

East Anglia_ISH2_2ndDec_Session 3

Thu, 12/3 12:07PM • 1:30:51

00:05

afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome back to this second pair of issue specific hearings. My name is Rynd Smith, and I'm the panel lead. And I'm in the chair this afternoon. Now, I'm this guy any further, I would just like to check with the case team, that recording is started. And the live streams are again in operation.

00:29

Good afternoon, Mr. Smith, the recordings have started and the live stream is operational. Excellent. Thank you very much for that confirmation was hope well,

00:39

okay, then Ladies and gentlemen, let's regather ourselves after lunch and remind us ourselves where we are and point ourselves in the right direction for the remainder of today's business. Now, and you'll recall, we broke out of the agenda order matter that we were on, which was item two D, in order specifically to hear off game in relation to a contribution on item two E, which I took out of order because I was conscious that if we didn't deal with that before lunch, we would lose them. So that has been done. We will very shortly ladies and gentlemen B and returning them back to the balance of item two D where I have a range of speaker contributions that I will ask for, we will then hear item to eat. item two will then be concluded. And we will move on to item three, where again, as I flagged this morning,

01:39

I was intending to offer to take and all parties associated with sizewell in its various

01:50

functions at the beginning so that the size well, relationship size will A B or C relationship can be brought on to the table at the outset of of the agenda three items. And also so that actually if those parties are pressed for time, they are then in a position to to potentially leave. And the rest of us can then go and work through the consequences of what has been said. So can I just check with those parties representing sizewell entities? And is that something that makes sense to you?

02:31

No, I'm not seeing any hands from anybody wishing to speak on that.

02:37

And so on that basis, I'm taking the view that nobody's objecting to that proposed change order. So that then ladies and gentlemen is how it will be taken.

02:49

There's one other preliminary stroke procedural matter that I want to refer to before we return to agenda and item two D. And that relates to the applicant this morning flagging potential changes in relation to footprints levels and heights at the substation site in Friston and talking about introducing outline material and effect deadline three, and detail a deadline for and we are also strongly conscious of the submissions that we received from Greg King QC for Stacy's essentially trying to push the point and saying that we should seek as much as we could achieve by deadline three, the examining authority have deliberated those points over lunch. Essentially, our view is that as long as this material is as the applicant suggests non material in nature, and that it should be brought forward on the timings that the applicant has proposed with the descriptive material of the nature of change at deadline three, followed by the detail and mitigation plans, and deadline for and the reason that we have for adopting that approach is that whilst in general terms it is desirable to have as much information early in the application as we can, we are very, very conscious that deadline three is very close upon us. And we would much rather that this work were done in full and done well than rushed. We are also conscious of a discussion that we had in the preliminary meetings for these examinations, where we did raise the flag that essentially deadline for was the freeze line deadline for was the point at which really, we should be making sure that then no further significant changes emerged. And, and and having had that conversation in the preliminary meetings and a number of parties having essentially bound themselves to it and it would be rather

05:00

Strange I feel to to resolve from it'll fall back from it now. So we do get very careful consideration to the submission about calling everything a deadline three, but no on balance, we will stick with the proposals as the applicant is put before us. Is there anybody who wishes to put anything final to us on that point before we make that as a procedural decision?

05:31

Again, I'm not seeing any any hands.

05:36

On that basis, we do have a hand we have Mr. bedfords. And up Ah, right hand not showing on my

05:47

apologies, in which case, Mr. Bedford.

05:54

Thank you, sir. Thank you, Michael Bedford, Suffolk County Council. So I wasn't going to in any way dissent from what you had indicated or offer any contrary view to that, what I wanted to just err, was a supplement to that. And that timetable of that deadline for being effectively critical for anything that were to amount to a change in obviously, very my consultation. And so and so clearly the points that we amongst others were making to you this morning, about the need for a wider assessment, in terms of the the scope of the developments forming part of the substation cluster, if I can call it that.

06:42

And obviously, we will fat a little bit more about that, either this afternoon, or tomorrow when we look at some of the nitty gritty topics, which we say, could have implications in more than one discipline. But clearly, if you were

06:57

of the view that you were minded to share this counsels view that further work needs to be done by the applicant on cumulative assessment matters. Obviously, the outcome of that work may or may not have implications for how the scheme is then presently drawn, either by needing additional mitigation or so on and so forth. So all I was saying was that if you were going to be,

07:25

as it were, in the lice of issue specific to coming to any views, that the applicant ought to be asked to do more work on wider assessment matters, that would dovetail into that exercise if that decision was made sooner rather than later. So the applicant could do that work, it could then feed into what was then available that deadline for indeed, and I think, you know, just as we had asked

07:52

the applicant and parties to bear that deadline for threshold very closely in mind, we ourselves need to try and be bound to it. So if we find ourselves deliberating after this hearing on matters that have been raised and forming the view that there are other things that we think the applicant or do, then, you know, some form of procedural decision needs to issue from us. And it needs to issue from us in time to enable action to be reasonably taken by deadline for. And so yeah, that that's definitely a living part of our consideration around how to manage these examinations. Mr. Bedford?

08:31

Excellent. Right. Well, that basis, unless there are any other hands raised, and I see none at present,

08:41

then I'm going to suggest that we do return to agender order, we return to item three d. And I need to then

09:02

just checking my notes just to remind myself where we left off. Yes, I need to come to the parish Council. So I'm going to ask

09:13

aldborough Town Council and then if we have Mr. Captain of first and parish Council, whether there are matters on

09:22

agenda 3d, which to remind you is National Grid structure policy and plans in the local area.

09:32

counsellor fellows, are you able to speak on this point? Or do you wish to speak on this point?

09:40

Yes, good afternoon, Mr. Jones, and panel members and everyone. Thank you. So I'm trying to sort of get back to where we were really, although I think it was really helpful to have that opportunity to speak to off gem so thank you for managing it in that way.

09:58

Firstly, I think

10:00

Like to address the idea that lace two may not be Friston. So we've heard from the applicant, and it's very clear that commercial bearing is very important. And also for national grid, why would they choose to build a second infrastructure in the same area, but not at the same location, if one already exists with, obviously spare capacity, so it's not going to be practical to say that it isn't resting, it is going to be Friston because they wouldn't commercially want to do somewhere else.

10:37

So let's think for a second that it isn't a stunt. It's not Friston.

10:43

As you've seen by your visits to the area, I'm sure, and in a lot of the documentation we've submitted, we're talking about a very small geographic area, the distance between Friston and laced in is literally only just over three miles, you're talking about six to eight minutes, a travel time, depending on which way you go.

11:04

There's large areas that are would be excluded, or the EDF land, you can't build within certain distance of least and town itself.

11:15

So even if it isn't Friston, if it is somewhere else in the leisten area, it's still going to be within four to five minutes of Friston and the same harms that we've identified. So the same negative impacts, which I'm not going to list, but will be relevant, within the same very small geographic area, you have to be this side of the a 12.

