TEXT_ISH12_EA1N&2_Session4_11032021

Thu, 3/11 5:37PM • 1:25:48

00:03
Good afternoon. Welcome back. Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Rynd Smith, the lead member of the examining authorities. And can I just check before we go any further that I can be heard that the live streams have returned, recordings have started and the captions are running.

00:25
I can confirm that the captions are working, the live stream is running, and we can see and hear you. Excellent. Thank you very much, Mr. Johnson. Okay, then ladies and gentlemen. So we return to agenda item three. And we are now at three B. And this is where we're going to deal with the effects of operational processes. And so, this is the point essentially wish that which we need to start to address any specific

01:02
operational emissions that require specific consideration or adjustment. So the tonal characteristics of operational noise with reference back to bs 4142.

01:16
We also need to consider if relevant at all standing waves, interference patterns, and the relevance of different operational noise emissions from the selection of GIS or AI s, and indeed, any other factors considered to be relevant. So can I now ask for the same experts, please, for Stacy's, for East Suffolk Council and for the applicants to return to the screen.

01:47
Now, let's start with

01:52
the SE C's proposition that there needs to be a 60 v correction to address the tonal characteristics and operational noise. And essentially, here, my core question is, is this approach justified? And if not, why not? So, Mr. Sahni, Taylor, it was your proposition you introduce it. I'll see if Mr. Bear wishes to comment for the council and then I will return to the applicants.

02:22
I think, I think in the interests, however, of making this as brief as it can be, whilst that's a specific adjustment in relation to tonality, if there are other factors that you believe Mr. Sahni Taylor, that needs to be taken into account and specifically addressed there's percussive noise, standing waves, interference patterns, anything else at all that might emerge from from the operating substation, then it will be useful to kind of bundle that up at the end, so that we've got the whole picture

02:54
in front of us as you see it.

02:57
Thank you, Rupert Tony diver on behalf of bases

03:02
in the environmental statement, and in the noise clarification note and subsequent documents, we are provided with predictions of noise from the substations to a

03:15
nought point one DB resolution, as if that is a number that we can confidently expect to see.

03:25
In fact, no

03:28
acquisition would really say that, that in those sort of circumstances with that sort of distance from source to receiver, predicted sound levels can be made to anything like that accuracy, atmospheric pressure, and it has to go up by 14 millibars. And the sound level from this sort of source goes up by naught point one dB, so tenths of a decibel don't really have any meaning.

03:53
So we therefore need to look at the underlying assumptions that the applicants have made in arriving at these predictions. And there are several things which arise when we do that. So you mentioned the figure of six dB, which actually that number crops up twice in the Stacy's missions, not just because of the fact it is the

04:21
correction for tonal tonality when the tonal noise is clinically perceptible. But I also raised it in my first submission, in the context of the very unusual state of affairs here, which is two extremely similar sources quite close together relative to the distance to the receptors, which is a matter of general principle, primarily emit noise at a single frequency of 100 hertz. You'll see in the applicants documents, they don't dispute that this kind of equipment emits noise at 100 hertz. They do challenge that

05:00
The perceptibility of it, and whether when it arrives at the receptor, it will merit consideration and the attraction of a penalty for being terminal. But just briefly run through the reasons why the predictions must be treated as approximations. And the fact that the outside noise levels could be substantially different and higher as likely as lower. I mentioned the simple thing of atmospheric pressure. But one of the responses we've had back from both the applicants and Colin copying or perhaps call them the applicant as well is that the ISO 9613 Part Two method has been used assumes meteorological conditions favourable for propagation from sound source to the receiver, they've actually left out the

fact that it says use of equation three leads to that assumption, an equation equation three consists of several factors which you calculate, which involve user choices, such as what is the relative humidity, what is the temperature

06:16
is the ground in the vicinity of the source hard soft, or somewhere in between, they've assumed somewhere in between. But if it were hard or not partly soft, it would make a couple of dB difference. If you choose different air temperature, different humidity, another a couple of dB difference, the standard makes quite clear that it's method of computing the effect of reflections from the ground which cause sometimes ground attenuation

06:46
is only applies to flat ground, we do have approximately flat ground, but

06:57
as soon as you do introduce light turbulence from source to the receiver, which the standard doesn't address at all, you destroy the

07:09
the uniform conditions which result in reflection from the ground interfering with the direct sound and giving us the ground attenuation was founded provides for

07:20
then introducing this fine dimension. The very unusual case of having to similar single frequency sources relatively close together, ps4 on for to warns against interference effects. And whereas standard software for implementing ISO 9613

07:38
had to equal sound sources together so that 40 Db and 40 Db taken together give you 43.

07:46
If they are both of the same frequency, and you happen to be in a place where the interference between them is constructive, the answer will not be 43. It'll be 46. And if it's the other way around, if it's destructive, it will be some number below 40. Now, two things flow from this one is that the predictions that were provided with

08:06
should not be taken as a single number figures that will occur, they are an estimate effectively.

08:17
The first of the two things to flow from it is that on days when

08:21

the compliance monitoring exercise is carried out. Those could be days when everything is in favour of low noise levels.

08:33
People go away with a smile on their face, we've met the conditions and the following day, atmospheric conditions change hand, we could see five or six DB increase in noise for exactly the same source sound power level.

08:49
The second thing is this question of tonality. We've been advised several times by the applicants that they will get this right they will get hold of some third octave band spectra between now and

09:02
completing the design. But that is not satisfactory. Because should the noise be clearly perceptible. And we do not currently have the information to say that it's not then the actual physical sounder, all they have to achieve goes down by 60 v. That takes it down to a quarter of its power output. It's a very big drop in term in engineering terms. And the additional mitigation that will be required in the design of the plant will be substantial. There is already a substantial assumption about mitigation. And we are examining authority I would respectfully submit do need to see actual information both on the magnitude of the tonality, it's unreasonable not to be able to get hold of that octave bounce back to other plenty of sources around to measure that burdens. But exactly authority need to see the mitigation measures set out

10:00
In engineering terms in a way which make it a safe assumption that the requirement noise limits will be met after allowing for this quite substantial prediction error that I've referred to. I think, I've guess in a nutshell that is probably a coconut shell is the Stacy's position on the matter of this item on the agenda.

10:27
Thank you very much.

10:31
I'm then going to move to Mr. Baer.

10:36
Thank you, sir Joba Isa Council. Just to present itself exposition is over. councillors expressed concern with the applicants predicted operation was raising levels, particularly with regard to the absence of any correction personality or other characteristic features. This is expected to result in higher real world noise levels than those predicted by the applicants.

