

TEXT_CAH2_Session3_16022021

Tue, 2/16 4:03PM • 1:27:26

00:04

Good afternoon. Good afternoon. I didn't dress. Well excuse me.

00:11

Cool. That's better.

00:14

A sudden,

00:17

Sudden Attack of dry throat.

00:23

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and welcome back to

00:28

the afternoon session of

00:31

compulsory acquisition hearings. And number two, my name is Ryan Smith, I'm the lead member of the examining authorities. And with me is my colleague, Mr. rippy, who I will shortly hand over to who is leading questioning and case team. Can I confirm? Can everybody see and hear me?

00:51

I can confirm that I can see you perfectly fine.

00:56

recording.

00:58

Excellent. And the captions have been switched back on. Yeah, that's

01:04

excellent. Thank you very much. In which case, I'll just speak very briefly on progress. And we're partway through Mr. Martinez submission. So when counsel for Mr. Marley, who I gather was seeking instructions from his client comes back to us. And then Mr. Marley has been fully heard. And we will then hear from the applicant In response, we'll then go, I believe we now have Mr. Cooper present for Neil and Lisa Louise Canyon. Is that correct?

01:35

That's correct. Yes, I'm here. And I apologise for the fact that I missed this morning session. Ah, well, you're here now. And that's the important thing. So we will be coming to you directly that we have heard from the applicant on Mr. Marley's submissions. After that, then, and I think it's worth foreshadowing that, although we have agenda items that are specifically to deal potentially with the interests of additional affected persons in relation to

02:04

compulsory Acquisition Regulations land the additional land, there is nobody here present intending to speak to those items. So Mr. Rigby will be able to move them very swiftly to hear the secretary Undertaker's who've been waiting for some time. So just that little bit on the order of play this afternoon, and finally, to flag that we will be taking an afternoon break. And now Mr. Rigby, when when would you like perhaps to be I should say, we should aim for a quarter to four and tend to at the latest. So that's an hour and a half. screen time. Thank you very much. Okay. In which case, Mr. Rigby, you're hearing.

02:47

Thank you very much indeed. Mr. Smith. So Mr. Fallbrook, do you have any further instructions from your client?

02:54

Thank you, sir. Yes, and I, I've no instructions to raise anything further since so those are my submissions. And I'm sure it's now now hand over to the applicant. Thanks. Thank you very much. Indeed. That's that's very helpful. So yes, over to the applicant, now pleased to speak on the issues raised by Mr. Fulford on behalf of Mr. Maroni Yeah, just before we do apologies, I do see I freeze has his hand up. Yes. Apologies. And I wasn't expecting suddenly to be called I'd take my jacket off. I'll put it on in a moment. But um, so we you've invited us to be here, we assumed that this was one of the items where you wanted to hear from us in that you wanted to know what works. We were going to do on or adjacent to Mr. Martinez, learn up tirely for you, but that's why we've been here at your invitation and brought witnesses. Indeed, no, thank you very much.

03:58

And look, it would make sense to hear from you before we hear from the applicants so apologies, Mr. Ennis, we've got your revved up, and

04:05

we've got I think we need to hear from from from Mr. Humphreys first. And in that, in that respect,

04:14

and

04:15

the the issues that did emerge from the submissions for Mr. Mani and myself.

04:25

were essentially the issue of how much land is required either side of the trend of each transmission alignment, in order to be able to safely deliver the works that are intended to be delivered and this question of whether or not

04:41

a pinch point that would leave Mr. Marley's own domestic curtilage out of the land acquired

04:49

could be delivered is is that feasible? And

04:54

now I do see Mr. In it is is flagging. I was just going to

05:00

comments about the applicant just to say that insofar as

05:05

this afternoon is concerned, what I was going to say, very briefly before handing over to en jet, is that insofar as we have a couple of clarifications, we think the hedge to 116 is clearly not one which we would be seeking to interfere with and will give further comfort and written comfort out of it. And insofar as we got into discussion about the vegetation clearance, adjacent to Mr. Money's private entrance, that is standard highway maintenance rather than clearing first for sightlines it would be overhang, etc. That was what was intended for that. And I just wanted to give those two clarifications, then I was going to say to hand over to en jet, because clearly there are a series of matters, which really related to their works, and both the physical works, and also the ultimately the point about the preservation of permanent rights relative to these men that had already been obtained. So I wasn't going to address these matters, I was going to leave it to me at this stage to deal with those matters. And then I probably have matters to pick up around the edge after energetic spoken. But that was all I was good to say. And I'll leave you in the safe and capable hands of energetic stage. Thank you. Thank you very much. Indeed, we're Swedish. That's very helpful. We just tried to make sure that folks aren't here for any longer than they need to be. Bearing in mind is the applicants, you need to be here for the duration. So

06:35

that's hope that's okay. And given that there are no additional affected persons present, and that you are going to respond to Mr. Martinez, points at deadlines, six. Thank you very much. Indeed. Mr. Humphreys, we will hand over to you. We're now on the fourth bullet points for anyone who's following of item five. And we're on to NGS. So the floor is yours, Sir. Sir. I thought we were still on agenda item three, which was dealing with the objectors. We are all

07:15

women here is just right. Yes, no, you're quite right.

07:20

Well, now we will now get on camera.

07:23

Our next speaker under item three, well, that is

07:28

no, no, no, no, we won't just just bear with me a second. And Michael Humphreys is seeking to address us specifically on the points raised

07:37

on behalf of Mr. marmi. So it's the questions about Okay, yes, that to me, the land required because this is land yet, as I understand this, and correct me if I'm wrong, but this is a this is an angle requirement that drives the extent of the land here. And, and it's also aimed at technical requirements around the the land necessary in order to undertake the cables works. And I stand corrected, I was expecting you to be introduced sort of by my

08:07

miscellaneous. So thank you very much, Mr. Humphreys. And we'll hear from you on the issues raised by Mr. Mani, Thank you, sir. So, obviously, make it very clear at the outset, as you well know, this is an SPR decio not not an N get decio. But certain of the works. And indeed, the land requirements are in effect, driven by and gets requirements in order to connect this particular project to the transmission system. And so what I'm going to do is get first of all, Mr. Mehra one up to to explain what the works are, what the technical works are, that we will need to do in order to explain the the,

09:02

the access we will require and what we will undertake, and then if necessary, Mr. Bell can explain the land or the rights or the temporary possession,

09:14

powers that we would need for each of those different elements of our works. And so I don't expect you to get all these documents out, but I'll just mention some that are relevant obviously, here, we are dealing with works 38 to 43. And I suppose to some extent 34, to 38, to 43, and to some extent 34, which is the access which is a shared access in shedule. One of the decio that's rep 5003 In its latest iteration rep 5003. The land plans, rep 1004. I think you probably have those open anyway, but sheet nine is the realm

10:00

One.

