances where if time is wasted, that relevant consequences can flow. Now, that of course does not apply directly to NGV. Because very kindly, NGV is here. And

45:50

okay, so having

45:53

tested those points with mgv. And

45:57

I will also then flag that there will be a connection between some of the questions around the extent of land required for the transmission connection at first and that did arise and compulsory acquisition, hearing one, and some of the ground that we will cover under agenda item D will build on the foundations leading compulsory acquisition, hearing one and so we don't need to repeat what was said there, and that this hearing will not be reviewing compulsory acquisition. It's focused on the projects and proposals and their connections, not compulsory acquisition or temporary possession powers that have been sought.

46:33

So what I'm firstly going to do then is I'm going to move to the applicant, and I'm going to ask for their contribution on agenda items. A,

46:48

B, C, and D. Now we can pull those in parts or we can take them together, which whichever is, is easiest in inverted commas. What I will then do is I will, I will seek contributions from attended attending interested parties on those.

47:10

We will then return to the applicant for a reply. So I'll be taking A, B, C and D together unless we need to split them in parts. And I'm reserving e until after we have concluded the discussion on D. So can I ask for the applicants initial stab at a and if you would like to subdivide and then move on to B separately, that's entirely understood. But equally, if it's useful to pass through or ALL OF A through D, I'm open to that approach. So ask the applicant to address us please.

47:48

Good morning palpate solar for the applicant. We'll cover a to see first I will cover that. And then we'll shift to DNA. And Colin will lead on that part of that.

48:03

In which case I will just briefly interject because obviously this is a cake that can be cut in several ways. Let us then say that we will run a through to see I will take D separately and then e separately

48:17

the applicant.

48:20

So the question was are the Part A was on decisions made by the Secretary of State and recent decisions? We've taken that to refer to Norfolk Vanguard plan extension. And Hornsea three minded to approve decision was that what you had in mind that was there anything else? And

48:42

indeed,

48:45

it is it is a it is those we were essentially wanting you to address us on those matters that clearly have been decided since the finalisation of the application analysis. And so therefore, looking at the degree to which there is any other material that needs to be drawn into cumulative or in combination impact assessment.

49:10

Thank you, paulo pezura for the applicant. Thanks for the clarification. So I'll go through those three projects, starting with the easiest one, which is a valid extension, which of course was refused in the summer. So

49:23

this has been taken out of consideration in the in combination assessments that we've done for offshore wind for the offshore apology, and that has come out of the in combination totals for the collision risk, and we haven't obviously included that in the consideration of the red throated diver displacement, as that project is no longer part of that.

49:50

I'm Norfolk Vanguard and hornsea three. So the position we've come to in agreement with natural England and the RSPB

50:00

is obviously there was some disagreement prior to application around what the in combination totals are for matters such as collision risk.

50:12

The there's arguments have been made and we've put in representations on precaution and assessment etc. But in order to move forward with that, and in order to have a common currency for the discussion, we've agreed with natural England and RSPB, that we would take a common position as accepted which was the Norfolk Borealis deadline, eight in combination position of all of the projects that are in the in combination suite in terms of the collision risk, and what the accepted numbers are for those. What we have done, obviously, because Borealis deadline, eight preceded the decisions that would take in this year, we are updating those figures. So we have updated for the vanguard final consented position with regard to all species.

