

# TEXT\_ISH16\_EA1N&2\_Session4\_26052021

Wed, 5/26 5:05PM • 1:26:24

00:02

Hello, and welcome back, everyone. Just before we begin, Can I check with the case team that you can hear me and that the recordings, live streams and live captions have started. I can see and hear you. And superlines it. Thank you very much. Nice. Thanks, Liam. Okay, and we were up to item C of this part of the agenda, which deals with the outline operational drainage management plan.

00:42

Just starting with the applicants in the first instance, if I'm trying to look ahead to the updated version that you're going to be submitted and just trying to get a bit of information ahead of that. Could we ask everyone to come back up on the screen who was on the screen before the break as well? Please? I'm not seeing people on the screen. Can you see people on the screen? Mr. Hockley? I can Yes Mrs. Jones? Yeah, okay, must be a problem. At my end I'll just carry on for the for the moment, I may need to leave and rejoin if I'm if I'm continue having problems Okay, um, to the applicant in the first instance in terms of the the infiltration tests feeding into the revised outline, operational change management plan, can you know achieve the 24 hour drain time with the new rates of infiltration from that initial testing

01:49

split the descent on the air for the applicant the 24 hours after it not be achieved with a factor of safety of 10 if a factor of safety of five is used in the calculations, then the aftering time could be achieved for both the infiltration on the on the hybrid solutions. options.

02:20

Okay, so just to repeat that a factor of safety of 10 cars at the 24 hour drain time with a factor of safety of five you can't Is that what you were saying? Yes. Okay, um, again to the applicants in the outline operational range monitoring plan submitted to the deadline eight, the total storage volume for infiltration only was 37,388 metres cubed for the hybrid scheme 36 913. Do you have new storage volumes following that initial infiltration testing

03:05

can have this further ascent on therefore the applicant. We have got some volumes, which which show a reduction on the on the volumes required to attenuate if the infiltration tests that we selected. Were us,

03:27

Mr. Vincent, glad to speak up and slightly better than just having trouble hearing you.

03:33

The results that we've got we have achieved at the moment that we've calculated to compare with the results that were given on the Alpine operation drainage management plan submitted at deadline eight will come compared utilising the infiltration test results that we selected from the results we got back from the site. And for those we've got a slight reduction on the volumes which would put for the infiltration only system for the project substations would give us a twin. So just 17,000 just over 17,000 cubic metres required for the infiltration system on the project substation, and for the National Grid substation infiltration only circuit 10,000 cubic metres of attenuation required.

04:43

Okay, that's for infiltration. So in comparison to the deadline, what's the reduction there between the the deadline eight version and the what was the MR deadline 11.

04:57

So there is a reduction For the infiltration only system on the project substations of circa 5000 cubic metres and 4000 cubic metres for the National Grid substation

05:19

okay and in terms of the hybrid scheme Have you got the calculations for that as well?

05:25

Yes for the hybrid scheme on the project substations the result gave us a requirement for 19,700 cubic metres you take and for the National Grid substation was 11,700 cubic metres which is a reduction of circa 3000 cubic metres for the project substations and just under 3000 cubic metres for the National Grid substation.

06:05

And in terms of reduction from the deadline a version that would be

06:12

those were the values I just said so, circuit 3000 cubic metres for the National Grid substation for the project substations

06:25

okay. And and those figures that you've just given me they are they the indicative lines that are shown on drawing a which was submitted with your rule 17 response

06:39

Yes, the those figures for drawing a with a factor of safety of 10

06:48

Okay. Now, I know there was some comments made by Suffolk County Council in response to the depths of the basins making comments that the depth of the basins in appendix four six and eight of the outline operational drainage management plan showed the difference between think 1.5 and two for

infiltration and hybrid in terms of the depths. So, the new lines on drawing a water the depths of those of those storage basins

07:31

the design depth for for the ponds on a safety factor of 10 was one metre deep there are further allowance for a 300 millimetre freeboard and then there was further allowance for 200 mil I believe in place in the field further freeboard which I would think then goes for the allowance of the overflow. So, if the system is to overflow controllably the freeboard would have to be slightly higher. So, then there could be controlled discharge

08:22

Okay, so the size of the basins that you're showing on drawing a the depth of those basins do they comply with this area? Since manual

08:32

for the water level design yes design water levels one metre max. Okay, and what about the the overall depth? overall depth was 1.5 metres deep with the freeboard

08:53

Okay, and that's for all the schemes. Yes. Okay. I'm actually having some problems with my with teams. I can't see anybody at the moment I can see Mr. Williams has his hand raise what I'm going to do if it's alright with you, Mr. Hockley. If you can just hold the fort for one minute while I leave and rejoin and hopefully that will fix whatever whatever bugs causing that is that all right with you?

09:19

Of course Mrs. Jones what I suggest now is if we just if we could just hold fire for 60 seconds or so until Mrs. Jones is back on and hopefully it will be working again then because I don't want to miss any of their conversation but hopefully what will come to you Mr. Williams in a few seconds hopefully.

09:44

And in the break briefly, I will just appear on camera so that Mr. Hockley also has a second in case the system is really broken. I very much hope it isn't. If Mrs. Jones returns per plan I will disappear. And here she is. Yeah, better. Mrs. Jones. You're on mute Mrs. Jones.

10:12

Yeah, no, I can see everyone now. That's great. Thank you for that. Okay. Mr. Williams?

10:20

Yep, I'll just point you towards appendix six. And specifically page two of appendix six. This is of the deadline eight outline operational drainage management plan. freeboard top level is listed on this section as plus 1.8 metres. That's contrary to what the applicant has just stated and is outside the scope of this series. That's manual, recommended maximum depth of basins. In addition to that, I would also query having had a flick through the calculations again, and I will note that it's the applicants comments at deadline 10 did challenge me on some aspects of that, and I appreciate that I'd taken the

sections the level shown on the section as the water levels they are actually the base levels is a slight, slight confusion there because you've got a base and top level at plus 2.0 metres but your freeboard finishes at plus 1.8. In the calculations, I believe that I can't remember if it's the project or the National Grid substations, one of them is slightly over one metre water depth, not massively, but slightly, we would we would still accept it, I think it was only 20 millimetres or something like that. My concern would be that when you then add the one in 10 rainfall event after 24 hours on top of what would the water level be then it could potentially be greater than a metre. But I think the bottom of bottom line is we don't know.