10:01

So you may want to bear in mind the works plans, obviously, because those are relevant to where we can undertake our work. So rep 1005. And it's sheet seven and following, if you remember, sheet seven is that rather complicated one with lots of different work areas,

10:20

it superimposed on each other, and then they break out. Seven, eight or seven, I think it is, which is quite helpful. And then

10:29

we mentioned and you mentioned this morning, so our written representation rep 1149, and the appendix and that just gives you the, the names of the two lines and the tower numbers, because that might be relevant, they have been mentioned. And then there is also and Mr. Holbrook mentioned this as well, the LMP general arrangement plan, that's rep 401 15. And figure three, I think, is the best one.

11:04

And so in relation to that, obviously, we don't speak at all to any of the landscaping things that's nothing to do with us, but what you see there is an illustration and I underline the word illustration, an illustration of what our works could be within their limits of deviation obviously, they can move within the limits of deviation, but you see there

11:29

a, an illustrative representation of the final position of towers, ceiling in compounds,

11:37

and the and the substation, and so as we go through,

11:42

you might find it useful just to do orientate yourself by reference to those various document. So one thing perhaps will be a relief

11:54

in our post hearing note, if you want we can write down some of these things and if necessary, produce a bespoke plan that points to tower numbers and and so on.

12:07

Because I do realise this will be a little bit

12:11

difficult to explain what our works are because of the temporary works. So so I'm going to ask now, Mr. Marwan Yuka to just turn on his camera.

12:25

Are you so happy that I leave mine on as well, so that if I need to follow up, I made by myself, thank you. And what we're going to do is we're going to follow the format in Mr. Warren is

12:39

written representation where he went through things plot by plot and Mr. fullbrook Follow the same format. So we'll do that plot by plot and we'll explain what we need to do. And then insofar as necessary, we can explain as well what

12:53

what land or rights or powers we would need. I hope that's helpful.

12:59

Very much.

13:03

Good afternoon. My name is Quincy modelling Euchre on behalf and get

13:09

first of all, like to refer to drawings rep one, one, dash 149. This will be relevant to provide just in context with the location of the end gets overhead line

13:24

of referring to appendix one of n gets written some representations submitted on the second of November.

13:30

Also to support this will be the werkplaats rep three

13:34

dash series or six and rep 1004.

13:40

Looking at rep 1149. Just as a context of the national grid lines, we it shows the force that acts and Forza w routes, which are constructed as double circuit lines to allow maintenance of one live

13:54

line whilst maintaining the security and supply of the end users by keeping the opposite second line.

14:00

This allows us while in order to do any overhead line works on one lifecycle to be temporary diverted onto a temporary muscle a temporary tower.

14:10

Now with regards to the works on plot 116

14:15

we start off with just clarifying one

14:19

comment that was made by Mr. Philbrick who would like to confirm that you know, no permanent works will be no permanent rerouting of the overhead line south of the Western falls that

14:29

would occur

14:31

our temporary diversion line of the foresaid x route

14:35

is required yes to replace tower floors at x 21. And by that we would achieve that by constructing a temporary structure or temporary tower to the north of the mature trees so that we can come off the existing tower floors at 22 onto a temporary structure.

14:54

I'm conscious that we we don't have a drawing actually shown showing actually the property

15:00

construction works have a at the moment. But we'll be coming off tower fours at 2222 onto a proposed structure which will be North off the mature trees and then back on to existing tower for the next 20. This would allow us to

15:18

bypass the mature trees although we might need to lop a few branches off the tree and allow us also to provide us a workspace area to dismantle and remove the existing tower falls at x 21. Which is in our plot 115. And, and also allow us to erect the new proposed tower for the next 21 on to

15:44

the land block 113.

15:48

Once

15:50

once a once we have constructed the temporary bypass and erected the the the the new towers We will then

16:00

begin the same sequence again now

16:03

bringing back the alignment back to the new tower and the old alignment as well.

16:14

Moving on to plot

16:19

just confirming what what our requirement for the Eric kuchta. That was brought up as well the Catholic on 116. Yes. Is the triangle of land the triangle of land. Yes, sir. I just interject for a moment. Obviously what Mr. Marwan Yuka has described there is the works on plot 116. Obviously, those diversions. It's not just a diversion of one time, the diversions continue further east. Oh, that's not on this land. So this is we can come to that later. Yeah, we'll come to that is your call piece.

16:59

This is just about Mr. Marley's interest, correct. Okay.

17:04

Now with the the triangle at the bottom that that was shown early on,

17:12

that land will be required, because for scaffold protection, what we looking to protect, there's during the spring work. So the overhead line, when we actually pull the wires from one tower to the new proposed alignment of the overhead line, we will need to build protective scaffolds on either side of the road, these will be netted to protect any vehicle vehicles that are passing through or any members of the public walking underneath the line during this stream works.

17:42

With

17:44

with the land we have, we have shown at the moment it's part of the scaffold might be will be built within that area. And this will be confirmed following up the detailed design as well.

18:00

And can you just explain why it's necessary to have the netting what happens over the top of the netting that that means you need to protect users of the road.

18:13

This is when we actually pull the old conductor, the one we need to replace usually we use a pilot wire just to pull the existing conductor which pulls as well then you conductor and top the one restringing.

18:29

So if there's any

18:31

incident whereby something might fall whilst we're pulling the new conductor in

18:37

the net will capture any falling objects

18:42

and protect the vehicles passing underneath it. Can I just clarify one point just to make sure that we're completely in the same place here. You will be pulling through from

18:57

falls at x zero 23 for Zed w zero 23. So from beyond the road, you will actually be pulling through new conductor you'll be removing old conductor and putting new conductor through across the road. That's correct. Yes, sir. Yeah. Okay. Yeah, I thought that was the case, but I thought it was useful just to have that completely concretely stated. Okay. Apologies. Please do continue. Okay.

19:23

That that was what the explanation really for the land area required in the triangle a bit.

19:32

Now, in which case, Can I follow up with a supplementary question very briefly, and that is the width of the land. So the extent

19:46

that you need Land Beyond the direct alignment of the existing transmission line? Is there a standard or a document that describes the minimum width that you require in order to

20:00

To draw through and remove old conductor and draw through new conductor

20:10

with the width required that would also depend on the alignment of the overhead line itself and also of the temporary alignment. At this particular stage, I cannot specifically state the exact document, but I'll be happy if it's okay. Sir, to

20:27

read the response. Yeah, in writing, it will be fantastic. Thank you.

20:32

Apologies. Thank you.

