

East Anglia_ISH2_2ndDec_Session 2

Thu, 12/3 12:05PM • 1:29:44

00:07

Welcome back, ladies and gentlemen, I just you've had a reasonably refreshing break. And can I just check again that the live stream has reconnects to this I can be heard.

00:20

Okay.

00:23

Thank you very much. So you'll be conscious ladies and gentlemen that we had been dealing with agenda items to A, B and C taken together that we have just heard from Suffolk County Council. In that respect, I do have to apologise it was drawn to my attention that I did inadvertently, say Sussex rather than Suffolk, and I'm obviously challenged in terms of my Anglo Saxon apologies, I will try and make sure that does not happen again. So we are now turning to East Suffolk County council apologies, district here. And Isabella tougher of counsel for that body on agenda items A, B, and C. So it was tough for Thank you. Thank you. So I'm going to ask my school to address you on agenda items to ATC. Thank you very much, Miss Gould.

01:21

Hello, thank you, naomi gould and a Suffolk Council. So in terms of the item A, and we support and agree with the with Suffolk County Council and their submissions in that respect. So I won't repeat those in terms of B. And we consider there is potential cumulative impacts with sites we'll see in a number of areas policy, and the county council has identified the traffic and transport issue. So I won't go over that. But there's also matters in relation to air quality. We're currently engaging with the applicants on this matter, and seeking to have a tripartite meeting with the applicants this size we'll see and the applicants for East Anglia, one north and two. So we can meet together to discuss that. And we're hoping we can reach agreement. We also see that could be potential cumulative impacts in relation tourism, which again, is another matter we're currently discussing with the applicant. And we know the additional submission at deadline to and also in relation to bats landscape and visual, and which again, we're also engaging with the applicants on those matters. And I'll just foreshadow just as I did with the County Council that just as we are going to be holding serving notice on the eighth of December for issues specific hearings. After the new year, we'll be dealing with traffic and transport We will also be dealing with a broad social and economic effects, hearing. One of the main purposes of which will be to address tourism matters and your sales and the dmo will clearly be invitees to that.

03:06

Thank you.

03:08

And then in relation to and see, we know your question that you asked the county council just for a list of the projects, and that we use consider should be included within the cumulative impact assessment. And we see that it's particularly in relation to the National Grid substation and future connections there. So we don't agree with the approach of the applicants on this matter and consider that projects such as North falls, and five estuaries and and particularly in relation five estuaries, we've had some initial engagements with the Atkins on that project. And we also consider an otter in euro link, which I know will go on to in Part D should have been included and are reasonable foreseeable. We don't agree that they should be treated the same as it goes to be he sang there for and and we understand that there is maximum facets to the individual extension projects identified. And that's with some information from National Grid, there's likely information that could be made available to provide a rushed out envelope approach to allow the cumulative impact assessments to be undertaken.

04:23

Thanks. Okay.

04:26

conclude your submissions on those three items. Yes, try to be as concise as possible. Thank you very much, much appreciated. I will just check with my panel member colleagues and see if any of them have any follow up questions to yourselves. But I'm not seeing any specific requests, in which case I'm now going to move on to parish councils because we did have a request to speak on this item from Councillor Marion fellows of obrah Town Council. I was then going to just check to see if Friston parish council wishes

05:00

To speak, then I will move on to the various action groups. And so I'm counsellor fellows, are you able to speak on on this point? And again, if you if you agree with matters that the other councils have raised its mission to say that.

05:18

Um, thank you, Mr. Smith panel members.

05:21

Yes, I think probably I'd like to speak briefly on B and C, if I may. So, with regard to size, or C, I believe this must or we believe this must be considered.

05:34

And I'd like to check that you did receive the map that we forwarded a deadline to, which indicated where all of these projects do overlap. And, as the county council and District Council have said, it isn't just about traffic and transport issues. It's about the impact on social economics, mental health and well being of individuals lack of benefits, the light noise, vibration impact, loss of footpaths, our o W's impact on habitats wildlife. And I'd actually just written down in my notes, that it's been quite sensible in other areas of this examination to adopt a Rochdale envelope approach where the worst case scenario is

included. So why could we not do that here. And with regard to see other projects, we would not agree with the applicant that these are speculative,

06:33

over town council, and many of my colleague councils in the area have received written materials and presentations, one from National Grid ventures around the use of the National Grid hub that is proposed here. And we are very distressed, greatly distressed and frustrated, that national grid are not here today, or at the previous hearings to be able to offer information or to be held to account for their decisions, because the National Grid substation is the driver here, it is, perhaps the principal or the first thing that you should be examining, because the capacity is not just for EA, EA one north or EA two, the land required would be different, the design would be different. And we believe the Inspectorate examining authorities approach would be different if you were starting with that, on in terms of the word and I, I must just emphasise the word laced and has crept into some of the applicants

07:43

rhetoric here, and it's not quite accurate at all to say that, because we understand that the substations for the independent projects. So for example, you've got the National Grid substation, but then you have a substation for em, one north and a two. So the substation is required for the additional projects that have been granted consent to attach to the National Grid substation, all have to be within five kilometres of that national grid substation. So please don't use the word leisten. It is the Friston hub that we're talking about here. So on that point counts, we will be testing that specifically with everybody, when we get to agenda item D, because we're going to ask the question, is there anywhere else that is within anybody's mind at all in relation to leisten?

08:41

In other other matters, that you need to add all or does that? Well, just to say that, um, we were quite shocked yesterday, when in listening to your very helpful hearing debates, that it is actually the applicant agreed that is actually actually for in sips we're looking at. And that phrase was used, because we've never had any consultation with the National Grid, or any opportunity to validate information or again, hold to account or engage meaningfully with them. And we don't believe that this should be buried within the two DCs that we're looking at. It's not for it's two and there should be a separate one. Thank you. Okay. Well, I hear that final point. I will confirm as well, that we have received your deadline to map so no worries about documents. Thank you. Okay, moving on. Can I just briefly check because Mr. Caplin's connection for first and parish Council has been a little in doubt does Mr. Caplin wish to speak? I'm moving through councils before I go to community action groups and the like. Does Mr. Caplin wish to speak on this?

09:53

I do not see or hear him. So on that basis, then I am going to move to Graham king.

10:00

Can you see our se C's and ask if there are points that he wishes to make on behalf of his client? Yes, thank you very much. So I don't need to take any time on items A and B, other than to endorse what you've already heard from, from the the two councils, I do want to spend a few moments dealing with

item C. And so if I may, I'd like to start by just making some points of general brief points of general applications and law and policy that bite on both item C and D. And of course, when we come back to D, I won't repeat.