11:53

The act in response to those points, please.

11:59

Bram grellus for the applicants. I'll respond on the point of day to hafter and dine time, and then pass across to colleagues to address the other points. So in terms of the half green downtime, where the half green type grand dine time for the one 100 year storm is not achieved, we then add a further storm scenario to the to the capacity of the Sun space and switches a 110 year event in the following 24 hours, the capacity required for a lot of fans is included within the capacity that Pedro just just read out and is included within the layouts that we submitted on Friday, as part of the rule seven out letter I can pass across through to Pedro to discuss the the depths point.

12:46

Recent on behalf of the applicants. I believe that the matters of the that can be easily reviewed, however, are not the point of Matt Williams that some of the ponds will be over a slightly over the one metre deep. And this is something we can rectify by increasing slightly the footprint of the pond to lower the height of the water.

13:20

Okay, and if that is is what you have to do, does that then have an impact on any of the mitigation such as landscaping or biodiversity For example,

13:35

we don't believe 11 a huge impact given the height is not extensive. So to reduce 200, even 200 millimetre on the water level for such a large one. It wouldn't even have a huge impact on the area. Mr. Carpenter

14:03

Thank you, Miss Jones, Clyde carpenter, for CCS. And then the applicants obviously just given us figures, which I don't think we've been party to in depth based upon the reason it's ground investigation. So I guess I would like to reiterate the point that that they had taken numbers, which are the lowest ones that they put through the, through the through the, the analysis, but there are these ponds in it almost half of the ponds, and it had been ignored in terms of the the lack of permeability that they demonstrated so so you know, they could take any one of those numbers they liked, and they can run it through this calculation whether this takes us any further forward in terms of the viability of the of the

sizing of the basins, is another point because you know, they've chosen to ignore those four tests. So I'm not sure if you know that takes us further forward and certainly it doesn't address the the findings of those of the tests. When you look at those in the In the totality. So I think it's it's a, it's a hypothetical discussion upon a proponent the selection of of core values, which may or may or may not reflect what they find in the future. But there is clear evidence that actually ground permeability or ground infiltration is problematic, over 40% of the testing area that they that they've looked at in this first phase of investigation.

15:36

Thank you, Mr. Carpenter, with the applicant like to respond to that.

15:47

Whether we sent on behalf of the applicants, I'd like to note that some of the failure for some of these tests, I note not all of the full audit failures were due to collapse of the pits, which shown some conditions which are consistent with good infiltration soils, so the soils were Sunday, and therefore there was some some collapse of this, which led to not all of the results being favourable. With regard to the selecting of the rates for for, for further calculations to address the development of the design, the applicant has selected the worst case scenario that was achieved in each of the locations of the current patents. If we were to assume the results that turned out not not valid, then we would regard the infiltration system all together. And what we've been trying to do well, since before was to try and maximise the infiltration systems as as to its maximum as much as possible. So we could not just take the non valid results as the site cannot infiltrate, that is not reflective of what's going to happen on the site, there are certain locations wet might not have enough or sufficient capacity for infiltration, however, has been demonstrated for some of the other locations, that infiltration is viable. Indeed, it might not be as good as we've got in this provisional results. But there is some infiltration, and we're trying to use this to assess what is the visibility of the infiltration and diverted solutions. Thank you, Mr. Williams.

17:58

Just contrast, we're at risk of going over old ground here. And to try and keep things on track. In terms of the deadline eight submission, I just asked that the applicant in future submissions of the outline, operational journeys management plan, if you could please mark, the maximum water level on the sections, that would probably help the examining authorities who will most likely not go through all of the calculations. So that would be the depending on the drawing downtimes. multi level after the one in 100, or after the 24 hour period, with the additional one in 10. If you could just put down the sections are being appreciated. Thank you.

18:35

Is that is that possible? Yes. Thank you. Mr. Carpenter, did you have to have your hand raised? Or was it the same point?

18:47

Thank you, Miss Jones. No, I think the point has been covered up but I think I would reiterate that in the design volumes, or at least in this submission in the in the the submission eight we're very close to the

calculated volumes within a couple of percent, which which is a concern. The statements today about there being overflows, you know, this is this is something new. So something that has not been described previously. We know that basins have been described previously as having free boards. And then additional volume for access tracks and when landscaping and so on, resulting in basin volumes, up to 35,000 to 36,000 cubes. So so the applicants position seems to change. And obviously we don't have the information to critique that. So

19:48

thank you, Mr. Carpenter. The applicant like to respond to any of those points made

19:55

was sent on behalf of the applicant. Yes. I believe In the last examination, we didn't mention controlled overflows would be applied to any of the solutions that might come out of the detailed design. Because there's always going to be extreme events that have not been designed for.

20:20

Thank you. Okay, my next question is also to the applicants, and that is to do with the relocation of existing storage basins on on the site. Sorry, actually, this question is to Mr. Williams. Could you explain exactly what your concerns outstanding concerns are in terms of the relocation of these existing storage basins? And how you think that those concerns could be addressed in any violations by the applicants?

20:50

Yeah. Williams county council, so the applicant has not proposed anything different to what was previously proposed in terms of the location of the additional storage area. So our comments remain the same as previously. The concern with that is, it is north of the watercourse that runs East West at present along what will be the top edge of the National Grid substation. Obviously, the land in Friston slopes north to south, so putting the additional storage, north of the watercourse that it's proposed to serve is going to limit its use. Now there might be changes in ground levels, etc, etc. That's a matter for detailed design, I'm sure his point in the applicant would make. So again, we're just trying to make sure that there is sufficient land to replace a service water storage feature that is there at the moment where it can function to the best of its ability as it currently does and afford Friston the protection that it currently does.

21:50

And so what would you like to see from the occupants to alleviate your concerns in that regard?

21:56

We'd like to see that basin or that additional storage area based downstream of the watercourse that runs east to west where they're like for like volume.

22:09

Thank you. I'm gonna ask the applicants to respond to that, please.

22:15

Prime Acropolis poured out cans. I believe the the watercourse running East West, I assume that's the surface water overflow area, just north of the National Grid substation has been referred to by Mr. Williams is not the case. Just to clarify.