20:36

And so there was a question it doesn't directly relate to Mr. Moran his land, but the point was raised Look, why why do those

20:49

brown plots extend across the road to the southwest? You're not moving any towers there? What's that all about? Perhaps again, Mr. Mehra, when you go can just explain that

21:12

could tomorrow and go on behalf of national grid and get sort of my blind just cut off for a second? Mr. Humphrey, can you just repeat that again? Yes, I'm sorry. And when this was being dealt with, before the lunch in German, there was just a question almost an aside as to why there was a wide swathe of

21:36

brown land on the rights on the land plans to the southwest of the road when we're not actually diverting any

21:46

overhead lines there can you just explain what works will be undertaken the US consumer only going to be able to get

21:56

there was need for additional Land Beyond Taos 23 up to 25 the works that will be undertaken there it will be to change the marking gap distances of the marking homes these are metal metal parts on the insulators on the on the towers themselves. This is a requirement from

22:18

from one of our technical specifications to change the marking gap distances of any towers within one mile of a new substation. So this will be required in either direction

22:28

of the substation to so we will need vehicle axis for the lines man or the robot overhead line operatives to actually access the towers to climb the towers and also to

22:43

electrically insulate the towers as well by earthing by installing it any earthing on the towers.

22:50

Thank you, and just keep keep your camera on then we've talked about plot 116. We've talked about plot 115. I think if we then just talk about some of those

23:08

small plots, there's 117, which is actually a longer plot and then 117. A, as Mr. Brett pointed out, they're the ones in the or at least part of them in the little inset

23:26

there Why?

23:31

Why are they included?

23:35

plot 1178 has been included, just to provide

23:40

traffic management signage in place when we have the scaffolds erected on the road. So the scaffolds will not be built or block any access

23:51

onto onto the farmhouse. So there have only been included guests to provide any broad signage.

24:01

Thank you.

24:03

And then there are I think so there are a number of other plots that were mentioned, including

24:13

114, which is that thins sort of slither of land along the footpath and then

24:23

one one to eight, which is Mr. One of Mr. Moran is plots and I think 1129 which, again is one of his and those are part of the access road. Not mentioned there 1127 because I think that's in a different ownership but it's, it's the far end of the access back down to the back down to the B 1121.

24:53

And just as far as those ones are concerned, obviously

25:00

Get will require access to

25:04

its

25:06

substation but but other dimensions of that driven by

25:11

n gets requirements or SPR requirements.

25:18

The dominance for any x rows are driven by SP RS requirements.

25:25

Thank you. And so I think muzzin is gonna explain this later. I think it's because they require access to bring in bigger bits of kit. If I can put it like that, then then n get does I think it's to do with their transformers. But they can explain

25:44

that. And so just one or two then

25:49

other points and perhaps in part, it's for

25:55

me need to explain this. One of the points raised was why do we need the decio powers rather than the existing

26:06

easement?

26:08

Which is appended obviously to Mr. Marin is written representation so that that's,

26:16

in a sense, entirely standard, the existing easement was

26:22

granted by the previous

26:25

landowner for the purpose of the line as it currently exists, obviously, the works, we are now undertaking our works, which will have a different nature, which will be Authorised by the decio. And to be absolutely Frank, we don't want to get into a legal dispute about whether we can carry out all of those works under an existing easement that was intended for another purpose. And so, as with all

26:55

undertakings of this sort in all, all schemes, were entirely content that SPR have applied for these rights, insofar as it is said, well, you already have those rights. And we don't see what objection there could be.

27:13

But But in fact, we think some of the rights go

27:17

somewhat further than those granted in the easement and for the avoidance of doubt.

27:23

They have been included again, obviously,

27:26

spr can can speak to that, but we would entirely endorse that position. Just a very quick question there. If I may, Mr. Humphreys, in respect to those additional powers obviously needed for new works as opposed to the existing maintenance?

27:41

Do you think in any way they are more than the powers that you actually need? Or is it the case that the project's not sufficiently advanced for you to know what you're going to need? So it's something that we can

27:57

perhaps come to later on to some of your later items, but your agenda item? I think six is about compulsory about compelling case. But yes, let me just explain very briefly, by way of a preview what we need, we need freehold for our substation, and the ceiling and compounds. Why particular to the point raised by Mr. Maroni about whether he thought the rights were what was were justified or not. Yes, I think there was some slight confusion.

28:31

There.

28:34

Mr. fullbrook, no criticism at all was talking about rights. I think actually he was talking or meant temporary possession, which is a power he referred to Article 26. That's not right. That's an hour of temporary possession. There's no permanence to that. The the power, the temporary possession power granted in Article 26. And I think article 27 is in a very, very standard format for each

29:02

decio obviously, not all of those, not all activities would be carried out on all elements of the land. And that's why I've referred to the works plans because obviously we can only undertake

29:18

the particular work within the particular work area. So there's no question of us in some way, exercising all sorts of rights for nefarious

29:29

purposes. So for the most part, if you looked at

29:35

the works plans, you will see that work 41 the substation is tightly constrained, the area of our substation is smaller than work area 41 which gives us some flexibility to move around within

29:50

that area but obviously we can't be bigger than the parameters set by requirement 12 work 42 is is the work area for that.

30:00

Work Area 36 is where we can have our substations in each of these allow us a little bit of, of of of room work area 40. is these temporary areas that Mr. merwin

30:14

was talking about?

30:17

And and that allows us

30:20

to sorry, 40, I think is the Yes. 40 is the temporary work area that

30:29

we were talking about. And so we can't we can't carry out any of those works elsewhere, just because there is a wider temporary, temporary possession power. Thank you for that. I was just thinking, with particular reference to submissions for Mr. Mani about not so much the not just the areas, but also what appeared to him, I think, if I got this right to be quite a wide range of powers within these areas, yes.

31:00

You know, the power to, you know, take down buildings and

31:06

things. And as I say, of course, it you know, it's one temporary possession power, it's not a right, it's a temporary possession, power subject to restoration, as you will recognise, though, that you don't have to restore by replacing a building bussiness will explain this, but of course, that's sudden subject to the payment of compensation, but we have no need to take down any building or do anything of of that sort, the most we might need to do is lop some trees, and we would take down

31:41

one of our own towers. So perhaps things that you don't need to do could in some way be removed from the rights you're seeking for that particular plot is not certainly not, not really. Not really, sir. Because the temporary possession, power and again, yes, we'll I'm sure explain this to you. But this is entirely standard, the temporary possession power is simply a power to go on to the land and, and occupy the land temporarily and do various things. If you want to leave anything permanently on the land, then you have to either acquire it or acquire a right you'll see that way that the article 27 is drafted follows that that form was first used in the Thames tideway tunnel hearings, where I helped draft out for Thames water and before that, temporary possession pads were different, but since then, all temporary possession powers pretty much are in that form. It's it's very standard. Right. Thank you for that. Thank you very much. Please continue. And so I think we've gone through all the plots, I was just trying to see

whether there were any other points that were raised that you might want us to, to answer at this stage. Obviously on that later agenda items are generally about our worth. I was going to suggest if you're not if that's okay, for now that you can always scoop things up and the atom five perhaps if you wish, or item six as you very happy, sir, you're going to say thanks very much for that. So in respect of Mr. Maron his submissions, does the applicant have anything to add?