51:07

And we have taken the numbers from the Secretary of State's HRA for whom c three and updated those four Kittiwake, the Hornsea three materials because they focus solely on the Kittiwake issue. When they made their changes to the project envelope they did not update their figures for other species that were not part of the discussion at that point. So we do not have up to date figures for the species such as Gannett, which for which there are potential in combination issues. So we've defaulted

to the best that we've got in terms of that, which is the numbers that were previously published. So in terms of Kittiwake, we're up to date or days in terms of other species, we're using the last published version of the numbers that have been provided by Hornsea natural England have obviously made the point that that gives some uncertainty around those numbers. But effectively, we are where we are with those. If they haven't provided those numbers in respect of their revised Rochdale envelope, there isn't much we can do to recalculate what their collisions should be. So we're still we're we would hope that they would provide more numbers for that so that we can have clarity around those other species. But clearly,

52:26

Kittiwake is the critical species that we're talking about across the southern North Sea. So we have the information for that species. I think in terms of those projects, that those are the relevant matters that we consider are irrelevant to this application. There's nothing on shore that we feel is relevant. So it would solely be those that are irrelevant to the consideration of any updates. As I say, we've already updated the collision risk materials, we put those in a deadline one, and obviously in regard to taking out an extension out of the displacement that will be going in deadline three. So I think that's everything on that matter of those projects. That's all clear. Now I am just going to turn to our natural environment and HRA lead, Jessica powis who has a supplementary on that point.

53:23

Thank you, Mr. Smith. Yes. It was just a point of clarification on on the points you just made about the Hornsea three material and in particular, I'm conscious that we do have the Kittiwake revised Kittiwake assessment as that's fed into the Secretary of State's decision but we don't as you said have information on collision risks or other species such as Gannett. And I, I'm aware that natural England have asked for that to be made publicly available. And I'd be interested in your view about Firstly, whether that you expect that that may become publicly available once the Secretary of State's final decision in respect to form z three is made. And also if it is, whether you will at that stage are planning to then factor that into an update to the assessment

54:09

policy. So if the applicant if the materials come become available at a suitable time, we will obviously incorporate them. The key thing to remember is of course, that with Hornsea three reducing their Rochdale with but mostly by the increase in the turbine height.

54:25

they've reduced the collisions. So we already have a worst case, if you like in the numbers that we do have any numbers that we get will only improve the situation. So we're not in a position where there is uncertainty about the final number, there is not uncertainty about the direction of travel of those numbers. So I think a obviously for completion sake, we would like to include those if they become available. Likewise, once the decision on Hornsea three is made and we have a position we will be very interested to understand what the Secretary of State's

55:00

position is do as with regard to the kittiwakes. for that project, if they are compensated are they removed from the combination totals because logically, we would assume that that would be the case, and they would not now be needed to be considered. So the in combination totals would actually reflect that compensation. If they're being compensated, they're not being lost. So there are a number of issues like that, which are not clear. And again, we would like clarification on those as much as anyone else. It's a natural England word as well. So and we will seek to do as what we can when we have the information. Thank you. And I would obviously, from our perspective, we would also like to have sight of any of the

55:44

Secretary of State's decision is made and it will, it will greatly assist us to deepen, even if we are to have a Christian parish Council. And we like to be talking about now exiting in effects. But that obviously still helps us in terms of out what we can report to the Secretary of State on so thank you for that. That there's a little bit of a rub about which my mind is is not fully informed, and that I would like an action to be taken on by the applicant in consultation with natural England please and that is in relation to the treatment of compensation actions. We are referring to kittiwake and artificial

56:31

structures are Kittiwake nests, etc. At this point, which is that in theoretical terms when a compensation action is taken, that deals with the feature of a relevant European site, and in policy terms, is that compensation then taken to be subject to the same protections as the site. In other words, we accumulate the compensation site and the birds active on that site as though they were resident in the original protected site.

57:07

And because if you follow the logic of that through, and what could possibly happen is that we could possibly end up with an additional Kittiwake population physically closer to the proposed developments before us. And that's all sign out, essentially, what amounts to in policy terms.

57:31

A new European site in there are compensating for an effect on an on a European site that's actually much further away. But they're now physically closer. Now. We're not going to resolve that now. Because that's a detailed technical bar diversity question. But if I can just add it as a as a list that item to be dealt with in writing, that will be very, very helpful.

57:55

Thank you. We'll take that away. Thank you for the early Christmas present

57:59

gratefully received. Thank you.