10:57
The applicants despite supplied a copy of the East Anglia one operational noises system, which states that sound emissions from transformers and reactors that substations typically contain most of their acoustic energy at 100 hertz. This statement agrees with a Suffolk Council's position that the substation

equipment of restaurant is likely to generate significant levels of tone and noises source. However, the applicant has not supplied any of the third octave data measured around the substation site, which would be required to test the tonality and source or otherwise substantiate the position that no feature correction particularity is required.

11:28
So in less that information exists, the Suffolk council position is that a 60 b rating level correction should be applied. And there's a precedent for assessments for some other similar onshore substation project projects to include a feature correction for tonality where no information on the proposed equipment is yet available.

11:52
I mean, given the lack of options for mitigation, or the equipment, post installation or mitigation at receptors, he suffered council considers the lack of consideration of tonality and the predicted operational noise rating levels, it gives rise to a significant risk of creating noise problem that can't be practically resolved, irrespective of any legal responsibilities, responsibilities placed on the applicant.

12:18
So that's Yeah, that's the position there is a potential way out of this, which we'll come on to when we talk about requirements, but that's the position on tonality. Okay, right. Now, a response from the applicants, please.

12:35
Continue go. Sorry, excuse me, calling again, on behalf of the applicants. I deal with the point about tonality first, and then I'll come on to interference effects, constructive interference effects. And you will note that serious concerns have been raised about tonality and the possibility of there being highly prominent tones.

12:59
Whereas the, applicants position throughout is that it can be controlled such that there will be no perceptible turns

13:10
before

13:12
Can I just intervene on that point briefly. And to be useful to hear an explanation of how that is, is managed, essentially, by

13:21
tuning the operation of two pieces of 100 hertz emission kit against one another?

13:30
I mean, how would you How would we manage that?

13:36
I intend to deal with that in some detail, because I think in doing so provide the level of competence that's needed. But before going into that, I just like to set the provide a bit of background. As you know, I've been asked to do a review, and I've reviewed the various documents and submissions. But in addition to that, last Friday, I was also afforded an opportunity to visit EAA one

14:02
and I conducted a visit to a one and walked around the perimeter. And I also observed sound coming from the substation, which was operational at the time at the bridleway at the same or similar location, as that referred to in the noise monitoring location. There was a point on the bridleway about 100 metres to the south of the of the substation

14:31
that that visit that I that I undertook, was principally around the perimeter of the substation, and it was in the afternoon. And then after I made that visit to EA one I then went on to first turn and I walked around the site there and kept myself to the public right away. But,

14:51
you know, I just wanted to add that bit of detail that I had been able to visit pa one which is similar

15:00
Know,

15:03
the point that most people will will have heard sound coming from Transformers old technology Transformers located out in the open, and they would have no doubt heard at home. And that's and it's easy to sort of associate those experiences with a characteristic, um, that comes from transformers, it's very easy to sort of then sort of, you know, make reference to those experiences and relate it to the proposed substations. But such comparisons would be completely invalid. Because the proposed substations will are is what's being proposed is modern technology. So sort of, you know, significantly better technology than older technology. But the other thing as well about modern substations is a lot of the equipment or indeed, a lot of it, if not all of the equipment that is capable of generating hums 100 hertz, will be enclosed, or could be enclosed if necessary.

16:05
And so, for example, when

16:10
when I went to pa one, the SuperGrid Transformers were fully enclosed.

16:17
And that and what that means is, is a point principle. They're not, they're not, they're not enclosed. But by the way for acoustics, they are enclosed to actually maintain and for engineering reasons. And that's

to maintain a constant temperature and regulate the conditions under which that equipment operates. However, the fact that it is fully enclosed, means that it lends itself to a high degree of noise control lends itself to a degree of design.

16:45
And that's reflected in my observations of when I walked around the perimeter of EA one, when I actually walked around the perimeter of EA one bearing in mind it was it was operational at the time,

16:58
a lot of a lot of positions around the perimeter, no sound coming from the substation was audible at all.

17:07
But then when I when I moved, in close proximity, I would I would estimate about 10 metres from the shot reactor.

17:19
There was there was a hum, tone that was susceptible.

17:26
And equally when I stood in very close proximity to the super grid transformers, about 10 metres again, from the super grid transformers. Again, there was a hum, that was that was audible. But as soon as I moved away any distance, and I would say estimate around about 50 metres from those local sources, that harm disappeared, and it was Inaudible.

17:55
And in my mind, I've seen that it gives very good corroborative support to the evidence that was provided in earlier in the submissions in the noise monitoring report, where Mr. Baxter and the assessment team reported their findings of their visit to EA one for compliance reasons in the middle of the night. And then when they took observations again in the middle of the night, sort of you know, then the point from the bite away, there was no tones, which were audible

18:32
I couldn't I wasn't able to make any reliable observations. By the way, when I went to the by the way on the on the actual my on my visit during the day because there was localised construction activity, which was masking the sound at that particular location. However, the observations that I made in very close proximity to the sort of the key items of equipment

18:59
very strongly supportive of the general observation has been made that we know they're not the tonal elements from that substation were inaudible and I think that gives a high level of competence that tones can and will be avoided. And in my mind, that makes sense, because

19:21
because all of the principal sources that are capable of generating sound

19:29
were fully enclosed. And so sort of known and you can and that means it can be designed and designed accordingly to meet the, the limit values. Okay? Okay, now, just before we go up a specific point that was put by Mr. Thornley, Taylor.

19:48
And this is the question of potential interference patterns bearing in mind that we're looking at there being a duplication of sets of equipment operating at the same frequency.

20:00
In terms of the EIA one substation,

20:04
my recall of that

20:07
is that it does not have that duplication physically present. And it is at some distance from National Grid equipment that is also operational and easy to direct analogue that isn't a direct comparable between the circumstances that would be emerging, potentially on this site.

20:32
And what you observed there? And if it isn't, are there any other particular control mechanisms or measures that might need to be put in place?

20:42
Yes, it is, it is, it is, it is a direct comparison. Because if we were to, if we were to get interference patterns of the type that's being talked about, you need to you need to

20:56
get a match in the

20:59
in the frequency of that sound, but also the amplitude of that sound. And so sort of winter, we often see these types of interference pattern patterns.

21:10
When,

21:12
as we do with the ground effect, where you've got sound waves travelling in the same direction of the same amplitude, and it's the it's the reflection from this from the ground

21:25

that causes that interference pattern. Okay? However, when, when you've got sources, which are

21:34
spatially separated, in the order of about 400 metres, it means that those types of interference patterns are far less likely. Okay. And, in my mind, we do have a similar effect at the substations as you do a lot of substations because if you go to EIA one, you've already got two Transformers that are actually operating side by side. So if you if you if, and you've also got other sources, which are operating side by side, so if we were to get the types of interference patterns that are being talked about, they should be apparent from, from observations from the sort of the types of sources that we're talking about, in my, in my mind, or in my view, I think it's far more likely to see these types of interference patterns from two Transformers which are located sort of close together as they are AI, one, then you would from sort of from sort of the transformers, which is separated by greater distances. So if there was a real risk of this thing,

22:45
this being a real effect and the risk of that effect, it would be apparent from observations at EIA one, but also at all of the other substations that have been modern substations that have been stalled, because often they are installed as a minimum as a pair of pair of Transformers pair of shank reactors, etc.