33:32

Thank you. Just a couple of brief comments.

33:38

Is that okay? Okay. I just want to hear from the applicant. First.

33:42

Mr. Martinez concerns relate to national Woodworks.

33:47

If I could hear from the applicant as to whether anything that the applicants wish to add in respect of Mr. Martinez submissions.

33:57

colonists, half the African I'm conscious that quite a lot of the the grid matters have already been dealt with. What I want to do is probably pick up on some of the aspects of detail in around Mr. manies property which you raised. I'm going to ask Mr. McGregor's to respond in respect to those matters. Thank you, that would be very helpful. Thank you.

34:18

Brian mcnellis for the applicants. Just to clarify in terms of the headroom that were referred to to the east until the last of Mr. Montes property, and also to the north of this neighbouring property to the north. It's certainly not our intention to remove the residuals and date their corporate within our LMS document our client landscape and ecological monitoring strategy document as important features to provide screening for the development. It may be that we seek to reinforce store cedros if there are any gaps within the recent years are undertaking additional monitoring procedures to improve that screening function. And we will certainly provide clarification on that within the next version of the of the old EMS.

34:58

Thank you very quickly.

35:00

There was an issue about I believe about which side of the hedge the landlord was the plot borders to go. Is that something you could address just now? Please?

35:10

Yes, on the eastern boundary of Mr. Money's property delaine itself is drawn on the on the field boundary, we will clarify the thought the intention is not for that page to be removed as part of those works, see for potentially some areas around the triangle or pocket that we were just discussing where access may be required for scaffolding. Right. Thank you very much. So if there's some more detail you can you can

35:35

give us and for Mr. Martin is benefit also, I guess that would help. Yeah, absolutely. We will find for clarification and Neo lamps on that. Yes. Thank you very much. Well, that'd be a deadline six.

35:50

Correct. Yes. Thank you very much for that. Is there anything else you want to respond to? In terms of Mr. marnus submissions before we move on? No, that's all for now.

36:03

Thank you very much. Mr. Fallbrook, I believe you wanted to come back. Just to conclude, is that correct? Just just in very brief comments, if I may.

36:14

I think the first thing to say is obviously we're grateful for some of the clarification that's been provided by national grid. I think on behalf of Mr. Mani, I'd expressed some disappointment that it's coming at this late stage in the proceedings when he has been very clear about his concerns from the outset. And

36:32

link to that is also surprising that, despite it clearly being one of the main issues is not possible even today to say, Why National Grid requires a certain amount of wit, the other side of the transmission lines, given how much

36:47

rise on that question for a thought. Mr. Mani, obviously, we look forward to what we have it more more detailed information on that from National Grid, but it is disappointing and notable that that information appears the absent today.

37:04

I think I would only

37:08

otherwise say that I'm grateful for clarification on plot 178, that scaffolding won't be used to block access. And I think my understanding was that that's the power sort of over that land are to read signage that goes around the house. I mean, that is different from what has been said by the applicants.

37:27

Very different, but it's notice nonetheless.

37:32

And then just finally, with respect to the powers granted under articles 26 and 27, it may be the case that that is standard wording, but I would maintain that if a power is not necessary, then it cannot be justified. And and it is really a simple proposition. But sound on nonetheless.

37:57

And those are all. That's all I wish to say it by way of reply. But I'm very grateful. Thank you. That's very useful. And we'll be hearing from you in writing in deadline six. Yes.

38:09

Yes. Very useful to make those points. Thank you very much indeed. So now we move on to Mr. Cooper. Apologies for it taking perhaps a little longer than we expected. But it's all been very useful. Yes, we can. I can see you and the floor is yours on behalf of the Kenyans. Fine, thank you very much, sir. And again, my apologies for late arrival.

38:39

My name is Richard Cooper, and I'm the lead for milesweb parish Council on this project. I'm also representing Mr. And Mrs. Kenyon of lime tree cottage milesweb.

38:53

So I spoke at the

38:57

I sh for onshore environment, construction, transport and operational effects hearing on the 20th of January, and I refer them to the lack of detail on the proposals for modifications to the bridge on the a 12 bit in miles road,

39:17

to enable it to take abnormal, indivisible loads.

39:23

Now the purpose of me wanting to speak today is to touch on what's been described as the lay down area. And in 2.2, and I'm just referring here to EA one n 2.2 of the EA one and land plans. Talking about plots One, two, primarily but also 180 and 177.

39:54

And at 2.3 point two, a one in the works plan

40:00

I'm sure we're talking about work number 37.

40:08

And that those references refer to land to the north of the a 12 in miles food, and it is in the ownership of Mr. or Mrs. Kenyan. Now, it's quite clear that this land is being considered by Scottish power.

40:30

But to date, Mr. Mrs. Kenyan haven't had any indication of how the land is going to be used, or whether in fact it is going to be used.

40:43

And now I know that at 4.1,

40:48

under the statement of reasons,

40:51

on page 39, there's a table headed off site highways works. And there is a reference to seven landowners who've identified who'd been identified whose land is out with the adopted highway and may be required for offsite highway works, I'm assuming that the plots that I've referred to, might fall into that category. But the Kenyans have no indication that that is, in fact the case. So my request is really quite simple to her.

41:30

And that is that

41:32

if the Kenyans land is going to be required. And we would argue there's some good reasons why it shouldn't be used. But if it is going to be required, then the the applicant should make contact with the Kenyans prior to the end of the examination, so that any matters of compulsory purchase can be considered by the examiners. And a moment that is, as far as I'm aware, not the case. Now, just for your interest.

42:07

I sent in my written summary of my oral case from the 20th of January, and included in it, some photographs of the Kenyans land,

42:20

which at the time the photographs were taken was underwater. And I can confirm that, since the snow it has flooded yet again. So I would argue that being in flood zone three, the land is inappropriate to use as a lay down area. Anyway.

42:44

Aside from that, we would argue that it's got various

42:51

important habitats in and around it. And these appeared not to have been considered. And in addition, we believe that there are archaeological considerations, which also have not been considered. So my request is that the applicant makes clear their intentions for this land

43:15

before the end of the examination.

43:18

Thank you, sir.

43:20

Thank you very much. That's very helpful. Could I go to the applicant now if you'd like to respond or to any of those points, please?