10:33

repeat them. So because you'll be familiar to anyway, but I think it's worth just setting the context. Very briefly, if I may, the cumulative effects assessment carried out by the applicant, you'll know, my client, Stacy says deficient and fails to meet a number of requirements. And I just want to set those before I come on to some more specific points. The first is, of course, the infrastructure planning EIA regs and in particular, power ffiv of shedule. Four, which requires the assessment of the accumulation of effects whether existing or approved product projects, so MPs in one, you'll, again, obviously be familiar with paragraph 4.25. That makes a similar point about the need to consider in an ies, the applicants proposal combined power, it will combine and interact with the effects of other development, including projects which consent has been sort of granted, as well as those already in existence at paragraph 4.2. point five. Advice no 17 essentially reiterates that in one policy, but so also footnote 10. makes clear in this context, for the purposes of the advice note, other existing and or approved development is taken to include existing developments and existing plans and projects that are quotes reasonably foreseeable. And that's certainly what we're dealing with here. And I'll come on to the design in a moment.

11:57

Last brief points on law and policies. So is when a first project enables a second project, it's particularly important to assess the cumulative effects of a proposal together with other proposals and that we know from the Court of Appeal case in brown and Carlyle, the references are in the written reps that you've already received from say says, Yeah, so in this case, so we know the applicant acknowledges that there's potential for future proposed National Grid ventures projects in the local area. But the line is that there's insufficient information in the public domain for any of these projects to be assessed. We've heard a little bit more about that this morning from SPR. Well, that approach is in my submission, both inadequate and it more importantly, renders the work that's been done deficient because the proposed national grid connection hub is designed we've already heard at a scale and capacity to accommodate and enable a greater number of grid connections from proposed through the two SPR projects, and well beyond the needs of the two offshore wind farms that are proposed. And there are known proposals for energy projects, which will either connect or we say are highly likely to connect via grid connection at Friston if these details are granted, and which therefore should be taken into account in the cumulative assessment. And so I agree with Mr. Bedford on behalf of the County about the applicants position on this, whatever it may have been in the past, no longer being realistically tenable. It's a very pithy way of putting it, as you know that the district takes the similar view

13:32

in terms of the projects, so there is sufficient information to know that these are all likely to come forward importantly, over a period 2030 whilst the SPR projects if they consented would be being built, potentially, at least depending on when they start. And therefore there is sufficient detail to undertake a meaningful assessment. As I say they're all certainly reasonably foreseeable. I'll come back to the National Grid ones under the item D, if I can just address you briefly on the two wind farms, five s trees

and North falls. So you've already referred to the fact that in relation to North falls, where we know an agreement for at least has been signed with the crown estate now. And we know an application for development consent is expected in 2023. That there's been a recent meeting which is on the pins website dated the sixth of November of this year. And those meeting notes are interesting and informative. I won't go through them but if I can pull a couple of points out serve present purposes. We know from those notes that North was able to sign a connection agreement with national grid in 2021. Mid quarter one of 2021 is when a scoping request is due to be submitted to pins. There are various other steps detailed along the way but but one I would particularly emphasise at this stage is we see from that note that in October 2020. So

14:58

two months back, we're told

15:00

The cable route slash landfalls slash substation selection activity is to start. So and also those notes record. So finally, that in combination effects, and the large number of n sips in the area, including other offshore wind farms and grid reinforcements are what the applicant explained what some of the current issues affecting the project. So all these things are clearly in mind and recorded on the minutes of the meetings of the meeting on the sixth of November. In terms of five entries, again, agreement for lease has been signed with the crown estate. We know that a grid connection officer offer Friston has been made by NGS Oh, we don't know the terms of the offer. But it is listed on national grid transmission entry capacity register, and I believe is shown on the pins website is having a likely submission data quarter one in 2024. So where does that leave us? So briefly, the agreements release, we say show that there's a strong likelihood of these projects progressing. The cable land for both the wind for farms is understood to be around sizewell so will require connections in the same area. We've already touched upon what at least and means. We say obviously, therefore, Kristen,

16:17

but it's at least reasonable assumptions. In terms of SPS points about what we don't know. It's a reasonable assumption, at least that each of the offshore wind farms will require a similar amounts of land to the interconnectors, which were told, when we look at the for example, the Nautilus information on national grids website, which we'll come back to later, we're told of an area of about 1.3 hectares for each of the interconnectors to connect to the substation. And they will also of course, be required to learn for the converter or substations, which would have to be either at or in the vicinity of Friston. Again, our land use written reps deal with that in more detail. And that's a matter which we'll come back to Under Item D.

17:03

One last point. So in terms of what we heard earlier about what we don't know,

17:08

off gem, as I understand it, and I'll ask Mr. Wilson, if I'm wrong about this, so I know is on line limits, five histories in North falls, and the extensions to no greater than the than the original. So if, as I understand it, if the wind farm has consented for say, for 700 megawatts that was built at 400, then the extension is

limited to 400. So what's known about power coming from power ratings, etc, is more certain than has been suggested to you

17:43

this morning by SPR so so I'll come back to to the specific issue that's raised more precisely about public domain in the context of national grid under D. But for the moment, I think that's all I'd like to say perhaps one last point on this before I stop on See, going back to basics, again, you'll be very familiar with this, the fact that other projects will themselves require development, consent and environmental impact assessment in due course, is not enough of an answer for SPR at this point, because the object of both object of both the directive and the regulations is of course, to ensure that any cumulative environmental effects are considered before his decision is taken as to whether a DCR should be granted. And so an assurance that these things are going to be assessed at a later stage when a decision is taken on them. Whether that further developments you've committed does not justify electing not to carry out now I appreciate that the judgement for you as to what appropriately falls into the basket of what needs to be assessed for cumulative impact purposes. But but that's where we say, this position, the position is in relation to these two wind farms, and certainly within the National Grid projects that I'll come back to under the next item. So So unless I can assist you further. I just checked with this manual. Mr. Wilson wanted to add anything to that if I may,

19:07

indeed, do please

19:10

see no hands or

19:14

that's it. I've got nothing to add. I think I'm I'm very grateful. Mr. Keen, if I can just check with my panel colleagues, whether anybody had any particular questions on those submissions for se C's. And again, I'm seeing no hands. So I'm now going to move to CS because we did have the request from as Gilmore to engage on this matter again, no need to repeat what I was said you can adopt it if that helps. So let's get them all.

19:48

C's totally endorses what Mr. Keen has just said from spaces and also Marian fellows. I just want to add one or two aspects to this if we had a national master plan

20:00

To the UK PLC, we would be asking the question National Grid needs hub, it needs a strategic connecting hub. That is where you would begin, you probably begin with that question. If you were a totalitarian state, thank god we're not. But in this country, we really should be starting with that question. And at the moment, this examination, and I have great sympathy for you, sir, because this must be very difficult when we don't know whether we're judging, you know, this was a house plan,

20:32

are we talking about four houses, eight houses, 12 houses. At the moment, if I can just show you this Russian doll, we are judging this Russian doll. And we are looking at this Russian doll, and we're saying scottishpower e one and E two is the equivalent of this Russian doll. In fact, the more we dig deep into this, we discover that this Russian doll is actually a bit bigger than the Russian doll I've just shown you it's this size. And this is 3d CEO's not to. And if I open it up, you see this. But in fact, the more we carry on, as the weeks go by, and we amateurs dig deep into all of these fascinating papers, we discover that the Russian doll is actually this size. And it includes all of these very exciting plans within it. And it seems to me in simplistic terms, not being a planner, that we need to like good strategic thinkers anywhere in the world, we need to have our scenario planning, where we look at the worst case scenario, the best case scenario and we say National Grid needs a strategic hub. And where is the best place to put that strategic hub? So when the gentleman from Paolo from scottishpower, says that he cannot acknowledge that these two projects galloper and great about I can't remember mothballs and the other one of their new marketing names, aren't they?