23:08
And we don't and that type of effect is not apparent. And that the my view

23:16
supports my error so that we can't dismiss this as a possibility. But

23:23
but it's unlikely. And the other the other thing that I would say about this is that it because the sources are enclosed, that does lend itself to sort of, to manage it through design as well. And so these are matters that can be dealt with fruit through detailed design.

23:43
Okay,

23:44
now, I see hands on both sides. This is only Taylor and Mr. Bear, as we did before, I'm going to pass around the table one more time. And so I will come back to you Mr. copping.

23:59
But I think in the interest of dialogue in the interest of moving as closely as we can towards shared understandings, it's worth passing around the table again. So Mr. Thornley, Taylor.

24:11

Thank you. So Rupert only Taylor on behalf of Stacy's, on the factual point about comparability between EA one and the Friston proposals. There are as you said, not too similar substations there so the interference effect cannot occur there.

24:33
on the list of sources in the applicants noise clarification report, the most prominent noise source is the harmonic filter

24:45
with massive sound level in 125 hertz octave band and very low levels either side of it, suggesting it strongly tonal and I believe there is no harmonic filter at East Anglia one can be confirmed by the appellant easily

25:00
I'm sure.

25:01
And we mustn't forget, of course, we're talking about a wind farm. And an essential feature of wind farms is that you need wind to generate electricity. And if there is low wind, you will get less noise. If I've understood what Mr. Corbyn did correctly, on the day he visited East Anglia, one, the plant was only operating at about 25% capacity. So I don't think we can take his observations as being representative of full capacity, which is what's required by requirement 26 and 27.

25:40
I do think I do think we have to have a caveat about all of these specific individual observations unless they're part of a broader statistical analysis of observations, which is that, again, if we're looking at, say, for example, wind capacity,

25:54
the wind conditions at sea, in an array may be very, very different to the wind conditions at the specific substation location. Or you may have a perfectly common still day onshore. And, you know, moving towards galeforce conditions at sea,

26:13
on the same day, at the same time, with the sun shining in both places, so we really do have to put a very substantial caveat around those sorts of individual observations that have just been taken on a single day. I mean, I'm having visited many, many of these facilities myself over my career, my own, essentially, anecdotal observations are ones that I take with utmost care for those very reasons.

26:41
But, but, but moving back, then you're clear that

26:47

in your view, you still take the view that there is dis deeply the possibility of there being tidal effects to which the penalty needs to apply and that there is also an excluded in your mind.

27:01
The possibility of interference pattern effects

27:05
Yes, I reflect on it on behalf of Stacy's.

27:09
There is a well established thing environmental in the area called the precautionary principle. And if the appellants don't know, whether a source which is acknowledged to have the propensity to be turned on, they must take the precautionary approach and design on the assumption that externality will be clearly perceptible and apply the six DB penalty, if that gives them engineering difficulty, then the route is clear it is to go and obtain accurate third octave band spectra. There is another development which has been through the

27:49
planning infrastructure system, which is tried to know. And there is an excellent report provided by RPS which shows that octave band spectra and shows quite clearly the tonality, and I am at a loss to understand why the applicants can't do that. Here in this case,

28:10
as far as the interference between two similar sources of concern, that's just basic physics, not a method to make assertions about when two sources are in phase, you will get a much greater additive effect than if you just take the energy average of two sources. If one is less strong than the other, it doesn't stop the effects happening does reduces magnitude, but interferences around real physical world currents and that's why it's referred to NBS voluntold to thank you, thank you very much. And in in relation to that, I mean, that there is a Rochdale envelope point here, which is us having confidence that a worst case assessment, a reasonable worst case assessment has been reached. And so that particular point, if it can be finally addressed by the applicant, when we returned to the applicant at the end of this particular move around the table,

29:08
really requires a view on whether

29:12
that third octave band spectrum analysis ought to be done in order to have the confidence that as the applicant says,

29:23
we're in a world where these effects can be discounted and the potential 60 Db penalty can be discounted, or alternatively, it can't be

29:34
so that there's some thought that does need to be given to that or a reason as to why that is not appropriate. That is that is clearly stated. Okay, Mr. Beck, and I come to you.

29:50
Thank you, sir. Joe, on behalf of the Suffolk Council, and just to very quickly come back on the observations from the a one substation at Branford.

30:01
Just to clarify that substation is next to a existing National Grid site. I've been I've been there as well. And I can say that when you stand with the bride away,

30:10
all you can hear is the National Grid substation site. And that's a very different character to Kristen. And specifically, I think it's not unreasonable. I think it's unreasonable to assume that you would be able to hear tonality from the EIA, one site right next to another source of low frequency noise, it's quite possible that it's very likely that the daytime noise levels there from the substation and other sources would mask anything I would see there.

30:39
And just to come back to a clarification from the applicants noise model, where they confirmed that the harmonic filters which are identified as a significant source of tonality, are one of the dominant sources at SSR, I believe, is SSR. Two, I'm afraid I'll have to check up on that in the clarification, though and confirm.

30:59
So

31:01
in summary, it's not enough to stand at some distance in a different noise climate to determine tonality, it's got to be

31:09
third octave measurements close to the kit to determine tonality then at that point to determine if that source is audible at the receptor.

31:17
So as I understand that, the EIA one commissioning measurements did include measurements on the Branford EA one site. So I would question Is it possible? What question Are these third octave? is that up to fan data? And can it be supplied to allow us to analyse test in the courts with annex si ps4 to be carried out?

31:40
And if it can't, I think the position is still a 60 B,

31:45
turn off the correction should be applied as a precautionary measure. Thank you, sir. Thank you very much, I will then go finally to the applicant.

31:57
Calling again on behalf of the applicants. I'm going to do with a couple of points. But then on this specific mask important that has been made by Mr. Baer. I'm going to defer to Mr. backdrop and Baxter on that. And he can say a little bit more about the observations that he took from the bridleway in the middle of the night.

32:16
Let me deal with the harmonic filter. First of all, it has been included in the

32:23
there has been included in the in the predictions, and on the basis of those predictions. I think that is quite correct in that it is an influential source. As far as I understand it, the assumptions made in that model for the harmonic filter are for a non unmitigated harmonic filter.