43:33

Thank you, Marina from the applicant.

43:36

So just on the interaction with the Kenyans, I don't have the exact consultation log to date, but I could refer to the highly hide from dark colour McLaren, for details. And we know that they've had all the obviously the statutory consultation, and we've been in contact with their representatives about survey requirements. And in terms of, you know, the

44:05

powers that we were looking for they are temporary possession powers, and if you wanted more, the project detail then colleague, Brian mcnellis, can provide those. And so I would either go to henry hyde, if you want to speak on the consultation to date or and to to probably probably best to talk with Brian about actually the need for for this land. Yeah, let's start with the lead. And then we'll go to Mr. Hyde because I think if if

44:35

the Kenyans for whatever reason believe that they haven't

44:40

been engaged with then we need to try and find out what's going on.

44:46

Mr. Hyde birth.

44:56

Good afternoon. How are you? Hi doc McLaren off the agent above the African

45:00

I just want to point out that in communications with the Kenyans, dating back to 2018.

45:10

We did write to the Kenyans explaining why that they were included within the book referencing within the order limits on the 21st of October 2019. And there has been further communications with their appointed land agent regarding access for surveys and explaining that when it comes clear as to what requirements we need in that land for the term possession, the size of it, and so on, we would table terms for a temporary licence for carrying out these works. And the response from Mr. Kenyans, Asians that they understood this and that they would wait to receive commercial terms once it's been decided the extent and the works that were required on that land, if at all.

46:00

Thank you. Is there anything else you Africans wish to say at this point? I would just also point out as quickly that further communications were had

46:10

on the statutory side of it in terms of notifications, running up to the application during the application and up to date today.

46:21

So on the point, in respect of when you're going to know whether you need the land and also the points about flooding, do you want to say anything at this point?

46:35

Not safe to Brian Ellis.

46:38

Thank you, I parameterless. For the applicants. We do recognise that the Deland itself off the off the highway the field is flood zone free and flood zone three B and within the state with a common ground we have entered into with the Environment Agency. That's both recognised and measures have been put in place to fully assess the implications of that flood risk. Once the final detail of the land use is established, we've explained previously the the potential requirement for works on the bridge itself it is it is solely related to the transportation of abnormal indefeasible loads ie the the Transformers for the for the tune onshore substations. And indeed the the the route from the reception port to the on to the substation site itself must be the closest available or the shortest available routes, which currently would be Lowestoft, which would come from the north, therefore, we would not travel over tomorrow's bridge, but there's no guarantee that most off will be available. So the second port of entry would then be Felixstowe, which would require Ai L movements to go over marsoc Bridge.

47:54

And with the lack of a statutory inspection on that bridge, current fall in stature inspection they've dumped can cuts considered that it would be prudent to include Marsa bridge to allow for some minor works to be undertaken on Marshall bridge, we're certainly not discussing or contemplating the rebuilding of the bridge or anything of that nature, these are minor works to accommodate the transfer of the L movements may require some some works on the highway on the carpets, etc. And the

purpose of the field adjacent to the highway is really for the day to facilitate those works. In particular, given the the flood risk associated with that, that that field we have made the area quite broad so that we have the ability to microsite, the areas that we require, depending on the season, little time of year that the works would be undertaken and give that flexibility that's required in order to ensure we don't create any downstream flood risks by virtue of our material storage within that area. But as I say that would all be discussed with environment entity and subject to an environmental impairment at the appropriate time. Should we intersect? Did we require the use of that area?

49:08

Can I explore one one point that is my goal isn't that that is the essentially the optionality pond. And because of the number of made orders where there is an option ality provided that the applicant might do a or b, depending on

49:23

how maybe another aspect of the project is is determined has been delivered. And orders have been made that allow that but have also included provisions that

49:37

temporary possession powers as in this case might fall away once it is clear that power is not to be required. So say for example, you were to conclude that the port of access was to the north and you are not requiring access to the south. If that were to be the case that the the the powers in the orders would be drafted so that the specific requests

50:00

for temporary possession, and these particular works as well would fall away. Is that something that

50:07

might be worth considering in this instance? Because, you know, clearly, I guess the point is that you should not burden

50:18

an affected person persons land with

50:22

an enduring power until the end of the construction period. If it can be determined relatively early on, because it might not be used.

50:34

Yeah, I'd like to pass through colonists to address that point, please.

50:40

Call us about the African. Yeah, we'll consider that one. Clearly, it's an either or, and it will be determined as a particular point, when it is known which port the

50:53

the Transformers will come from.

50:56

The The only thing I would say is that we we,

51:01

we may even in those circumstances at that stage still wish to retain the ability to come from the safe in the event that anything happened along the way. So insofar as it would only be, it could only fall off after we've taken both of the Transformers to site. So I don't think it would be falling off until very late in the process, because that would be a relatively late part of the construction process would be the transformer. So I think what you're actually talking about is a very limited time scale, but actually, probably not worth it. I mean, in terms of that particular aspect, as far as it's a field with flooding,

51:42

issues, the likelihood of alternative development coming on that field seems pretty limited. And it's really the falling away is more relevant to circumstances where the land in question might be capable of further development. And as I think in this particular instance, my concern would be the falling away provision really comes exceptionally late in the construction process. And equally, we would wish to retain it until we've got the second transformer to cite in relation to that particular order. So as I say, I think it would be very late on before almost the date where we'd be losing the power to exercise the seven years. So I think it really is probably that that particular one's probably probably probably less justified in some respects, although clearly, clearly, it's a very clear binary option. But we would wish to retain the option as long as possible, just in case anything happened.

52:34

Okay, well, we'll put that into the big melting pot. And we'll we'll give it further consideration. So maybe just just to be clear, to help

52:43

the Kenyans to confirm that the rationale for needing their land, temporary possession of their land is the you're using a port from the south wrong north. You don't know whether you're going to do that yet. Although we have pushed that in the examination, I know in other places. And it's basically almost like an insurance policy in case Lowestoft falls over and you need to go somewhere else. And he may be quite late on. So perhaps that gives them some comfort, to know that that's the rationale behind

53:17

your seeking of temporary possession powers. If they get

53:22

your console off the African, we're certainly in contact with our agents and have that having that those conversations. And I think they'll be fairly direct about that. Thanks. Because it certainly the clarification about timescales is what I suspected, but it's certainly very useful for us to know, that's what your thinking is on, on that side. And I presume also that

53:45

you won't know, until you know, what state master bridge is actually in, in respective load carrying capacity. Is that correct?

53:54

That's Yes, economists.

53:57

Yes, and low, low capacity, but also what you can do.