22:16

It seems to me I refer to pins, your tier three unfortunate name tier three now, but pins tier three of the planning Inspectorate advice note 17 states that the cumulative impact will include projects and my predecessor has just mentioned this same thing that you need to take into account those projects where such development is reasonably likely to come forward. And our personal view about what it is we should be looking at is on Paul Chandler's cumulative impact shot, which he has supplied you with. So it could be that we have a document so excellent.

23:00

That we believe that the cumulative impact of all of these projects needs to be taken into account. And just one final example of why this is the case. When I know this is d we have to go off piste a bit here, because C and D do interconnect when people say the EIA has not been carried out the Nautilus and euro link. Well, the reality is that Nautilus is going to be completed according to the timetable in 2028, which is the same year as East Anglia one and East Anglia two. And on that basis alone, surely, these projects should be taken into account when we're having these discussions, because they are likely to happen. So my recommendation is that they're all included sizewell c plus, and by the way, when you look at net negligible impact for tourism, which is the stance on Scottish pars part where they say to people in obrah, small business owners that we've interviewed negligible impact two to three years construction, we say net 12 to 15 years construction, cumulative impact. So we are comparing apples with pears. And I do think we need to get to the bottom of this as soon as possible to make this examination worthwhile.

24:29

Thank you. So thank you very much, Miss Gilmore. Now, I was then going to come in order to s o. s, but I see that Mr. Chandler has his hand raised as indeed as Mr. Chadwick

24:44

who's, who's going to speak for you.

24:49

Thank you, Mr. Smith, for chance to save our soundings if I could ask me to put up the graph that I submitted this morning. And thank you for

25:00

For your indulgence and allowing me to submit this, this graph to this panel,

25:08

I'll basically explain what it is it's an area graph. And it's really our socio economic perspective.

25:16

It's based on percentage values for each project that we know about across their timeline. And the values are not linear, but follows of the bell curve as the project ramp up and ramp down at the start and end of each.

25:34

As you can see, the greatest cumulative impact will be between 2027 and 2031.

25:43

start and finish dates are based on our sort of best intelligence to date. And

25:49

by here, there's no granulation by month, and has been used this data really this

25:57

is an unknown form the sort of contact details at the moment. What is not covered is the impact this will have on the construction traffic and the increase in the additional workforce numbers. I haven't shown that and I can't really show that on the on this graph. But I thought this would just act as a visual representation of how all these projects work together, and the impact they're going to have on us. Now. I've also included in the National Grid interconnect to SCD one and SCD two,

26:35

we have with the

26:38

intelligence that they're going to be running a cable from Friston, down to the London gateway area and to Kent, we don't really have the proper dates for those as such, the Kappa, the Gabbard and the Gallup of wind farms, I'm still using those names. Because that is what most people locally know, these farms and to introduce two more names to them, I think that would just introduce yet more panic to the local population, we certainly don't need that that moment.

27:12

So people are it's I sit on the pins website, people are free to use it, it gives them an idea of say the cumulative impact. And, you know, hopefully find some use to them. And I will specifically Mr. Chandler say that

27:29

later on in this hearing, we have another additional submission document that was admitted on request of the applicant that we hope will assist us with the these discussions. And so we felt that it was only fair that if we had admitted their summary document that we should also admit yours. So it was admitted on exactly the same basis as the applicants document. This one is you foreshadow has been published, it is a additional submission as dash 071 in our examination libraries when they're updated. And but if if people who wish to see it, go to

28:05

the Documents tab on the websites, you will see the most recent documents at the top and you will find the Save As handlings additional submission cumulative impact accepted at the discretion of the examining authority, either at or very, very close to the top of the list. So anybody who needs to follow the document may do so. Now. Can I check? I did see a hand from Mr. Chadwick. And but Mr. Chadwick, you are an SOS as well. Is there anything additional that you need to put? Or as Mr. Chandler would just like quickly to book something? Can you hear me? Yes, I certainly can. Yes. And what I'd like to say is that I think this really makes it clear that this beautiful area of ease to suffer is a totally unsuitable place to but these connections were there with successive cable routes, or through the eo n b, and the sanderlings. It's the heritage coast. And I'd also like to say that that national grid, not taking part in the proceedings could be prejudicing the outcome. Because if they don't put their submissions until the very end, it doesn't give

29:28

people a chance to reply to them. And I think this is totally unfair.

29:35

Thank you. Thank you very much. Now if I could ask both Mr. Chandler and Mr. Chadwick to lower their hands having completed their engagements. And can I just check is there anybody else now wishing to speak to these items before we move on to item D. I see Harry young

30:00

Suffolk coast dmo and will Fletcher

30:07

Okay. Um dmo first please Good afternoon. Yes Harry Young chair of the Suffolk coast destination management organisation just like to make some quick points if I may, which is that

30:20

hearing from our membership and we are responsible for marketing, East Suffolk as a tourism destination hearing from our members have their concern about the cumulative impact of these energy projects on demand. for holidays in the area, we commissioned a study by leading consultants BVA bdcrc in 2019, to measure how the you know, the the press are surrounding these projects, and what impact they could have on visitor demand. And the results were highly concerning.

31:01

The survey told us that 84% of visitors to the area cite peace and tranquillity as the lead reason for their visit. But hearing about just the energy projects, the two scottishpower any projects in size will see led to a net fall in visitor demand of 17% or would lead to that fall. But if there was a momentum and and more energy projects were to follow, leading to East Suffolk being renowned as a place where major energy projects take place that actually that downturn could rise to 43%. So the Suffolk coast dmo found for money to pay for the significant costs of a proper independent survey, and have been continually disappointed with the outcome has not made a similar effort to try to measure the potential harm to the economy.

32:01

This gentleman has done what I am going to play that I've already flagged to earlier speakers is that we are intending to hold after the new year a full issue specific hearing. So you don't don't feel you have to inject all of the detail of this into this hearing. We just need to know essentially what needs to be inside the pot, as opposed to outside the pot for cumulative and in combination assessment purposes.

32:27

At this stage, okay, so is there anything further you need to add? Or shall I move on? Please move on. Thank you very much, Mr. Young. Now we've got will Fletcher of historic England. Mr. Fletcher.