32:46
And, again, I may come back to the same point that I made earlier, the harmonic filters are if necessary. First, first of all, there was passive provision for harmonic filters, made a one. But in the event, they in the end, they didn't include how many filters because it was deemed not to be necessary. And but if harmonic filters are installed, in EA one orphan EA two, and that is a potential source, then they can be enclosed, and they can be fully mitigated. So that can be dealt with.

33:24
Mr. fornito makes the point that

33:29
given the conditions which are provided at the time, my visit, suggests that the substation was operating at 25%. I do not know On what basis that points being made. It's not something that sort of, you know, I would agree with the one the one point that I would make is that

33:50
when Mr. Baxter did all of his carried out all of these compliance checks.

33:57
I know full well, that sort of the substation was operating at full load at that time. And it was over it was her is operating a full load when he took those observations. And he concluded and observed that there were no audible tones 100 metres from from that right away position.

34:17
Then, now, I'll come on to the third octave point.

34:22
And

34:23
my position on this is that, hey, it's not necessary and beard, I don't mean to be particularly helpful to provide for doctors at this at this point in time. I think that the observations which have been made about the tones are sufficient and robust enough as they are, if you can't hear it, 100 metres. You're not is you know, you can't hear it.

34:44
But, but the thing is, there seems to be a presumption here that you can easily brought provide for doctors for the sources whereas in fact, you're talking about a multitude of sources. We're not just talking about the transformers.

35:00
The shank and the shank reactors and so on, there's an awful lot of other equipment, m&e equipment that's used for controlling the temperatures within each of these buildings. And so if you wanted to look at the third octaves,

35:19
for, for as a totality, you'd need to look at the third octave for those spectrums for all of the sources, and then look at that in its totality, because that's what will reflect this situation. And so I just don't see how that's practical at this stage and or necessary at this stage.

35:38
The fact is, is that predictions were carried out in the octave bands. And those predictions were carried out in accordance with 9613. And that's more than that sufficient in my view, and that's exactly what form four two says.

35:54
It says that 9613 and carrying out those predictions in the octave bands is adequate and a reasonable approach.

36:09
I and then I'll come to Joe Bear's observations about harmonic filters. And I think I've already dealt with those, insofar as the model assumed that as the emissions coming from our motive filters were unmitigated, and that is perfectly capable of being enclosed and mitigated if necessary.

36:31
Now, in terms of the level of

36:37
get the level of assurance around meeting the limit values,

36:43
I think that there's we need to say a bit about the assurance process that will be used. I'm just wondering if now is perhaps a good time to deal with that point.

36:54
Well, could it be released? It relates to the uncertainty point?

36:59
Yes, I mean, bear in mind that Titan D, which we'll touch on very shortly, where we're going to look specifically at

37:10
the control measure and security

37:13
bundle.

37:15
In in that case, it may be better to wait until that, yeah, let's have it wait until then, I think we have the we have a clear in principle understanding of the three positions and the difference principally between them. And again, I am going to suggest that we need what amount to concluding written technical submissions essentially from the applicant, setting out essentially the rationale for its argument as to why

37:51
the six DBA penalty does not apply, and why there will not be relevant tonality, and or it can be controlled and mitigated against, and why equally specific other concerns such as interference patterns will not arise, or if they do, again, can be mitigated against. So a final summary document. I mean, this is this is essentially your written submissions or your writtens.

38:20
Confirmation of oral submissions. Similarly, from route authoritative societies, and Mr. Bear for the council, your final statement

38:32
informing the position as to why you believe that those are applicable. And therefore why it is your view that, you know, an adequate approach to this particular

38:47
pair of proposals would be the application of the 60 b correction. So is that something that we can have by deadline age, please?

38:58

So there's, again, the residual differences between you are matters on which the examining authorities can deliberate.

39:07
Okay, on that basis, ladies and gentlemen, I'm going to move on to items small C and D. Now, C was there in relation to individual receptors. And the question of whether there were any particular individual receptors around which there were concerns expressed in terms of the potential noise impact operationally. And I do see Mr. Attorney seeking to address me.

39:44
Mr. Attorney, Sir Richard, Attorney for spaces, just very briefly, we suggested in our revised DCA requirement that it should be expanded to include all residential receptors and also the St. Mary's Church.

40:00
So that's the additional receptors, which we say should be in the so far as the identified receptors are said to be representative. Well, that that point can

40:13
can rest there, but we say it's appropriate to apply the noise conditioner all residential receptors under the church for the reasons I've given already.

40:22
Okay.

40:24
Now, in that respect,

40:29
is there anybody else seeking to advance Anything else? Mr. Burke, what's, what's the council's position on this?

40:39
the council's position is that the receptors were agreed early on in the process, and they welcome the inclusion of the additional receptor in the DCO requirement. Okay, at SSR. Three, Thank you, sir. Fine. So you're content with the requirement as it rests. Okay, so in terms of the target that the applicant is addressing,

40:59
its addressing specifically the SE C's submissions, I apologise Mr. Thornley, Taylor. I, I shopped directly to Mr. Baer, having heard from Mr. Turley. So I will, I'll draw you back in. Thank you very much, sir Rupert, on the jailer, representing safety, on the matter of the changes that have been made to requirement 26 and 27. We've had the national infrastructure that national grid infrastructure added in, and we see from the

41:35
noise clarification predictions that while it produces, according to the calculations, Alo la que level over the period to which the regulation applies, its maximum level is high, it's over 60 DBA. And this, I believe, can occur at any time in the 24 hour period. And when it occurs at night, it will cause awakening if the receptor has open windows, and therefore there's no actual real control over them. Major source from the National Grid infrastructure in the revised 26 and 27. Okay, and so your proposition would then be what all be done to the revised requirement. 27. But as I understand it, there's actually no mitigation available for the noise of switchgear

42:26
operating. And we seem to have an irresolvable

42:32
issue here, there will be a significant adverse effect from this plant, which I don't think can be mitigated.

42:40
Okay. And

42:43
in, in your view, what are the consequences of that?

42:48
Take it forensically starting with policy, going to predictions, assessing them and looking at mitigation options.

42:56
You cannot granted SEO.

43:00
Okay, that's clear, and succinct. So I'm then going to go to the applicant on that point.

43:08
Sure.

43:10
Thank you. Sorry, I'll just go back to the app. And just to add something to Mr. Fahmy Tyler's point on the maximum noise levels, I think it should be stated very clearly that this the maximum

43:25
levels that that occur from the National Grid infrastructure are under emergency use only. And it really should be noted that that is the case and that those those switch gears and circuit breakers, that sort of thing, they only operate in case of an emergency. So I think that should be clear that that should be borne in mind and noted quite clearly.

43:54
Okay.