54:01

It's a two fold exercise, really of understanding the bridges capability, and then also, what engineers are capable of doing in response times. And it is a relatively common thing for major infrastructure projects to actually use engineering solutions rather than relying on the bridge entirely or strengthening the bridge, but there are other engineering solutions around the bridge structures, and which can certainly increase the potential to use it in a safe manner. So it it will be examined and then the best engineering and most effective engineering solution would find to accommodate the particular if it was acquired. Yes.

54:42

Sorry. Yes. So it would be it would be first of all, understanding the bridge structure secondly, possibly options. And clearly, in many cycles, that will be an engineering option selected that is effective and is usually the one that causes the least disruption because that's usually the yeah

55:00

The most effective one from the from the Africans perspective as well.

55:04

Risk of prolonging this, there's one additional question that I then wanted to ask, which is that, quite plainly, the extent of the land sold to be subject to TP powers is in part A responsiveness to the fact that it is land subject to flooding.

55:22

Which means, as has already been explained to us, the the, the active uses of that site would be microcytic. So you're not going to need all of the land all the time.

55:34

And part of the comfort that the Kenyans might seek in these circumstances will be a clear understanding of the maximum extent in square metres if you can give them such a thing. And that would be required. So they can make such plans or think about such other things as it might be prudent for them to be able to continue to do on the land. And knowing that it's all subject to the power, but not all of it would actually be taken. Again, this is around minimization. And there are more than this, there are many more than one way of minimization, including setting out clarity about what extent is required

56:14

comments of our Falcon, I think the real challenge there is understanding the the options in terms of structures. And some of the structures in terms of lay down area may be relatively large scale, depending on what the engineering option is, or is to support works, that it's not clear at the moment, particularly as to the very specific measures that we would sell because some of it if it was a large structure, we may have more flexibility in terms of where it went. Whereas if it was actually more sort of traditional lay down area for bits of works that we were doing at the bridge, then it may be different. So it depends on what it's for. Is it to actually carry out works the bridge? Or is it a lay down for structures that we're then placing to facilitate that that crossing and the stage whilst we've there are a range of options open? The finalised option has not been determined yet because that would have to be a detailed study. And we okay, but but we are going to put you under a measure of pressure here, Mr. Ennis, because if if you're going to justify the taking of land even temporarily, then it does become necessary to know sufficient about the rationale, the rationale for that. And to be clear that, you know, x is required not x times 10. At the moment, we we do seem to have really quite a nebulous envelope around the amount of land required for what and somehow or other we need to bring this to a greater sense of clarity. And if that justifies a broader extent of, of land being subject to the power in order to respond to the flooding, flood risk. So be it. But there needs to be a bit more precision in my mind about the extent that would need to be taken.

58:02

Our comments above African Thank you, Mr. Smith, we will take that away and come back with a plan for you. Thank you. Excellent.

58:11

Apologies, Mr. No, that's absolutely fine. That's where I wanted to go with that. Because the more the landowners know about what the plan is, the better I think, to what why that why the temporary possession is being sought. So yes, that's that's absolutely fine. Let's move on with finished item three now. Just before we move on, I do see a yellow hand from Mr. Cooper. Yes, Mr. Cooper? Yes. Apologies. Would you like to come back to us, please?

58:40

Yes, thank you, sir, for making the request to the applicant for further details. That's very helpful. I think the point I would make, though, is that, unlike some of the other plots that you discussed today, in some detail,

58:58

the future of this particular plot remains uncertain. And that uncertainty is likely to push it if we're not careful outside the examination process. And if it is going to be used, I think it's only fair that it is capable of being considered in the examination. So I would like to use her to ask the applicant to speed up their decision making so that the Kenyans have got some certainty around what might or might not be happening to their land.

59:34

That is a fair observation. At the end of the day, we need to have sufficient of a case for its requirement before us to enable us to be able to make a recommendation one way or the other, to the Secretary of State and that absolutely has to take place within the timescale of examination, because it happens A moment later then we can't have regard to it. Okay, Mr. Rigby? It's very much

1:00:00

So just making a quick note here.

1:00:04

So yes, there were no people wishing to speak under item four. So, we're moving on to item five, which is a statutory undertakers. And what do you know, we're back with an gats. I think they're the steps to undertake is why here. So many thanks for your explanations earlier, in particular reference to Mr. Martinez land. So item five, is your place to be able to put any issues you have,

1:00:40

particularly to do with protective provisions, but also to do with anything that concerns you in respect to the applications. So

1:00:50

if that's okay with you, we'll do it that way. Are you ready to proceed? And gatch?

1:01:03

Hello, say yes.

1:01:05

Thank you. Certainly.

1:01:08

So as far as protective provisions are

1:01:15

concerned,

1:01:17

protective provisions have now been agreed with the applicants they were agreed a few days ago. And the latest agreed protective provisions will be incorporated. I'm told into the draft decio at deadline seven, the protective provisions that you had, I think it deadline, fives,

1:01:45

which was rep 504. That included protective provisions for us, but those were not at that stage fully agreed to the deadlines, seven ones will be

1:01:58

will be fully

1:02:01

agreed and you'll get those.

1:02:05

So we also anticipate having a side agreement

1:02:11

with SP R, that is nearly finalised. I think the next meeting is in very early March.

1:02:25

That sir, as as usual with these things is not a document that that normally goes into the inquiry but in broad terms, that that relates to things like you know, making sure that there's appropriate insurance and surety addressing specific interactions between what we're doing and and SP are are doing. Um, so So you've asked those things in this first part of agenda item five, and then there are some other questions in agenda item five, that are addressed to the applicants and us I can touch on

1:03:12

some of those that might be relevant to to us I notice.

1:03:18

You've asked her how each DCI relates to the other East Anglian decio in various possible respects.

1:03:30

And and part of that one maybe for

1:03:37

SP AR, but I noticed that the the sub bullet points there transfer to N get and whether or not and get substation will be treated as a separate and see if I can I can touch on those. Because those do seem to Yes, yes will be helpful, if that would be helpful.

1:04:00

So and I sort of started on this slightly

1:04:06

earlier and you quite rightly directed me to touch on this now if we're dealing with what what land rights and temporary possession Do we need I what will be transferred to us.

1:04:20

We need the transfer of the land for the substation and the ceiling and compounds

1:04:29

including appropriate land or rights for drainage and access. You'll have noticed we saw it on the outline landscape management plan the the suds area for the substation is outside the perimeter fence. So we would need some arrangement under which we were able to use

1:04:51

that as well. We will need the necessary rights and easements for the overhead line works and so the underground

1:05:00

tables. So, if you remember in that

1:05:04

landscape management plan, there are the three ceiling n compounds, and between the substation and each of those ceiling n compounds, there is an underground cable. In other words, the cable that takes the power to the ceiling and compound, which then places

1:05:21

or transfers the power to to the particular circuit, there are the four circuits on the two lines on each circuit, which is why there are three ceiling and compounds. And then the final circuit is connected, as you can see on that pan directly from the substation, which is why we have the three ceiling and compounds and then the Fourth Circuit directly from the substation, so we would need those rights will need the permanent access rights and easements to all our operational access assets.

