

TEXT_ISH11_EA1N&2_Session3_10032021

Wed, 3/10 5:26PM • 2:04:33

00:01

Good afternoon, everyone. And welcome back to today's issue specific hearings, 11, East Anglia ONE North and East Anglia TWO offshore wind farms. Before we resume, can I just check with the case team that you can hear me and that the recordings, live streams and live captions have started?

00:22

Hi, Caroline, I

00:23

can confirm that the recordings internally have started, the live stream is running perfectly. I can hear you I can see you and the captions are working.

00:32

Thank you, Emery.

00:35

We were

00:38

the point of the agenda where we were about to discuss infiltration. I'd like to start with the applicants on this just in light of what's been said already today. In the outline, operational drainage management plan that you submitted at deadline six, you stated that assuming a worst case infiltration rate of 10 millimetres per hour and infiltration only design would be advisable for the project as the required 24 hour drain, half drain and a specification is not met. Is this is this still? Do you still maintain that stance in light of what you've said today? Sorry, just before we go on, could I ask everyone to come back on camera again, please? Thank you. Sorry, just returned to the app, and then

01:33

it will be sent on behalf of the applicant? Yes, that's still the case, the 10 millimetre flower is an assumed rate. So we demonstrate that that rate is not feasible because we cannot infiltrate to what discharge point of half of empty within 24 hours. So it demonstrates that it's not feasible.

02:00

Okay, so even though this morning, even though today, sorry, that we've already said, You've already said that you are going to amend the outline operation drainage management plan. So that option one becomes infiltration, you're still maintaining that infiltration isn't viable, is that correct?

02:15

Okay. What we are committing to say is that we want infiltration to be the primary means of disposal of water. But we need to carry out the investigation to find out the exact infiltration rates, when we've gotten those, we will use as much of that as possible. And if possible, 100% will be utilised. It benefits the applicant and the benefits everyone if we use the filtration available. So there's no reason for us not to make use of that filtration rate. What we've got at the moment is an assumed rate, which in combination with a factor of safety of 10 demonstrates that it's not feasible to to implement any filtration only system within the site. So that is showing one of the extremes of this hierarchy. And that's why we then explore the other extreme. So we know the site will probably be somewhere in between these two extremes.

03:34

Okay, just from what I've understood what's being said today, you have slightly changed your stance from that that was submitted it deadline six in that your intention to submit something at deadline eight for us. I think what I'm struggling to understand is it deadlines six, the outline operational drainage management plan said that infiltration was not viable. Full stop. We're now not saying that, is that correct?

03:58

Yes. Well, I think the we are going to clarify the principles in which we intend to develop the drainage strategy around and which will clarify the priority is only a filtration. The current the current document, probably that doesn't reflect that very well. What it means that it's not feasible, it's, it's not feasible with the current assumed regs. So, we need to establish what the exact rate is on site and once we get the results from the investigation, then we will know that and we can develop the design to prioritise the filtration system as a priority.

04:50

Okay, so correct me if I'm if I'm wrong, this is my understanding. You're still saying that assuming the worst case infiltration rate of 10 millimetres an hour then infiltration only design would be would would not be valuable. But you are going to now assume infiltration only as option one following infiltration testing that you're going to do post consent that you would do post consent.

05:18

Yes. So we are going to commit to use whatever infiltration is available within the site following the confirmation of the investigation rates.

05:32

Okay, do we have a hand up from someone else from the applicants team?

05:42

Yes, calling some of the costs of the applicant. The way in which the documents submitted their line six was formulated, is it dealt with infiltration based on the assumed rate of infiltration and is in accordance with the guidance. So, we use that infiltration rate, it didn't work, but a paragraph 140 of the document, it highlights that unless the hydrological capture modelling and the population tests which will be

undertaken person sent conclude that an infiltration any design is feasible, the inconclusive This is not a feasible occasion feasible solution. And it then goes on to do the secondary test based on their infiltration. So it's not a question of us or the applicant changing their position. It's within that document. It demonstrated that on the honour, a low infiltration Lake, it wasn't viable. On that basis in terms of a process we had to demonstrate or if it's not viable, is an alternative solution viable. So we go to the next hierarchy and assess on the worst case, that does not say that that's our solution. It's demonstrating that effectively, we've looked at number two with no infiltration and cannot be accommodated in terms of infrastructure within the red line boundary of the order limits. And in effect, we aren't changing up position, because the position was that we would go back and do percolation tests. And if it could be 100% infiltration, we would do that. So it's really more assessing within that document, because we've had discussions with the current authority that they felt there wasn't that emphasis that they felt should be incorporated in that document to give the priority to the infiltration. It was to make sure having had that discussion that the document properly reflected that that was the intention, because they felt there wasn't given sufficient prominence within the document. And as I say, 140 says it, but perhaps not given the right priority and should have been given more context. So that's the the change in position. It's to give give it a greater prominence, but it wasn't a document. So I don't think we're changing a position or making absolutely crystal clear within the document deadline. A quad opposition is

08:01

thank thanks for confirming that Mr. Ennis. Mr. Williams for Suffolk County Council.

08:08

Yes, Matt Williams, Suffolk County Council. I think we need to be very clear about what is meant by the word viable. Here. What is shown in the outline operational drainage management plan clearly identifies that an infiltration only option is technically viable. There is this space and it does work from a hydraulic perspective. Now, this is the issue we've raised previously, why does the applicant deem it to be viable and they've identified that the landscape mitigation clash? Is there a reason for determining this to not be viable? So it's not to do with half drain times? Because that's addressed and I'll come on to that in a minute, is because of the clash or our understanding and the statement in the applicant's most recent submission is the clash with landscape. Now, we don't believe that is necessarily a choice for the applicant to make we believe that's the choice for the examining authority to make as to what is the priority is it landscape is it drainage and where does that line need to be drawn, but in terms of technical viability and infiltration only option is viable half drain times are required to make sure that there is sufficient volume in the attenuation storage be that for infiltration or positive dish discharge for subsequent rainfall events. Now, that rainfall event is in this instance and in any pre other incident is a one in 10 rainfall event. So can the suds accommodate a further rainfall event after a one in 100 and climate change event? submission identifies? Yes, they can. There are alternative approaches that can be taken. Indeed, you could increase the plan area of the suds further by increasing the plan area of the suds further and I think we can all acknowledge that's probably not justifiable in this instance, you increase the plan area you increase the amount of infiltration and therefore you reduce the half drain time and the other option which is the option that size See has taken is to assume there's no infiltration and their red line boundary in order limits, shows the rainfall volume for one, and 140% climate change one in 10 40% climate change, and they can hold that within their order limits, regardless of where they have to put that water. So the discussion isn't, isn't needed. But the key point here is infiltration only is

technically viable. However, the viability argument, I believe, is to do with the clash with landscape, not on a technical basis.

10:30

Okay, and it comes down to this, the half drain time. And I think that's where there lies a bit of a difference between the applicants and yourselves, I think their opinion is that it's not viable, because the drainage time was in exceedance, of, of seven days, but you dispute that.

10:46

So as I say, with a one in 140%, climate change, if it doesn't half drain in that time, so long as there is enough space for another one intense storm on top of that, there is space in that attenuation structure to hold the rainfall.

11:00

And ideally, it has been done has an index

11:04

assessment has been done in the latest outline, operational drainage management plan, and as far as we are concerned, and as part of most recent submission, that design check is passed.

11:16

Thank you, Mr. Carpenter, do you have anything to add on that matter?

11:21

I have some separate questions on the resulting designs, which I guess we will go on to in a minute. So I will just park those, I think this reiterates the point about a lack of a lack of information, that the applicant doesn't really have an understanding of whether they have been highly permeable soil have a strong underlying strata or a very low permeability strata, and in fact, both exist on the geological maps. So it's a failure to undertake investigation means that they are using a infiltration rate, which is basically a rate that's used, because anything worse than that you blank is not considered to be a viable infiltration rate. And that means that the issues that Matt was just discussing in terms of the impacts upon landscape, and then on the viable infiltration areas can't be taken forward at this time, because they haven't undertaken that work. So obviously, at this point in time, and as Mr. Williams said, you know, they presented a design in it so that it's not an options analysis. And so, therefore, they know the viability of the infiltration test at all that the options that they can take forward, are unknown to them because they haven't undertaken this work. And I will make a second point without straying onto on to the design elements, which is that we haven't seen any evidence of an assessment of groundwater risk of groundwater flooding risks. The site is very low nine, it's and the village even more so made a lot of the villages below 10 metre Cod, it's six kilometres from the coast. A brief look on the public domain, groundwater. groundwater levels that are available for a drought period in 1976, which is a benchmark here is the groundwater levels beneath the village are about four metres AOD. So there, there hasn't been any evidence provided that even if this water gets into the ground, that it can get away from them from the infiltration basins, and it doesn't cause a flood risk to groundwater flood risk to the village. So this is a another example of of inadequate baselining. And another example of not providing sufficient

information to be able to test the viability of the options, because it's in such an environment where groundwater is potentially so shallow. One would, one would expect to see an assessment of the groundwater impact through a whole series of modelling programme evaluations. And this work is obviously absent as well.

13:57

Okay, thank you. I'm going to ask the applicants to respond to that. But in your response as well, I wondered if you could explain to us why the degree to which infiltration will be possible is influenced by landscape and ecology mitigation.