44:00
Moving then on again, that there's a there's a gap between you and that these are matters on which we will have to deliberate as examining authorities. And one final question then that I wish to raise in relation to small d and mitigation measures stroke security

44:20
there's been

44:23
actually no there are two matters that I'll cover off there. The first of these is the reference that was made to

44:30
the level setting the equivalent requirements for other projects with made orders not Vanguard 35 Db la que Dogger Bank A that's an old Creek back a and b that's Craig back be 35 again, and Dogger bank city which is the old Dogger bank teeside a 42 at specified resident

45:00
To receptors, but the point being that the these are values above and in some cases substantially above 10 Db above

45:13
the values that are secured for rent certain relevant receptors here.

45:21
Now,

45:23
I did want to test the view as to why the difference? And so I would just like to hear from Mr. Thornley, Taylor, Mr. Bear and then go to the applicant on the rationale for the difference there as you said.

45:44
So as to Tommy Taylor.

45:46
Thank you, sir. Rupert Vanya Taylor, on behalf of Stacy's,

45:50
they will have gone through a similar process to the one that has been embarked upon here,

45:58
but not in one of the qualities places in England, and therefore have not arrived at

46:07
desirable limit levels as low as unnecessary at Christian.

46:15
What I find most interesting about today's proceedings is Mr. Bear's reference to a separate low frequency control. I did not make a note of the location where that applies. But I think that is as interesting as other sites which are not in rural Suffolk, which may have higher limits the fact that there is a low frequency limit in force in another case, I think is a particular interest. I don't have personal knowledge of those sites. So I can't give any specific information. Okay, Mr. Bear, and if you are able to turn up that reference that Mr. Sahni just reminded herself that would be very, very helpful and included in your written submission as well after today that would be helpful. first comment on those. Thanks, Joe bow on behalf of a Suffolk Council.

47:07
Get that reference is Norfolk Borealis, which is the onshore substation at nektan in West Norfolk, and I can pull up the DTO reference for that. And my understanding of the Dogger, the two Dogger substations and the vanguard substations in though in all three of those cases, there's an existing no existing National Grid site in the area already, which comes back to this argument of context, we would be looking at a very different context if we were looking at a new substation going next to a existing substation just as a different context at Branford as that substation, the EIA, one substation went next to the

47:45
substation there.

47:48
So in this case, this comes back to this discussion of context of the industrial source noise source going into a very rural area. And that sets a limit. Can I just ask, I didn't quite understand your question. I'm afraid in terms of 10 Db below the levels set there. Are you talking about our proposed levels? of levels? Yes. So for example, we've got Dogger bank, see the old bank t side a 42. Whereas we've got levels set at 31 and 32, respectively.

48:17
In required 27.

48:21
Okay, I can't I'm not familiar with the noise climate there. But I've looked at the site on Google Maps. And I can tell that

48:29
it's,

48:30
I think those houses quite close to those substation sites. And it would appear that the noise climate is probably dominated by existing National Grid substations. But that's only a passing observation. Okay.

48:46
In this case, the operational limits have been we're coming slightly back to the earlier discussion about methodology used up to recently and the operational limits I had understood had been set according to a low level of five DB above the background noise level. Now set aside any discussion about what that background noise level is?

49:07
There's the question of how you determine the level. And in this case, I would argue that the context of the very rural location suggests that you should use an alternative low of equal to the background noise level and there is a precedent for that another deep dtos. Now that may come out in the wash, depending on where the background noise comes because it may get bottomed out by an AI discussion about absolutely noise levels. I'm guessing you're gonna want to us to document that. Yes. Yeah.

49:40
So but just highlighting that that's position has changed slightly from the applicant, in terms of earlier on in this session

49:49
says that the limits are set according to the operational level levels predicted by the noise levels. So I'm just not clear what the consultation is. We're not clear whether these levels

50:00
Be set according to the low thresholds or set in order to what can be achieved. I know there's been some

50:07
representations saying that the council is asking for low levels, that irrespective whether they can be achieved, and that's absolutely not the case. And understandably, local, the ISA Council have written to the applicants this week to clarify that. That just the position from the council's is that if the noise levels, if the operational levels can't be achieved, there needs to be a statement of what can be achieved, and then that point allow the examining authority to assess what the impact is added achievable level.

50:39
So that's the end of our submissions. Thank you. Okay, thank you very much. And at this point, I will apologise for the level of emissions, my dog that might be providing a little bit of momentary distraction. And can I then go to the applicant for a response on this?

50:58
Thank you, Alice Baxter, for the applicant, I think we do need to

51:06
look at the assertion that the area around Preston is is somehow

51:13
an accident has been painted very much as an exceptionally quiet area. That is that is somehow almost unique within the country, when we look at the noise climate and the measured noise levels.

51:26
And we do recognise that obviously, during the early hours of the morning, background noise levels drop away very, very much during the, during the daytime, it's an area that's affected by many other manmade noise sources distance road traffic, the ambient noise levels are consistently at, at the sort of low to mid 40s level that's not exceptionally quiet. That's just a normal rural area. And I feel that we have to do, we have to make that point that notwithstanding the very low background noise levels during the during the sort of the deep part of the night, the rest of the time it is it's a rural area, we recognise that it's not close to hugely noisy transportation noise sources but it but it is affected by noise. It does have a noise climate, as I say, le cues within the sort of low to mid 40s during the majority of the day time period. So that that has to be borne in mind.

52:28
And

52:30
just to address, Mr. Bear's point,

52:37
in terms of

52:40
app, in fact, I would wouldn't mind if Mr. Burgess repeated his point. I was concentrating there on the on the nice climate within the area.

52:51
Thank you, Mr.

52:55
Chair. He said sorry, which point are we talking about? Here? It was the latter latter point that he made.

53:07
While we were talking about the how the lowest observe how the low levels were chosen, and

53:14
what gives you

53:16
a good egg memoir for me, thank you. So, we really do need to

53:22
make a point is that the proposed

53:27
requirements with a with a with a rating level, first of all the dress

53:33
the approach where you would look at the difference between the rating level and the background, the rating level does take into account any particular penalties that might be applicable. So it does look at first of all the approach in relation to background.