32:43

I think Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to delay matters too much on the we are independent, statutory body, but I just wanted to confirm that we share the view of Mr. Bedford and Miss Gore from as expressed today from from a Suffolk County Council with regards to the human impact. We've raised concerns about the historic Environment Matters about the siting issues for a long time, we are also as a statutory body engaged in negotiations with other parties, as mentioned by people around the around the I was gonna say around the room today around the screen today. Sorry.

33:18

technical matters in

33:21

this room.

33:24

multiple screens is the appropriate. So yeah, so we find ourselves in in negotiation with others. And we are aware that these things it is I was gonna say vexation, it's a vexing matter that we cannot

33:39

get get to discuss these matters with national grid. And I find that we do agree with the points have been raised by by Mr. Bedford and Miss Gould. I think that's probably what I really need to say. Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Fletcher. And now finally, if I can just ask you to lower your hand. And I'll move to Carly. Vince.

34:03

Thank you. I'll be brief. I just wanted to assure the panel and the communities that you're representing sorry, Ms Vince and envy generation that sighs We'll see. Yeah, sorry. Yes, sorry. And I just wanted to assure the panel and also the communities and other stakeholders that we do take this matter of cumulative impact very seriously. And we are actively discussing matters with Scottish power. And we will continue to make written submissions into this examination, not only me, having regard to the additional information of Scottish power, but also in light of our change consultation, that will that an application that will come into course, but also, as our mitigation develops in the early part of next year.

34:50

ms Vince, thank you very much for those submissions now, and can I just check Finally, whether there are any other persons who

35:00

wish to speak on these items because we need I think promptly to move on to agenda item D. And I will just check again with my panel colleagues, are there any remaining questions arising from a, b or c that they wish to bring forward. And again, I'm not seeing any hands from either my colleagues or the room. Gosh, I wish it wasn't room.

35:24

Now, so we need to move them to agenda item D. And now very much as we did before, what I will do is I'll ask the applicant to set out their initial store and I will then ask in G v to take us as far as they can. My guess will be that we will then be essentially placing an action on Engadget and mg E. So, to the extent that we need their input to listen to this event, and to respond in writing by deadline three, and then I will seek requests from other parties who wish to speak on it. So the applicant first please on item d.

36:21

onus, on behalf of the applicant.

36:26

The question is clearly directed primarily at National Grid, eso and transmission.

36:35

Yeah, the Applicants are not directly involved in discussions regarding any future use of natural grid substation that is proposed for them. as set out in the record play context Nate rep 2003. These are matters which are of a confidential nature. The applicants are aware that national grid ventures have signed connection agreements for to potential interconnectors. And that national grid official ventures wish to retain the ability to potentially connect at first.

37:06

And I think it's quite helpful to note that within our statements of common ground, and this is the most advanced of the projects in the general area, that the statement that is agreed is at the date of the statement of common ground. Neither Nautilus or euro link projects are the sufficient stage of project

definition to confirm whether the National Grid substation will present a viable option for the connection to the national electricity grid. So that is the most up to date position, which effectively we're aware of. And we've obviously had discussions with National Grid benches, in order that matters relating to the design of these two projects would not compromise a future connection at Friston. And that is the extent to which matters of a and they're dealt with in the statement of common ground between us.

38:05

I think it's dissolved negatives, that in terms of the next topic matter, which we will come to look at in terms of the base review, that none of the other projects are at an advanced stage of consenting, have yet to seek scoping opinions. And of the other issues, the applicant obviously, is aware of the sizewell c application. But as far as we understand, that application has no bearing on the grid issues associated with the projects

38:39

and our submission. Therefore, at this stage, the future connections can only be described as speculative, and uncertain. And, as I said, that is about as far as I can go in relation to this matter on behalf of the applicants, because the question is more properly directed at others. And indeed, and and apologies to a degree for putting you in the hot seat first, but the convention is in the matters that we do. And if only at least to set out the applicants context, as they are informed of it, we then move on. So in which case, I am then going to ask NGV to engage on this matter. And essentially, what we are seeking from mgv is the clearest summary of current public IE, not commercial in confidence, intelligence around

39:43

the specific projects other than the application proposals that might connect at what has been referred to generally as leisten. Specifically, the Euro Lincoln Nautilus proposals, but indeed, the possibility of coming

40:00

actions for five asterisk, North falls, or indeed any other project. We're also interested in the question of whether a transmission system connection out in inverted commas, Leysin is anywhere at all could be anywhere else other than Friston.

40:22

Because if there is a potential kind of multi connection point in the offing, and again, it would be very, very useful for us to know about that, but at the moment, I think the local community are making the very broad brush assumption that when laced in is referred to in public documents that, essentially what is now meant by that is first and

40:45

so, I'm very conscious that mgv do not necessarily hold all of that in their command, but if they can walk us through that, the responses to that, that they do control the answers to, and then we can work out the balance that and get and so need to be questioned on and we can try and work out a method of doing that. So can I call on NGV? Please,

41:12

sir, I will try my best to assist the examination as much as I possibly can in response to those points.
And

41:22

at this moment in time, we have a connection agreement in place for the Friston area.

41:30

In our discussions with

41:34

system operator, the ESA

41:37

and our discussions with the relevant interested parties in the area are predicated and haven't changed from the position that we are looking to connection within the Friston area. And it hasn't at this stage move to a point where we can say with confidence today, within the least of area, I should say that we haven't moved to a position by their certainty. It's been Friston in the way in which had been described by others earlier in the examination hearing.

42:08

We continue to formulate and define our scheme.

42:15

And in the process of formulation, which has been continuing for some time, two years now. There have been recent changes in approach

42:27

that have moved to the promotion of a multipurpose interconnector. So in that context, Euro link and Nautilus are not seen for our purposes as a combined project and where you reference other projects a moment ago, I can't assist you with those

42:50

adventures purposes. Were only involved with the promotion of Nautilus and your link through bmpi to purpose interconnector.

43:01

Just to touch on the commentary made, I think by one of the parishes earlier by reference to SCD one and SCT. Two,

43:11

to the extent that they are projects that have been formulated, they are projects with the not interconnectors. They are operated projects. So they're not matters within our control as ventures and just to qualify those as well.

43:30

So we're proceeding with ski formulation having moved to a multipurpose interconnector in recent months, we are stepping back considering and re determining the impact of that change in approach. And we're moving forward, as has been suggested to a process for four, three, a scoping.

43:57

The timescale for that, at this moment in time is uncertain, it's certainly over six months away.

44:05

And we're looking to a period to the end of this year, it's a 12 month period.

44:15

We're not in a position where we can define with sufficient confidence, a determined connection point. We can't say it's Friston. And we are looking and continue to look at the latest in area.

44:33

could assist. I can comment briefly on on issues of cumulative impact that have been raised. Happy to do that. Now. We'll come back to that later.