14:20

And by that, I mean the extent to the extent to which the landscape strategy would be affected by an infiltration only solution

14:30

from from Berlusconi port the applicants in in terms of our design approach for the onshore substation, to substation, the integration of all design elements has been fundamental to what we what we're proposing, and that comes through in the substation, same principle statement that we have submitted. It comes through in the oil lamps that has been submitted and doing a very detailed master plan. Exercise has been undertaken outline but still very detailed master plan the exercise has been that has been undertaken to convey how we can reach that balance between landscaping biodiversity flood management, access both access for operational purposes and also access for members of the public grown public roads brain networks etc. So, it is very much a balance between that landscape and biodiversity and surface water management elements that needs to come out in in in the planning balance at the at the point of the detailed design stage. We mentioned earlier for instance, the consultation post consent consultation that will be undertaken that we have committed to you under the substation design principles statement that will again further inform the landscape and measures within the within the substation area that we will be taken forward and incorporated within the detailed design of the of the of the projects, and that that essentially gets wrapped up into our detailed submission centre through to the relevant plan in the 40 for a relative plan Florida then tend to make the planning balanced decision on the acceptability or otherwise of that of that integrated solution. And that is no different to the flow policy itself, s CLP 9.6, which identifies that sustainable drainage systems should be integrated into the landscaping scheme and green infrastructure provision of project after development, it should contribute to the same quality of the scheme. And it should deliver sufficient and appropriate water quality and aquatic biodiversity improvements were possible. So that that is very much at the heart of what it is that we are seeking to do in the in the final scheme. The same considering landscaping, biodiversity and surface water management provisions.

17:00

If I could just ask a question if we're if we're looking at, you know, an infiltration only is the first option because that's the top of this hierarchy. And we know that you've got a landscaping strategy in place as well with the two together not looked at initially when selecting the site and determining the order limits, if you didn't think that you could fit all of this in it at that point in time was that not looked at that at that stage

17:30

Brahma gras for the outcomes, we did consider the order limits and the work areas that were established for the project, we need to be mindful of our need to be able to justify the use of the land fill capacity acquisition process and through general dcl provisions. We believe strongly that we have sufficient land available within the grid, the substation development area to accommodate that balance that we need to strike between landscaping, surface water management and biodiversity in terms of the what is considered to be feasible or practical, rather, for surface water drainage, it is not just one factor that needs to play into that that consideration, we do need to consider groundwater matters, we need to reconsider the groundwater table we need to consider the wider groundwater risk associated with an infiltration scheme, we need to consider the detail of the Seine of the of the substations themselves all this information feeds on to the final surface water drainage solution at the detailed design stage when we have that very detailed hydrogeological model which is more detailed than the surface water response plan that Mr. Williams refers to that will be a fairly detailed very comprehensive model of the of the of the wider area and it will reflect the actual substation design footprints that we are we are we are taking forward in terms of fibre optic and going back to the artline operational drain and sponsoring plan that the size of the suds ponds that are identified within the one Sorry, I wanted 10 millimetres for our infiltration rate. We consider those not to be viable based on based on the same parameters that were included within that extreme modelled scenario. We we do expect an attrition rates to be greater than 10 millimetres per our again, that's something that the decline investigation studies that are pending will will allow us to establish and feedback into the detailed same of the infiltration system.

19:50

Okay, so just as I understand that I take your points on board but as it stands, assessing the drainage requirements on a worst case scenario As and the proposed landscaping strategy as it stands at the moment, you can't fit all of that, that in to the order limits Is that what you're saying?

20:12

Roma girls for Brahma girls for now can choose in the worst case infiltration rates, we do not consider that to be viable on a number of grinds, one of which is to compromise that it would have to landscaping measures.

20:26

And to what extent would those landscaping measures have to be reduced?

20:32

With regard to the figure within the art lane pentik study, within the latest version of the operational drainage sponsor plan, you can see that in essence, it removes a majority of the landscaping along the western facade of the National Grid substation, and onshore substations. And that's, that is a key landscaping area, that's key screening the area from our perspective, to screen the substation developments from properties to the to the west and to the to the to the site. Okay, thank you.

21:09

So see hand raised out, Mr. Davis, I think is it for the applicant. You want to meet Mr. Davis.

21:24

Probably make more sense. Now. I just wanted to make a brief point in case there was a misunderstanding with this discussion. And it appears as though we're talking about landscaping or infiltration. Landscaping itself is an infiltration system. And assuming we have better rates than the worst case, we would be able to take advantage of that within the landscaping area to capture more water and keep it local, which is I think the aim of everybody now to actually maximise the capture of water within the site. I just wanted to make sure there wasn't a misunderstanding that it was either or they both have a function.

22:12

Thank you. Did the council or these wish to respond to any of the points raised by Mr. McGregor list there? We have Mr. Bedford

22:29

Madam just briefly, and obviously Mr. Williams can provide the technical position. But just on that last point by Mr. Davis. Obviously, landscaping as a generic, including all types of things which might be included within landscaping could include landscaping that is compatible with infiltration techniques. But that as I understand it is not the point that Mr. Davis was referring to, which would be as it were prejudiced by reference to what is currently shown in the DMP, using the 10 mil minimum infiltration rate, that landscaping on the western side is landscaping in the form of tree planting planted areas and those as I understand it would not be compatible with a suds infiltration area. So I said Mr. Davis's point, which seemed to be suggesting that there wasn't necessarily a tension between landscaping and infiltration was, as we understand as a generic point, when you come to the specifics of this project, what is proposed for the landscape mitigation, the nature of that landscaping, so far as providing a screening function, there is a tension between landscaping and infiltration, which is I think the point that Mr. Williams was alluding to that some, somewhere in this process, as it were an adjudication has to be made as to where the balance lies between those issues. And that's something that we think that the examining authority may need to come to by the time that we get to the end of the process. And we've seen it deadline a what it is the final position from the applicant. So if I've misunderstood that Mr. Williams will perhaps correct me but that's what I understood to be the point.

24:35

Yes. Not wanting to get into detailed design as the applicant has clearly stated, our general rule of thumb is you do not have trees within five metres of an infiltration component. That which is to prevent the potential issues caused by tree roots with infiltration. That's not to deny that sometimes if it's designed correctly, trees can aid infiltration, but there is a risk there. And so, as a rule of thumb, we do not accept infiltration and trees within the five metre distance as the first thing is also worth just remembering that this approach is required due to the lack of infiltration testing. So, these 10 million hours and all of these other parameters are required because of that. And then the final point which Mr. McGillis touched on, was the viability aspect, I think it would help everyone in this regard is to give one aspect of landscape to have a clear understanding of exactly what those viability issues are with it that written out and supported by plans and other supporting evidence.

25:42

Mr. Carpenter, I can see Mr. Attorney also has his hand raised who would who would like to

25:49

go first, if that's all right, man. The first point I wanted to just raise was reflecting back on what the applicant has stated, which, which demonstrates that there is considerable uncertainty over the parameters that they have available to them to, to identify the size of the structures because they have they have no evidence base for the infiltration rates, and therefore this is impacting upon the other constraints that they're working with. So it's a security argument that they unless they unless they address that fundamental point, they can't look at the impacts it has on the on the other elements of their their proposal. The second point actually has just been made by Miss by sec, which is that the landscaping as integrated into the basins themselves is inconsistent with with viable infiltration systems. This will introduce in a wetland habitat, biota rotting debris, and this will make this will start to clog up the infiltration basin and it will make operational maintenance industrially impractical. This has consequences from a CCS perspective, because it increases the risk of having greater water storage inside the base and then otherwise proposed and ultimately a risk of overtopping and failure the landscaping issues also impinge on on the infiltration basin in that the the basin designs which I assume you were going to talk about a little bit shortly, but they they integrate the design storage they require the freeboard storage that is necessary, but then there is additional storage that's created because of the landscape. The landscape forms to the point where the total volumes that can be contained within these structures in one particular case for the substation for the infiltration basin exceeds 35,000 cubic metres. So if the infiltration basin doesn't work as proposed because of debris inside it, if they get the infiltration rate wrong, then there's potential for to hold quantities of water that are 10,000 cubic metres over the reservoir act limitations, which introduces not only a whole raft of engineering issues on an operation and maintenance issues, both of which are inconsistent with with wetland and landscape habitat, forming part of their structures. But it also demonstrates the risk that is being posed to the village of Friston with with bodies of water that is so significantly large that the reservoir will come into the reservoir, it will potentially come into play. Okay.

28:40

You're muted.

28:43

Sorry, Mr. Attorney, please. Perfect. Thank

28:48

you, Madam rich attorney for status. And just to make a more general point, you've heard from the experts on this issue. But what we're faced with is a situation where it is recognised by the applicant, that there will have to be some sort of trade off in the design process between landscaping within the site and provision of the best possible infiltration solution. And that's recognised because it's accepted that on the worst case assumption, they cannot accommodate the infiltration solution because of conflict with landscaping. So, these are matters which in our submission very clearly need to be resolved at examination stage and not through subsequent approval, because those tensions is the

landscaping sufficient is the extent of infiltration provision, sufficient those matters, that bargain between the two is not a matter that should be dealt with, through a submission in due course, on the applicants proposal to the local planning authority and not even to the local lead flood authority. So that whole issue is really should be resolved in examination so that we can say, Well, if you have that approach, the landscaping is too far cut back. And it's unsatisfactory in landscaping terms. If you had another approach, then you're not doing enough by way of addressing flood risk. So those submissions have been effectively stopped by the applicant saying, well, we'll sort this all out later down the line, but we accept that there is a potential conflict between the two. Thank you.

30:31

Thank you, Mr. Tierney. Can I ask the applicants to respond to those submissions, please?