58:01

Well, apologies. But it doesn't need to be touched on because I'm sure somewhere in our reporting will need to deal with that. So is that is there anything else that you want to put to us on a before I ask you

to move on to B and C. And what I will say to the other parties present is that because we're taking a B and C together, I will come to you once we've heard from the applicant on B and C. So anything further on a nicer? And if I can just check with my colleagues, any other questions in relation to a little useful? No. Excellent. So let's move to be then

58:38

this harmlessly is the fact that we now have an accepted and moving towards examination ends at proposal size we'll see and the degree to which there are any further analyses required

58:51

in relation to cumulative or in combination assessment by the proposals, the applicant

59:00

don't keep outside of the applicant. So obviously we included the information that we could prior to application that we had regarding sizewell C, and came with impacts, as best we could, based on the information that we had from there were from our consultations and discussions with sizewell See, obviously, since the application was made. Earlier this year, we looked at those materials to determine where there were differences. And I think it was it was I think it was it was must have been the procedural decision a where we put in the notes where we basically looked at and we effectively did a screening of where those effects were that we've considered had changed from the application position we needed but in some further information, so excuse me, we did obviously make a few submissions at deadline to with regard to the social economics. So there was a

1:00:00

Few submissions there, in terms of that, and where we actually updated some of the, of the work that we've done for that. And more deadline three coming in, in terms of predominantly, it's the traffic and transport, obviously, which is a critical consideration, and has been a critical consideration right from the beginning of this project, and aligned with the traffic and transport come considerations of air quality and noise because they are the gain. Those impacts are predicated on the traffic and transport considerations. So, if I might briefly interject, I mean, this was going to be the thrust of the questions I was going to ask you that it did seem to be that that was a really quite significant potential interface between your proposed developments. And there's a lot particularly issues around things like the timing of the delivery of the size will relief road and the potential for possible further deconfliction of construction traffic for both your pair of applications and their proposal. And our matters were some possible additional conversations between yourself and the sizewell applicants might productively take place. And I was just going to ask whether those conversations are occurring because that, you know, there's at least in principle, some scope for and looking at measures that could potentially further mitigate the cross impacts of both projects on each other your projects and theirs.

1:01:42

Thank you perfect. So yes, those, obviously those that it's been a critical issue. And we've been say, we've had consultation with sizewell since the pre application days. And that is ongoing. And obviously, it's a key consideration for us. We're also obviously having ongoing discussions with the local authorities as gang because it's one of their critical issues. So during those discussions are ongoing.

Yes. And I will specifically invite representatives relating to sizeable and local authorities to address us on point B when we ask you to speak. Okay. Is there anything else you need to draw our attention to

1:02:26

work? So we got to expect a deadline three, some significant additional documentation around particularly traffic and transportation impacts?

1:02:36

Yes, yes. And I think it's just worth noting, of course, that the size, we'll see traffic submissions included updates to sizewell B. So we have got the those cumulative issues are all taken account of in the one place where they don't need, we haven't missed anything out because they were actually included in in sizewell C's own submissions as part of their numbers. So we've got that.

1:03:03

That's, that's it. Okay, good. Now, I'll just check with my Councilmember colleagues, are there any supplementary questions on that item we'll obviously hear from from the other interested parties shortly.

1:03:18

But before I move the applicant on to item C, now to help the applicant here,

1:03:25

essentially, what we are most interested in is the degree to which in terms of both cumulative and in combination assessment, we are in a position where in relation to some prospective projects, there is, in inverted commas, no publicly available information, or was a dearth of it at the point when your applications were put together. Now, obviously, in relation to the galfer extension, which we must now refer to as five bestiaries offshore wind farm,

1:03:59

that has

1:04:02

been announced by the crown estate on the 28th of September 2020.