44:43

be directed by you. See, I'm not sure where to start. So I'll go with that. And apologise. Apologies yes, no, we'll just

44:52

yeah.

44:54

For our purposes, what we're sympathetic with the applicants position as

45:00

renesis suggested asking isn't sufficiently defined and to determine the location for connection. But similarly,

45:09

where we assume that East Anglia want to consented.

45:17

And certainly for engagement purposes, we have to a degree followed that assumption because it's a reasonable approach in scheme formulation. We couldn't assist any further if asked to, to advise on potential cumulative impact, because we have no clear position as to landing point to cable corridor, or

possibly more importantly, in the local geography, to the location of any converter building. And if I Rochdale and the envelope were to be defined to catch a collection of worst case scenarios, it will be too broadly defined to assist proper examination in our view, because there isn't the clarity. At this moment in time to assist and any deep work, we're unlikely to reach that position until we've come to a point where we're able to present a scoping report to the relevant authorities to assist that, on that stage of our project formulation.

46:22

If we were to try and do more to assist at this point, I think as Mr. annissa suggested, we will be stepping to pure speculation and

46:33

imbalance, I don't think we can we can assist further

46:38

because of the stage we're at in the formulation of our project. So I hope that it is

46:45

just cysts I obviously later on in in in this issue specific hearing issues specific going to tomorrow and the sort of much more design focused day, we're going to have to grapple with some of the fallout of that, which is

47:00

we will then need to review what it is reasonable to expect these applicants to do in terms of dealing with the management and mitigation of, for example, its landscape and natural environment effect in its context. And there's a difference between what one might expect to be done. For example, if this is a transmission connection project purely for two offshore wind farms, in which case its boundary treatments and resolutions in design terms could be expect to be very firm indeed, as opposed to it being a flexible grid connection opportunity for to offshore wind farms plus a range of other proposals. So that's one of the reasons why we're we're trying to nail this particular piece of jelly because we were trying to work out what it is reasonable to ask the applicant to do before we then assess the degree to which the applicant has then met policy in terms of what it has done.

48:00

But now that you've set out your stall, and what we will need to do and I will note this for the action list is that we will need to ask the ESO and and get And to the degree that is relevant for them to listen to these specific items on on on the recording of this event and to make their best written submissions answering the same question so that the universe counted for NGV. So that to the extent that there is any additional and publicly available information about what may be being considered whether or not listen means Friston or whether there may still be other possibilities, etc, all of those questions, so, that I put to you in terms of the action list we will need. So and and get and to also address so, we have a clear position. And Mr.

49:04

Mr. Andrews, if I could also ask that you and your written submission at deadline three, render this as closely down into the table as you can.

49:15

So that we have a clear outlining of project positions and where you are saying that something is uncertain, it is made very clear your view that a particular project is uncertain therefore, you're taking the views that should not be considered for cumulative and in combination and impact assessment purposes.

49:37

Now then, can I just check with my panel member colleagues, whether there are any follow up

49:45

items that you wish to ask before we then move on and I ask for expressions of interest in speaking to this item from

49:58

the other interested parties.

50:00

In that respect, I already have on my list and expect to call on

50:07

Suffolk County Council, East Suffolk Council, and then the town

50:15

and parish councils, and then to move through the Community Action groups and other any other bodies who wish to speak up. I see is about tough for obviously,

50:31

you will be asked

50:34

to to put the position of the Suffolk council as soon as I've heard from the county council.

50:41

So shall we move on to the county council?

50:49

Thank you. Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council, just briefly. So I think three points in relation to item D, much of the ground is very similar to what we've already said to you, particularly in relation to item C. So I don't repeat that. But we say it translates across.

51:10

The second point,

51:13

just on the position, particularly from what you've just heard from

51:20

National Grid ventures, about what they can or cannot, as it were, comment on, sir, in our response to you, in relation to written question, one point 10.8 team, we did provide a link to ngvs website and a briefing pack

51:47

that they have published and put into the public domain. Now, I don't know whether you've taken the opportunity of following that link to actually look at the briefing pack yet.

51:58

Obviously, we could provide you with a hard copy if you'd prefer that with our written submissions. But if you're happy with the link, and I think it still works,

52:07

it was just the way that they put matters in the briefing pack in relation to this issue about connection having referred This is on

52:19

Yes, it is. Yes, it is page four I can just read it paid for that document having referred to their connection agreement.

52:30

They say en jet have provided a connection agreement to use a new 400 kV substation provisionally referred to as less than 400 kV substation. Then they say this, this is the same substation that SP our offshore wind farms East Anglia one north and two are proposed to be linked to ngi h SPR and n jet are currently working on the premise that all projects will be connecting to the same substation plate and 400 kV substation. Now, obviously, we know what the position is in relation to SPR and these proposals, and whether we call it speculation or we call it a working premise, we think there is sufficient information to make it clear that we are talking about Friston, even if matters may need to be further refined by the promoters in due course. So that was our second point. And when I say we refer you to that brief, the third point and I don't incense. As a lawyer, you may think, well, this is a bit of an odd point to be making. But But I would invite you not to view this solely through the prism of a legalistic approach, ie solely through the prism of the requirements of the EIA regulations, and the habitats regulations in relating to either cumulative assessment or in combination assessment. Because quite separate from those legalistic requirements, which obviously do have to be complied with. There is the concept of good planning, and joined up planning and matters of planning judgement, and whatever you might think about the strict I say, regulatory compliant, there is a wider question as to what good planning requires in this instance. So I just leave that with you as authentic, overarching comment. So there is a reasonable person on the Ipswich Omnibus test that we ought somehow to be turning our

minds to, well, he might have come by as it were a temple key house to get to Ipswich but yes, I got a king right. Thank you very much, in which case I will now go to Isabella Tafur for East Suffolk Council.

54:51

Thank you very much, sir. And I adopted endorse everything that Mr. Bedford has just said to you. We didn't really touch on

55:00

This topic in as much detail under agenda item three, because we understood you just want a factual update under that agenda item, but we also endorse everything that the county council said under that topic. One thing I would like to add is Mr. Bedford referred you to a briefing pack that was produced by National Grid ventures in 2019. And there is a more recent document, which was produced in May of 2020, which we provided the link to, again in our

55:32

responses to written questions, I believe, and possibly also the local impact report, which again, refers to a connection at first.

55:42

So as recently as May of this year, the Nautilus and euro link, projects were being said, by National River adventures, to be intended to connect at first. And then there's discussion from National Grid ventures as to what that would require, and they identify approximately 1.3 Hectors of land for each connection at that location. Now,

56:08

we say that these projects are reasonably foreseeable, they should be taken into account in the cumulative impact assessment. We understand the applicants position that they say, well, they're not party to discussions, that national grid that happened with other bodies, but in effect, we have the applicant saying to you, well, we don't know what the answer is. And we have national grid saying to you, well, we're not willing to tell you what's coming forward. And they

56:37

raise concerns about confidentiality, but these connection offers are all in the public domain. And it's not such an

56:45

amorphous project, but it's not possible to come to any view as to what might be like clear to be required in order to accommodate this. So if we know that a 1.3, Hectors, footprint is likely to be required.