22:32

Yep. Matt Williams county council is the area it's the small pond that's just nearly out near the telegraph poles there at the moment, where you've got the one water course from the west, the one was bought in the east and they converge before heading south towards church, right.

22:48

Brahma crossford Elkins, so that was referred to us as a watercourse. So it's a it's not actually a watercourse that runs to the north of the National Grid substation. It's a conveyance route, or overland flows. It's not it's not continuously wet. In essence, as Mr. William says, it is a detailed same point. The overall master plan for the substation area must take that into account must ensure that any modification to the existing infiltration pets or southern pets are compensated for and final in the final design. So that obstacle was like saying,

23:30

Mr. Williams, did you wish to raise a point on that?

23:34

Yeah, I'm sure that we're talking about the same area because it most definitely is an ordinary watercourse. The county council regard it as such. It is very regularly work. There are COVID crossings of this there are land drains that discharge into it. And as far as we're concerned, it is an ordinary water course it is also a conveyance flow path as shown on the surface water flood maps, which could be due to a lack of understanding of the surface water flood maps of that feature, base certainly a watercourse and have fairly deep one at that. And we're more than happy to submit photographs at the next deadline which are of this watercourse, which I'm sure the examining authority have seen on their site visits and I'm sure the applicant is aware of to

24:18

brown Macross for for napkins. The my earlier point stands, any interaction that we have with existing surface water features, whatever their their description, based on the final detailed design of the substations must be appropriately compensated for within their final operational drainage monitoring plan that needs to be submitted for approval.

24:40

I think Mr. McGregor is what Mr. Williams is asking for at the minute. I think the moment you're showing the real potential relocation north of the National Grid substation, I think what Mr. Williams is saying that the county council would like to see relocation of, of that existing storage basin. downstream is that correct Mr. Williams great

25:04

primer graphs with outcomes. That's something we will look out for the deadline nine submission of the outline operational drainage drainage monitoring plan

25:12

deadline. Okay, thank you would just like to move on, just to discuss the discharge to the Friston watercourse. So that county council don't view the discharge to the forest and waterfalls is achievable. And I have read the Atkins responses a deadline 10. I don't know. Mr. Williams. Have you had the opportunity to look through the applicants response to your points at deadline?

25:50

Yes, Mike Williams, Suffolk County Council, I've had a chance to look at that and their correspondence and response to the Environment Agency. comments. I don't know if the applicant wants to come in here. I know we've had discussions about their proposals. For the first time watercourse, it might be better for them to put those forward. And then I'll give you my comments on those costs

26:13

parameterless sport outcomes in terms of the downstream aspects, we have indeed been discussing with the Environment Agency. It is quite common for developers to enter agreements with Environment Agency for for a wide range of development developments, which in essence required the developer to compensate an additional cost to the Environment Agency with half by virtue of increased maintenance that's required if that main river I due to increased sediment, then farmed agency. It's standard little legal agreement from from the from the EIA, and it's something that we've committed to entering into prior to the commencement of construction with the Environment Agency, and that'll be reflected in or not be able to sit with a common ground submitted in into course, in terms of the wider aspect and terms of sediment within the festen watercourse itself, the whatever surface water drainage system we establish, will ultimately have a betterment we will be introducing the settlement function within the within the sub basins that will control the lice control the discharge and unrestricted discharge of sediment with a noxious watercourse over and above what is experienced today. And finally, just in terms of the environment agency's position on the sedimentation of the first and water core Stein stream, they are absolutely content for such matters to be considered within the final operational transformation plan. They're content with the these measures that are secured within the draughty seal currently to address the longer term operational integrity of that first of all, of course. Thank you, Mr. Williams. Do you want to respond to that?

28:06

Yes, Matt Williams, Suffolk County Council will obviously wait to see what the applicant submits with regard to their discussions with the Environment Agency, in principle that would resolve a large part of our concerns. With regard to siltation of the first and main river, there is still the possibility that that does have silt in it, by virtue of the overland flows that come down the Church Road track because it is an unmade track, it will still silt up, I would highlight that it's not just a case of maintenance. Indeed, an agreement with the Environment Agency could stipulate clearance every two years, for example, it's also about inspection. We don't know if two years is sufficient, it might be more than sufficient, it might be insufficient. So we'd expect that to be covered in the outline operational drainage management plan as part of the maintenance plan, but providing there is sufficient provisions there and we're comfortable

then that was overcome our concern regarding siltation of the watercourse however, I would then defer to my highways colleagues, regarding cover of any pipe that were to pass under Church Road. I believe the applicant will submit more details on this matter at the next deadline for which my highways colleagues will comment on at that stage. If that was to be acceptable, then that would remove our concerns regarding discharge to the first and watercourse and the feasibility of that.

29:30

And when we're talking about an agreement with the Environment Agency, that's just for the river itself in terms of maintenance of the actual pipe that you propose to instal who would have maintenance responsibility for that.

29:47

Brian Macross, but outcomes. So the outline operational drainage plans from plan sets out that the applicants will be responsible for the maintenance of the sun's system and that is taken all the way down to the arc fault. To the first immune mean, main river, so that would be the secondary to the Delta concert to the undertaker in terms of the the implementation of the DC

30:09

Okay, and it's all of that within the order limits because it's quite difficult to tell from the scale of the concept that we've got whether that entirety is within the order limits

30:19

prime grounds for napkins reconsider it is there's a a small segment from a subspace in stone to Church Road and don't today don't follow that that is absolutely included within the surface water sorry within the order limits and the limits extend further to the size to your low for say scar protection to be incorporated up their qualification which would be required within the first or maybe required within the first meeting or

30:46

could you prove as an action point to take away Could you please provide us with an inset plan to a better scale so, that we that shows that the pipe and and the apple two within the Ord with the within the red line boundary in the order limits please just so that we can be sure that that is the case.