1:04:08

as potentially being taken forward as part of the 2017 extensions opportunity. Pre application advice has been given by the planning Inspectorate, but no project page set up on the national infrastructure planning website, no scoping requests, but there is general section 51 advice that that is available. So again, we're taking the view that this is a kind of moot point project, but it clearly is in the public domain now, and there is therefore a need to respond to it. Similarly, the greater Gabbard extension, which is north falls offshore wind farm,

1:04:47

was in the 28th of September 2020. Crown estate announcement and planning Inspectorate pre application meeting was held on the sixth of November 2020, which again has been public

1:05:00

There is a project page online now so that the scope of essentially what is in the public domain has, you know, expanded now, very conscious of the fact that, you know, you react to what you know about, but we now know about these things. So, what, if anything needs to be done in terms of revisiting your cumulative and in combination analysis?

1:05:24

I think effectively, my point would be that there is no substantive updates on the progress of those projects. We have obviously known about these since 2017. They're part of the 2017 extensions round. So they've been around in the public domain, there was the HRA plan level screening undertaken by the crown estate last year.

1:05:49

But that's it as compared to the other 2017 extensions. Of course, sharing and dodging and rampion are all well progressed through their processes, showing him Dudgeon were scaped. A over a year ago now. rampion, I think it was earlier this year. So there's a considerable amount of information on those, as he say for North falls and fight estuaries. All we have are a a the

1:06:17

offshore boundaries that were provided as part of the HRA process, that plan level HRA process. And obviously, some information that indicates one of those projects maybe go first. And there's no more information on the scale of those projects, what their capacities would be, where they would make landfall where their good connections are, or any information about those on which we would be able to undertake a meaningful assessment. I think this is the critical point, nothing has changed since we made the applications with those projects. In order to allow us to make a meaningful assessment, we could undertake a theoretical assessment on what those projects might look like, where they may make landfall where their cable routes might go, how big their substations would be, what their technologies would be, et cetera, et cetera. But none of that would be realistic, all it would be would be an absolute worst case. And it would not be a robust basis upon which we could do an impact assessment. So I think in short, there's there is no substantive information available in order to makers

1:07:32

in order to for us to progress, anything, that would look like a cumulative impact assessment.

1:07:38

Because I'd obviously you one of our key considerations here is is consideration of the degree to which Friston strike least and is a prospective transmission system connection point for one or both of those. And, and trying to work out the degree to which that is an important and relevant consideration for us or not. And, and, you know, that is a matter on which we are obviously, deliberating with great care, I've given you a Christmas present, you have given us a Christmas in 2021.

1:08:15

And, but and so of those projects, so we're going to have to give that very, very careful consideration. And I will be asking for other party's submissions on those two points.

1:08:27

Could I just make a point on this, Mr. Smith? Yes. That's what I just like an illustration at this point, in terms of certainly from an EIA perspective. And I understand that is my position and why I've been responsible for on this project is the EIA. So

1:08:47

six years ago, I was working my team were working on a project called East Anglia for it was scoped. It had a grid connection at Branford. It was a very viable project that was obviously in the public eye. We don't we've done we've done a whole stream of work on that up to the point at PGI, at PGI. It the project was pulled and we did not include that project in the in combination of documents of assessment for East Anglia three, because the information at the time said that that project was not going ahead.

1:09:20

It's worth saying that some of the parties involved in these discussions did not raise objections at the time such as SCC natural England historically etc. did not raise objections about as taking that out of the combination assessment because it seemed like a sensible move. the relevance of this of course, is that East Anglia floor ceased to exist. It became part of Norfolk Vanguard was Norfolk Vanguard east. It went from 1200 megawatts to being 900 megawatts. It went from being at Brantford in Suffolk to nektan in Norfolk, um, you know, it went from a 360 kilometres area to 300