11:42

It wouldn't be viable for cable runs to go all the way from the coast, across and beyond the a 12. So you are literally bounded by the sea on one side the a 12 on the other and laced in EDF land on the north, and then, you know, the the old nor on the south. So we're talking about a very small geographic area, even if you believe the applicant of other projects, National Grid ventures, for example, to say that it's not Friston, although I'd like to concur with Suffolk County Council and East Suffolk council that we to overturn Council have seen those documents, where it does say that the connection points are the same place. Okay.

12:29

And as the final point on this, if there is another site, where we could have a, you know, a huge five Hectar National Grid substation or infrastructure, then why hasn't SPR considered that alongside Friston? Why is Friston The only offer? Where is this mysterious site that can be somewhere other than Friston?

12:54

National Grid ventures are not said they're not sure that there'll be connecting there. But I personally and others have seen the document that's in the public domain, where they've shown their for their four options for land for for Nautilus, and euro link. And those four options for land four, are all within the area that links and cross deforestation. So they they have defined down an area of where they are planning, and also geologically, and because of the coastal Caroline crag and everything else, they're rezone a set place that you can really come ashore here. So I'm sorry to say that disappointment rains.

13:40

It's not speculation, it's been in print, please don't Let's be distracted from the real issues, which is regardless of whether it's Friston or hundred miles, hundred minutes up the road, you know, it's still going to be impacting the same area, because it can't be more than two or three miles away. Okay, thank you. Thank you very much. That's clear. If I can then move on to

14:06

first and parish council if they wish to make any points on this?

14:14

I'm not hearing Mr. Kaplan. And can I just check with case to whether we know whether Mr. Kaplan is actually back in the hearing, there was a suggestion that he was potentially going to rejoin using

14:27

using digital this afternoon.

14:32

I'll move on at this juncture though. Can I then check who else wishes to speak on this item? And

14:44

I was planning then to go to and having having done the council's to the community groups to say C's to C's to SOS? And is there anybody else who wishes to speak to this idea?

15:03

I see Michael Bedford with his hand up. Was the Bedford is that a relic from earlier? Or is there a point that needs to be made for Suffolk County Council? So it should it, it doesn't appear as a hand on my screen. So it must be a legacy hand or a relic hand and I apologise. I'll look at my technology and see what's gone wrong there. Sorry, sir. Do not worry. These things happen in in virtual events. It was a Ghost in the Machine. Let's move on. Okay. And so I'm going to call first arm Graham king who see in

respect of Stacy's. Thank you, sir. And can I just say before I begin on Tuesday that I'm grateful for the indication you just gave to Mr. Bedford.

15:58

On the need, you know, if there is if you the panel do decide.

16:04

The assessment that's a decision taken

16:09

is that Mr. Pepper indicated, so I'm grateful for that. So

16:12

a couple of preliminary points before we look at the specific national group.

16:23

Kelly, can I just check, Mr. Kean? Certainly, in my study, and your connection is tripping in and out and I'm afraid I lost the last sort of eight or 10 words there right after

16:39

I'm maybe gonna suggest that if you have another go and if we, if it's still dipping in and out, we might try and presentation without video.

16:55

So right back, your back.

16:59

Okay. Well, I don't know what happened there. So But anyway, I was simply saying so that in relation to do we heard earlier from SPR,

17:09

that this is a question directed at the National Grid in its various guises.

17:15

That's obviously the case but these issues have all been flagged for a very considerable period of time SPR in communication with national grid or in its various entities. And whilst it's unfortunate the National Grid have chosen not to attend at least two of their corporate entities to assist the authority it's also in my submission surprising the SPR who, after all, promote the National Grid substation now have nothing more to say on that. As for NGV, who were in attendance I was about to say I was grateful for it's always nice to see Mr. Andrews.

17:51

But but they're gone before we get to to to the but the line that, as he puts it, all of this was too speculative for cumulative impact assessment. I mean, one might say, well, ngb would say that,

wouldn't they? But more to the point, let's just look at a little bit more of what is in the public domain. And what we do know. If we turn first to Nautilus the interconnector, which we know is promoted by ngb. We know as we heard a few moments ago from the last speaker has proposed landfall between thorpeness and sizewell and jet has provided a connection agreement to use a new substation at least and and so that is explicitly identified in the Nautilus briefing pack at national grids briefing package July 2019, page four for your reference, as the same substation that EA one and EA two will connect to. So that's the Connect connection hub for which this development consent is sought. And the interconnector was the subject of a direction under Section 35 of the Planning Act in April 19. It's on the pins website. And we know it's gotten likely submission data, quarter two of 2022. euro link connector, what do we know about that? Well, it's on national grid interconnect to register which identifies a connection site for the project at least him and Angie so has identified it as having the same landfall and grid connection parameters as Nautilus. And so the statement of common ground with national adventures which references rep 1062 that paragraph 13 states I'll quote it short sentence. The National Grid substation has been identified by the National Grid so as the potential future point future point of connection to the national electricity grid, the Nautilus and euro link in accordance with their agreements with nga eso.

19:46

So we've heard some reference to the Nautilus documents and I would just like to draw your attention to the frequently asked questions. Nautilus National Grid document, you'll have seen it, I'm sure but it's

20:00

It's on the website and we can obviously provide a hard copy to you. But page four of that tells us that for Nautilus and euro link to connect to the proposed end at substation at Friston, the proposed substation would require an extension for each additional project. So firstly, Kristin specifically identified the next sentence that makes the point that I touched on earlier that that ngb understand typically, the maximum land required to facilitate extensions to substations is approximately 1.3 Hectors for each connection offered at a location. And then Jeff has indicated the provision for the land required to extend this subsection priston has been provided for as part of the Scottish powers renewables proposals for these 238, a one and a two so that that's national grid's own

20:50

information publicly available. And so that also tells us at page nine that each of those interconnectors will require land for converter stations.

21:04

And page nine tells us the typical footprint for converter station covers five Hectors with a maximum height of 24 metres. So they'll each require a converter substation, which would be at or in the vicinity, or forest. And of course, that's leaving aside the land that one would then require to landscape etc. And you'll recall the sizes, land use written reps set out some detail on what that might mean in cumulative terms and land use terms. I won't, I won't take time on that now.

21:33

So SPR has been aware of these projects for considerable time, and it's worth just touching on a couple of documents again in the public domain as early as 2018. And this is referenced in our impact cumulative impact assessment written reps. ref 1354. SPR acknowledge that it made commitments not to as it puts it sterilise ngvs ability to develop their projects. And as recently as March of this year, 2020 ngb, wrote to the Inspectorate accepting that there would be a need, as it puts it to future proof. The substation for future development that's as 018 For reference, and that the Northwest neural link projects would result in this in the substation, the National Grid substation needing to be extended. So land would be required, and it makes reference that email to arrangements being necessary to be good to to extend the substation being explored.