30:36

prom across party applicants. Just to reiterate, again, reiterate our point, it is simply not possible at this stage of the project design to incorporate to deliver what Mr. Turley was seeking, we do not have the definition on the substation for prints, we do not have the definition on the National Grid substation footprint, or any other infrastructure that is all subject to detail the same. And that will all feed into the final design of the surface water management system. I would also like to take a step back. A lot of the discussion that we're hearing is premised on a lot of infiltration on the delivery of the maximum infiltration solution. That is something that we're absolutely focused on delivering that as our primary solution. But unless were practical, and I believe it was mystic Mr. Cotton to refer to two volumes of water that could be potentially retained, but that is another one of the considerations that we will have in terms of whether an infiltration only solution is viable. If we are storing right, what is legally classified as a reservoir of water, adjust to substation, that is something we need to consider is that fireable? Is that is that a practical solution. It's also premised on the fact that infiltration is the only solution. And that is not the case, infiltration is the primary solution, but where it is deemed not to be viable for a number of reasons. That will form that that deliberation as to what is viable and what is not what is practical. What is not were done is not deemed to be practical, then we have the fallback position of the sons arrangement, which would still maximise infiltration, but we would have that sensor arrangement with our positive discharge to the first motor course, which were chosen in aeroplane operational driven sponsored plan as a worst case, assuming no infiltration whatsoever still fits within our footprint and allow us the landscaping to be accommodated around that. So that is that is the that's the insurance policy for one to read a word that's the worst case backup scenario, that infiltration doesn't work today to the extent that everyone wishes a three work to but in that scenario, we then fall back to the infiltration plus sensor insurance.

33:05

Thank you very much. Mr. McGinnis. Before we move on from infiltration, Mr. Carpenter, did you say you wanted to say a few words about design? it this is this item?

33:18

Yes. Thank you. Thank you. Um, yes, I mean, you know, obviously, we I just mentioned this issue about the reservoir act, and the consequences that potentially has in in terms of integrating the designs into the landscape, non engineered landscape is not the same thing as the requirements required for

for reservoir engineering design, you know, these are very different things, but there were just a number of things that that we picked up that the design storage is that I mentioned, you know, these are these are very close to this to the storage volumes that are being proposed, you know, within within 7%. This doesn't allow for much of a sensitivity analysis, it doesn't allow for clogging, we do recognise that this freeboard over that, but the purpose of freeboard is to be above the design not to not to be available within the sensitivity of the design the depth of the basins and Mr. Williams may wish to make a comment that from the SCC alep phase suds guidance if these basins are accessible to the public and that information is not available to myself then the depth of the basins are meant to be no more than point five of a metre and the basin depths are based in depth or in breach of this that deeper than that when therefore I think point seven metre it comes out of the design dock. So, so there is a there is a safety issue there. And there's a safety issue there to the proximity to Friesen village and to the In particular to, to the children and the less aware members of that of that community, who will be in close proximity to these structures. And the last point I wanted to make was that there was a comment about the any lost storage. So any of these depressions taken filled in from on the site, this will be included in the in the storage calculations. Well, from a review of materials, it would appear that some of them are and some of them are not. So this is, you know, this, this is it's important that that this sizing is done correctly, and that these issues on overlook.

35:39

Thank you, Mr. Carpenter, Mr. Williams,

35:43

just on the aspects of water depth, so I appreciate why our guidance says it has been superseded as it were. The serious suds manual gives a maximum water depth of one metre. That is what water companies now use for their son's adoption. And it is what we are seeking to align ourselves with now and it is what all developments in Suffolk are expected to achieve.

36:05

Thank you for confirming that. Can I ask the applicants to respond to those submissions, please?

36:13

resend them on behalf of the applicant. I would have to agree Well, the safety is paramount and we using the guidance that was given to us by the FAA. So the design is compliance as far as we know. in detail design, obviously, if any, any issues arise, they will be dealt with.

36:37

Okay, thank you. And that is the end of my questions on input infiltration before we move on to attenuation Does anyone else have anything that they would like to raise? No. Okay. In that case, we'll move on to attenuation. And my first question is to Suffolk County Council. The updated outline, operational drainage management plan submitted it deadline six has produced new figures and larger storage basins to accommodate 40% climate change. Are you now confident that the storage requirements can be accommodated on site?

37:19

Yes, but obviously with the premise of what we've discussed already with regards to the clash with landscape

37:26

and the same question to say CS please.

37:31

Thank you, madam. No, we're not satisfied because the design is contingent on on on an adequate certainty of the Q bar calculation. And as we've spoken at length, the understanding of the the baseline conditions and the hydrology of the catchment is poor and inadequate, and therefore, there cannot be confidence in the in the designs that are presented.

37:56

The applicants like to respond.

38:01

So, the Q bar rates were calculated in in accordance with current guidance as well. We can review this once we've got more site investigation and we know more about the ground conditions during the design, I think at this at this point for what we know about the site that Cuba used is appropriate.

38:33

Thank you very much, Mr. Carpenter.

38:38

Thank you man. We just do the comment from the applicant that the methodology used is acceptable. And there are a range of techniques that are available and we recognise that the the, the technique that has been used is is the preferred technique for larger catchments. But defer guidance is clear on this once the catchments become small, then the reliability of all of these techniques, the technique that the applicant has chosen is the best of those other techniques, but the preferred option is to is to secure catchment data to secure rainfall and to secure water level and flow estimates because the reliability of taking those approaches down to the small catchment level is known to be unreliable.

39:33

The applicants like to respond

39:36

because we sent on behalf of the applicant. Well, I guess we we are following the guidance we see so as far as we are concerned, but the applicant proposed to use the coupon which is suitable.

39:55

Mr. Williams Yeah,

39:57

I think it's worth us coming in here and that William Suffolk County Council, this applicant has undertaken a sensitivity test, it is established that 100 mil orifice on attenuation systems is should be a minimum to prevent blockage 100 mil orifice generally accounts for a five litres a second discharge right. Now working on that basis, the applicant has for one of the basins from memory, I believe it's the National Grid substation assess the five litres per second discharge rate as per sensitivity tests. I haven't done that for the project substations. But once if they were to do I think they would still have sufficient space, the applicant has committed to undertaking the detailed hydraulic model and amending their discharge rates based on that however, I think there would be a discussion to be had at the detailed design stage, if the key bar rates were identified to be less than five litres a second, the balance that's to be had there between the discharge rate and the potential for blockage. So there is circumstances well established circumstances where the key bar rate is less than five litres per second, but that is increased to five litres per second. Now, flood risk implications of that would need to be assessed completely agree with that. But I think that is something that we couldn't necessarily do without the detailed hydraulic model, which we don't have at this time. Something we have asked for previously, and we've queried in our submissions, is whether the applicants intend to do or intend to have rain gauges or flow rate measures are in the first domain river? And the answer to that was no, we still have concerns about that. That is what we would like to see because it would give some certainty towards the hydraulic model coming forward. But I think at this stage, we're not going to get that information and what we have is the best that is going to be available at this stage.

41:55

Thank you. Is there anything else that the applicants would like to add? Oh, sorry, Mr. Carpenter first.

42:01

I don't mind doing second. That's fine.

42:03

No, I'd rather you then we'll allow the applicants.

42:07

That's fine. I just like to reiterate what Mr. Williams said, which was that the impact of releasing at q bar on flood risk is unproven. We in we know that the flood events in fishing village happened several times a year and larger events happening yearly or or twice every couple of years. So the whilst ordinarily, when we aren't, we understand the why the QPR approach is used in this particular case. And given the sensitivity of the site, I feel it's important that actually that's put into the context of the actual flood risk, and the work is put in to demonstrate that that flow rate does not contribute to increased flood risk. I'd also like to make a similar point that I made on infiltration, which is that the the total storage that's provided once you allow for the, the, the, the freeboard and you allow for the additional landscaping brings the total storage to within about 7% of what of what's required for the reservoir and so, the the applicant may be sitting just beneath that, but it only takes blockage an excessive event and then we are looking at water being retained and potentially overtopping a structure that has the risk very close to that of the reservoir so this is a significant impairment risk above the above frison vintage Thank you

43:41

napkins like to respond

43:45

with a recent on the effort the applicant. So yeah, I don't disagree that all that there's several factors here that we'll need to look into and obviously they will be more assertive once we have the SEC investigation information and those will dictate than the size of the structures we're going to have. It is assumed that the moment from our worst case scenario assessment that reservoir is going to be required however, that has not been proven yet until we have the actual rates of infiltration that will be required upon having those done that the design needs to be developed accordingly. One thing that I will note is with regards of exceedance flows and emergency overflows. Obviously, whatever structure is going to be constructed here will have to be fitted with controlled overflow system, which will be above the level of what the for the 100 return periods plus 40% climate change because obviously regardless, but we got one So far being the structure is this would cause perhaps a safety issue and so on to the downstream effects to be controlled. So we are, we are mindful of that, and that is something that obviously would have to be incorporated in the retail design.

45:22

Okay, thank you.

45:26

Thank you, Brian Macross napkins. I would also just like to point out that they the figures, the actual backgrounds presented within the outline operational drought drainage management plan, they they haven't yet taken into account that detailed design element off, can we can we split the salt spawns off? Is there a cascading effect that we will deploy that balances the surface water drainage requirements with the landscaping requirements, there may well be other solutions than simply having a single sub spawn for the onshore substations and a single source pond for the National Grid substation. That is all again subject to design and consideration of landscaping, biodiversity, surface water drainage and access considerations.

46:14

Okay, thank you. My next question is directed to Suffolk County Council the existing depression that will be removed by the access road, the applicants are now proposing to replace a storage and the third base and you don't think you don't consider this to be acceptable. Could you elaborate on exactly why you don't consider that to be acceptable?

46:40

Yes, so without a drawing, I'll try and describe it as best as I can. The depression is based at the intersection of two watercourses one comes from an easterly direction and one comes from a northerly direction. The basin at the moment is towards the southern side of that intersection and has an overflow pipe into the depression. So those joint flows can access the basin or the depression. The proposed location of the depression is adjacent to the watercourse from the north and it is more remote from the water cost to the east. Now in the example that there was no flow from the water course from the north, and a large flow from the watercourse to the east, for whatever reason that may be the basin, we're not confident the basin or the depression would be able to provide the interception that it does now

because of the proposed location because it is then more remote from that intersection of the two the two watercourses.