31:09

Yeah Burma grace for the outcomes we can include that in the deadline 11 submission for the outline operational drainage management plan. Thank you be grateful that Mr. Carpenter

31:23

Miss Jones clay Carpenter for cc's we have a number of concerns about this, about this this helpful arrangement and when we repeated some of these in our in our deadline nine submission and obviously, we haven't been party to these additional conversations between the applicant and the regulators. But there are two issues to blockage risk one is that which could be controlled by the applicant in a sense of what is in the infiltration basin or the LT or the the hybrid in the attenuation basin. The other is the receiving water pools, it is an agricultural catchment in there is a there there is a

lot of sediment that's mobilised during runoff. And, and there is a frequent occurrence of sediment being entrapped within the watercourse in infringement. It's it's a small pipe, and it's the design is located at the essentially at the at the bottom of the of the ditch system. So it's going to be vulnerable to blockage that is outside the control of the applicant. The other element of blockage risk is that of the of that of the from the attenuation pond up itself. And I think we'll probably be going on to explore this further in a minute. But, you know, the applicant is proposing that the ponds have have woodland and other vegetation in them. And we would argue that this creates considerable blockage risk that's inconsistent with the use of such as small diameter discharge structure. The the point made by Mr. Williams about the crushing risk, which his colleagues from highways will look at a later date, we still see this has been critical to the viability of the option not something that should be left to a later date, because of the crushing risk with the lack of cover depth from heavy plant, and whether it's agricultural or otherwise, this is what pushes the pipe downwards and creates the blocky tricks risk. So that this resolving one risk actually increases the risk of the other. So this is not something that necessarily can simply be engineered out, it needs, it needs careful consideration, the alignment appears to go up the existing agricultural track. So in a which is as Mr. Williams has said, it's on paved, and it's prone to erosion. And so the pipe work itself could be could be exposed even if the even if the the outfall arrangement was was protected. And so, these all point towards concerns about both the viability of a structure that could address the blockage and the and the crushing risk, but also the longevity of the structure and its protection from from the natural environment. And we consider that these points have not been addressed in sufficient value and detail to to demonstrate that it is a viable, long term option for for release of the water. I do have a couple of points about the hybrid basin and which relates to its design. And I don't know if you'd like me to mention them now or later date.

34:23

No, no, no mention them. Now because I know the the applicant said that they would like to come back in on on on this item to discuss the options as well as if you want to make your points now then perhaps you can address that.

34:35

Thank you very much. So the hybrid basin design. Again, we come into this on day nine but I think it's worth mentioning is that to our understanding, the way it works is that it's essentially an infiltration basin that once it holds half a metre of water, then it starts to overflow down at a culvert root or pipe root to provide the surface water release. And obviously it's the inflow exceeds outflows in the the volume of the offshore basin becomes available. But the the issue with this design that we have is that there is no details provided on the total flows that will leave the to surface discharge. I don't know details of the the flow rates and we're not able to distinguish between the amount the volume of water that goes into the ground and that which will go to the surface water costs. By having only an overflow essentially a half metre height in this hybrid, then it means that the, this hybrid design very much actually focuses on the release of water to the surface water environment. And we would suggest this is inconsistent with the prioritisation it'll only prioritise water going into the ground until the base and fills to half a metre for so. So in in the larger events, this water is still going to go to the to the surface of water, the majority of it will go to the surface water environment, but the details aren't provided to articulate that. And we don't consider this to be consistent with the position that Suffolk County Council have taken about optimising or maximising infiltration, where you think what it does is it allows them to infiltrate over a footprint

which which enables them to address their other non drainage concerns and allow the release of water to the surface environment. Whereas what they should be doing is maximising the infiltration into the ground, which would probably require its own pond, which would overflow at a higher elevation into into another structure for subsequent release of site. So we don't consider that the structure that's proposed is maximising opportunities for infiltration, it is enabling them to retain the structure within the area they have available.

36:52

Thank you very much, Mr. Carpenter. I'm going to return to the applicants if they would like to respond to any of those points made, but I know Mr. minnis said earlier that he had some points you'd like to make regarding the what you see as being the preferred scheme. Would you like to make those now?

37:16

Brown girls for napkins, just come back to what Mr. Carpenter has has said in terms of what the applicant should be doing, what the outcome should be doing is ensuring that there is no increased flood risk to a village of Friston which is what we are doing, how do we achieve that in terms of attenuation on the scheme in terms of an infiltration only scheme or in terms of a hybrid scheme is subject to the detailed design, which will feed into the equations, the infiltration rates, the surface areas that are covered by the development, but the fundamental premises that it will not increase flood risk within the village system. That is why we have no claim plan at this moment in time. Now, there's my post consent, a final operational response plan will be submitted to the relevant planning authority for for submission. Any other things in terms of the point at which a hybrid solution discharges to the the first motor course, again, not as a point of detailed design, it'll depend on the again the size the footprint of the space since it is not set at a half metre as as described, and data can be variable depending on the rainfall event and depends on water levels with within within that hybrid solution itself. But we will clarify that within the deadline 11 submission of the outline operational dream transition plan.

38:45

Thank you, Mr. Gross. Did Mr. Ennis wish to say anything at this point before we move on to the aliens, the aliens that item of our agenda?

39:01

Thank you, mom. I just wanted to get a generic comment on this with regards to the different options that are being put forward. In my opinion is the hybrid scheme probably offers the best solution for the concerns, especially some of the concerns that have been raised today, because he actually utilises multiple mechanisms on conveying the water, it doesn't just rely on just infiltration or just attenuation. It gives you the maximum number of mechanisms which gives you the most robust solution. So my recommendation to the applicant is that the hybrid probably at this moment in time. Bearing in mind, we're still waiting for results to come in, will probably give you the most robust solution to this and protect the village of risk and downstream.

39:59

Thank you mistake Davis, Mr. Williams. Mr. Carpenter, would you like to make any final points on this item before we move on to item d?

40:13

Matt Williams, Suffolk County Council, nothing for me. Thank you.

40:17

Calvin to the SE C's I just to clarify the point I was making, I was not trying to direct the applicant to a particular solution. I was simply pointing out that what had been presented in their documentation was not consistent with the prioritisation or optimization that the Suffolk County Council had asked for.

40:36

Okay, in that case, I will allow the applicant to make any final points before we move on to item D.

40:43

Our brand regardless of outcomes, no further points to make.

40:47

right in that case, I will hand it over to my colleague John Hockley.