22:34

It's it's our understanding that the design parameters for a national grid substation are standard size requirements. And so that if anything else is the standard approach should inform the cumulative assessment as to how the National Grid infrastructure would need to be expanded to provide a connection point for other projects. So that's, I think all I need to say for now on those two interconnector projects there is also serve very brief reference present purposes to other engine projects that are out there the CD one and SCT. CD two projects they're both domestic interconnectors between I think Ken's and a landfall around sizewell SCD one is proposed to be operational by 2028. sc D two has, I believe been put on hold at present. But they're also therefore, projects that will at least one of them CD one that falls within the timescale that we're concerned with and an irrelevant where there's information in the public domain. So, so pausing there, the other point to note is that it must be relevant, picking up really on Mr. Buffett's good planning point earlier, to note that there is increasing pressure for greater coordination of this sort of infrastructure. And I know, the B's review is something we're coming on to. But its very existence is indication of the serious problems that exist in relation to the environmental and local impacts or onshore infrastructure provision. And that pressure in itself indicates that it's likely that future connections will be at Friston if these DCs are consented because that will enable existing facilities to be made use of and that's at a location where there's potentially available land within the order limits to expand National Grid infrastructure.

24:31

So the projects are readily understandable. In terms of the nature of the works required. There are additional grid connections requiring infrastructure that can be seen elsewhere. There is in fact, considerable information in the public domain, including likely connection dates, and there will clearly be an over overlap within with the with the two decio projects that we're concerned with here if they're consented, but in any event, so this is also an important point, particularly

25:00

Given the no show today, of NGS and NGS, so,

25:05

in any event, so information is not in the public domain is held by national grid in its various entities, and National Grid has a direct interest in these DCs because development is consent is sought on its behalf for the national grid connection hub. And four of these projects that before that I've just identified are promoted by members of the National Grid group. So, what can we take from that? The National Grid

substation is plainly regarded by National Grid as a strategic group connection location for future infrastructure projects. And it's vitally important therefore, that the impacts of those projects are properly understood, there is sufficient information available, particularly whether existing group connection offers and I repeat the point so that given the interrelationship and timings of these projects, there must have been at the very least some detail communication on these matters between national grid and SPR on this topic. So, the proper examination of cumulative effects by this authority, Canales in my submission be governed or limited by what national grid or SPR has chosen to put into the public domain as it as it puts it. And we know unfortunately, that the two of the National Grid bodies have chosen not to participate so far. I was heartened to hear yesterday so that you did indicated that you would be requiring action to be taken and some details to be submitted. I know that list has been growing today, as we've gone on for matters that injured and nzso could do with assisting examination on and on behalf of a status I heartily endorse that that those those action points are made. And that national grid in its various guises is encouraged to take a proactive and transparent and constructive part which sat sadly, it's not done to date. So two final brief points if I may. This is not a case where it can reasonably be said that the effects of the project may be experienced together with some unrelated project, the proposed development will directly facilitate and accommodate the further developments that we've been talking about. That means greater uncertainty as to the duration of the construction. It means significant environmental impacts,

27:25

including through the need for significant additional infrastructure at Friston.

27:31

And, of course, multiple cable routes through the LMB, etc. So these projects require proper assessment, including, for example, the need for more land at the site to accommodate more grid connection infrastructure, the effects of a larger surface area on flood risk, landscape and visual matters, heritage effects etc. Because they'll all be extended, and there'll be greater construction, disruption etc in terms of noise and amenity and, indeed, interference with public rights of way on a raft of matters. So they're all things that need to be examined, so that the authority can report all cumulative adverse effects as required by the regs. And of course, he and one last point, sir,

28:12

the very broad parameters of perhaps the matter will come on to tomorrow in relation to design, but I put a market down now and it is relevant in this context that the very broad parameters of the proposed development may provide capacity for further developments in relation to these or other projects. And we know that by Article 33 of the draft decio, the land comprised in the national grid connection hub works will become operational land for the purposes of national grids undertaking, so National Grid will have considerable scope to carry out further works under PD rights, but permitted development rights to accommodate other connectors, which makes it all the more important that there's proper assessment of cumulative effects at this stage. So, so nice, I can assist you further or less Mr. Marley or Mr. Wheeler would like to add anything at this stage that that's that sound, topic of 3d TV, two D, two D, C, two D or not to D, and D. Mr. King, thank you very much for those submissions. They were clear as far as I have heard them, I'll just check with my panel colleagues to see if there are any questions and I'm also seeing no wish to interject from your client. Mr. Kean. So I think we will move on. And I do

note that there has been a hand up from Miss Gilmore for CS. I was coming to CS In any case, in this order, I'm going through the the representative community bodies. So Miss Gilmore, are you wishing to speak?

29:46

Yes, please. Thank you so much, sir. I would endorse everything that Mr. Bedford and just now Graham Kean have said, we are on behalf of all the local communities that I work with

30:00

present today.

30:02

disappointed that national grid has not respected you, sir and your panel to be present here. Today I'm talking about eso and National Grid at. And it seems to us You only need to look at this map. Can you see it? That is, if you like page 19 of the draft statement of Common Ground National Grid ventures, which was published by Scottish power on the second of November. That map kind of is, you know, at the heart of the issue really for amateurs like us. Here we are, we are talking about cumulative impact that is not being recognised. And therefore we have no common ground for assessment. If, when you arm consider whether to invite Scottish power to redo their cumulative impact assessments, you asked them to look at 12 to 15 years of construction versus two to three years. The conclusions that you come to are profoundly different to the things that were being discussed yesterday, at the biodiversity session, when we were talking about two non breeding seasons. And the same on tourism. We are talking about permanent disruption, where local businesses will close and they will go away somewhere else. So we have to look at 700 million pounds of loss to tourism. We are not talking about 80 million over two years. We're talking about much more. This is why to us unless those assessments are carried out fully and thoroughly and openly. We believe that this examination is not able to fulfil its purpose. So we are hopeful that the examiners will ask Scottish power to do those cumulative assessments, as have been requested by Mr. Bedford. And Mr. Kean. Thank you.

32:22

Thank you very much Miss Gilmore. And I would now like to just check whether saver sanderlings in the form of either Mr. Chandler or Mr. Chadwick wish to speak. After I've checked them, I will also finally check

32:41

if

32:43

counsellor north as the representative for Dr. Coffey, MP wishes to speak on this matter, save our sanderlings first.

32:54

Thank you.