47:47

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Williams. Mr. Carpenter, do you have anything to add? In relation to that matter?

47:55

No, we concur with Mr. Williams observations?

48:00

Could I ask the applicants to respond to that point please,

48:04

by themselves on behalf of ligand? Well, the last submission shows the the applicants will to accommodate and review the design to be as correct and and reflect the current catchment area as possible. We would say that we review your comments and would address the comments in the following submission.

48:43

Okay, thank you so, so, you're going to consider what Mr. Williams has said and address that in their next the updated outline operational drainage management plan.

48:52

Yes. Yes.

48:57

Thank you and to the to the applicants in a plan submitted deadline one reference rep 1062. It shows the potential expansion of the National Grid substation East with westwards having looked at that plan and then having looked at the proposals, both infiltration and attenuation it does appear that those the expansion of potential future expansion of the National Grid substation does conflict with the sub basins based on worst case scenario, is that correct?

49:43

parameterless for the applicants, what we're showing within that the potential expansion area is a potential area for a national grid substation to be expanded to accommodate national adventures, projects. We in terms of the design and evolution of our projects are not given any credence or any attention to the national grid extension works, should they come forward? So it's not it's not influencing our landscaping design. It's not influencing our surface water drainage management design. We're designing our systems for our projects and our projects mode.

50:20

Does the Council have anything they would like to raise on that matter?

50:25

is a concern we've previously raised the applicant come back quite strongly and said that wasn't for consideration as part of these applications, which is a point they've just repeated there. But I think Yeah, the potential issue there is clear for everyone to see and it is a concern that we have

50:44

he's he Mr. Bedford has his hand raised.

50:49

matrimony microbead for the very first Suffolk, only to make the point, which I'm sure you you're very well aware of a separate point about cumulative impact assessment. And this obviously feeds into that wider point.

51:04

Thank you. And Mr. Attorney,

51:10

that enrich attorney for says is, it's the same boy really is Mr. bedfords. Because what this shows this point exposes and it's point we've made previously is that where we have a location that is clearly going to be the site of future grid connections, if it is consented now. And there's no doubt about that, and the applicants mind or in anyone else's mind, then there is a an issue about whether they're in scaling, citing the flood mitigation, and indeed landscaping and other matters, that those cumulative impacts being properly assessed, and the direct conflict between what they're showing is the likely location of attenuation. And what is likely to be required by way of national grid substation. increase in size is rather confirms the point that there is a problem but it needs to be assessed and it hasn't been.

52:15

Thank you very much, Mr. Attorney, at least if it Council have their hand raised.

52:22

Thank you. If Namie go to him, he said the council I just wanted to support the comments made in relation to the cumulative impacts for the national grid and the potential extensions, the National Grid substation. And obviously, we've, as with Suffolk County Council, and others, during the in within this hearing have made extensive representations on this. So I just wanted to acknowledge that obviously set the council supports those comments raised. Thank you.

52:48

Thank you for confirming that. The applicants like to respond to any of those submissions made there?

52:58

Yes, good afternoon, conus. Above the applicants. While we're back here, again, more claims about future schemes. All the evidence that's coming forward into this examination over the past week, have been the claim schemes that are coming to Friston are committing not to come to Friston. And simply put is no good to keep making the assertion when the evidence before the examination of these

schemes is disappearing. The only one that's left is National adventures, which again, at deadline three, they've made the position absolutely clear that they're still having to evaluate their matters. And simply put is not for this applicant to sit trying to evaluate the potential for a future projects footprint, when we have no detail of the exact extent of that footprint for the location of the infrastructure that might be involved in that. It's simply beyond our ability at this stage to assess that particular aspect. And, quite rightly, in my submission, the applicant when putting in an application is perfectly entitled to put together their applications and consider them properly. And if other schemes look to come along in the future, it is entirely their responsibility to consider these other technical matters such as flood risk, because clearly we have to deal with the matters which we are dealing with. And that is the basis of it. So far from saying that we should change our flood design. Because of a future project. We have to build our foot design in accordance with the position that we present. And one of the issues here is that our scheme is clearly at this stage. I am an indicative and I think that's a key point. Is that what we've done, and it really mirrors essentially the assessment Rochdale envelope, we've got an outline framework for our substation which we've managed to refine already in the application process. And if we've done detailed design work in my world of work There's a consequence of that. So what we've already done is narrowed the design, we will have a further design iteration. And it's from that, that we will work out exactly how and where things sit. And what we have set out in our flood risk. matter in the average range management plan is the current worst case scenario, a worst case footprint for the applicants, or worst case footprint for national grid. And that is the basis on which we then assess the worst case footprints for all the matters that we've identified in terms of basis now, and my submission factors the correct basis of which the applicant has to proceed, and thought is the basis of which we'd have to proceed in terms of the proposal. And it is where we are in terms of worst case scenario for the applications that are put forward. And ultimately, the design workflow have had to be influenced by what infrastructure actually comes forward in terms of that final design. So I think there's only we can take further at this stage by the applicant. And you're right to point out that in terms of those drawings is a conflict where we're putting our substrate, in worst case position, as it currently stands. But what I would say, is what we've put in those drawings of a simplified process of setting out what scale would be required for National Grid infrastructure of that scale, indicatively, next to the National Grid infrastructure. And similarly, what would be required and scale terms to accommodate the two onshore substations, that may well not be the ultimate solution in terms of how rare it is an indicative layout to illustrate. And I think it's probably far fairer to illustrate them in two large ponds, because they make it very clear exactly the scale of what's required, rather than breaking them up all over the site into bits and pieces, which may have a component part of how it's dealt with, ultimately, in the detailed design. So I think we have taken it as far as we can, but it is on a worst case scenario around. And I think that is a fair and appropriate basis on which to design at this stage.

57:08

Thank you very much, Mr. Ennis. In that case, I've got no further questions to ask on the matter of attenuations. I'm going to move on to discharge to the Friston watercourse, I just have a couple of questions on this matter to the applicants in the first instance, how can you be sure that a pipe connection to the Friston watercourse is feasible?

57:36

Well, we'll have to look at the details of that. But the connection into the water course can be made by shallow COVID COVID. Under the road. I don't think that's why I don't see issues on the visibility of of the connection. It obviously needs to be submitted for the approval of the local authority. And the details of the design that will be established during the detailed design period. I guess, for the time being. I don't see an issue that

58:18

okay, but could it could that be the situation that a pipe connection to the forest and waterfalls would not be feasible? And if that was the situation, what impact would that have on the project?

58:32

Um, I don't believe so. I believe that visibility of any infrastructure could always just be coming down. What? several options. I don't know if Brian wants to say anything about that, but there's multiple options are built

58:56

at parama grace for the outcomes. So in terms of the feasibility of the connection into the forest and surface water, there is an engineering design solution a field we are confident there's an engineering and science solution available for that. It will, it's highly likely to involve reinforced concrete culvert type type arrangements, where we then deviate from what is traditionally the depth coverage between said road surface and utilities that reinforced concrete The same can be will be reflective of the the both the needs of the highway itself thought of the needs of Church Road, and also reflective of the various outfall levels and then parent level support the surface water discharge pipe and the system watercourse itself. Again, this is another element that is tied to the very detailed engineering the same of the off the project.

59:50

And you say you're confident what gives you that level of confidence. So that was

59:59

great. outcomes. So in terms of our advice and input from our engineering and delivery teams, they have been on site they have looked at the various levels, they flipped the size of the outfall pipes to be required. And the feedback from our design teams and delivery teams is that this is a very deliverable solution. It's not a conventional solution. It is not just a conventional pipe, buried a standard depth below the root surface. But there is an engineering solution that balances the needs of the highway with the needs of surface water discharge.

1:00:34

And is that something that you're going to add to the updated operational change management plan to be submitted at deadline eight?

1:00:45

Bram grasper napkins. So the in terms of the design design for that has not been undertaken, that that will be subject to detailed topographic surveys on site, the sign of the the surface water monitoring

system, so we established the size of the pipe required, etc. So there's a lot of information that feeds into what that final design solution would be. So perhaps we can we can read reiterate the the concept, but in terms of the design that won't be available until the detailed sciences he paused and said,

1:01:14

I think I think it would be beneficial to submit into the examination why you have that level of confidence that a connection can be made to the watercourse, particularly when we have concerns raised by the local sort of flood authority. If that could come in at deadline, it i think that that would be most helpful

1:01:32

for grasping outcomes, certainly.

1:01:35

Mr. Williams,

1:01:38

Matt Williams, Suffolk County Council, the applicant, obviously, as you picked up on states that they are confident there is a solution, as seems to be a theme. Today, there isn't the evidence to support that we do have serious concerns. The level of information that Mr. grellus refers to in terms of topographical surveys we have that I have it on the screen in front of me right now. The levels are very, very shallow, it will be very, very tight if an option is achievable. Obviously, we work closely with our colleagues in the local Highway Authority, they share this view, they have to accept the design underneath Church Road in order for it to be acceptable at the moment they do not see a solution. We do expect the applicant to come forward with a solution that they call is our view that they can't use the option to discharge to the first and watercourse unless they can demonstrate there is an achievable option there. Otherwise, it's a non starter. And that is our our position until we see anything to the contrary.

1:02:36

Thank you, Mr. Williams. Mr. Carpenter.

1:02:40

Thank you, Mr. Carpenter, Stacy's it's just reiterate Mr. Williams point. This is an issue of feasibility. This isn't an issue of detailed design, this is wood, whether it actually at the options are even on the table. And therefore whether the option of the attenuation pond is viable, which itself is the backup option if the infiltration basin doesn't work. So this, you know, this is not a small detail design issue to be pushed away to some other later date and time. This is a critical part of the decision making as to whether this is the drainage schemes are viable at all.