57:00

And that connection offers have been made in respect of three potentially four projects, why can't those things be taken into account? It's not, it's not cable corridors were asking about or landfall locations. It's

specifically the cumulative impacts of the substation site that we're concerned about, as you'll have seen through our local impact report, and our various consultation responses to date.

57:26

We don't accept the position that the applicant outlined earlier in the hearing, where they refer to as angler, four and said, Oh, well, you know, a lot of things changed ultimately, in that scheme. It's obviously the case that things change. But that doesn't excuse them for the requirement to assess that which is reasonably foreseeable in this at this stage, even if that might change at some point in the future.

57:56

Thank you very much. For now, can I just again, check with my panel colleagues to see whether there are any other matters arising from those otherwise clear submissions.

58:09

I see none. Now at this stage. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm looking at my watch, and I'm very conscious of time and the movement towards the lunch break. And I am very, very conscious that we do have OFGEM in the room about him, we have a very specific set of questions in relation to agenda item to E. And whilst I would not normally do this unless I had to, what I'm actually going to suggest that we now do is punch a little lacuna in the proceedings, and that we specifically deal with just the off game item under genda item to E so that the examining authority can put some specific questions to them before I understand they have to depart before lunch. And what we will then do is seeing how the Time marches we may then take the break and return to responses on D after the lunch break with interested parties who are when all of a sudden done due to be here for the remainder of the day. So ladies and gentlemen, let us now briefly just turn to off gam and ask if they are agreeable to that course of action.

59:23

Thank you very much for the understand the timing on.

59:29

Um, okay. Well, listen, I think probably the best way to handle this will be if I just put to you the specific matters that the examining authority wanted to check with you and which relate to change in the policy and regulatory framework around and energy generation and transmission and market performance that might bear on the decisions that the Secretary is the Secretary of State has to make. So

1:00:01

Amongst other things, we've read with very considerable interest, the decarbonization action plan that was published by ourselves on the third of February 2020. And that plan, I think, in summary terms is directing you to take actions that support the achievement of the net zero emissions by 2050. Target

1:00:23

actions of which include, and I draw out two of the headline, action items.

1:00:31

Exploring with governments and industry opportunities for greater coordination to enable rapid expansion of an offshore grid at lowest cost.

1:00:42

And then there is an extraordinarily interesting action, which is probably if I had to nail something over the door of this virtual hearing room was our motto and say that it ought be our motto, it is this, we will respond to the need to take big decisions facing a deeply uncertain future by becoming more adaptive in the way that we work. So in other words, it's about agility, looking at how you regulate, and indeed how everybody in the decision making processes around the delivery of energy generation development, conducts themselves prudently in order to make sure that we do deliver the net zero emissions by 2050. Target. And as we are all charged with doing

1:01:36

so,

1:01:37

off camera, of course, is fully alive to the ongoing review of offshore transmission networks by bays.

1:01:45

And this is where we have, I guess, you know,

1:01:53

the crux of our question to you, which is that the applicants in these two projects have proposed means of connecting the proposed developments to the transmission system that respond to transition says transmission system management and market policy objectives that were developed before the change to net zero by 2050. Now, those are still in force. And but they're evidently undergoing substantial review and change and and that change is clearly

1:02:21

identified in the decarbonisation action plan.

1:02:25

And so what we need to get a handle on is the timing or likely timing of formal changes to relevant policy and regulatory regimes. So do you have a roadmap towards the implementation of the decarbonisation action plan? At what point in time, might assets that are planned to be transferable to an off toe or off toes under these applications, be subject to amended policy or regulation that might bear on the feasibility of another form of connection or a shared form of offshore transmission connection, as opposed to the ones that are being proposed by this applicant? Now? Now, the reason why we're asking that question is not because we believe we have to take that into account necessarily, but we want to understand

1:03:19

better bearing in mind that these applicants are asking for a seven year commencement window. So we're looking at 2027, eight, before we're in a world where potentially these projects might even be commenced. We want to form of view about what adaptability, what

1:03:41

agility, and it might be reasonable to suggest that this applicant take into account to face potential changes to market regulation, and potential changes to the way that the offshore transmission regime is managed. I'm sorry, that's a very complicated question, but you focus sitting in the hot seat. Thank you.

1:04:04

Thank you for the opportunity to come and talk about the work that we're doing as well, and I hope it's helpful.

1:04:10

We published the carbonization Action Plan February and particular points in relation to offshore transmission brand recognition that the growing volumes of offshore wind coming onto the system meant that the existing radial Point to Point framework of connections may not be either acceptable, economical, efficient, or environmentally sustainable moving forward with the increased projections of offshore wind capacity coming onto the system.

1:04:42

Last year, government agreed the offshore wind sector deal, which set a target of 30 gigawatts by 2030. This has since been updated to 40 gigawatts by 2030. As government policy,

1:04:54

you've mentioned the offshore transmission network review and we're working very closely with base on that area of work.

1:05:01

Turning to the timelines. We're thinking about projects in two contexts, and beachum tactical timeframe, which would be projects connecting between 2025 and 2030.

1:05:15

And then longer term Bosch tg changes, which would be project connecting after 2030.

1:05:23

The way we're thinking about the shorter term stuff is

1:05:27

projects that might be able to coordinate with one another in terms of shared transmission assets under the existing regulatory and legislative regimes, but may require changes to those regimes to facilitate them. So that may involve changes to how we assess the cost of the transmission infrastructure, the offshore transmission infrastructure, and also how that cost is then recovered. Whether it be from the

the generator connected by the offshore assets, or an increased proportion of costs being socialised. Across the consumer base.

1:06:02

The longer term work may involve quite substantial

1:06:07

weight change and a broader remit in terms of regulatory change and who delivers What

1:06:16

if we think about the delivery of an offshore wind farm from seabed lease through to an energisation. As I'm sure everybody on this call knows, it's very complicated pilings, one bit of economic regulations and other bits of it.

1:06:32

One of the things that's within the scope of strategic changes, whether or not there are different building blocks of getting from seabed lists to energisation, whether or not different people do different things, I think one person earlier on mentioned the central plan for the development and delivery of infrastructure. That is one of the things that's on the table for the longer term.

1:06:56

In terms of tactical timeframe, we were hoping to develop an implant policy over the next 12 to 18 months.

1:07:04

The strategic timeframe would take longer, and when be implanted in a policy sense until maybe the mid 2020s is what we're thinking at the moment, with projects then connecting later, given the wait time that's required by developers, and all stakeholders in terms of development of the wind farm. I think at the moment, if everything goes smoothly on the timeline, it can take 10 years, but oftentimes it takes more than that.