40:52

Thank you very much, Mrs. Jones. So this is item free depth. And the purpose of this agenda item is just to discuss the relationship of flood risk and drainage with the outline landscape and ecological management strategy, do limbs and specifically with what we've heard today. My first question I've just have a few questions on this agenda item. My first question is to the applicant. And obviously, we've heard today that the sub basins are in outline form at the moment outlined design and so on. But however, the indicative size of them is such that in them in themselves, they have the potential to have an effect on landscape. with potential result and effects on the setting nearby heritage assets and safety factor 10 drawings submitted as part of the rule 17 drawings, I'm thinking specifically about drawing he would seem to require potentially larger ponds that are in Oakland at the moment. And I wonder if you could clarify that for me.

41:59

I will primer grounds for napkins. Yes, the drawing he does relate to safety factor of six out of 10 based on all three substation infrastructure elements being being deployed, year one, year three, and the National Grid substation that what we're showing is an essence a circular feature on the master plan, the points obviously will not be circular in reality, what we're showing is the relative circular size required for for the for the surface water management based on that that very conservative factor of safety of 10 there is so many factors that will influence the size of those bonds as we mentioned earlier the actual footprint of the substations themselves any surface water monitoring features that are embedded within the fabric of date the onshore substations based on the based on the the the the master plan, the the the shift sons basins that are on the base map, if you were said they are based on the attenuation only solutions, and it's our position that they are practical, they did not compromise the landscaping elements associated with the with the substation developments and you can see that the the circular areas that overlaid whilst to maybe be slightly larger they are they are marginally larger they are they are slightly larger, we we don't see that as compromise in the landscaping elements. And

indeed We are confident that the with the same refinement of the various substation elements, the actual final quantity of water that the the spacings will need to accommodate will be less by virtue of the footprints and substations reducing during the detailed same stage.

43:58

Okay, thank you. I don't, we don't need to go back over old ground, obviously. But it's useful. I'm interested really to get to try and get and again, I know you said earlier about the you know, we're in outline design and so on but I'm interested to get more of a feel for how to sub-space and may look on the ground. Because obviously, we have lots of visualisations and lots of plans detailing the land proposed landscaping and the proposed substations themselves and their design. But we have considerably less for the proposed sub-basins. So, I wonder if, how far you can describe them to me how they might appear, how much vegetation might be in them, what type of height and fencing might be required around them. The details such as that.

44:50

primer girls Falcons, I can pass across to Paul Davis to answer most of those questions in terms of vegetation within the sun's bonds. touched upon earlier in terms of wet woodland the the consultations that we undertook during the pre application stage with the depth and the the expert topic group that considered landscaping matters felt that the wet landscaping would be a beneficial element to the to the to the master planning hence it was incorporated within the suds basins themselves. Again, the the the final detail the sign of it may be that we can still retain wet woodland, but retain in different area incorporated within that wider landscaping element rather than within the body of the suds ponds themselves. Again, that's all part of the detailed design process and indeed the the public consultation Don't be undertaken post consent I can pass across to Mr. Davis to talk through some of the more practical elements of a conventional science, isn't

45:53

it just if we do Mr. McGrath, as you mentioned there about the wet woodland may be required? Or maybe maybe move somewhere else if you like. And is that because of the that the the bases themselves may need to be more engineered? And in which case, would that mean that the sub-basins themselves would have more of a modular thesis correct word but more of a barren field

46:17

parameterless for the Afghans so the master theorists can talk through the the configuration of the conventional sunspace. And in terms of the wet woodland, it really would be a point of discussion between ourselves that lead local flood authority, the Suffolk council as relevant planning authority to establish what is the what is the optimal and the local communities? What is the optimal configuration for that for that landscape, landscaping and maybe with woodland drops from the scheme in its entirety. And we instead focus on the on Dr. woodlands, I guess, I've been the opposite. And the other biodiversity measures that we have available to us within the within the order limits.

47:05

Thank you. So Paul Davis, the applicant Li designer, suds basins vary significantly. in different parts of the country. Traditionally, this type of structure would effectively be grasped depression within the

ground that would normally be dry, there wouldn't be standing water in it, although in some areas, they do have sort of a small detention area where they can actually remain wet. But I don't think that's the proposal in this instance, as I understand the Suffolk County Council have specified that no trees should be planted within five metres of the basin, which is, as I understand it being applied. So effectively, it would just look like a graph of depression in the ground. You can put shrubs, landscaping within these structures. There are lots of features that can be added to them in order to encourage and enhance the biodiversity impacts that they can have. That would all be subject to discussion on the retail design stage of the project with traditionally a green dry depression in the ground. Thank you, Mr. Williams.

48:33

Matt Williams, Suffolk County Council, I would just come in on that point. Yes, we did say issue specific hearing 11. That tree should not be planted within five metres of infiltration structures. That remains the case. But I would just highlight that until we know what that basin is going to be is it going to be attenuation? Is it going to be infiltration, then we can't really say too much more on that topic. It is entirely possible that further discussions at detailed design stage with the applicant, their landscapers and landscape offices ECF accounts will indeed at Suffolk County Council, we may be able to incorporate some trees, it would depend on the leaf level, the root structures etc, etc. And when we when the applicant says so green basin that it does sound a bit barren, it won't necessarily be like that and things such as wildflower and other planting can be within the basis of infiltration basins and attenuation basins alike and will not affect the function of those features.

49:33

Thank you, Mr. Williams. Davis, was there anything else you want to come come back on that?

49:37

No, I concur with Mr. Williams points. You know, there are you can you know, Meadow planting and this kind of aspects can actually be introduced into the basis.

49:48

Thank you. Could you give me any indication of what kind of fencing might be required around these features.

49:55

They're normally designed with hind slopes of wanting for To allow people effectively to walk around without, you know, falling over, they don't have to have fencing around them. Because it's a dry structure. It's not, it's not a wet base to it. Some people put sort of small fencing areas just to denote an area. And frequently, there may be notices port round to actually notify people, but this is going to be on a private site. So it's probably not going to be, you know, generally acceptable, accessible by the public. But it may be pretty no worthwhile putting notifications around on what purpose this serves and what benefit it has to the community. But generically, this structure doesn't actually need to be fenced off. Thank you. Mr. Carpenter, did you want to add something that?