1:03:11

Thank you, Mr. Carpenter. And just back to Mr. McGregor. Is there then the further information that you're going to submit? Oh, you're confident that that will provide cc's on the council with that level of comfort that that solution is feasible.

1:03:30

promo price for the applicants. I suspect what local party and assassins are seeking as a detailed design of the of the solution, that that is not what we will have at the stage, what we will do at deadline is provide additional reassurance as to the concept of that discharge into the first quarter portion.

1:03:53

I think I think it's not so much detailed design. I think it's proving whether or not that it's feasible. I think that's what they're that's what they're requesting,

1:04:04

promo CrossFit outcomes. Our deadline aid submission will address that point to the best extent that we can.

1:04:11

Thank you, Mr. Williams.

1:04:14

I'll just make the offer now that the topographic survey that we have is available for the applicants and we can send that over to them today if it will aid them in this design.

1:04:25

Thank you very much for that offer. Mr. Carpenter

1:04:33

Thank you, Madam Clerk Carpenter Stacy's whilst on the subject of discharges to watercourses, we know there is no outfall from the attenuation the northern attenuation pond. Perhaps the applicant could inform us is how they propose water leaves that pond is is self evidently not being considered.

1:04:55

Thank you. Attend to the applicants please.

1:05:01

Private grounds are the outcomes. The means of release for the norvan plant is the same as the means of release to the southern pond and not if it is a sun solution, it will be painted down to the first and watercourse in the same corridor as the other in the same pipe or indeed in the same quarter as the discharge release for the controller substations sponsor.

1:05:26

Thank you. No further questions in relation to the discharge to the fist and water core. So I'm going to move on to adoption and maintenance. Paragraph 5.7 point 10 of MPs in one states that the development consent order or any associated planning obligations will need to make provision, the adoption and maintenance of any SIDS section 5.4 or the outline. Operational drainage management plan does set out inspection and and maintenance. To the applicants in the first place does this secure adoption in accordance with the MPs requirements?

1:06:13

envoys were not seeking any party other party adopts slots regime or the drain issue seem it's a tiny matter in terms of the nature of this particular infrastructure, that the place that operator will want to have control of these matters, and to make sure they're adequately maintained and operated. And that's why requirement 41 is specified in the terms of service and the operational drainage management plan. When finalised, we'll have details within that it's already set out to 1232125. That that's the approach that's going to be adopted. But in terms of this nature of infrastructure, it would be normal for the for the operators to take control and seek to ensure and maintain the infrastructure involved it for a number of reasons. Not namely that it's really important to the to the projects to maintain them. And it's a part of a process which they would want to take the obligations on under the right type of party to take that obligation on in the context of these particular matters. Equally, I think we're all getting on to the next point later. But the key point is that we would we as the undertaker on the operator would wish to retain the control and make sure that actually happens and is done properly. And of course, that is the I mean, a lot of this the such guidances that is also related around urban development and residential on where one does get into the debate about who should retain and who should operate etc. Clearly in terms of a national infrastructure project, we are in a special regime and for regime for a purpose. And that is because of the importance of this infrastructure to to the nation, and therefore it is quite proper that the undertaker maintains the these facilities are whole.

1:08:10

Okay, thank you for confirming that. And if it's the case that it's the responsibility of the the operator, how does this work? Sorry, couldn't get you back on the screen a second Mr. This? Sorry, if it's the case that the responsibility of the operator and obviously, we would have here national grid, as well as the onshore project substations you would see the responsibilities are shared between the operators.

1:08:40

Well, that's yet to be precisely defined, because the infrastructure yet to be precisely defined. If, for example, there were separate infrastructure for the National Grid substation, it may well be that they would wish to have the ability to maintain and operate the whatever drainage is being provided infrastructure has been associated with that. However, if it was all integrated into one, then it may well be the one Undertaker will take responsibility and will have under agreements regarding cost. And of course, within the plan, there obviously has to be an engineering obligation that if for example, one of the operational substations was subsequently not to be commercially operated and left but National Grid was left that there will be a transfer of any infrastructure that remained or had to be the in terms of we'll come on to the card requirements this week. But there are areas where effectively the, the the the operator of the onshore substations is taking responsibility for certain obligations in the decio requirements to the exclusion of national grid by taking over cumulative responsibilities and how that will be dealt with is there going to be sub agreements with National Grid As to how that operates. But I think the key, the key point is that within the operational drainage management plan, we will be able to clearly articulate who is responsible. And generally speaking, shared responsibility can be an option. But usually it is more effective to have an individual operator responsible for particular aspects. and thereafter if they have to be contributions about a cost of those things that is dealt with by separate agreements. But I think largely speaking, having identified individual entities responsible for particular

aspects, probably works better in terms of process that, as I say, will be worked through in the detail of of the implementation of the respective schemes.

1:10:45

Thank you very much, Mr. Tony, I can see that you've got your hands, I'm just going to ask the council to respond first. In terms of Are you satisfied with how the how this this is secured? And are you satisfied with the level of information with regards to inspection and maintenance in the outline operational drainage management plan,

1:11:07

in terms of inspecting the maintenance first and the outline operational drainage management plan, it's a bit of scant on detail. However, that's not necessarily an issue, it can be addressed quite quickly. Our standard methodology is to use the information from the serious suds manual. So it could simply be a quick copy and paste job, which can be expanded on further calm the detailed design stage in terms of the adopting body. I think it's fair to say that it was appeared odd to us to begin with, that the applicant would take on responsibility for both sides basins that for the projects and that for the National Grid infrastructure, here in Mr. Ennis, his point, then it does start to make a bit more sense if the basins were to be integrated in some way, shape, or form. That's something they want to leave until detailed design, and they don't want to prejudice that now being tied down to maintenance and Opera and adoption options. I can understand that. And we don't necessarily have a problem with that being secured as part of the operational drainage management plan. But we would expect those details at that point.

1:12:15

Thank you, Mr. Williams, Mr. Attorney for cc's

1:12:21

Thank you, is a basic generalised concern in respect of having three Undertaker's operating at the same site. And saying that it will all come out in the wash through a commercial negotiation doesn't give much assurance about the long term maintenance of these assets. So if for example, one of the Undertaker's ceased to operate, there still be a need, obviously, for the attenuation measures, whatever they are, the subs measures to remain in situ, unless all the built infrastructure was removed, and it was returned to Greenfield. So there is a considerable concern about the fact that the applicant says Well, this is all okay, it will be left until we sought out a commercial arrangement between the one two or three Undertaker's that may or may not be on the side.

1:13:12

Thank you and Mr. tinian returned to the applicants in that case, they would like to reply to any of those submissions.

1:13:22

Close Well, if the app can simply put we have to await department consent and exactly who we transfer to and when, in the context to deliver certain of the undertakings obviously, there's a expectation that the national grid that takes over the National Grid Elements, but at this stage, who knows, there may be a reorganisation of national grid, it may have another entity. So we have to be careful. But it's saying

exactly who the key is providing the framework within the DCO. For the essentially, the council to be satisfied that appropriate arrangements are put in place. They are legally binding commitments. And equally, I see the point that members certainly about engineering liability. That was a point that I specifically identified in upfront in the sense of eight would have to cover that situation. And there's no reason why our discharge plan does not have that level of detail in it. And it will cover those matters, because it would be appropriate to do so. So we'll identify who's responsible for different elements, if that's the way forward, or indeed, if one party is taking responsibility, but as a fallback on a transfer, or if any other part of the infrastructure is no longer use. There's a mechanism to ensure that identify a party. The key in these matters is to identify who is responsible for doing the maintenance, and who reports to the relevant authority to make sure that insofar as there was a breach, there's a clear obligation. And I think that's the key point and we've got a mechanism, both within the DCO and within the plan to secure that and we feel very confident that we'll be able to put forward proposals that fully meet the needs of the council in relation to these matters.

1:15:09

Mr. Carpenter Thank you,

1:15:12

Cliff carpenter, Stacy's just returning to I think the point that Mr. Williams made, which was about the lack of detail, in terms of the maintenance plan, we will go further than that to say that there is inconsistency between the landscaping that's proposed and the inherent risks of clogging and blocking. And that of structures that are just below or potentially just above the reservoir Act, which requires a very high level of maintenance and maintenance to this focusing on the structural integrity of these schemes as well. So, again, it's about the lack of the lack of it of design inputs, which reflect on the lack of design, which would then reflect on on the lack of, of determination of the of the maintenance requirements, which could then arguably then have an issue on who is competent to discharge those requirements. So, again, it's just raising the point about, you know, a lack of a lack of detail.

1:16:14

Thank you very much. Mr. Ennis, do you have any further points you would like to add before we move on? No, thank

1:16:26

you, madam. Thank you. Thank you.

1:16:28

Thanks very much. In that case, I am going to hand over to my colleague, Mr. Oakley, Mr. Hockley, sorry, who has a few questions for item 4d.