53:52
But it also looks at

53:55
it also acceptable the rating levels that have been proposed are also acceptable in terms of an absolute level. And in fact that below what Mr. kovic has, has

54:06
recognised the 35 db, which is which is really there's no evidence within the literature that suggests that there are

54:16
adverse health effects or quality of life effects below that level. So, I think I think we do need to to stress that, but the

54:28
the levels have been set in this particular instance and for the rating level in accordance with our derived background noise levels and not particularly on a it can be achieved i think the it was then check whether those noise levels can be achieved by SPI as engineers and confirm that that would be an appropriate limit to set. So they have been set in relation to the background. First of all,

54:58
with regard to the absolute law

55:00
But also, again, it has obviously been checked whether SPF can achieve that limit, and has been confirmed. That concludes my input on those points. Okay, thank you very much now,

55:15

what I'm just going to show, sir, can I just? Can I just come in? And I'm sorry. But I think this is an important point that sort of, you know, that needs to be dealt with in terms of the level of competence, because serious concerns have been expressed about

55:32
sort of the level of lack of competence you can have as to whether those limit values will be met. The fact is, is that sort of the applicants have set the limits for engagement with the Suffolk Council, and so on, and they've lowered the levels down to 3132. And that the question then becomes,

55:56
can you be confident that those limit values will be met. And for the reasons that I've explained that sort of is a matter of principle, it lends itself to noise control, it lends itself to design, but we need to sort of explain that there will also be a very rigorous assurance process that will be adopted and followed to ensure that those rating levels will be met. Because the applicants carry a lot of risk if they if they don't comply with those requirements. And so, it is important that they do everything that they possibly can within their gift to actually ensure that those limits are met. And so, what will happen is that sort of a rigorous process will be applied throughout the design, installation and commissioning process to ensure the limits will be achieved. Such an assurance process is necessary to manage the risk, as I've as I've described, and to avoid the need for any costly remedial treatment, as would be the case if they were found to exceed those rating levels. And the assurance process will include such steps as but not limited to,

57:07
selection of quality equipment for the procurement process, specification of noise emission levels for each item of equipment and plant, selection of good

57:18
equipment suppliers, monitoring and verification and lots of acceptance test to ensure that before anything's installed, that that equipment will be meeting those specifications. And in addition to that, when they are installed on site, there will be commissioning tests.

57:38
And the suppliers will be if they carry out commissioning tests at site and find that they don't meet the specifications, then they will be placed under requirements to take the necessary corrective action so as to meet that. So with such a strong assurance process in place, as you would expect for

57:59
this is not just limited to the substations is the type of assurance process that you would expect with any power generating plant, there's nothing new about this, you can have a high degree of confidence the limits will be met.

58:13
Okay.

58:15
Just to wrap very strong.

58:18
Yeah, very shortly. There's just one point.

58:21
I've been involved in quite a number of offshore projects. And where I think the difference in terms of this project has been is that we did have engagement with a Suffolk Council, they expressed concerns about whether we could go lower in terms of noise emissions from the substation, and in terms of a company scottishpower renewables have that global relationship because they have a portfolio of offshore projects. And many of the individuals involved in at scottishpower new goals are responsible for those global portfolio. So what that enabled

59:02
them to do was to carry out a much earlier engagement with the supply chain than would be standard on a project and therefore, to some extent, that expertise and experience having it in house and being able to go to that engagement level during the

59:20
early part of the examination. And to gain that

59:25
benefit of that early engagement is essentially why we were able to shift with confidence to position which was being advocated by the Council, which was to push to could we do something to lower the noise emissions from the substation, the only way that we could do that with confidence was for the client to engage with the supply chain, look at the equipment specifications, and identify what key elements of plant were proposed, to in order to then realise the extent to which that could be

1:00:00
realised. So it is a process has probably been done earlier in the process. And the point is that many of the other schemes will have done similar processes after the event. And the other point that is particularly important is that the way this works is that we will contract with the supply chain, to deliver on that to make sure that they deliver to those requirements. And we obviously make those requirements ones that give the, as the party with the ultimate responsibility for meeting the limits, some comfort, they in turn will be contractually obliged to meet standards, and therefore, they will also make notes on it, it almost leads to a greater level of certainty through that procurement process. And I think it's important to recognise that that is how affective design is delivered commercially, to meet the limits which have been set, because that is exactly how the commercial chain operates. And I think it's important to understand that, thank you. Thank you very much. Now, I'm very conscious that this was meant to be the applicants closing on this point. And yet I see three hands raised. I see.

1:01:10

Richard tourney for Stacy's icms to take for the council. And I see Mr. Baer, the council's expert, also wishing to come in. What I'm going to do is, Mr. Attorney, I'm going to go to you briefly then I'm going to go to Mr. Tate. And then if needs be we'll come back to Mr. Bear. But of course, that implies that we will then need to return to Mr. Ennis, all his experts to give them a right of reply to the material that you bring in. So Mr. Turney.

1:01:40
Rich attorney for says there's a number of points that are made by Mr. kabang and Mr. Ennis, there, which needs to be noted as being substantially in dispute. The first point is, is Mr. Copying say, Well, this is a big risk for the applicant. And I have to make the point that obviously, the biggest risk is for the residents and Friston. Because if this goes wrong, there are people who day to day will have to experience unacceptable noise environment caused by this project. So it's not a attractive point to make here. And it needs to be understood that the real risk is with the residents of Friston. The second point is about supply chain engagement. And lot a lot a lot was said about that by Mr. Ennis, in particular about how there's been careful thought about the equipment and so on. Where is the third octave data? Where is that data is inconceivable that if this has been carefully thought through, that that data is simply unavailable for this project. So it should be provided. The third point is that the underlying assertion is that the examining authority should be confident that the noise requirements as proposed will be met. Well, that is dependent on the applicant being right about tonality is dependent on that, because otherwise, the penalty applies and it's not met.

1:03:06
And finally, it's the overarching point we made repeatedly that you as the examining authority reporting to this sector of states will need to be sure that this requirement as proposed, and as any modification to it can be achieved. And if it is not capable of being achieved, you can't say, well, the applicant will in any event have to find some magic way of achieving it. That is not the test, the test is Can it be achieved, not that the applicant would somehow have to bend over backwards to achieve it, and the evidence before you is not sufficient to be sure that this requirement can be achieved.

1:03:43
Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Tate.

1:03:52
Thank you. So

1:03:54
could I say, in relation to requirement 27, which had the

1:04:00
the new

1:04:03

noise rating levels and that's not good, further updated? that's been very much the process that's led to that has been very much welcomed by the Council. But bearing in mind, what we consider are the real background levels.

1:04:20
It does seem important to us that

1:04:23
there is further information that there's no other mitigation measures, which can reduce that further and there is rep 443. The clarification note on noise modelling, which sets out very briefly what is considered feasible in two paragraphs 19 and 20.

1:04:42
But it doesn't say

1:04:45
why it is not feasible or whether it's not feasible to reduce that further. And that is important.

1:04:53
An important question given the policy imperatives that you've referred to earlier about mitigation

1:05:00
Clearly not ignoring cost and other factors, but it's a very brief

1:05:07
reference to ongoing engagement with the supply chain. And we have asked the applicant to give us further information that hopefully the examination as well as further information to explain why further mitigation is not considered possible at this stage. And that isn't addressed in this document. So whilst we very much welcomed the reduction, there isn't the information currently before the examination as to whether further mitigation is feasible at this stage.