50:56

Maybe Sir, I wanted to raise a couple of points. One is that the, the, the drawings, as shown, show that there is a bond on the western side of the other structures. So then they were just described as as depressions. And I think that's misleading. They clearly because both are located on a slope on a Hillsborough hillside might be overstating the case, but certainly on a land slope, that they will be excavated on the recent side, and they will, they will have some kind of retaining bond on the western side. So which of course, goes back to the flood risk issue that the prison presidents are concerned about? So let's just think there's a misrepresentation there in terms of the structures are above ground on the western side. The second thing I just wanted to highlight was was that the description of the ponds has been grass isn't isn't consistent with what's shown in that in the drawings. And we have routinely said that the growth of of woodland and larger foliage in these structures was is going to seriously compromised their ability to function either in terms of clogging of infiltration or blockage of the of the outfall pipes. So, if the approach is to keep it short grass or similar, then I think that is a fundamental point in terms of the long term viability of the structures. Thank you, Mr. Carpenter. Mr. Williams.

52:33

Just a quick comment regarding the applicants statement that fencing would not be required, we would support that given the water depths proposed we would not like to see fencing around an attenuation basin or an infiltration basin, in a setting such as this. Indeed, other features and planting indeed such as Hydros can support biodiversity whilst also preventing access to people who you don't want to access such a basin, whilst not interfering with maintenance. Thank you, Mr. Davis,

53:05

did you want to come back on those points and specifically the comments by Mr. Carpenter on I did notice it in a previous Oh lambs, but not in the current om so was referenced degraded bands up to 1.5 metres tall.

53:18

As I understand that, this is an indicative design. So it would be wrong for me to say that that is actually where the pawns will end up on whether they will need bonds or not at this stage, and I think those will be details that will be resolved at a later stage during detailed design. Again, the capacity of the infiltration in the ground may have an impact on the locations of the actual ponds, it may need to remove is one area has got less capacity in the ground and another area. So some of those details are yet to come will probably influence the position and location of the final features.

54:03

Okay, thank you. I can see that Miss Bolger, you have your camera on your hand up. So anything you'd like to add at this point?

54:10

Yes, just just to say that as far as the the final appearance of these ponds is concerned, there is so much uncertainty at the moment and so much is being left until detailed design, that it is very difficult to be certain. And factors such as how much funding will be required. And in fact, it's to the Western and the southern side of the of the Southern most pond is shown at the moment how much funding will be

required, how close to the edge of the ponds it will be possible to plant whether there will be planting in the middle of the ponds or not. All of those are factors that will significantly change how they're going to appear in the landscape. And At the moment, we don't because we don't know, the detailed design. We don't know what that's what the implications of that's going to be.

55:10

Thank you for that. Mr. Davis, or any more you wanted to add on on that somebody goes back to my initial question really about, while noting the statement about it being outlined design, where we have lots of detail about possible other landscape effects, we seem to have a lot less detail about the possible landscape effective D of the buns, not the bump, sorry, the basins themselves.

55:38

as I've stated the factors still have to be resolved will influence the look and the position of the basin. We have tried to give an indication of what we are expecting at this stage. But it will change as information becomes more clear.

56:02

Thank you, and will that information in landscape terms become more clear during the examination period

56:13

bramah graphs but outcomes, it won't become clearer during examination period as it is, as mentioned earlier, a detailed same point and indeed one that we'll be discussing with the local communities as part of the substation, same principle statements in terms of the overall landscape treatments off the substation site, I would also point out that in terms of the bond locations themselves and the the bond height relative to the landscaping, relative to the substation infrastructure, they are small height elements, they are either screened by landscaping or the back back cloth to the to the to the bonds would be landscaping. So in terms of the significance of the visual aspects, the screening is very much a play in terms of mitigating any any potential impacts from from from those small bonds. We also have the potential obviously to plant on those bonds. So again, the bonds can be the same such that we have shrubbery, we have green, Meadow grass, whatever on the on the on the buns themselves, both on the dark side for Sunday and the inside face.

57:33

And planting will be possible on the Bund in engineering terms, I guess.

57:39

parameterless for dumpkins. trees can certainly planted on bonds, if the bonds are designed for planting that that's done is commonplace. If the decision is made to trees and are planted because of a five metre separation, will then not say it would be a shrub or grass feature that would be deployed. Thank you, Mr. Carpenter.

58:05

Thank you, sir. The as bands seem to come into the conversation on by all parties. And we will point out that these that these bonds are the retention structure for 10s of 1000s of cubic metres of water. Potentially, especially if these ponds do not work as intended or didn't perform as intended, then potentially holding quantities of water that would create a risk that is in red would not ordinarily be captured by the reservoir, right. So so the the necessity to construct those bonds out of or in a manner to ensure their their resilience and their integrity, given the volumes of water that we retain behind them. It needs to it needs to reflect that risk. And we would have grave concerns about anything, any vegetation that was substantive in any way, the implant being planted on those bonds. And we would expect that those bonds should be given the level of inspection and maintenance to reflect the potential hazard that they hold behind them. And they're likely to be consistent with you know, the landscaping approach that's being that's being illustrated.

59:24

Thank you, Mr. Carpenter. Mr. Margolis. I think we may have covered that point already. But is there anything else you want to add on there?

59:31

Prime across for the applicants again, we the detailed design could have multiple sunspots that could have the Tucson sponsor, we're showing that the capacity within the basins are all subject to detail the same and it goes absolutely goes without saying that any bond feature no matter what the purpose should it be purely landscaping or should be for water retention would be appropriately designed in line with the guidance and standards in place of the at the time.

59:58

Okay, thank you. I just have one final question for you, Mr. Grannis on this agenda item. And it's just a clarification really, earlier on in the agenda items with Mrs. Jones, you mentioned and please correct me if I'm wrong, but they'd have the whole of work area number 33 for drainage purposes during construction. And I just wanted to check, or to clarify that or how it would interact or work with early planting specified in the early lambs.