1:16:38

Thank you very much, Mrs. Jones. My questions under four D are all initially, initially at least to the applicant start with but obviously, feel free to put your hand up just there's things that you want to come in to the other parties. So my question to the applicant first is about paragraph 88 of the outline operational drainage management plan, which notes that there is a natural surface water flow route,

which runs through the National Grid substation location. And that you're in detailed design, the applicant will ensure that the surface water flow route is diverted around the northern perimeter, the National Grid substation by working with and refining the natural topography of the area to accommodate the flow, as well as the realignment of existing ordinary watercourses. I was wondering if there was any more detail on these works? And has that potential impact on the landscape being taken into account? Or will it be taken into account in the OEMs

1:17:37

firmer grasp or the outcomes in terms of the detail? That is the level of detail that we have currently, we're aware of the presence of that surface water overflow at startup continuously wet flow path that is full afterwards that becomes wet during certain certain rainfall events. The concept is that that would be moved to slightly for a little north. So it facilitates so so it runs between the National Grid substation, and the cable field and then components are potentially again dependent on the detailed design of the National Grid infrastructure, perhaps slightly further north again, so it goes to the north of the cable ceiling then compounds itself. We don't see that there's a landscape implication in in this we do not have trees for instance, located to the north of the overhead outside to north of the National Grid substation, simply cross update the interaction between the cable ceiling and components and the the substation itself. So potentially more of a growing covering consideration in terms of data, the nature of grassland or the nature of grass covering the trees within that area, rather than rather than pass on any any higher landscaping, elements, trees, shrubs, etc.

1:19:02

In fact, thank you, I understand that I think my question was more about not any effect on any landscaping your proposed but any effect on the landscape as it is now.

1:19:11

Oh, yeah. So the grammar grounds for the outcomes. So that the expectation is that the it is a a small movement to the north to accommodate the room, the redirection or realignment of that overflow, or surface water flow. So we don't consider there to be on a landscape complications and not regard.

1:19:34

Okay, thank you, Mr. Williams.

1:19:37

Matt Williams, Suffolk County Council, I would just highlight obviously, the as the lie of the land is today taking the watercourse to the north is uphill that will inherently have impacts on the depth of the water course the size of it in terms of the width as well. And therefore the visual impact that has and potentially the impact on landscape in that regard. Thank you

1:19:59

for not necessary useful. Mr. mcgrill as the paragraph 135 of the OEMs states, funding proposals associated with onshore substation, and National Grid infrastructure, sub basins, and purchasing of basins in location is identified in figure five of the island. This is clarify clarification point for me really, what does purchasing of basins mean please?

1:20:27

Sorry, can you repeat the paragraph number? I'll just go back to that source.

1:20:30

Yep. It's paragraph 135. of the OEMs.

1:20:35

Okay, let me just find out documents. Sorry, go.

1:20:47

I've got the truck version. It's on page 42. Of that, if that helps.

1:20:51

Okay. Just got the document here. On page 42. Sorry, is this the deadline six,

1:21:07

deadline six track version? I've got

1:21:12

paragraph 135. Sorry, let me just refer to figure five. I need to open the the non tracked version to get to figure five.

1:21:58

It was more it's more a question of clarification for really me really, it was almost What does the word really mean? What is purchasing and basins mean?

1:22:08

I suspect I would need to hand across to Helena from across outcomes. I suspect I need to refer back to Helena for that. Helen is unavailable till 330. Unfortunately, unfortunately, but we can perhaps picked up at the end.

1:22:21

Okay, either at the end or in an action point will be useful, I think. Good writing afterwards. were useful. Thank you. Okay, thank you. earlier on, we've heard that the worst case infiltration case results in the removal of landscaping proposals would do? Well, the effects of that be considered in the new version of olms do a deadline eight

1:22:45

primer girl sport the Atkins it's not intended that we would modify the landscaping to accommodate any theoretical surface water discharge arrangements, that we would develop it that deadline it. So So yes, the answer is no, but on the logic that we have a firm landscape and proposal presented with a new LMS, which is subject to further public consultation. But at this moment in time, we don't believe that the end for the infiltration only solution, the extreme scenario is viable. Suffice to say the secondary

solution, which is subs is already incorporated within the the landscape master plan. And that solution is incorporated within the landscaping presented with the noble lambs and the various put on titles that we submitted through the course of examination.

1:23:42

Yeah, thank you. I've noticed obviously, that the that the attenuations can be as in the latest version of your lambs is more I think you refer to yourself referred to earlier with that worst case infiltration case, the effect that that would have on landscaping. And if that is a worst case, is it still a realistic case? And if so, does it need to be assessed in terms of landscaping as well and heirlooms?

1:24:08

Brown grass for an outcome? We don't believe it is a reasonable worst case. We believe that the the extreme infiltration scenario, which is using 10 millimetres PR is not viable, and therefore we do not consider that to be a reasonable worst case.

1:24:25

Okay. And Mr. Williams?

1:24:29

Williams, Suffolk County Council at risk of going around in circles here. Obviously we do contest what is viable and what isn't viable from a technical perspective. So just to reiterate that point.

1:24:41

Thank you very much. That's noted. And Mr. Magoo. rellis. Overland Thank you. islands paragraph form for two states that you've committed to providing additional surface water management side space. In capacity said to be currently identified as concept within figure five to reduce flood risk for Friston in addition to the sub strategy currently proposed, and our confirmation decides volume and location of this additional surface water management sub basin capacity will follow detailed design. Now, this may be something obvious I'm missing completely is it but I was wondering where it was identified on figure five

1:25:27

sir Brian Macross for the options right

1:25:29

describe it I'm afraid

1:25:32

Yeah, sure. Brahma girls for napkins. Let me just flick through figure five and I will give you some features to

1:25:42

fix.

1:25:49

So if you refer to figure four, in the old AMS document, you'll be able to see, starting from the just at North we have got three cable ceiling and combines a metal cable ceiling and component just to the south west of that cable ceiling and compound. There is an illustration of a potential suds location, I would like to stress that it is simply an illustration at this stage, it's just to show that the the context of in the wider landscaping context where potentially a an additional salt spawn could be located. It is also the case that the this additional benefit is naturally delivered through a specific dedicated son's pond or infiltration pond or a separate pond, it may simply be incorporated within the cost of the sunspot for the National Grid substation or the onshore substation that again, as a matter of detailed design, it is absolutely fair to say at this stage that even with the the same that is in outline form today it we still consider the rehab delivered betterment to the village of Friston through the through the same principles that we have adopted, but have secured the detail the same stage that will be defined in more detail.

1:27:14

Okay, and thank you for that. So I've got that identified on your land. So in principle would that additional bond need to be bonded as well.

1:27:24

So I brought my girl sporty for napkins, it is too early to say at this stage. So that pond for instance, is within the surface water flow path that we were referring to a few minutes ago that runs to the north of the National Grid substation, there may be something we we do to integrate that flow path with a another infiltration pond or short spawn. It may be that they integration their own debugger headlines to factor that sonder currently illustrated fellatio in 300 over headlines means for counter manifestation or end up spawns because of the interaction of your head lanes that might land its itself down through to move it from that location to a different location, which would then allow additional landscaping to be provided around that additional measure. But again, that pond could simply be incorporated potentially within the onshore substation, or the National Grid substation. And filtration systems are some system. So

1:28:27

essentially, you don't know whether that pond would be there? Or would the capacity needed will be going to one of the other two ponds until you've done detailed design? Is that correct?

1:28:40

grammar grounds for the outcomes. Absolutely correct. And it's premised also on the much more detailed height hydrological model that we would undertake as part of the detailed design process to identify where the optimal location is for the quality of May, for instance, be further to the north east to try and capture some of some of those flow paths going along the full path to North National Grid substation, and may be more appropriate to capture it further to the southwest. So we read contain an infiltrate and apply suddens to two floors. downstream effectively of the National Grid substation, that's all subject to detailed same optimization. Okay, thank

1:29:24

you. So my next question would be that noting your answer to that question, there seems to be quite a considerable I'm not sure what the right word is there, but still detail to be worked out around the these three ponds or these two ponds, if you like. And I suppose the question would be, how can ourselves how can the examining authority consider any effect on your landscaping or indeed the landscape as it is, or the setting of nearby heritage assets if there is still so much details to be worked out by location of palms and their visual effect.

1:30:07

parama grace for the applicants, so in terms of the information we've presented within the dams, the landscape master plan, so that is based on the land required for sought for subspace. So that is the secondary solution. The all em show that that solution works with the landscaping. It's what our landscaping original impact is based upon. It's what our photo montages are based upon. So that solution works, essentially with the landscaping that we're proposing on at the substation site. Moving forward with the roof the the infiltration solution that we're discussing, that boils down to the viability and the practicality argument, we would not consider infiltration only to be practical or viable if a compromised a landscaping solution for the project. So that's where the detailed design and the balance between landscaping and the surface water management drainage underneath the the the actual infiltration rate that's established and grade vestigation works. That's where that all consenting to the consent to the maximum part. Subject to absolutely the post consents, community consultation on landscape, insane. But it's all taken, taken underground, as it were, and submitted to the local development planning authority in terms of the submission and approval of afterwards of those details.

1:31:36

Thank you. Just a couple more points. And one point was the the location or rough location of the third base, and he pointed out to me before and figure four,

1:31:49

has that

1:31:51

been assessed as part of the Oh lambs? Because the only reason question is because only I can only find the one reference in our lambs is the paragraph that I cited there. 142. So I just want to check that the effect of that or potential effect of that base and have been assessed in your lamps.

1:32:09

So in terms of the assessment with the New Orleans, New Orleans, as isn't the forum for the assessment. So expected dual answers the measures that we're proposing for, for landscape and ecological monitoring, it hasn't been taken as an example that hasn't been taken into account in our flood risk assessment. Because we've reverted back to the worst case scenario, which is looking at the provision of sub basins or infiltration for the National Grid substation, and the ones who are substations in isolation, a professional front of red wire to third pond would then be of betterment over and above that, in terms of impacts on landscape matters. Because there's no planting around that spawns in that particular location. It wouldn't impact on the landscape, visual elements of the of the project. And again, the upgrades were proposed for that network. Again, it would be sufficiently far away from those public

grants away in order to have any consequences or any impact on on users of those programmes. So it's very much included as a means to provide further betterment within the within the overall scheme design. But other than identifying an illustrative location with a new lambs, that's as far as we've taken that concept, for one thing, better word. Thank you. That's useful.