32:57

I heartily agree with everything that all the previous speakers said. I'm hardly disappointed that national grid hadn't decided to make any contribution to these examinations. The one question which we dearly want to ask national grid, but never been able to get an answer to is why was firstly chosen as the prime site in a lot of a brownfield site? That's the if we had an answer to that, and we could understand why first than most an era is so important, and the prime objective for all development, then perhaps we could proceed with a clearer mind align set because at the moment, it's it's a totally unsuitable location, which I think you've heard covering more ground here. So that's the one question I would like you to pose to national grid. And if they are listening, I think they did intimate they might be listening in. Can you please explain to us why Kristen, is the the premier site and why you haven't chosen a brownfield site? Yes, what I will do, obviously, the applicant will be able to

34:18

draw our attention to their take on that, which I'll obviously invite them to do. And for the purposes of the Action List, if we can just capture that. I won't make a formal commitment to the precise formal words but some measure of that some element of that does need to pass forward as a written action to

34:41

end get Okay, and now, that is save our sanderlings

34:50

can I then just ask counsel North if there are any other matters I'm very completely legally on each

35:00

Dr. Coffee did include in her original written representation. Yeah, thank you, Mr. Smith. I just wanted to sort of back what the previous speakers have said really, that it's really important to know that cumulative aspects and then therefore the impact that that will that will have, because different conclusions would then be reached potentially on site selection. I think I mentioned it earlier when terez made her written submission, she referred to a site of Bradwell, which is obviously, Brownfield and I referenced earlier that the technology is there to underground cabling to go up into to Bradwell to be closer to centres of or population. I don't think I've got anything further to add than that, Mr. Smith. Thank you very much counsellor. And now I did note that very rapidly, and we did see a hand go up from Mr. Chadwick and Miss Gilmore, your hand is still up. I'm assuming that's a relic from the previous

36:08

submission that you just made? Can I just check whether Mr. Chadwick needs to say anything else bearing in mind that we have already heard?

36:18

From SOS? Yes, I was just gonna say that, that the National Grid substation seems to seems to be working or been almost used like a Trojan horse. So that the effects of it seem not too large. But actually, when you look at the

36:42

the things that will come afterwards, it is terrible. And it becomes plain that the negative effects of the whole project will greatly outweigh any benefits.

36:56

Thank you. Thank you very much Mr. Chadwick. And in, in general terms, if

37:02

SOS is able to put a kind of United oral position, through some form of coordination text message, or whatever, between the pair of you, that would be much appreciated. Um, okay, so I believe that has brought us down to the end of item D. Now, as I flagged there, I will give the applicant a right of reply on that wrapping all of those matters up, then we will do item to E, and then we will move on. So to the applicant, any further reply on those matters that have been raised at D to D.

37:48

colonists and the Africans.

37:52

I can be relatively brief, and I would invite you to look very carefully and listen to the submission made by national good finishes this morning. It's absolutely clear that their project is still being developed. And they departed and are thinking of a new concept of a multi multi purpose link.

38:16

In my submission on any basis, that the current information available, would be entirely useless for conducting any appropriate cumulative assessment. Where would these cables come ashore? Which cable route would they take to post substation? Where would a 26 metre converter station be located? And where would it link into or entirely speculation? And in my submission, there is no purpose for an applicant having to effectively prejudge work, which would be undertaken as a potential project development by another party. And that's effectively what we're being invited to do. There is simply the lack of detail and understanding of the project to enable that to be taken forward. Equally, national good ventures still indicated that they are still conducting investigations as to what they might take forward in terms of a project and whether it's in this area. And those circumstances that thanks about the delivery of these two interconnectors are such that in my submission, they should not be taken forward in a curative assessment in the context of this application. Insofar as what we have had discussions in relation to national grid ventures about is simply one aspect and that is not to prejudice the potential for the cables to connect into the forest and substation. And that is exactly what are allowed as satellite and submitted does, and the aliens and the landscaping allows for that. And we have essentially acceded to that request to attain that element of flexibility. There is nothing more

40:00

But the applicant can do in the current circumstances in terms of further assessment, and it completely inappropriate for us to do so, because it would be utter speculation. And certainly we have no information about the voltage that the mail to be selected all that would influence any electrical design, or any equipment that will be located that. And as you can see from our own assessment,

40:24

the electrical equipment and the size of the housing and the voltages that you'll come to here are all relevant factors and working out what electrical equipment will be laid out and how we like that and how to connect those matters are all simply lacking from any of these other projects. And in my submission, there is absolutely no purpose to be served by inviting the appellant to try and undertake an exercise, which simply an EIA termed as impossible. And I don't really have anything further to say but as I say, I would invite you to look at the National Grid ventures material, and on the matter of operational land of national grid. Obviously, our works numbers will reflect the precise extent of the works ultimately undertaken. And as identified by Mr. King, any further connection would require an extension, ie acquire land overnight with the land that was currently being utilised by a future National Grid substation. And equally any subsequent alteration to a project that's already been subject to EIA would potentially have to be screened for any further EIA. And we're potentially subject to consenting regimes. So I don't think it's as simple as saying that an extension could be delivered by way of permitted development. And I think it's extremely unlikely that any of these scales of postponement could be. So I think we've addressed that and written submissions to you in response to certain questions that have already been posed. Apart from that had nothing further to add at this point. So thank you. Thank you very much for joining us. Now I have one immediate observation that I'm going to make in relation to those submissions. And

42:12

that essentially, you know, the panel is not going to make a sort of x x temporary, procedural decision on any of these points. So we're not we're going to have to deliberate extremely carefully on all of the materials come forward, both written and the oral explanations of a very complex environment, and that have come forward in this hearing. So we're going to give very, very careful consideration to everything that has been brought forward.

42:37

But I did want to kind of lay down a kind of landmark position in relation to some of the Sephton names of pop more likely tomorrow's business, which simply is that

42:50

to the degree that these are essentially the unformed and has not yet properly entered into the planning process set of additional projects that that you are submitting that they are and NGV is also submitting that they are I was going to ask you to reflect on and I'm not seeking an answer. Now we will, we'll get to the detail as we move through the examination, but to reflect upon, then the value or otherwise, of making any form of accommodation for them at all, in terms of, for example, the the landscape design and mitigation strategy. Because if they are as essentially, early stage, as has been suggested, then there is a there's quite a forceful argument that your applications need to address and mitigate to the best and most policy compliant extent that they can the adverse environmental effects that they have themselves generate. And that if there are things that are not being done, in order to preserve potential expansion options at some speculative future, but that's in turn, depress your ability to mitigate, for example, landscape harm, or alternatively, not to fully manage the setting of a listed building, or to not fully deliver a range of possible solutions in natural environment terms. If there are things that start to fall into those baskets, there is a question that does emerge from your submissions, which is and

whether or not more can be done broadly within the old lems framework, and then maybe has been done to essentially tighten up some things that maybe at the moment are not as tight as they could be precisely because they're trying to maintain a strategic flexibility to face some projects that actually are speaking

45:00

Let's see if that submission is correct.

45:10

Enough for the applicant? That that's a separate point. And certainly we're prepared to deal with that in the next couple of days. I'm happy to deal with that for that particular matter. And certainly will be with that. Okay. Excellent. Right on that basis, then Ladies and gentlemen, I believe we have reached the end of agenda item two D. And so therefore, we need to move on with no further ado to agenda item to E and the wording for which is before you on the agenda paper. Now, some of the background to this has already been shaken well and truly onto the table as a consequence of the discussions on A to D. And so again, I will

45:55

remind everybody that we do not need to repeat material, we have also dipped very heavily into the IE pond because we have heard from OFGEM in respect to the decarbonisation action plan. However, there are other

46:14

elements either of policy review in train. And so there I will thought, I will flag the BS review of offshore transmission, which is in process and that many of you have already referred to earlier and in writing. I will refer to the 2019 national infrastructure assessment in the UK government's response to that that was released literally a few days ago, the national infrastructure strategy of 2020, that is in the spending review papers November 2020, again, released literally a few days ago.