1:00:28

parameterless but Elkins, the early planting areas, or potential early planting areas, identified within the all am struggling landscape in the cost for monitoring plan is really focused at early planting areas that will not be disturbed. By virtue of the construction there's there's obviously a little point in establishing early planting, and then having to remove up by virtue of the of the construction works. So they're they're planting is very much at the periphery of the relevant so it's the hedgerows to the south of the subsections development substantial was too large to substation development, or indeed hydro strengthening at the age of core woodland that we're proposing within the within the landscape mitigation plan. So we don't see early planting, too. We don't see early planting as being a constraint through construction surface water management.

1:01:20

Thank you. Okay. I think that is all the questions I had on this agenda item. So I'm going to open up to the floor if you'd like. I know, for instance, at Christian parochial church Council have been very patient

and they wish to speak on this item. And if I could see hands from anybody else who wishes to raise anything on item, agenda item free D before we move on to agenda item for not seeing any hands. And Kristen parochial church council wish to say anything at this juncture Mr. I can see your hand now. Can you hear me? All right. I can. Thank you, Mr. If

1:02:04

so, clearly, this late stage was slightly off. Mr. level. Now there was going to speak about the impact on the landscape on system church. Now I was going to follow up. And I wish to do that now if I could test your patience on this. Because I'm the only one here today that actually lives in Pfister. And for those of us who have been sitting in and survived seven hours, the question there's got to be there's got to be a better way. And indeed, what we've heard is actually quite frightening in terms of what at this late stage of the examination process which has been extended, there's so much outstanding, which would give cause for concern, though, to our our community. But the point I want to move on to one of being a layman, one of the biggest challenges during this examination has been how to understand better the real issues and sift through the noise surrounding climate change and renewable energy. And as part of that, at the end of April access to webinar presentation by Sir DITA helm. So due to his professor of economic policy at the University of Oxford, and is regularly called upon as an advisor to the UK government on energy and climate change. his presentation was entitled net zero, the energy white paper and the cost of energy review, quite well mentioned. And the cost of energy review was a study he led for the government in 2017. So his thinking was set out some four years ago. The presentation was sponsored by the social policy Think Tank onward. It also coincides with the publication of his latest work, how we stop causing climate change. And I've read that along with other work of his. Actually, I've been following it. Since this examination started. This message is quite blunt, we must get to net zero carbon consumption. We must act now to avoid the adverse legacy of increasing climate change for future generations. It's not a happy read, since it calls on us to make substantial sacrifices to our lifestyles. And that probably explains why the government keeps kicking down kicking the can down the road and why he writes off 13 wasted years in failing to address effectively infrastructure issues. And in fairness to the industry, those wasted years probably also explain where we are today and the first station and consternation within the industry. The UK has not exploited effectively the potential benefits of its competitive advantage in wind power. meeting his work and what we face in piston to me is the wrong solution for the wrong problem. He calls for an overall national network infrastructure plan and that should incorporate the challenges of intermittency of renewables, the interactions between local networks, storage and carbon capture local generation batteries, none of these issues have been considered if at all in any great depth in this examination, these the wall because this all has to be planned and coordinated, but who should be responsible. So details in system that the system is planning and coordination should be the responsibility of the core system operator, and that should be publicly owned. It becomes the driver of investment in r&d, which in turn will incentivize the private sector. This cannot be left to the private sector, which is going to worry who pays and how bearing in mind the uncertainties of payback over a prolonged period. But it does explain how in our case National Grid as the systems operator has played an almost passive if not invasive? Well. First of all, the National Grid organisation has conflicts of interest with its separate commercial arms, not least the interconnectors, these are still waiting in the wings despite all of your ROI that has arisen during the current examination of the current proposals.

1:06:48

For the windfall operators, all their costs are up front. And they will ruthlessly exploit the system to minimise those costs by citing as close as possible to the coast regardless of environment, environmental costs. And here today, we've heard don't know how many times outlined a sign subject to this document diving, rolling for sure. This is causing well you have to challenge at this late stage. How realistic Can we trust SPR? And is this the right place? For what they propose we just a connection point. Consequently, the cumulative impacts and costs are not being addressed because they lack any incentive to do this. Instead, the proposals before so being considered in an inappropriate way. Those no that's no criticism knock yourselves as examiner's there was no sense of these being considered as part of an overall energy strategy. As with most of these developments, there was no proper cost benefit analysis, the cost of its own carbon footprint, loss of natural sequestration. And what we have covered before loss of social immunity, which contributes to healthier lifestyles and well being which are embedded in covenant government policies, which in turn, offer economic benefits of inward investment, and the visitor hospitality sector. And I have not mentioned size, we'll see whether developers have acknowledged that the carbon footprint will extend their own payback period. But the final point I want to make is that so data says that we should focus on the natural environment, and especially on natural secular state sequestration. I quote, bring the trees, the soils, the peat and the marine world into the carbon play. Here we are at the heart of the Sutter heritage coast. As I look out across from our church, all I see is loss and destruction. And that is our legacy for future generations.

1:09:10

Thank you very much, Mr. I for your contributions and thank you for your patience. Okay, before we move on, I do see a hand from Mr. Turney place. It's sorry, Mr. Ivey, if I could ask you to lower your hand and turn your camera off, please. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Attorney.

1:09:30

Thanks to the bridge attorney for spaces. Just very briefly, please on this final item D. The first point that we'd make is that when you're looking at the impacts of the location and scale of these drainage solutions, we just emphasise that they lie between the church and the historic farmhouses to the north. In other words, They sever an existing relationship. We've already made that point in our heritage submissions. But I just wanted to emphasise that for these purposes, there's also a historic footpath which lies effectively under the footprint of these basins. So when you're looking at the impacts of attenuation structures, sub structures of this size, they are structures which have a direct impact on the historic environment. And the final point on agenda item three, this I just wanted to mention briefly, is, of course, cumulative impacts. And the impact of increasing the size of the National Grid substation to accommodate additional projects, which has been shown on some plans inevitably means that there would need to be further drainage solutions and an expansion of existing or perhaps new sub features. So the cumulative impacts on surface water drainage on flood risk, and on the wider landscape and historic environment consequences of having to deal with that are matters which the examining authority should also take into account. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Turney.

1:11:12

Very useful. Just to just to reiterate really, that the cumulative impacts are obviously being considered by ourselves, but not specifically in this hearing. We are doing that via the written process. Mr. For you have your hand up.