1:33:40

So just to go back on that one point, then, so the third pond is for the better than or benefit. And the scheme with the two cons, if you like, is to achieve, I guess, a neutral result. That'd be correct.

1:33:56

Brahma grasper Elkins That is correct. I would also say that in terms of in terms of the design of the of the sons ponds as the currently presented, by definition that generates betterment during certain storm conditions during certain storm events. And that's inherent in the design of a suds pond that is designed for say a one to 100 year event. Events less than one 100 years would derive betterment from from the provision of that

1:34:27

one 100 care

1:34:30

system,

1:34:31

so to speak.

1:34:33

Okay, thank you. And before I pass back to Mr. Jones, does anybody else want to raise any further comments on these issues? Mr. Turney, please for Stacy's?

1:34:48

Yes, good afternoon, Sir Richard turn on for our status. Can I just very briefly, pick up a couple of points on on the consistency of the proposed approach to drainage and the O land, there is a very significant concern about how these matters will be managed together. And how it can be established that the surface water drainage provision will not conflict with what is proposed in the OEMs. And what's been the subject of assessment and consideration. In the application process, there will need to be a lot of water on site in some of the scenarios which are considered and a lot of infrastructure to accommodate it. That there's also we've already made submissions, which I won't go back to in detail, but if I can just point to the submissions, we made it deadline for on cumulative impacts, noting that the om at least at that stage, contained identified areas for potential future surface water management, in connection with the National Grid substation site. And the possibility there that future expansion of the National Grid substation may require yet further drainage provision. So it's a broad and high level concern, but it is one which is which is very significant in the context of what's being examined. Thank you.

1:36:27

Thank you, Mr. Turney. Mr. Granite all the applicants who have been able to come back on there before we move on

1:36:43

Colin's napkins note. Thank you.

1:36:46

Thank you very much. I will just quickly go back to Mr. coffin Do you have your hand raised? Thank you sir. Sorry, it's

1:36:53

a little labour putting my hand up dr Carpenter cc's. This This item is called relationship with outline landscaping, a well relationship with the old lens and I think most of the questions have been directed back in towards the end. So, if I might just take a moment to kind of reflect the impact back on on on flood risk and drainage. And there does appear to be an issue of of the landscape potentially impacting on on on the drainage schemes and therefore the potential risk reduction or risk mitigation in terms of in terms of flooding. So, the first point I just wanted to make was that the issue of minimising flood risk is is a key planning requirement. So, so, whilst the landscape design can influence the design of those ponds, it should not be influencing the effect they have on risk reduction in the volumes still need to be retained, the flow rates still need to be met irrespective of of necessarily the shape that is achieved to achieve some other landscape landscape benefit. Second point I wanted to mention again was related to the size of protect the size of these structures or potential potential size of these structures once we start to include the landscaping elements of those of those structures, which can start to get out to and exceed the requirements for the reservoir act. And that the design and engineering and operation and maintenance requirements around such structures of such size are completely inconsistent with a landscape managed or designed environment and these require detailed engineering design and management. So there is a there is a potential conflict there and certainly something where the you know, the Odense cannot be driving the design of such structures. And the last point relates to opposed to better operation and maintenance, which is that the old employer is always referring to these basins as having a containing elements of wetland habitat. And again, this is entirely inconsistent with how we wouldn't we would want to see such structures management. If it's infiltration, then clogging is an issue and anything which increases the risk of clogging is a problem. If it's an attenuation pond, which has got a relatively small outfall orifice, then the risk of blocking of sediment accumulation is is a critical issue and the consequences of which are greater levels of water being stored and potential overtopping risks to the forest and village. So that there are at every level there are implications in terms of the primacy given to Ireland over over drainage and flood risk matters.

1:39:35

Thank you very much, Mr. Carpenter. Three useful the applicants wish to come back on either of those points.

1:39:48

Yes, coins for half the applicant just to confirm that insofar as the approach here is concerned, we've been getting around the houses but in broad terms, this area is flood risk one, in terms of limited parts

of the infrastructure are engaged with pluvial overflow. In terms of managing the process, we've managed it in a way that our infrastructure is protected, and is adequate for protection of office matters. And turning to that to the and that's all part of this drainage process and the management of of it, turning to the infrastructure that has provided the debate has essentially, in my submission, one should look at the detention basin in one in 100. Year with 40%. Climate change is the back of the outline, operational drainage management plan. And what I think is, we are testing extremes here, in terms of these documents. And essentially, what we end up with is very large structures. And essentially, when we produce detention basins based on one 100 year, and a 40%, climate change, add on in design terms, and ultimately to achieve the maximum discharge of the keyboard. Insofar as those those are concerned, I think it's pretty important to understand that it's worst case, and that we are testing these to the extreme. And that the reality, as Mr. McGregor, has said, is that it's not likely to be of this scale or this size. And that is very important when you're testing the extremes, because it's got to be recognised that it is an extreme level. And furthermore, that that does demonstrate there's honour a worst case scenario, we can turn over all the landscaping that's in the lambs. And the real question here, in relation to this issue, is the balance between the hierarchy of one and two, in that, in terms of the balance to be struck between infiltration and potentially having drainage basins. And again, I think looking at the matter in a hole. And I note that Mr. Grant has made the point that if we put this infrastructure in place, that having regard to the area of the substations that there will actually be significant mitigation of flood risk to Friesland, not just neutral in relation to extreme events, because that is what we have tested in terms of the basis and the discharge of arise from that. I think that's another important point to make, is that key point. And whilst we've discussed, it's in general terms, that we in terms of these documents and testing, have taken advice from Suffolk County Council, in terms of pushing the matter to the more extreme elements of testing the limits of what we're having to provide here. And we'll obviously set it out in writing after the event, the various standards that are applicable, but we have gone with Suffolk County Council's position in relation to testing these events on extreme level. And I think that all needs to be recognised when we're coming into the balance because that's effectively what you end up doing, pushing us to a really, really high standard in terms of attenuation. And then saying, well, there's limited room. So I do think that needs to be borne in mind. And we will put this all in context and writing in response to this hearing. But I just wanted to close that off about half the applicants with that position, if I may. So thank you.

1:43:36

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Okay. I shall now pass back to Mrs. Jones. Thank you.

1:43:44

Thank you, Mr. Hockley. I just have one more question really, to both East Suffolk Council and to Suffolk County Council and that is with regards to the requirements in the decio. Now obviously, the subspaces form an integral part of both the operational drainage management plan and also the landscaping scheme for the substation site. Now requirement 14 requires a written landscape plan for each stage and requirement 41 requires an operational drainage management plan for works numbers 3034 38 and 41. Do the council's see any issues arising where the information to discharge these requirements are going to be submitted could be submitted sorry at different times. Mr. Bedford,

1:44:39

Madam, yes, in principle, there could be a question of needing to ensure that there's a coordinated approach and therefore, potentially there could be difficulties if there is not a coordinated approach. Obviously we would expect the applicant to be locked to coordinate its submissions, so that the integrated relationships between those various disciplines are properly brought to bear. We would also expect to be engaging with a Suffolk Council in liaison and dialogue. I think that the difficulty, I suppose, as we said, it's actually quite hard to write into the DCO. That as it were co operative mechanism in a way that, as it were, ensures that there could never be any kind of disjunct but I think we would expect it sensible working relationships to prevail between the respective parties.

1:45:44

And just while having Mr. Bedford, is it still your opinion that requirement 41 should be discharged by Suffolk County Council rather than in consultation with Suffolk County Council?

1:45:57

Absolutely. And in a sense, all of the things that you've been hearing about today about how the drainage matters, do have significant implications in terms of their spatial arrangements, and therefore potentially, their ability to influence other disciplines reinforces certainly to our perspective, as the lead local flooding authority, the need in sense, we don't get squeezed out of that exercise. Because incense, it's tempting, and there has been something of a flavour of this, in some of the applicants comments of seeing as it were, the drainage just having to fit around the landscaping. And a number of times that comments have been made, which have suggested that it's deceit to do these things so far as practicable subject to and then the subject to is always reference to landscaping, or biodiversity, whatever. Clearly, there is nothing in national guidance, which sets out that there is as it were a prioritisation between those different environmental topics. They're all important. They all need to be considered. But we think that certainly when it comes to the matters of drainage, and flood risk, that the lead local flood authority should be the discharging authority for matters which directly bear on its responsibilities. Acknowledging, of course, that it expects to have to consult with all other relevant stakeholders on that to make sure that it's fully appraised of those other interactions.

1:47:48

Thank you, Mr. Bedford, at least Suffolk Council.

1:47:55

Thank you. I'm Naomi Gould, a Suffolk Council. Obviously, in terms of what Mr. Buffett has said, we fully support that sort of initial comments that there's potential for conflict between the different documents. And I think that's, essentially we see the importance of ensuring that an appropriate and functional drainage plan solution is incorporated, we see it as part of the overall design of the site. And as it's been mentioned, there is this potential conflict between the different elements. And so we see have a solution to that to ensure consistency would be have one authority to oversee all those elements, whilst completely recognising the Suffolk County councillors elite local flood authority, and incorporating their comments fully into any discharge documents that will come in and oversee ahead of any discharge documents that would come in, we would obviously seek to work with the County Council and the applicants to try and ensure that we have a consistent approach to all matters. But we

really consider that this coordinated role to ensure consistency is really important. And that's why we see that, you know, our position of then being the discharging authority will assist in this manner.

1:49:19

Thank you very much, miss. Just before we finish this agenda item, is there anything that the applicants wish to add on that point?