1:05:52

Including obviously the overhead lines, seeing the end compound compounds, towers, cables, and so on. And we would need temporary possession for construction of all of our assets. Now, I can read this sort of your bullet point in a slightly different way as well, which is well

1:06:09

how are you expecting to get this in get and

1:06:15

I don't believe this is obviously in control of SPR. But I don't believe it's been finally

1:06:21

determined we we are assuming that in the first instance.

1:06:27

SPR is is seeking as we know where possible to acquire land by agreement. And if they do, then appropriate land rights or powers would be transferred to us. And the next option is obviously they they haven't been able to acquire by agreement and they use their compulsory acquisition powers. And again, we're assuming that they would exercise them and then the necessary land rights or powers would be transferred to us both to construct and but also the land

1:06:56

rights and powers. We are not anticipating that they are transferring the compulsory acquisition powers to us I mean, they could under

1:07:08

under the particular article but that that's not what we have assumed that they will want to do you would need to ask

1:07:15

them so we're not expecting to be told look, you now have compulsory acquisition powers please exercise them what we're expecting is we will be given the land that we need shovel ready land wanted a better description correct. And, and so you know, in relation to that, obviously, we only need transfer to us the land rights and temporary possession

1:07:42

or ability to temporary possession for the land that we need. We don't need anything

1:07:49

else so on on that outline, landscape master plan drawing, there's a lot of land, which is obviously landscaping, we're not anticipating that we need to have any of that land transfer to us. That might be a matter of a detailed negotiation. But But as far as we're concerned, that's SPR

1:08:09

land. And so the final of those sub bullet points is whether or not the end gate substation should be treated as a separate end zip. So the substation, not the substation is not a type of development, that could be an N zip, because it doesn't fall within section 14 of the Act. It's as I know, you know, there's it's the overhead line that is the

1:08:34

is the end zip and the substation might seem paradoxical to many other people. But the substation, the largest bit of the development is actually the associated.

1:08:47

Insofar as the question, is the overhead line, a separate entity? And yes, it is. And it's identified as such, in the shedule, to the development consent order.

1:09:01

It's on

1:09:03

the right one, but I think page 33 No, two, I said it's, it's an answer. Your question, should we promote? That ends it? Mm hmm. So we we certainly could promote that and sit but it's entirely a matter for the, for the

1:09:24

for the developer? I mean, you know, I think we've referred to this before, and I know you'll be familiar with it. But I just stated for the record, the national policy statement in one makes it pretty clear that all other things being equal.

1:09:38

Government wants a holistic approach whereby the developer brings forward all elements of the scheme. And if it means that that scheme comprises more than one enzyme that one developer promotes that and that's very, very common. We've given a number of examples, I think in our written response to some points you made

1:10:00

Whether that's the case, you know, a number of them, but it's not always the case and very often, so, if there are large grid projects, we will promote those separately. So, I promoted the Hinkley Point C connection, which was in fact removed from the power station, but was about 30 kilometres of wider reinforcement, because, so it was such a large project, it would have been odd to, to, to tag it on, and we will very often then promote them quite separate Lee, but in this case, and it's the developers choice, they've they've, they follow the standard guidance in in MPs and one paragraph 492. And, and they've promoted it themselves and we have no problem with that, and we've had good working relations with SP R to to be able to explain as as as we did earlier, you know, what our requirements would be.

1:11:01

Now, in that respect, and obviously, part of the

1:11:07

question that underlies This is around the fact that there is a possibility that there might be other connections

1:11:16

delivered to this particular piece of infrastructure where it to be constructed and commissioned, and to a point where it is possible that the majority utilisation of it might be by other projects as distinct from the SPR projects. And

1:11:36

I mean, the reason that we wanted to spend a little more time exploring that in the context of a compulsory acquisition hearing was to

1:11:48

to gain a sense of the degree to which there is clarity and certainty that the specific rationale for essentially every square centimetre of it that is

1:12:01

to be brought forward as the end get development is specifically required for the service of the SPR project. But if there is also to put on onto the table the POS the possible argument, that if there are other justifications for

1:12:22

the substation transmission line works, that there is another possible alternative mechanism that might enable consideration in the round of the mitigations of the adverse effects of those works, which is the teeth taken in the round the works are to provide for the needs of multiple projects. If it was if they did comprise and ends up in their own right, then the requirements that might attach to it could address a longer development period and the need to manage down impacts. Now, I know we're moving outside the land of compulsory acquisition a little here, but when we then get back to the question of the justification for the need for the land to be taken, and there is there is a living question in our mind about

1:13:12

the degree to which the justification is you know, clearly for the SPR project and or for others so, so it's it's it's a combination or a different there are different aspects of

1:13:29

this, the first thing I will say is that the

1:13:34

the works that we have identified and that that includes the you know, the dimensions and the requirements in requirement 12 that limit the size of the station are absolutely designed for this project I II, the connection of the to East Anglia projects is not designed or sized for anything else. I think, I hope we made that very clear in our last sort of retinue. That is absolutely the case. I mean, obviously, you've

1:14:12

you know, you've asked the question, and others have asked the question, is this substation capable of being connected to by

1:14:22

other other projects and you've seen the answers from

1:14:28

the electricity supply operator? Yeah. So Angie, so and ourselves

1:14:35

about that, and you know, it is clear for example, from

1:14:44

the National Grid ventures, same to common ground where they say that they have been offered.

1:14:51

Connections I think they say in the listening

1:14:56
area, so

1:15:00

So you it's perfectly legitimate for you to ask us the question, but I think you have to ask it on the basis of not.

1:15:09

Have we designed it for anything bigger? No, we have not designed it for anything bigger if someone else came along with a decio.

1:15:17

and wanted to connect to this substation, though, what I can ask Mr.

1:15:24

Morrow and Euchre to to explain is

1:15:29

would this substation be any bigger or different? Or if it needed to be added to? How would it be?

1:15:38

We can answer those questions. And there's another, I think, maybe implication almost at this bullet point that we could touch on, which is where you talk about the relationship of the two East Anglia projects, which is Wood Art, would our substation and our work to be any different if only one of them? Yes.

1:16:00

So what I'll do then is is just sort of, again, if Mr. Mehra when you get if you just turn your camera on, we'll we'll kind of do the double act here.

1:16:14

And and you can do the work and I'll just, I'll just ask the question.

1:16:20

Could you could you

1:16:23

start explaining to the inspectors, sir.