1:07:34

So I'm checking, think about my notes to see the missing.

1:07:40

Yeah, sorry. So in terms of this particular project,

1:07:43

we had taken the view that if development had entered the planning process, there was probably limited scope for them to change their development to develop more coordinated assets. So we have grouped projects, and our thinking to projects are in the planning process, those who are slightly earlier in their development, who may be able to develop and coordinated assets and shared assets. And some of the extension projects, which you've spoken about earlier on today. Maybe some of those, and then, in the longer term, the projects that are being

1:08:20

leased at the moment, they're going through the corona state, seabed leasing round, and thereafter. Okay, I hope that's helpful. No, that is extremely helpful. And what I would then like to just test with you then is that the consequence of that, as you see, it would be that

1:08:38

these two applications then having entered this kind of formal, kind of a final move towards decision in the planning process with examination and then reference to the Secretary of State, and that you would not envision either of these two projects

1:08:59

having any reasonable opportunity, as you see it to infrastructure share between themselves, or infrastructure share with others in ways that would mean that potential transmission system connection options that are not currently before us might evolve in a timescale prior to their formal commencement. So you know, if we're looking at that time scale up to 2027, eight,

1:09:33

we need to we need to form I sent a sense of view about whether or not

1:09:40

the applicant needs to dance an agile dance in relation to

1:09:45

potential and transmission system connection, sharing or collaboration.

1:09:53

Or alternatively, you know, your view is that you are satisfied that they are

1:09:59

you

1:10:00

even earlier than any short term action to directly respond to the changes that you're bringing forward.

1:10:09

These projects are probably too soon for our policy changes to have an effect.

1:10:16

The be me I'm not, I don't know the details of the particular development, but they may already be sharing some assets, such as cable routing, I don't know, but I wouldn't expect that our attendees would be able to drive any further changes this particular development.

1:10:34

Okey dokey. Right. Well, that's, that's a, that's a, that's a clear position. And it was one that, you know, again, helpfully, I thought, we did need to get onto the table and from the horse's mouth, and in this examination, now, I do see a hand from counsellor Marianne fellows and what I am however conscious of is the fact that we are moving really quite rapidly now towards the lunch break. Now if the because your position again bears on the applicant, I was going to offer them an opportunity to raise any points through me that they wished before you depart and and I was going to record the same opportunity to others so I was going to go to the applicant first and then I see hands from counsellor fellows and counsellor North who is of course representing trees coffee MP, so can I I actually let's let's hear from counsellor fellows and counsellor North first simply because the applicant may need to wrap their matters up. So let's then go to counselling North first and then counsellor fellows.

1:11:50

Thank you,

1:11:54

Mr. Smith,

1:11:57

from the spokesman from from GM, because he mentioned dividing up into short term 2025 to 2030, which obviously this project falls within and then longer term 2030 onwards. And but he already referred to that change in government policy, whereas 40 gigawatts needs to be delivered to 2030. So if you're dividing it up by then, then no meaningful change will come into effect until after 2030, whereas the bulk of that energy needs to be

1:12:32

supplied and online. Before then, I would also like to hear what the options were one has to say about the

1:12:42

National Grid transmission network review, which quite clearly states that changes can be made within the current regime. And that's what we're talking about here. There's also been comments made by secular state four bays in Parliament recently is as recently as the fifth of November when he says the argument for some form of offshore network system has been one and then he goes on to refer to refer to the integration and coordination of connections and that offshore Network Review that he initiated. So these are the points that theresa wishes to put across that the Coordination and Integration clearly needs to be part of the current thinking in relation to these two applications. Thank you, Mr. Smith. Thank you very much, counsel. Now, counsellor fellows, and counsel North if you could lower your hand so that I can.

1:13:54

Thank you, Mr. Smith, do appreciate the opportunity to jump in here before OFGEM leave really because I'd like them to hear directly from myself as representing over town council but as representing the public view, really.

1:14:10

I'm really really upset to hear that he says he doesn't believe that these projects could actually benefit from policy changes in the future.

1:14:21

The strategic policy in terms of n one for overarching public interest and meeting carbon targets could still be achieved by radically different locations. So even one north and E and two was somewhere else in the UK. Um, we could still achieve the end one principles, or if they were paused. Um, I do think these projects have been pushed forward by the applicants timeline and their desire to get in before any review takes place now, and I actually think that as a country, we

1:15:00

You'll be so much better off to pause and benefit from changing technology, innovative solutions, moving away from the environment that exists with Ofcom. And also the crown estates of piecemeal commercialization decisions without the common good. And looking at the bigger picture. And I think that we will rule the day, if we let these two projects continue and be approved, only to find that there is light at the end of the tunnel, and there is a better way forward of working together as a nation and this part of the country to actually contribute to UK PLC and our energy needs. You know, it, we can't allow this to happen. Yes. COVID. Brexit has changed our environment, both politically and personally. And there's been delays in the reviews. We shouldn't suffer here. Friston leisten because of those reviews have been imposed or delay. So I'm sorry. I've got to have off Jim here that from us from the heart that we can do better, you could do better. Let's not give up on this is it? It is possible for a better way. Thank you. Thank you very much. And I do now see one more hand that I see. Miss Gilmore for sees. So if I can ask Miss Gilmore overseas to come in applicant to reassure you, I'm going to ask you to respond. Once we've wrapped through all of these and I will return to Afghan briefly just ask if there are any final concluding remarks they would make in relation to these points that have just been right. So

1:16:56

let's get them all it is. Suppose could you lower your hand be very helpful.

1:17:03

Even the Minister kwasi kwarteng said on November the fifth in Parliament, the crucial thing to remember is that most of this technology is already here with us right now. shifting away from individual connections, what we call spaghetti towards a larger, more integrated solution would be environmentally sensible, as well as presenting an enormous Akon anomic opportunity for the whole country and for every stakeholder group. What I would like to say is, I totally endorse what Marian fellows has said, We are dismayed that what off GM has said today, and we challenge it, given the fact that the technology is available, we have a majority government that could vote for legislative change, and that we know from speaking to engineers, across the sea in Belgium and Holland, that there are mid term solutions available that do not require what we used to call offshore remains, but simpler solutions that would allow this to be done in a more modern way. So we ask off gem to reconsider 2025 to 2030 solutions. Thank you, sir. Thank you. A number of people have made direct reference to the adjournment debate in parliament on the fifth of November, in which the Minister kwasi quieting made a

response Damon to a number of Suffolk members of parliament on points that are directly relevant to this. And

1:18:47

I think this will first raise counsel north by itself, would you be able to as an action and take onboard them the provision of a submission to us in writing by our next deadline that formerly records that and provides us with the link to it on Parliament TV or the transcript of it? Because then it is formally a documents that we can consider at the moment we know about it, but it hasn't been brought into us I believe yet as a document. So