1:10:00

ometer area from 240 metre turbines to 350 metre turbines, a 40 kilometre cable router 60 kilometres cable. What I'm saying is that illustrates the point that had we done a cumulative assessment on East Anglia, three but East Anglia for at the time, none of the information that was publicly available and a lot more information at that stage than is available on any of the other projects that we're talking about the moment none of that in combination assessment or cumulative assessment would have been relevant to what we are doing today. So it was the right choice to make at the time. And that is why we've made the decisions in our applications, not to include speculative projects about which we did not have enough information to make a decent sense that I take that as your as your kind of principle submission in this matter, that essentially, you would wish us to treat five mysteries and North falls still, as being essentially no more qualitatively, no more to be taken way to account of than say, for example, the now laid ghost of East Anglia for

1:11:13

Yes, okay, that's your submission. And we'll obviously have to hear others on that point. Now, we're not going to talk right now about euro Lincoln Nautilus, because I'm going to read and other things that might possibly connect it Friston that are not crown estate licensable, necessarily, I'm going to pitch those in to item D when we talk about national grid structure, policy and plans. And so for my purposes, I'll just check with my panel colleagues again, but I'm, I'm content that we've heard now from the applicant on items A, B, and C.

1:11:51

Any other questions from

1:11:55

my panel colleagues, before I throw those items open and ask who of the

1:12:03

other interested parties wish to speak to these items? Now I would expect to hear specifically from Suffolk County Council and East Suffolk County Council. I would also imagine that we will be hearing from the combination of C's, se C's, and as potentially SOS but if there's anybody else who wishes to speak, I see Marian fellows hand up for obrah Town Council. Miss fellows up I think the best thing to do will be to start with

1:12:42

the county Council's first. And of course, the representatives of the sizewell operating and proposed projects, we are very welcome to request to engage on Item b.

1:13:01

So let's go to item A and ask if

1:13:06

first Suffolk County Council have matters that they wish to put to us.

1:13:14

Thank you, sir. Good morning.

1:13:20

In relation to Item a,

1:13:27

I don't think there's a great deal that we want to say in terms of the additional information in terms of what has been either consented or not consented since the application was submitted.

1:13:46

Simply in a sense, as a point for information, although I suspect the examining authority is probably already aware of this, there is at present a judicial review challenge which has been brought to the Norfolk Vanguard

1:14:01

decision, I only mention it because obviously from a legal point of view, the decisions are valid decision unless and until it's overturned by the courts. I don't know anything about that challenge or the timing of it. But clearly, you simply need to know on your radar that that exists as a challenge. And if anything

changes during the course of the examination, no doubt somebody will tell you about that. So I don't I don't, I'm not making a point, I'm just sort of as it were just

1:14:26

a very, very valuable reminder as to that for them. to reassure you I will say that we do scan the horizon continuously through examination on such matters. And if the status changes, ie there is a judicial review decision. And if that is within time that we can actually see parties views on it, we will do so if it's not within time where that can occur is very close to closure, or indeed critically after closure. Then what we normally do is report to the Secretary of State on the basis that there is potential for such a decision and that indecision the Secretary of State

1:15:00

needs to take its outcomes into account. And there's little more that we can do that it will come into the wash up when it comes into the wash up. Absolutely. So the the slightly wider point simply from those decisions coming through the interrelationship of their construction periods and potential overlap with the construction period for these projects, that is something which obviously you will have seen already rehearsed in some of the comments that we have made.

1:15:36

Certainly, our factory our overall position in relation to particularly the socio economic implications of overlapping construction periods, particularly on employment

1:15:50

potential and stuff you've seen, we've referred to a memorandum of understanding, which we contend is a suitable vehicle, and flexible vehicle for allowing those issues to be addressed. So we don't see the need to bring that as it were into the examination, because we've got to, as it were a tried and tested way of working with SPR. On those matters. There are issues in relation to port related traffic and construction traffic, particularly where we're still in dialogue with SPR about the scope of the port travel plan, and detail matters of that nature. Again, I don't really think of that those matters for today. But they obviously do.