46:49

And that highlights two apparently relevant elements, firstly, and

46:56

the need for

46:59

a significant level of design commitment by an enzyme projects, including what is referred to as a board level design champion. Now this is a theme that goes back and to actually some of the questioning that we undertook in writing in EAX, q1. And, and there, there seems to be the emergence of a policy change theme in the national infrastructure strategy in the response to the national infrastructure assessment of 2019. And this is kind of bearing in the same direction as some of those questions. So we're certainly very interested in responses in respect of those two changes the national infrastructure assessment and strategy released recently, and of course, the strategy papers also highlight now, and a review of the energy suite of national policy statements. Now, what we can't do here is

48:02

and to face policy that when we do not know what the outcome of reviews will be, and again, there is a there is a suspension process put in place in the 2008 legislation, and it has not been invoked. So we are working with the national policy statements as they currently are. And we'll have to continue to do so until

48:22

anything any other indication is put in front of us. But again, we're in a world where taken together with the Afghan policy change as well, we're seeing a set of movements in policy. And what we need to do is to work out where the nail goes in the jelly. How much adaptability how much fleetness of thought an applicant can reasonably make in respect of these known processes of policy review, and how much we essentially work within the existing framework. unalloyed or uninfluenced by the fact that these reviews are also ongoing. So that's, that's the brief. I'm going to come to the applicant first to lay out its stall, and then

49:09

I'm going to seek interjections from other parties. So I do know that I've already got hands from save our sanderlings from Mr. Chadwick and from Miss Gilmore, but I will provide the applicant with the opportunity to set out their stalls before I come to speak as for other interested parties, and then I will pass through broadly the same rules I pass through before by going to the council's first, so the applicant

49:38

coordinates on behalf of the applicant to deal with the item to E. In terms of the base review, I've got a fairly lengthy submission. But given where we are on the agenda and how far we've got through the agenda, what I proposed to do is really take it pretty short in the sense of I can always put it in writing subsequently, but I'll just do an action

50:00

Rather than a lengthy submission, because I appreciate that we've got a lot to get through. So in terms of the base review, I said doesn't arise from a background or a vacuum. This is a matter which has been emerging over a period of time from 2015. And before we were involved in an integrated offshore transmission study then and it reached fairly clear conclusions about the limit some limitations that were

50:27

contained in the current regulatory framework regarding particularly funding of particular assets within the offshore industry.

50:36

The concept was taken further forward by natural gas transmission in that business plan at December 2019. Again, exploring the concept, that there would be the potential in relation to future development for a proactively seeking to influence some changes. And equally what the key driver was that the existing transport network on the east coast of building loops was potentially not meant to be was going

to be added to by a series of events including offshore wind, interconnectors, and rain for projects and the current state rainforest still an ongoing process of allocating further potential offshore sites. And obviously, the results of that are not yet known. And so therefore, we don't know the locations of those because that will await a further process. And as further environmental consideration to be taken into account after that auction round in terms of strategic assessment. So that is a matter of which is unknown at the moment will have to be taken forward. Equally in 2020, the National Grid so and then network options assessment raised some similar, similar comments. And again, identifying rain forests being a key driver and recognising potential to utilise in certain circumstances, the benefits of H DVC links. So they are then identified, again to review that review the benefits of these. So in the context of when the base reviewers are names to those participants and providing both the overview and grid, we're already reflecting and look at opportunities that might exist in the future.

52:24

The context, therefore, the bass review was delivering 40 gigawatts of offshore wind by 2030. And against that background, we have the publication on July of the announcement of review. And in particular terms of reference.

52:41

I don't want to go through those, they are set out and I think we've been through the various timescales. And certainly, the off gem clarifications provided today were extremely helpful in that context.

52:56

But it also has to be looked at, and further recent developments in terms of the 10 point plan for the green Industrial Revolution. And the purpose is to lead the world into a green Industrial Revolution. And that's reflected in our climate change targets. And furthermore, within that 10 point plan, we have an ambition of advancing offshore wind, and but to become the leading offshore wind provider by 2030. And we're going to quadruple our efforts. And this then makes a further commitment to the industry and seeking out through CFD rounds, and the ultimate ambition of 40 gigawatts.

53:36

So I now turn to the

53:39

applications and the relevance of the base review to them. The timetable for significant reform required to establish a new regulatory and technical framework for an offshore condition network is like it take a number of years. The applications for the projects are submitted in October 2019. And the examinations for projects commenced to the sixth of October 2020 and are well underway. And I think it's quite helpful in that say science and CS actually raped to the energy minister in September, seeking clarification on various matters relating to the applications which are before you. And clearly the minister was careful to make his comments about the process in general. But he did make specific comments about timing.

54:33

And in terms of that, it said, in terms of quote from that our intention regarding the engineering regime is communicate their direction of travel during 2021. as you rightly state. This is a very complex issue that touches on many policy areas across several organisations, we do have a hope to expect that a significant portion of work will be completed during 2021. So that clarity should be right for those projects connecting after 2030 funding regarding the

55:00

Currently CEO applications as these will be for the sector statement, I cannot comment on the specific applications. However, as outlined above the timing of their view and the outputs are not expected to have an impact on projects at an advanced stage in the planning process. And I just pause to serve that

55:19

both these applications are precisely at that advanced stage in the planning process.

55:27

The further lesser of the 18th of September 2020 provides further clarification, and the minister says the ambition of the medium term work stream, so enable and incentivize as much coordination as possible within the bounds of the existing regime.

55:44

As you will appreciate, it's not possible for us to mandate projects to alter existing plans, given that they would have been designed and funded based on the existing regime.

55:54

Not only would changes to some projects that are later data designed to cause significant additional costs for consumers, it will also have a detrimental impact on investor confidence in the UK offshore wind industry and jeopardise our long term goal to achieve net zero emissions by 2050.

56:14

And it goes on to say as previously mentioned, we're not in a position to mandate changes to projects already in the pipeline under the existing regime. And it will be up to individual developers as to whether or not they wish to make changes. This will need to be considered in terms of the costs and delays that will be incurred for a specific project versus the potential benefits that may be realised. And my submission these comments accord very strongly with the comments made by off gem. And I think what they really demonstrate is the concept of actually altering the structure of grid Connections is a complex matter, but it also bears upon other aspects of the electricity framework. And that is ones where we have actively promoting competition and other aspects and the desire to attract further generation investment. So these in my submission are very important matters and they support the view that was given to you by off gem this morning.