1:49:32

colonists behalf of the Africans. Yes, insofar as a Suffolk County's position is concerned, we agree with that, in the sense of one discharging authority should be responsible for that element of coordination. And I do cause to observe that that also is a matter that's recognised in planning practice guidance were important. Aircraft 82 that whole point about whether or not a particular sustainable drainage system would be an appropriate is a matter for local planning authority. And in making this judgement, the local planning authority will seek advice from relevant flood risk management bodies, principally the lead local flood authority. So that clearly sets out in that guidance, the, the that the that, that that that a planning authority has the suitable balancing role insofar as that position is concerned. And the way that we have drafted the requirements in relation to 41 is to recognise the very specific role that Suffolk County Council would have, as an advisor in the discharge of that matter, expressly stating that both the Suffolk County Council and the Environment Agency would be obliged to be consulted with in relation to the discharge at that. And our submission does appear to ensure that all those bodies with an interest in that technical matter of ensuring that the drainage management plan is suitable have their input. But it should probably be a Suffolk council as the planning authority, who would be best placed to input all that into it. And it's not to try and undermine the role of the locally plot authority in any way. And certainly I just wanted to respond to one of the things that Mr. Bedford said, is that we were downgrading the matters, we've been absolutely clear that in relation to flood risk, that there is going to be no compromise in relation to flood risk arising from the drainage management plan. And the only real issue within that is ultimately the balance to be struck between the various options in relation to their management. So in terms of the hierarchy, apart from our dealing, I can be of any further assistance. Thank

1:52:05

you. Just about to do you have a new point you wish to raise on that matter?

1:52:17

Yes, by the micro Bedford Suffolk County Council, two points. First of all, first, just to make the general point obviously, the PPG is drafted in the context of applications which are being dealt with under the Town and Country Planning Act where you have a planning authority is granting the original permission. And then therefore, seeing off the as it were discharge of conditions pursuant to that original permission. That is not obviously the situation that we have here, where the consenting authority in the first instance is clearly the Secretary of State. And it's in fact, not the secretary of state that generally has supervision of the planning system, who is the Secretary of State for an energy project, it's a separate entity, the local planning authority is not directly involved in the decision whether to approve the project or not. So there's a distinction there and the PPG guidance, I don't think you can extrapolate from that to say that that therefore means in all cases, it should be the local planning

authority. But secondly, and this is, as it were a more specific point. We know, under the terms of this draft decio, as drafted by the applicant, that there are a number of requirements where the discharging authority will not be the local planning authority. And yet there will be interplays and interactions with matters that fall within various disciplines. So that for example, there are a number of requirements where the Highway Authority is rightly recognised, should be the discharging authority for particular requirements because of the importance of highways matters. But inevitably, when one's considering those highways matters, there may well be landscape implications, there may well be biodiversity implications from whatever the details are that are put forward in relation to those highways matters. It's not being suggested that it's impossible, or impracticable for sensible public authorities to engage and have liaison and dialogue with each other. Even though they might not all share the same as it were statutory responsibilities. And it's not being said that it's necessarily inconsistent with having an acceptable highway solution, for example, whereby I say landscape matters or biodiversity matters are considered by the county council, whereas they may be more naturally the remit of the District Council. So Madam, I would invite you very much not to get as it were bogged down in what might sound like a rather, as it were unsatisfactory, the turf war between different authorities, what you should be looking at in my submission. Is the effectiveness of the result. And also which body is best placed in terms of technical expertise to satisfactorily manage those different processes. And on the subject of flood risk and drainage. In my submission, it is blindingly obvious that it's the lead local flooding authority, which should ultimately manage that process. And therefore, any as it were balancing that's required within that, I haven't, obviously, we don't seek to cut across the district Council's responsibility in relation to the oatlands. But what we do say in relation to requirement 41, that very clearly is a matter that ought to be a matter that is dealt with by the county council.

1:55:47

Research Council.

1:55:52

May we go with the Suffolk council? I just wish to add one sort of further quick point then on the back of that said by Mr. Buffett, is just that it's correct that some elements have been agreed between the District Council and the county council that some elements of the draft decio, and some of the requirements will be discharged by the county council. And those elements were we considered were more sort of the discrete entities. So where, for example, there might be, they might discharge something in relation to access, it wouldn't necessarily have the same into relationship, although it would have some relationship with landscaping, that landscaping might be designed for screening purposes of that access road, for example. But we're not talking about that sort of set of circumstances. Here, we're talking about a situation where all the elements are very much intertwined with one another, and they're not discrete. So as we've seen, there could potentially be conflict between one element or the other. Whereas we don't see that same level of conflict in some of the other matters, which we've agreed that the county council could discharge. So again, we would say that, in relation to these matters, we're sort of dealing with a different set of circumstances where one discharging authority would be beneficial. Thank you.

1:57:24

Thank you. those points are all noted. With the applicants like to add anything further before we move on.

1:57:38

Colin's behalf of colonists about the applicants now quite happy to leave it there, madam. Thank you.

1:57:44

Thank you very much for doing this. In that case, we'll move on to agenda item five, and I'm going to hand back to Mr. Hockley for this.

1:57:53

Thank you, Mrs. Jones. This is the agenda item five is any other business. So there are no other matters that the examining authority wishes to raise during today's hearing? Before we move on to review actions and next steps, Does anybody else have any other business they wish to raise today?

1:58:11

Yes, coins of the applicants. I didn't get in quick enough. This morning. There was a matter that was raised by Mr. Williams about a digital guidance which have been published in relation to Appendix A. And I've heard it as an addendum for the document that I have. And I just wanted to confirm at this stage that we understand that we're talking about the same documents is called Appendix A to the Suffolk flood risk management strategy, outline planning applications interim guidance, which was published in February of last year. And I think the background to it was essentially it changed the standards for planning applications. And what was identified was that the issue is that the approval of indicative dwelling numbers outline stage can conflict with the space required to deliver suds compliant with national liquor policy. This has led to applicants having to undertake additional work and sites that have already been granted outline planning approval, leading to delays and additional expense. And I was just wanting confirmation as to whether that was the document was being referred to as the attendance because it was my understanding that in terms of those planning applications, effectively, the the current position applied until the 31st December 2020. And effectively the new provisions came in after 31st of September 2020. I was just seeking confirmation that that was the document ie the interim guidance as opposed to the being any other addendum. So I appreciate that it's often quite a mass. So I was listening for Mr. Williams if he was obviously I want to go away and and I had that doctor of registered want to didn't want to go searching for another document or if that says thank you,

1:59:55

of course. Thank you Mr. Williams.

1:59:57

Matt Williams Suffolk County Council that is the correct document. And the point we were referring to at the time was specifically the tables within that in terms of the information expected for each application stage.

2:00:08

Thank you very much for clarifying that.

2:00:11

Thank you very much.

2:00:12

Thank you, Minister. Okay, that brings us to item six of our agenda. We have not identified the need to make any procedural decisions this morning. This morning. Today, I should say, really, in terms of actions, we have a list of some seven actions arising from these hearings. These have been flagged as we progress, we'll aim to publish these on the national infrastructure planning website as soon as possible. We'd advise all participants today and those not in attendance. But we have an interest in the matters covered by this hearing. To review this action list when published and act accordingly. We can confirm that the Action List from yesterday's hearing is 10, has already been published and can be seen at the top of the document tab on each project website. Mr. Attorney, I can see your hand up.

2:01:03

So yes, rich attorney for say says I just want to raise a short point and that's that we found out today as I think the examining authority did that. We're going to have a new operational drainage management plan at deadline eight. From the perspective of an objector in the position of samosas obviously, we have to engage professional advisors every time a new submission is made of a technical nature. And I have to express some quite serious disquiet about another iteration of a document of such importance coming forward at the last possible deadline, with the exception deadline nine which is reserved for commenting on what's been deadline eight. So that's going to be further work. In matters which by the sounds a bit was set was something that could have been discussed and agreed with Suffolk County Council long before we got to this hearing and certainly long before deadline eight. So I have to express that disquiet, we will have to deal with it. We'll have to engage Mr. carpenters deal with it will be put to cost because of that. And the applicant really could have done this a lot earlier. Because all these points were being raised by Suffolk County Council and by us from the first deadline. Thank you.

2:02:24

Thank you, Mr. Turney, your concerns and your disquiet is noted. Thank you. Okay, I'm now going to hand back to my colleague, Mrs. Jones to take you through the next steps and to close these hearings. Thank you.

2:02:37

Thank you, Mr. Hartley. This has been an issue specific hearings number 11. And having reached this point with also standard business don't we can safely cancel the reserved hearings, issue specific hearings 11. A set for the 23rd 26th of March, which were there as a safeguard to adjourn this hearing to have we had technical difficulties, and we can now say that they will not be required. Returning briefly to the business of yesterday's hearings. We've also decided to cancel the reserved hearings, issue specific hearings 10. A during the same week for the same reason. The banners will be updated in due course to confirm that those reserved events will not be needed. Our next hearings in these examinations will be issued specific hearings 12 on the topic of noise, and that starts tomorrow at 10am. That brings us to item seven of our agenda. I would just like to thank all of our speakers today for your attendance and your contributions. We recognise the additional pressures on everybody at the

moment due to the continued national lockdown. And we are hugely appreciative of your time today. I'd also like to take the time to thank our case team led by Mr. Williams for supporting these hearings. Just before we close I have a final check that there isn't anything else that anyone wishes to raise before we close. And that case I'll ask my colleagues to ask my colleagues to say their goodbyes starting with Mr. Hockley.

2:04:04

Thank you very much, Mr. Jones. And thank you to everybody for your for your help. today. It's been very useful

2:04:12

indeed. Thank

2:04:12

you very much rent Smith panel lead speaking and your contributions during the sitting have been much appreciated.

2:04:19

Goodbye.

2:04:22

Okay, thank you all again once more, the time is now 1539. And these issues specific hearing 11 are now closed.