1:16:40

Or at least the timing of the later decisions has a bearing on the implications of what needs to go into those discussions, because obviously, the time periods may change. Yeah. So I can ask you then. And

1:16:58

the purpose of this was to ensure that we didn't have any kind of very large skeletons in very large cupboards were from the governances Gallery, and in case we missed it. Now clearly, the sense I'm getting from your submissions are that there is a broad contentment in your client within the framework of the written submissions that it's made to us. And that that you're not wishing to surface substantial concerns that haven't already got a means of being dealt with, even if they haven't already been dealt with. Yeah, yes, I think that that is fair. I say we flagged certain issues. We are in dialogue with the applicant about those issues, but they are matters which we think the dialogue on the requirements and the detail should be able to pick those up. They're not matters, which we think would I say need further

consideration by you certainly in this stage when we are dealing with incidents big ticket issues, and we don't see those recent decisions in that context is giving rise to those matters.

1:18:02

So far as

1:18:05

sizewell C is concerned, again, traffic you've identified, it is clearly an issue. We, I think,

1:18:16

understand from what has been said on behalf of the applicant, that we are going to get some further information at deadline three, and also we'll reserve position on that. And again, it feeds more into detail about the construction traffic management plan and the requirements and the scope and so on. Which again, we flagged up in I think our responses to your written questions, and on the applicants responses so far.

1:18:46

And I don't think that apologies for the critical focus for us, there will be the degree to which your clients wish anything additional to be done around essentially the sequencing of works and or the potential sharing or interface greater sharing or interface between the construction traffic management process for these applications, and that those four sides will see.

1:19:17

That hasn't already been surfaced. So post deadline three, they'll clearly need to take a very close eye on on that. Yeah, absolutely. I mean, in particular, is it most footbridge where we have flagged up what we see very much as a sequencing issue, because of the order in which activities are done and wanting to avoid both for existing traffic, any disruption from temporary works together with feeding that into the sizewell construction traffic and this project is construction traffic. So there are some real issues where we are having some dialogue and we have flagged up concerns

1:19:57

which I would hope

1:20:00

are falling on as it were fruitful is on the part of the applicant.

1:20:07

And so I didn't think it was anything particularly to raise today in relation to those matters, but it's just that they are, they're already on the horizon, as it were.

1:20:19

There is a slightly wider point, and I don't know whether I can just trespass for a moment just to air it.

1:20:26

Obviously, you have reserved the opportunity to have further issue specific hearings, and you set aside some provisional dates in the new year for those to take place. But you haven't identified any particular topics to which they will be addressing. Traffic transport and highways matters, does seem to us albeit that there are some useful discussions ongoing between us and the applicant. And no doubt, we all hope that they will continue fruitfully. But it does seem to us that there may well be a benefit to the examination of you having an issue specific hearing, specifically which we'll look at traffic and transport matters. And if that is, as it were already, in your mind, even if it's not been over the expressed, that gives us some reassurance. And again, we don't need to consent, keep saying to you

1:21:21

this issues was a bit hearing, well, what about traffic matters, because we will know.

1:21:27

Let me put that one then directly to rest, we will be issuing further notice of additional hearings and on I believe the eighth of December, and you will note when that is issued that we will be flagging

1:21:43

a transport focus. I sh I'm very grateful for that there and so grateful for you indulging me in that little bit of slightly off piste commentary was Thank you sir, for that, that, that that is helpful. And then

1:22:01

so far as the the crown estate licencing

1:22:08

and the implications. So that is a more fundamental issue. For us where with respect, we don't think that the applicants approach in the light of the circumstances, as they now are, is realistically tenable, as any essentially almost saying nothing to do with us. gov, we can't really do anything meaningful to grapple with the point. So, if I can try to lay out, in an overarching sense, our concern, but I suspect that there's a certain amount of overlap between how we say that you should approach this issue and the item to see and the matters that come up more under item three d and indeed the matters tomorrow.