1:19:22

castle north, if you could do that, we'd be very, very grateful. Of course, I will provide a written submission with that with the hand side link. Mr. Smith, can I just make one further comment in relation to technology that was just bought up by the by the previous speaker, I will I will indulge you but the one thing that we must be clear about that we've got to try and everybody needs to try and bring their own speech to a conclusion in these proceedings. Otherwise we do go around in circles but counsel I will allow is just a very brief point because I was going to mention it later on after the lunch break if you still remain on this item, but as it's been

1:20:00

brought up in terms of what the Secretary of State said in terms of the technologies available now and that was endorsed in the transmission network review as well. And indeed SPR are already suggesting about building a Scotland to England superhighway by 2027 to underground cabling. So it seems that the technology is already there from their point of view. Anyway, so there is a possibility for them to underground cabling here and bring it on the shore, closer to centres of population, rather than where we've been speaking about today, and its raises made in her previous submissions, clear her thoughts about about Bradwell and the brownfield site there rather than going across the amb and in Suffolk at which means I will raise that we will be coming to these items in the afternoon. Now I'm seeing what is beginning to be a forest of of hands, and Miss Gilmore, we have already heard from you. So I believe I don't need to come back to you.

1:21:11

And then we have Mr. Chadwick, SOS, and Mr. Wheeler of se C's. Now I'm going to ask you to please make summary points of no more than a minute in duration because I am very, very conscious that the reason we accelerated this item was because our Afghan representative cannot be with us after the lunch break. I need a fairness to allow him to respond to these points. And then I need the applicant to be able to put their position in relation to anything that OFGEM have raised. So Mr. Chadwick for no more than one minute, please.

1:21:48

Thank you. Yes, I totally agree that offshore connections and much the best way, but but before that came along, there were Brownfield connections. And as last speaker said, Brad Welton option that Thames Estuary where there are miles and miles of brownfield sites, and there are national grid connections. Surely,

1:22:17

if we're not in time for a offshore connection, which I think we are in time for, then a brownfield connection should be mocha rescue at this point, Mr. Chadwick because we will cover a lot of this in the afternoon, and it doesn't directly necessarily bear on on allowing off get him out of the room.

1:22:39

Mr. Wheeler for se C's, then finally, and again, one minute maximum, please. Yeah.

1:22:45

Can you hear me sir?

1:22:50

Can you hear me?

1:22:53

Yeah, we are if you want to come in. Thank you. Sorry. Um,

1:23:00

I would I'd like to do examine is to revert to the statement that I made in open floor hearing three, which was a suggestion that if scottishpower were willing, they could coordinate their East Anglia, one North and East Anglia to wind farms, and deliver the power from those two wind farms together to a single site using high voltage DC, rather than using high voltage AC that would facilitate a connection to a site, which was far distant from the pristine site that is currently being considered. And what I would like to do is for the option representative to comment on whether or not is Scottish power, bearing in mind they have control over both projects, were willing to do that whether the current regime could support them in doing so. Thank you. That's a great question. Okay. I'm going to wrap this up. Now, I'm going to return to Afghan for any risk remarks in response that they wish to make in relation to those matters that have just been drawn forward. And then I'm going to come to the applicants, and then we can release off down by the lunch break. Mr. Copeland, thank you very much. And so I think a number of

1:24:12

pieces of feedback there regarding the timing of the review and whether or not it be possible to pause projects.

1:24:19

Making changes to projects at an advanced stage of development puts at risk. Achieving governments net zero targets, also potentially causes supply chain issues. In terms of procurement. I think some of the other questions were more related to government policy, rather than necessarily regulation. So for example, German, the Cronus, they operate within the legislative framework that's set for us to some of those questions are perhaps better directed at government colleagues rather than ourselves. Indeed, with regard to the comment from Mr. Wheeler,

1:24:55

there is scope for the development of shared assets and the

1:25:00

can be considered within the existing regime.

1:25:04

There are perhaps commercial disincentives to how anticipatory investment might be treated at the moment, which might stop a developer from developing infrastructure in the way he suggested. And those are some of the things that we are thinking about in terms of that tactical work stream, which I referenced. But that probably doesn't not get around the point that I sort of had when I was originally speaking. And the fact that this project may be too early for those policy changes to take effect. And those policy changes cover things that often female bolts are things that are not within gems remit.

1:25:41

Okay, look, that is

1:25:45

a clear response, it may not have been the response to certain other persons around this virtual table wished to hear but at the end of the day, we have to hear from every body and give them a full free and fair opportunity to put to the position of their entity onto the table. So I'm now before I release you, Mr. Copeland just going to return to the applicant and ask if there are responding points that they wish to make, once we have heard from them. And we will be in a position then to release you. And we will close at roughly the point in time when we had indicated that we would

1:26:21

if I could ask Mr. Wheeler from se C's to lower his hand, because I believe so we've already spoken.

1:26:27

So to the applicants,

1:26:31

Thank you, sir. Column ns on behalf of the applicant, I have nothing further to add at this stage. Thank you. Okay, I'm very grateful, Mr. Ellis, in which case, and let's now draw

1:26:44

the agenda for lunch. To this point, it is my mind box. Mr. Smith just can see we've got one hand up just before we draw this to a close, sorry, to prolong things.

1:26:59

So sorry to interrupt just as you're closing this session, we've looked at the agenda this afternoon. Obviously, we've identified our position in the course of this morning's hearing, we just wonder we're available. And we just wonder whether we're needed for this afternoon, and whether we can make a valuable contribution, or whether we can be released. And, indeed,

1:27:25

I mean, there are elements that could bear on your involvement. For example, various people wish to speak to the Brownfield connection option around Bradwell or equivalent etc. and but I suspect from what you've already said, that you would have very, very little to say about any such options. And we need Yeah, we indeed also have to be measured in terms of our engagement with them, because we are at the end of the day and examining authority appointed to examine the applications before us. And so we will be investigating them. But there's a limit to how far we will be able to go. And

1:28:08

I, I would suggest that. And given the picture that you've already painted, it would be reasonably fair that you also be excused at this point. But obviously, there will be those actions in the action list for the National Grid stable overall.

1:28:27

And we would very much welcome their contribution on those points. Well, there's a business separation, which stops us from influencing them, I hear what you're saying you understand what I don't influence constantly. We can't do anything more.

1:28:42

To assist on that point. There is just one point of clarification. When I was explaining the relationship with projects and the movement to the MPI, I described, the Empire's combining euro link and Nautilus. That is inaccurate, they are to MPI projects, and just to be clear on our position. And we'll deal with that and written submission anyway. So, okay, so if you could, in that, in those circumstances, the greatest party that you can bring to that in writing, and will be much appreciated to avoid the need for any further questions or indeed, requests to attend for further hearings. Okay, ladies and gentlemen, we are now at the lunch point. I will say for timing purposes, it is now 20 past one so therefore, I think we need to allow full hour for everybody to do all of the following up on things that they need to do and return here at 20 past two, ladies and gentlemen. So let us now break