1:16:28

When we made our representations at our response to your actions, do you remember at one of the previous deadlines, that was rep three, dash 111. Rep. 3111 was our kind of response to your actions,

but there was a note attached on the front of it, which was dealing with ai sgis, which is a an issue that maybe comes up a little bit later, but on the back of that note was a plan

1:16:59

of an AI sgis substation, they kind of hold it up, it looked like that, you'll you'll see that.

1:17:07

And what I'll do is ask Mr. Mehra when you could first just say, Well, look, if there was only one SPR substation connecting in would our substation be any different? And if not, why not?

1:17:23

And then to perhaps answer the the sort of related question that if other projects came along with their own DCs, and they compulsorily acquired land next to ours and demanded, you know, connection? Would our project change then? And if so, how would that be helpful? Sorry, okay.

1:17:50

Over to you to explain the difficult stuff, that's fine, could zoom out on your behalf of and get here. Just to respond to the first question regarding the weather, if one of the projects IE a one off or a two is to, if it proceeds, whether they'll make any difference to our current proposed design of the substation,

1:18:12

that will not make a difference at all, to the current proposed substation, because the only thing that will change from the current design will be just the removal of the customer connection bag. From the overall footprint of the substation.

1:18:28

Pretty much the elements on the end, get the end get elements of the DCR will not change.

1:18:34

So So if on that diagram that I pointed you

1:18:40

to,

1:18:42

if you look at the top one, which is the AI, as you'll see, on the left hand side, if I can sort of describe it in that way, there are the four ceiling ends that go out to the ceiling and compounds I they connect the wires, lines, but you have those two bits of kit that come in from the other direction, which are also labelled their ceiling ends. They're the ones that come from either side of the control domain of the building correct. And what would happen is if there was only one SPR substation, one of those would go but you can see that that the overall size of the site is driven by the equipment and the ability and the need to have obviously access

1:19:23

around that equipment so it doesn't change the size of the site.

1:19:32

And the same would be true for the gas insulated

1:19:37

substation as well.

1:19:41

doesn't change the overall size of the site. Okay, right. So then we move on to the so that that's the that's the downward case for nspr from two SPR projects to one now the upward case from two SPR projects to additional

1:20:00

So for these purposes, we don't we don't need to get into an argument about whether they will or you know what consent or whatever we just asked ourselves the question, if there was to be a further connection or two connections or however many you want to specify, what would happen, what would it look like from an electrical point of view?

1:20:21

I mean, if there are any other further extensions required of the substation,

1:20:26

then the we would require an extension to the substation to be considered separately.

1:20:32

The look and also the location of extension areas

1:20:36

would have to be considered

1:20:39

by the relevant promoter at the time at the appropriate time in liaising with the end get and also be considered in their site selection process as well.

1:20:48

In order as well, to facilitate any grid connections to the National Grid substation,

1:20:55

we would require additional area to the substation similar as shown to figure one appendix one of the draft statement on common ground.

1:21:09

So so to draw that into a nutshell, then I'm

1:21:14

it's your very clear evidence to us that

1:21:20

nothing within the land requirement or justification advanced in these two draft orders and their associated plans, Book of reference, etc.

1:21:31

Contains anything that in any way facilitates the possibility of additional connections, those would have to be dealt with completely separately and promoted completely separately.

1:21:45

Yes, that's, that's correct. And the controls you have on on that you have obviously,

1:21:53

the limits of deviation on work number 41, which is the substation but you also have perhaps more importantly, the parameters set by requirement 12, which tell us how big our substation can be so it can move around within that area. But once it's crystallised in a particular spot within work area 41 that's then it the powers to create the substation are to that extent sent us we can't reuse them to make another substation I've explained to you previously, we would, we would only want the freehold for our substation, we wouldn't be asking for anything outside that save in relation to being able to access the suds area, you know, in other words, we need to properly drain and the other bits of our equipment. So

1:22:47

in the

1:22:50

statement of common ground between SP R and National Grid ventures, that's rep 1062. There's a plan on the last page where those two bodies identify

1:23:09

what is called area available for potential future expansion of the substation, that's that's not our document. That's, that's someone else's document. We would agree that logically those would be the only places you can't extend the substation, into the overhead lines, you can't extend the substation into the SPR substation. So the only places you could extend would be at either end. But we are not applying

1:23:38

for that we are not anticipating that we will be granted the freehold for those

1:23:45

for those areas.

1:23:48

Because that would be one argument that could be mounted, which would be that we're used to be, or were there to be any capability to deliver works that did those purposes within the land that you are seeking this at this juncture, that would be an over acquisition. Yes, I mean, that that would be the our human I mean, I think in fairness, and in his will talk to this and we looked at, of course, the

1:24:21

outline, landscape master plan, and that is various sort of landscaping and other works proposed around our substations that has nothing to do with us. But But those are

1:24:36

those are proposed, but the work don't extend to, you know, there may be works,

1:24:44

made powers for them to landscape there, but there's no power in the order for them to create an extension there. And so what we would anticipate, you know, on this assumption that, you know, whether it's National Grid ventures or someone else and I emphasise the point, sir, that

1:25:00

regulatory setup for all the National Grid companies is that national grid ventures is dealt with entirely at arm's length.

1:25:10

On this, they're treated by n gators any other generator because in a sense, they're just another person that wants to connect into the national electricity transmission system.

1:25:22

That they will come forward. I anticipate with their own development consent order that would compulsorily acquire the land and rights that they needed, or indeed any one else proposing to do that. But that's, that's not what we're proposing here. I can make that absolutely clear.

1:25:41

Thanks. That's, that's very helpful. times ticking on. So I'm proposing that we take a tea break, just now. If there's anything else that and get wish to speak to item five, could we do that? After we come back, and then I'll hear from the applicants if they wish to respond

1:26:05

under this item, or whether they wish to respond later under item nine. But I perhaps would be helpful if they were to respond to your points at this juncture. So if I may propose that we take a break. And I notice it's just gone quarter to four, may I suggest we come back at 10? past four? Would that be agreeable?

1:26:30

Ah, yes. Yes, I'm content with that.

1:26:34

Thank you very much, then everybody. And we'll be back here. We have a hug from Mr. Mr. marmi. Apologies, Mr. Rigby, but just a yellow hand. May.

1:26:47

Yes. Thank you, Michael, Omani speakers and affected person. I think this can wait until after the break. But I would like an opportunity to say a few words after the break in relation to the submissions just made by Mr. Humphries. If I may. Thank you. So if you could take you when Mr. Humphries just concluded before returning before the applicant? Yes, that'd be grateful. Be grateful. Thanks very much then thank you very much. First of all, it's so we'll see you all again at 10 past four.