57:20

Finally, in relation to the current national policy statements,

57:25

we have to work under the current regulatory framework as applicants. And as paragraph 2.6 point three four of em three states, applicants for consent for offshore wind farms will have to work within the regulatory regime for offshore transmission networks established by often under the regime of chosen Muslim relicensed activity. By off gem, the Africans have progressed the projects in line with the regulatory regime, and networks established by legislation and off gem. And to assist in that context, we have provided a regulatory context, Nate, setting out that current regulatory framework against that background changes the coordinated approach to offshore transmission are likely to require significant regulatory change deliver. And there's certainly going to be challenges in terms of timescale delivery. Given the considerable time periods that would be involved in developing a different regime. The applicants have a legitimate expectation that the applications will be considered within the current regulatory framework, and lighter paragraphs 2634 of em three, and as reflected in the letters of the minister. And the circumstances is not envisaged that the review will lead to opportunities or outcomes, which are likely to be relevant to these projects.

58:47

And that's the current position of the applicants.

58:55

Thank you very much, Mr. Innis . Now, can I just check with my panel colleagues, whether there are any points that need to be raised directly in relation to that before I turn to submissions? Firstly, from the local authorities, I gather, by the way in intervening whilst I wait any possible comments that I owe an apology to Mr. Chadwick and Liz Gilmore, because I referred to them having their hands up. And

59:23

it seems to be that something slightly strange is happening with my system and that their hands are frozen up on my system. My colleagues tell me that elsewhere on the system, their hands are not up at all. So apologies for that. And I've my colleagues are assisting me and are now sending me messages whenever hands are raised or lowered. So even by very remote mechanisms, I will find out who needs to speak but bearing in mind that I'm not seeing the hands properly in front of the present. Can I just then run through the potential speakers on this item? Can I check Mr.

1:00:00

Bedford, do Suffolk County Council need to speak on this item.

1:00:05

Yesterday, sir, briefly.

1:00:07

Excellent. The floor is yours. Thank you.

1:00:12

Michael Bedford sir. I think maybe that that that hadn't problem explains the earlier glitch that that I seem to be causing but there we are. So, clearly, we don't seek to

1:00:24

dimir from the fact that you have to apply existing policy, and section 104 sets out the requirements that you're operating under. But that with respect isn't a complete answer to the conundrum of what do you do when you know that there is an evolving, potentially changing policy landscape, and in my space, and the way you were square the circle is yes, you obviously do apply existing policy. But when you're applying that policy, the weight you give to particular factors, within that policy, could well be informed by what you can see as the direction of travel of emerging policy. So if I give an example, and I say as a stress of example, in E and one, paragraph 4.5. point one, when it's talking about good design,

1:01:22

makes specific reference to the functionality of an object, be it a building or other types of infrastructure, including fitness for purpose, and sustainability, is equally important. Paragraph 4.53 talks about

1:01:42

subject to regulatory and other constraints, ensuring energy infrastructure, attractive juror herbal, and adaptable as can be now, so when you're then applying those policy tests of existing policy, you're perfectly entitled to attach weight to the fact that under as it were emerging policy, there's clearly a greater focus on coordination of infrastructure provision, that there is a desire to minimise, as it were unnecessary additional infrastructure, if there is a way of avoiding that. And so so that's why I say that you can look at this, not that you seek to apply what you can't do, which is embryonic policy, which doesn't yet exist. But you can acknowledge that direction of travel, and it will help you on the weight that you attach to factors which are already flagged up in existing policy. So that's the way that I put it essentially. And also, albeit, I acknowledge that this is in the nppf, and not in an national policy statement. So it also has secondary status in terms of any weight. But it's just worth bearing in mind that when para one to seven, a of the nppf talks about design matters, it talks about design, looking at the lifetime of the development, and therefore it being physically fit for purpose over its lifetime, rather than merely looking at the short term. So those are the points I think I'd wish to make on this item D.

1:03:10

Thank you very much. Now, if I can just check with my panel colleagues, whether there are questions about those submissions that we need to explore further, I'm content with them and

1:03:22

moving them on, because I'm not seeing any questions arising. Can I ask Kim Isabella, tough for of counsel for East Suffolk Council ? If there are matters that a client wishes to bring forward? Thank you, sir. Yes, please just briefly.

1:03:44

Ea Suffolk council together with the County Council have been raising their concerns with bays principally about the piecemeal and uncoordinated approach to energy Related development and grid connections? For a number of years now,

1:04:02

in 2018, they were writing to Greg Clark, the Minister, saying we're about to be inundated, I think was the word they used with energy projects. And identifying a number of the projects we've been discussing today, and saying that they had concerns about the piecemeal approach with each application effectively proceeding in its own silo. And one of the specific concerns they raised in that letter in the many subsequent letters that were exchanged was, for example, the location of the National Grid substation, and the longer term consequences of that and any cumulative impacts that would arise as other projects connected into that substation. Now in light of those concerns, the council very much welcomes the work that Bayes has embarked upon to

1:04:51

to look into ways that greater coordination can be achieved.

1:04:57

We accept the position as

1:05:00

out by off gem to you earlier in the day, that there's little that they can require the applicants to do in this case

1:05:10

to partake in in that greater coordination. Albeit we do note that bays and off Jim wrote in August of this year wrote an open letter to developers, inviting them to see if there were ways in which greater coordination or the sharing of facilities could be achieved. And we would encourage the applicants to respond to that invitation to try and minimise impacts where possible. So what I suppose we say is in light of the emerging position towards greater coordination, something that you can do in your role in these applications is to invite the applicant to ensure that they don't proceed with their applications in a silo, for example, in respect to the substation site, but rather take into account projects, which we all know are likely to be coming forward, which is suffer Council has been raising with Bayes and the energy minister since 2018. And to ensure that those are properly factored into the assessment

1:06:18

and the real likely implications of the National Grid substation or forest and are properly taken into account. Thank you.

1:06:32

Apologies, I was muted. Thank you very much. It was tough, Paul. And again, just a quick check with my panel member colleagues to see if there are any other matters that they wish to have put to you.

1:06:44

What I was then planning to do was to run in the order that you're probably used to now through the town and parish Council,

1:06:55

and then on to various community representative bodies, and I am informed by my colleagues that Miss Gilmore has her hand up requesting to speak and Mr. Fain of SPS also has a hand up requesting to speak so I will come to you. But I will go to council fellows of old Bruh. town council first

1:07:24

council follows on matters that you wish to put on here.

1:07:29

And Excuse me.

1:07:32

Thank you, sir. panel members, and everybody feels a bit of a burden that I was go next. And I'm quite happy to let others go in a different attorney. If that might be easy for us and keep hearing my voice. But oh,

1:07:49

no, that's fine. But so a couple of things. Um,

1:07:54

I think just going back very briefly to to D, we can't have it both ways. We can't have the applicant in developing bodies saying that they want to future proof the site of Reston and the you know, in terms of not putting in hard landscaping, for example, that then would preclude something else and then have the more so say, but we're not going to consider the community of impacts. So they're asking to future proof in everything they do. yet they're not willing to consider the community of impact. So So that's our starting point on that.