1:05:45
Thank you very much, Mr. Tight now Mr. Baer,

1:05:49
either you building on those submissions, what?

1:05:54
Thank you, sir, do bear and eat on our behalf the staff and council just very quickly,

1:06:00
slightly build on what Andrew Davis has just said, just welcoming the inclusion of the specific reference to tonality tests in accordance with annex D of baseball 40 within requirement 27 and just highlighting

the suffix councils position, which is that if the third octave data is not available for the proposed plant, a good

1:06:23
way out of this would be to impose a pre commencement requirement for people pre commencement noise assessment based on a detailed design of the proposed plant.

1:06:33
As there's precedent for this being imposed under DCO, East Anglia, one substation, and we

1:06:40
regard that as a perfect way to go towards de risking this in terms of looking at what the details proposals are at that stage and require a third of the tonality test stage before it goes ahead. Thank you. So given that is a kind of solution finding.

1:06:59
Submission that if your position is one that commends itself, to us, provides a mechanism to address it.

1:07:08
Without Prejudice to our deliberations on that point, of course, put it in in writing a deadline date

1:07:15
with reference to the EIA, one detailed design requirement. So we have a precedent, we have a form of words in front of us, and the applicant indeed can then responds to it.

1:07:29
Now, Mr. Tate, you still have your hand raised? Is that a residual hand or is that?

1:07:35
it? It's it's a residual hand, but just picking up on that.

1:07:41
The EIA one operational noise assessment Rep. 522. Very helpfully set out by that.

1:07:49
You've directed me to it. So we've already got it in. That's excellent. Thank you very much. Apologies. Sometimes with the amount of documentation we have in front of us, it needs other minds to remind us what we haven't haven't seen. Okay, I'm then going to go back to the applicant. Final concluding submissions on these points. Bearing in mind the time so brevity much appreciated,

1:08:16
is, again, a con carving on behalf of the applicants.

1:08:21

I deal with two specific matters.

1:08:25
First question is whether it is possible practical and reasonable to mitigate further,

1:08:33
my evidence is very clear on this point. And that is, it's not necessary to mitigate further. As a matter of fact, I think that

1:08:43
the applicants have already gone to a point where they will be avoiding any impacts at night whatsoever. And that's and the reason why I say that is clearly set out in the expert noise report. And if you go below, if you're at 35, in my opinion, there will be no adverse impacts whatsoever. And just if you go

1:09:12
even further below 35 at night, then you're providing sort of further comfort, further protection, but it's not necessary in my view to to go even further beyond that, as far as the as far as the third octave point is concerned.

1:09:32
And

1:09:33
and it's been persisted with despite the points I've made, the one piece of advice that I would give is that this request clearly goes above and beyond what's required from the standard

1:09:49
and it does not serve any practical purpose I mean, so if you if you

1:09:56
if you wanted third octaves, third octave him

1:10:00
Information at this stage. My question is what would you do with that information? Now that what the standard requires you to do is if you want to, to apply for doctors, and in particular, if you wanted to apply the objective method,

1:10:14
then you need to do that at the receiver location.

1:10:19

And so you'd need to have all of those detailed predictions offered octaves at those receiver locations. And that's just simply not practical at this stage. So it just it just is. It is excessive. It goes beyond the standard. And it's it's impractical at this stage.

1:10:40
Okay, I think we've again reached a point where it is clear that there won't be a meeting of minds on this, though there will need to be an evaluation of the remaining gap conducted by the examining authority on the basis of final concluded statements between yourself so we will look forward to the deadline eight submissions.

1:10:59
That brings me to the end of small item D on the basis that we have now passed through the structure drafting and approach. In requirement 27.

1:11:13
Five Finally, then in relation to items, three, B, other operational noise effects, we focused very strongly in these conversations on essentially the transmission the operational effects at the transmission connection location. It is essentially a capsule that we now ask the question, is there anybody wishing to raise before us operational noise effects that arise from anywhere other than Friston for any reason whatsoever?

1:11:49
Now, Mr. Tate, you still have your hand raised, but I do believe this is residual.

1:11:55
Thank you very much. on the basis that I see no hands, that matter is discharged, I have no further direct questions to raise on it, which then moves at a pace to agenda item four, where we did place cumulative effects on this agenda. Now, here, essentially,

1:12:23
there are two broad sets of issues that we wish to raise in questions. Now, in this respect. Just before I commence this, I'm going to time check and we are at 12 minutes past five. So we're already a quarter of an hour beyond the time we normally would have hoped to to bring this hearing to a close is everybody broadly content if we continue until about 535 540

1:12:52
if I if anybody has any specific constraints, please raise your hand now and let them be no.

1:13:00
Okay, on that basis,

1:13:03
we will continue.

1:13:06
So in relation to cumulative effects,

1:13:12
we are clear in terms of the response to a second round of written questions e x, q 2.0. Point 14 that apps deadline eight there will be a cumulative effects assessment using information submitted to the examinations for the proposed Nautilus nearly projects. Can I just ask the applicants?

1:13:36
To the extent that it is known, will that include construction, and indeed operational noise considerations around

1:13:45
the Friston site and the cable corridors?

1:13:58
Korea suppose the applicant

1:14:00
position is no because the information is not available.

1:14:06
Okay. So

1:14:10
in that respect,

1:14:15
you'll submit what you'll submit, and then there will be an opportunity for

1:14:21
parties to respond to it at deadline nine, which is again very tight up against the end of these examinations.

1:14:33
Does anybody else want to make any other observation on how best we take

1:14:41
construction and operational noise considerations into account in relation to gnosis neural link, other than noting that observation from the applicants?

1:14:51
I see Mr. Turney.