1:22:58

Because if I can put it in a nutshell, with it, we see that there is a strategic issue as to what should be assessed and how which is both in said top down and bottom up. Yeah, in this way that we see it as intrinsic to good design, which obviously is a more detailed matter, but we see it is intrinsic to good design, that good design is flexible and adaptable and takes into account what is realistically known at the time the design is formulated, or if I can assist you the main function of this item is essentially as I indicated to shake skeletons out of cupboards and and we can paint the detail in tomorrow's item when we will have more time. And what we critically need to know from you now is your in principle submission of opposition to the applicants point which is that you believe there are a number of matters that are in the public domain are known about need to be taken into account around and particularly I would take it the question of what is to be physically connected to the transmission system at Friston.

1:24:24

And, yeah, I mean, what we what we want to know in kind of summary bullet point terms from you now is what you believe needs to be in. In that respect. Yes, absolutely. So, the point is, that as has already been rehearsed, Friston is clearly in the frame in terms of a connection point, not merely for these proposals, but also it is identified as the

1:25:00

intended connection point.

1:25:04

For Nautilus, I know you said that we pick that up under D. And so far as five Esther is concerned, you've seen the email that we provided with our response to the written questions, which refers to the least an area. And it's quite obvious that if these present application proposals were approved, what was referred to as the least an area clearly becomes Friston, because those were the that point with

1:25:32

the applicant. Yeah, absolutely. Well, we see, we see it has been completely obvious, that therefore, that is the the location that would be come, as it were the hub or the focus for the National Grid infrastructure, connection points. And so what we see as being important is that the design which is put before you, on behalf of the applicant properly engages with that wider picture and shows that it is an appropriate and sustainable choice, in terms of the

1:26:07

site location, has the capacity and the flexibility to accommodate those future changes. Now, we're in the position at the moment, having looked through the applicants material, that we're not confident that it can all be done, if those future events happen in a way which doesn't give rise to impacts which have not yet been fully assessed. Again, I'm trying to keep it to headlines, you're aware of the debate or discussion in terms of the technology, the AI is in the GIS in terms of the cooling strike insulation infrastructure for National Grid switchgear, that has implications for the size of the facility. It also has implications for the heights of the plant and equipment. And they almost work in opposite directions in the sense that the the a is requires a larger intake, but potentially has smaller buildings in terms of height, g is the other way around, getting that balance, right. Bearing in mind the the cross disciplines of landscape rights of way, drainage and design for the development. We think that the applicant should be providing further information to you as to how the two permutations work through bearing in mind, what would happen if you built on these interconnections? Yeah, that we're going to unpack a lot of that tomorrow.

1:27:47

He has a number of detailed questions that he that he does wish to ask you amongst others on that tomorrow. So essentially, I think we've got the watch should be in what should be out map. And now coloured in by Sussex County Council. We understand you say that those matters that the applicant deems it should not include you deem it should you for thinking okay. And do you have anything else to put on a B or C before I move on? No, thank you, sir. Excellent. Thank you very much. Mr. Burfoot. Now, I've had a hand raised by Mrs. Gilmore for quite some time. And Mrs. Mrs. Gilmore. If this is a request to speak on this item, then

1:28:36

let me know and I'll make sure that you are brought in but I will be going to a Suffolk council etc. Before I draw you in. So can I just check Mrs. Gilmore. Is that a request for you to speak on this item? Yes, it is. Thank you Excellent. Well, in which case I will flag that I will be coming to you. And after a break it is now 1130 and given that we've just reached the end of Mr. Bedford submissions for the county council on a B and C. I am then going to queue up East Sussex Council for the same response and flag that if there are matters that the county council put that they agree with, all they need to say is that they agree. We will return to them after the break. It is now 1130 Ladies and gentlemen, we will resume at 1150

1:29:28

Thank you very much