1:08:32

Moving on to the Bayes review, and government policy currently, as you're aware, the en suite of policies is out of date is overdue. It's review but that's what we have to rely on now. And the applicant yesterday, Mr. Ines represent them quotidienne one and stating all the things around overriding public interest and the need to contribute to carbon targets etc.

1:09:03

But he failed to also say that no one does talk about protection of the environment. So that should not be at any cost. Ian five also 2.2 point five says that under Section nine of the electricity act 1989. developers do have to have regard to the desirability of preserving natural beauty of conserving for foreigner, geological or fuzzy geographical features a special interest in protecting sites, buildings, objects of architectural historical architectural interest, and do what is necessary to mitigate any effect on those things. So although the en suite of documents is out of date, is not just one sided, it does put a restriction on what can be developed in areas out of that standing natural beauty

1:10:00

Whether there are other options as they are clearly, the National Grid currently has a huge ownership of the grid and huge capacity elsewhere. There's over 7200 kilometres of overhead lines. And I looked

last night, there's a map which are sending our written, written representation that indicates this spare capacity on other parts of the 400 kV line. So in terms of a review of the current political strategy is very much overdue. And I believe we would all be negligent if we didn't push for this to happen before these projects are consented, because I do believe we can catch up and still achieve things if that was done later on. So there is evidence that the Aeon documents are out of date. They also when they were written, and I've double checked this, when they were written, there's no information about the onshore infrastructure required. So there's a lot about offshore, there's a lot about the substations. But there wasn't the understanding then about the impact on off cable runs and things connecting those two points. So I leave it in your capable hands. We trust you to make the right decision. And to actually push that this is included. I know we've started the six months journey with you. I know the examination has to continue. But I would say that this does point even more. So now for you to be not able to put a recommendation for approval to the Secretary of State. Thank you. Thank you very much. Now, I do know there's on a number of occasions now I have asked whether Mr. Caplin is present first and parish council I will ask one more time. And again, if I can just ask the case team to check whether whether he is present and perhaps message me if he is because in subsequent rounds, I will not introduce him unless it's clear that he's here and wishing to speak. And moving on then can I just check briefly

1:12:21

Mr. Keen for SASES other matters that you wish to bring. So yes, please, if I can just take two or three very quick points.

1:12:34

Firstly, SPL position, as we heard at the outset of this matter, to me, seems to be that the damage to be caused is acceptable. But as I've already noted, the very existence of the BS review is an indication of the serious problems that exist in terms of the environmental and local impact on

1:12:54

onshore infrastructure provision, and indeed in relation to coordination. So we can all shrug and wait for any emerging policy that may happen but as you know, ceases position is that an integrated and coordinated approach should be taken whereby offshore electrical hubs or substations are shared between multiple projects or, or even connected to an offshore ring main as they're sometimes called.

1:13:23

The point being so that is, if the applicant was willing, there could be a better solution. So the other thing I'd say about emerging policy is simply to pick up on the Mr Bedford submissions on the relevance to you and your ability to take into account emerging policy in terms of the direction of travel in terms of course, you're doing it within the existing legal policy framework, but there it is, you can see what's emerging, and that's relevant to the way that you might give a particular existing policy. Those are my points. I think, Mr. Mani and Mr. Wheeler might like to just add something quickly, on behalf of say, sir, if I can, thank you very briefly, because again, we're trying to make sure that as far as possible, these submissions are channelled through a principal advocate and

1:14:12

so far, it's just been me with one month, but

1:14:17

not all in the same room.

1:14:21

I am being indulgent. But But obviously,

1:14:25

we can. So Mr. Mani and Mr. Wheeler very, very quickly, please.

1:14:36

It's just, it's just Mr. Wheeler. I don't it's just Mr. Wheeler. I didn't want to wish to make a contribution at this point. Thank you very much, Mr. Wheeler.

1:14:45

Can you hear me sir? Yes, I can. Right and just very I will keep this very brief.

1:14:53

I am in fact a direct contributor to the NGA. So, interconnection and coordination review

1:15:00

There's been going on since May this year. So I've been taking a very personal interest in the all the work has been done, including the additional interest that base has now taken in an overarching capacity.

1:15:15

With that in mind to two points, one earlier today, when we were talking to the off chain representative, I did raise a very specific proposal for a capability of interconnecting and coordinating the current projects which are on the table with a different technology solution for delivery elsewhere. I won't bore you with the details of that again. What I would like to do though, is to say a couple of words about the NGV proposal for multi purpose interconnectors because I believe there is some misunderstanding about the way that these are configured. Mr. Ennis earlier referred to them as really rather nebulous and melted cables. And it was all very unclear. That is not in fact, the case. I've been in contact with Martin Moran, who's the business development manager for ngvd, only six weeks ago, and I have a response from him, which is very clear. And that is that we're an MPI, to be invoked on the Nautilus project, it would imply an interconnect would imply a connection of an offshore wind farm onto the cables running between Belgium and potentially Preston, it wouldn't have no impact whatsoever on the onshore element of the Nautilus project that would relate as a high voltage DC connection to the station, potentially in the limestone area, no further complication. So all the understandings we have about the earlier invocation of the Nautilus project and potentially also the Euro link, one can be directly deduced from the information that mgv have already put in the public domain. Thank you.

1:16:57

Thank you for that, Mr. Wheeler. I just see that Mr. Smith is as frozen on us. So thank you for those contributions.

1:17:05

Mr. Fane of Suffolk Preservation Society. Yeah. Have you got anything to add at this point? Please?

1:17:14

Thank you very much, sir.

1:17:17

I do commend the way you are handling this very sensitive matters of a Preservation Society, as I indicated when I was first introduced, covers the whole county. That means I've been very happy to let the local organisations take the lead in this matter. But it does also mean that I do enjoy an overview of the importance of this iconic landscape because I look at the landscapes of the whole county. And I don't think I need to add many more illustrations because words have already been used about this particular landscape around Friston to say that it's a mediaeval village of the ancient settlements, dark skies, tranquillity, a collection of historic buildings and ancient paws, I think covers it citizen iconic landscape. And in terms of current relevance only the other day, our Prime Minister was quoted as saying, Britain's iconic landscapes. So I'm using his terminology, a part of the fabric of our national identity, it is more important than ever, that we act now to enhance our natural environment and protect our precious precious wildlife and biodiversity. I just put that comment in to give an additional context.

1:18:34

I think the reality is we know that this, this project has to be seen

1:18:40

in its cumulative context. This is the consent that is granted that will breach that dam at all, the following consensus will have By comparison, a very easy path, because the destruction of this iconic landscape I use the word again, will be affected totally by this first DCO.

1:19:05

I think we've all heard and I'm not going to add to the evidence has been brought to bear already we've all heard that it is quite clear that emerging technologies are coming forward rapidly, which may very possibly mean that in quite short order, the destruction of this site will wouldn't not have been necessary. And indeed, there's a more efficient alternative. a better alternative on a better side could have been available only on Saturday, and a bog of Vattenfall the chief executive. Vattenfall Of course, do engaged in very similar work to SPR. She was quoted as saying shared infrastructure is likely to be cheaper for developers. Westminster must avoid the situation where projects that are being built now are less competitive than the ones being built later.