1:14:58
I don't see a request to interview

1:15:00
From Suffolk So Mr. Attorney, the floor is yours. Sorry, sir, I jumped the gun, rich attorney for status. The opposition is known on this, we say that, that these projects especially known about their location is known about and so on, that the applicant can carry out a cumulative impact assessment. And so the submission will be making so there's no doubt about it is that the failure to do so means that you do not have a sufficient or adequate environmental statement. And accordingly, that you must recommend the refusal of development consent on that basis. So that's our submission, just said it's known that applies to noises applies to other masks as well. Oh, yes. No, no, we're, I mean, we get the generality of the submission. I I'm touching the noise point specifically as we're here. So for the council, Mr. Baer

1:15:55
Thank you, sir Joe, bad. He suffered Council. And it doesn't relate specifically to Nautilus in euro link, because I understand it's not firmed whether there'll be connection to that substation, or not. It's, it's really just to do with the precedent that this development would set in the first an area in terms of

1:16:14
altering the noise climate, in the study area and a set of precedent for future developments, whether it's Nautilus or any other connections to that national grid site, they would at that point be assessed as an industrial source going into a noise environment where an industrial source exists at that point. And therefore there is a cumulative noise creep issue that the council considers needs to be considered as part of this application, just because the presence of the natural good side substation, it becomes it sets the precedent for connections coming to this area, which wouldn't otherwise be there. So that's, that's the point. Okay, very much. Now, I did have some other possible questions on what essentially constitutes a worst case in terms of in parallel construction between East Anglia, one North East Anglia to Nautilus and euro link, but

1:17:08
I'm taking it from the applicants answer to my previous question that insufficient is known about sequence and timing of delivery on either of those, at this point that in the applicants view, no, reasonably sensible answer can be given to that question.

1:17:29
Is that is that correct? Yeah.

1:17:33
I think you asked Mr. Tony and Stacy's On what basis could accumulative assessment be given? The response you got is we're going to make a legal submission that there has to be taken into account? I think that's a, quite frankly, it's not an answer to the question, or the discussion which we were having, which is, what information is available to undertake an assessment and simply put, you did not get an answer to that question.

1:17:56
So there's no response to that, on behalf of Mr. Beer. If there were an extension to the National Grid substation, it would have to be considered an extension to that substation. It's not an entirely new extension. And in my submission, the applicant to any of those proposals would indeed have to assess the noise implications of that overall infrastructure that was created. But and that would have to take into account the existing development that was proposed, because that's what we're at the stage of here is proposed development, they would have to consider cumulatively, what the position was with this particular project. Because that is the basis in which the applications would have to be considered if they were to come forward. So in my submission, it would have to because of this extension, I'm just going to pause those and it is that Mr. Turney is leaping back in. So I'll leave there. Thank you, sir. This is going to become a round robin discussion. Thank you. Well, I wish to make sure that it doesn't become too much of a round robin, I will indulge you, Mr. Turney, but it is very close to the end of the day. So let's say I recognise that that

1:19:07
the approach that's taken by Mr. Ennis is not the help not a helpful approach. Because he says, well, Tony didn't answer the question. The answer to the question is, it's for the applicant to carry out the assessment. If you need more on that, sir, then we'd be very happy to explain it. But the applicant hasn't carried out the assessment. The data that's that could be used, for instance, is the generic data, which is relied on by the applicant for the assessment of its own proposals. So it's no more equipment is involved in various elements of these proposals. interconnector equipment is well now they can go and look at it at other sites to understand what is likely to come to this site, by way of the works involved. And by way of the operations involved when it's constructed. It is

1:20:00
But very much within the width of these applicants, but they said they're not going to look at it. And that's their point. So I target, therefore, would you say we're not going to look at it. But if they wanted to look at it, it would be very simple for them to do so.

1:20:15
Yes, though, those points you have previously made, and at the end of the day, we're going to have to

1:20:23
review and deliberate very carefully on what we have on our table at the end of these examinations. Now, Mr. Bear, I'm very conscious that we are trying to move to the point where the applicant concludes on this. So again,

1:20:38
ah, was was was that a, a camera by accident incident? I'm sorry, sir. Yes, it was. Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. So, back to you very briefly. Mr. Ennis, we, you know, we've heard, we've heard the various interventions. Can you now conclude, on that point? concluded? Thank you, sir. Thank you very much. In which case that, ladies and gentlemen, is me concluded. So I'm going to hand over for agenda item five, and move through to the closure of this hearing now, or be very rapid to Mr. Rigby.

1:21:18
Thank you very much, Mr. Smith. Thank you, everyone for your submissions today. There are no other matters that the examining authorities wish to raise. In today's hearing, you'll be glad to know because it's 20 past five. But before we move on to review our actions and next steps, I'll just do the total close out anyone has any other business that they wish to raise in his hearing? Says he hoping to see no hands. I see no hands, I see no ships.

1:21:49
So that brings us into item six of our agenda, which is procedural decisions, review of actions and next steps.

1:21:58
We've not identified the need to make any procedural decisions today. In terms of actions, we have a list of actions arising from these hearings. And these have been flagged as we progressed, and they've been noted. And we will aim to publish these on the national infrastructure planning website as soon as possible.

1:22:21
And we can confirm while on this subject, that the audio recordings and action points for both issues, specific hearings 10. And issue specific hearings 11. Earlier this week, have now been published. So we'd advise all participants today and those not in attendance. But with an interest in the matters covered by these hearings, to review the Action Lists when published, and act accordingly. Deadline eight being the deadline for any written submissions. So I'm now going to hand back to my colleague Mr. Smith to take us through the next step and close these hearings. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you very much, Mr. Rigby. And in that final respect, just taking on a point that Mr. Rigby has raised deadline eight, because we are so close to the anticipated end of these examinations, it is absolutely critical as anybody who wishes to participate in any final comment whatsoever, addresses deadlines, and does that utmost to ensure that the material is submitted on time by the deadline, the amount of room for manoeuvre for the consideration and possible acceptance of late material will be very, very limited indeed.

1:23:36
In terms of next steps, this has been issued specific hearings number 12. Having reached this point with all substantive business done, we will then say that we can cancel the reserved hearings issue specific hearings 12. A, that was set potentially to occur between the 23rd and 26th of March as a safeguard if we had had to adjourn this hearing as a consequence of technical difficulties. That reserve hearing will clearly not now be required. The website banners will be updated in due course to confirm their cancellation. And next hearings in these examinations, however, will be issue specific hearings 13 on the topic topic of traffic and transportation starting bright and early at 920 in the arrangements conference for 10am. Tomorrow. On that basis. Ladies and gentlemen, I will now bring us to agenda item seven, which is the clothes. And once again, I will extend a thank you to all of our speakers today for your attendance and diligence in preparing and for the contributions that you have made. And, again, we are hugely appreciative of your time recognising that in a continued national lockdown

serving us is a little harder than it perhaps might be in normal circumstances. I would like to thank our case team led by Mr. Williams for supporting these hearings. And so by way of

1:25:00
final check that there isn't anything else that I have somehow forgotten, or that anybody else wants to raise before we close, I'm doing a final check for yellow hand.

1:25:11
I will now ask my panel colleagues to say their goodbyes. So firstly, Mr. Rigby.

1:25:18
Thank you very much everyone and good afternoon.

1:25:23
Mr. Hockley. Thank you for your contributions today.

1:25:27
And for me, Rynd Smith, the panel lead. Thank you very much. Once again for your contributions. It is now 25 minutes past five, and these issue specific hearings number 12 are now closed. Thank you