1:20:00

The important thing not to forget is in the end, somebody is going to pay for that. And most likely it's going to be the consumer. So that this is not just a question of about deploying the latest method of

connecting up power supplies, it is about cost and efficiencies. And it's very interesting that professionals within the industry are arguing quite strongly for that to be taken into account, even now.

1:20:27

So I think, I have to say, looking at our particular interests, I've talked about landscape, but also heritage, the applicants have failed, in my, in our view, to analyse objectively the huge impact of the transport that this development will require. And it's not just the impact on the immediate road system, which is manifestly inadequate, or anything like the volume even of the first DCO before us now, let alone the cumulative ones. But they have failed to assess the impact on a wide range of historic buildings, which are not immediately on the route, but are nearby. And guidance of the impact on historic buildings does require that there's wider issues be considered as, as historic England have eloquently argued in their submissions. So I put it to you, firstly, that we on behalf of the whole of South Africa, and we are also cancelled for the campaign for preservation of rural England. in Suffolk, we wholeheartedly support those representations that have been made by other people. We think this is a potential tragedy imminent, it will be damaging not just to put the poor people who live in Kristen, but to Aldeburgh, to Snape and all around those surrounding areas. And so we support wholeheartedly the efforts made by our colleagues to resist this DCO thank you very much for listening to my quick verbal representation. And also, of course, to considering our carefully prepared written representations earlier. Thank you. Indeed, and Mr. Fine, I trust that you will be able to be with us tomorrow when I think matters that are close to the heart of your written reps will probably be dealt with in more detail.

1:22:29

Sir, I have committed to spending two whole days with you on this occasion. Because I think well, in that Mike, my Commiserations to you and thank you very much. Okay, now, moving then on. We have CS and mas Gilmore, who has asked to be drawn in? And could I ask people to try to draw quite quick submissions now because I'm very conscious that time is probably against us. And there is material that we need to have covered before the end of the agenda. And so Miss Gilmore if, if you wish to speak. Thank you very briefly, partly because Mr. Ennis did mention a letter that was written to season phases earlier by the Minister for energy kwasi kwarteng, we believe that the 40 gigawatt objective that is now set is a key policy change that has huge significance on how we have to plan more holistically and strategically in the future than ever before. And therefore, we believe that as the base review comes to its initial conclusions, it will be hugely influenced by that very target. And that very target will mean that we have to look at greater synergies and efficiencies. And that will mean that perhaps some of these things that historically would not have been contemplated, may well now be relevant. Hence, I would finish just by quickly referencing the quintet, the five MPs in East Anglia when they said at the parliament debate on the fifth of November, with the clear precedent of the Western link, which of course, I believe was a national grid and Scottish power joint partnership project brought in to protect a beautiful part of the country from physical harm, and the substantive vision of a connection light integrated future. We would regard it as a difficult exercise to communicate to East Anglian residents in the months ahead. We're moving towards an offshore future be discarded, delayed or approached without maximum thrust from all relevant stakeholders. My proposal

1:25:00

here is we believe that national grid and Scottish power at the moment don't have the incentives for maximum thrust to pivot. And with the help of government, perhaps there can be more incentive for that maximum thrust. Thank you. Thank you very much. And then I see Mr. Chadwick for SOS and, and again, because we're short of time, can I ask No, multiple submissions, please? So if it's possible for Mr. Chadwick to draw together any points that Mr. Chandler may have made? Thank you very much. Mr. Chadwick.

1:25:43

Thank you. I actually didn't have my hand up. Ah, this is a fact of the system then again.

1:25:53

Does Mr. Chandra want to say anything? Yeah. Can I check with Mr. Chandler?

1:26:01

One thing from me, thank you. Okay. Well, on that basis, the only remaining hand that I have been informed I've given them my hand system is clearly malfunctioning.

1:26:15

Was Councillor North speaking for Dr. Tres.

1:26:21

Thank you, Mr. Smith. And in the interest of time, I won't repeat obviously, what Theresa has made previously in her verbal and written submissions on this subject. I did just want to go back to the point I made earlier before lunch, though about that adjournment debate. And I'll do what you asked me in terms of sending over that. handsaw link, because as interesting comments, they're made by the Secretary data, which I quoted before, and that major policy change or 40 gigawatts by by 2030. And I and terez, will agree with what both Michael Bedford and Graeme Kean mentioned earlier in terms of giving weight to this merging merging policy. And I just wanted to remind you, as well, Mr. Smith, that this this part of the offshore transmission network review, which says quite clearly that integrated connections should now now be established, rather than looking at onshore infrastructure, in isolation. And I think that's a really key point in terms of the emerging policy framework. And finally, I just want to say, I agree with what counsel fellows said, spr can't have their cake and eat it in relation to this. Thank you. Thank you very much. That's a lot.

1:27:49

On that basis, then, ladies and gentlemen, we I think have reached the end of the interested party contributions. And so I just need them to return to the applicant to ask if there are any matters that they wish to put to us orally. Of course, bearing in mind the time they have a full opportunity to make a concluding submission in writing if they wish.

1:28:11

So to Mr. Innes

1:28:14

to bring it

1:28:16

up. Yeah, Mr. puff, the Applicant I'll be very brief. Are we like national good have different functions. And scottishpower does have a transmission business, which is a regulated one. And it is not part of SPR. I just want to make it perfectly clear. It's a separate regulated entity, and is not part of SPR. So comments about us building transmission links are not accurate. And it's not about having cake and eat it. We're not in that regulated position. And I'm more than happy to give you details of those projects in the public, those in the public domain in the course. And I've got one further point to make in relation to all the submissions, is that effectively, what they were trying to suggest was this was just a change of policy.

1:29:07

The matters relating to the regulatory framework on grid are actually a matter of law. And the regulatory framework is set up through the electricity act. And it's one in which the regulators and the regulators have to work within. So it's not just a policy issue, given some of the matters. It also raises future matters of legislative change, which may have to be introduced, and I think off gem fairly fairly stated earlier today about the fact that the current regulatory regime simply didn't cover certain arrangements about joint expenditure in relation to assets. So I just wanted to make that clear that it's not just simply a change of policy. The matter relating to electricity regulation is both a matter of law and subsequent establishment of regulatory framework.

1:30:00

And I think that's an important matter when coming to consider the timeframes for ultimate delivery. Thank you.

1:30:09

Thank you very much. Now on that basis, ladies and gentlemen, I think we have reached a natural break point is the switch point. And between the end of agenda item two and the beginning of agenda item three, we have all of a remaining fourth session of the day in front of us in order to deal with that agenda item. But we are a little pinched for time. So it is now 350. Can I ask that we resume at 405405 Please, let us now adjourn for the break. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.