1:11:29

Thank you, sir. Isabella, for on behalf of the Suffolk Council. So I would thank you for noting that point on cumulative impacts, I would endorse what Mr. Turney just said you already understand our concerns on cumulative impact assessments, just in terms of landscape and heritage impacts, the applicant has confirmed that their drainage proposals won't affect the landscape mitigation that they've proposed. And on that basis, the comments that we've made, particularly at deadline five remain. And as you know, we consider that the impacts on landscape and heritage are greater than those that have been assessed by the applicant. And we've made our representations on that. Obviously, if the outcome of the further infiltration testing throws up something new such that different mitigation proposals are required. We'll comment on that at Juco in due course, but at the moment, we're accepting what the applicant tells us. And so we don't want to identify any further heritage and landscape impacts beyond those which we've already raised. Thank you,

1:12:43

Mr. Hall. Just before we revert back to the applicant, is there anyone else who wishes to say anything on this agenda item free day? Okay, I'm not seeing any further hands. If I could ask Mr. further. To fall to put hand down, please. And I'll now go back to the applicants place.

1:13:11

Yes, Connie Smith, the applicant just in response at Mr. Attorneys point. In terms of the drainage solutions, clearly, they will be part of the overall landscape plan. And I think one of the things I would just suggest, is to urge a bit of caution about us just illustrating concentric circles, there will be a full proper integration of the features equally in the context of the features Foster's suggestions that are close to the church, etc. I would just ask you to note the the landscaping that already exists between affectively the areas where the potential suds might go to the west of the substation sites, and the church there already strong landscape features, which really make it almost I would suggest impossible to see these matters, no doubt, you will see that equally, if you look at the landscape plans, you will see that landscape framework or it will sit within that within woodland and other areas which we have identified. So in my submission, I think there is an overstatement as to the potential impacts that these features may have, particularly with the potential for them to host various grassland and other features, which will help integrate and helpfully potentially aid other aspects as well. So I think a key aspect of this is, is these are indicative in a final design that we're trying to make them look and fit as well as possible within the landscape framework which has been created. And I think it is particularly important to understand but we've always understood that this side, it will be important that the landscape set a framework and we've been slightly through the boundaries and why we've got there Earlier today, but that's the context all these features is part of that Lidl framework. There was always going to be part of this overall proposal, and has been absolutely from the start of the site site selection. And I'd refer you to appendix 4.5 of the ies which clearly sets out, we had full regard to the potential impacts, the impacts that are set out in that document, and landscape and visual terms are largely the ones we're speaking

about today. And the response that we would make in terms of a landscape framework are part I have always been the intention at work was needed and brought forward together with these applications.

1:15:46

So that's really, I'm restricting my comments to landscaping, landscaping, visual matters, which I think is the primary matter which is raised under this topic heading. I'm not going to go into other matters which you've identified, your voter asked questions on. Thank you, sir.

1:16:00

Thank you very much, Mr. Ennis. Okay, we should now move on to agenda item four, which is any other business? There are no other matters that the examining authorities wish to raise during today's hearing. Before we move on to review actions and next steps, I'll ask anybody who has any other business that they wish to raise in this hearing. I have one hand from Mr. Turney. And we have Mrs. Gilmore as well. So we go to Mr. Tony for safety's first place.

1:16:35

You'll probably tell me, which tape says sorry, you'll probably tell me that this is for the action points. But I just wanted to emphasise that, in light of what's being said today, there's still a very significant concern about elements of uncertainty in the project. And I know you'll be posing further questions to national grid, in particular. And the main point that we emphasise is the lack of justification for the parameters that are shown on plans, and which are contained in various documents the design principles, and indeed, in the draft DCA, and in particular, for national grid. We'd emphasise the lack of explanation of the scale, and the full purpose of each of the cable semaine compounds, including the existence of the additional circuit breaker this I referred to earlier, in the northwest cable sealing and compound, and also an explanation of the size and true capacity of the proposed substation. And the fact that none of that infrastructure is affected by losing half of the capacity by losing one of the proposed substations for the project's causes us alarm as to the Purpose and Need for structures of those scale. We also emphasise the issue of the control of design. And my short point is that from what you've heard today, the applicant is being fundamentally inconsistent in relying on subsequent consultation on the approvals process, and so on, whilst at the same time saying that the engineering design, the power design of this project will be settled before there is any further engagement with the people at first and, and before there is a submission to the approving planning authority. And those matters, which we say need to be given further consideration and examination in particular. And I just draw those out is, of course, far broader issues from today about flood risk and so on, but I just draw those as points of particular emphasis. Thank you.

1:18:46

Thank you for that. Mr. Attorney. Obviously, you raised yourself there will be number of action points, including questions for national grid. And honestly, you'll have a chance to respond to their answers to those and put in any further comments on behalf of safeties that you wish. If I could move on now to Mrs. Gilmore for CS please.

1:19:10

Good afternoon. Speaking on behalf of see, first of all, I have sat and listened for seven hours I think it is and it has confirmed I've received texts and emails during today's hearing from the supporters who live in Princeton, who have reinforced their concern that I wish to share with you that the whole question of the classroom has not been resolved satisfactorily and they are concerned and we are concerned that the risk is far too great for the site location. That's the first point. Second point I would endorse everything that say this and they're specialists and Mr. Richard Send me a set today, we totally endorse all those points. And finally, I would just like to say, as you know, we are not happy that these extensions are taking place to the examination because we doubled our efforts to complete all our submissions in time for the closure. We said goodbye, thinking it was combined. And we, if you like entered our pocket, so we have many resources remaining for specialists and so forth. But what I would like to say to you is that given that these examinations have been extended, we do feel wherefore there are one or two outstanding questions that are not on your agenda for Friday. And yet we feel that perhaps they should be addressed. And perhaps you're going to say to me, Well, there's always the written submissions. Nonetheless, I think the way that you work, examine something in a live hearing allows that subject to be fully ventilated. And I would suggest that tourism has still not been fully addressed. There are many aspects of tourism, that I don't feel the applicant has recognised or acknowledged. So I would ask you to consider between today and Friday, if there is any opportunity for us to have a few words on tourism. Thank you, sir.

1:21:44

Thank you very much, Miss Gilmore, your comments are noted. Thank you. Okay, just before we move on, does the applicant wish to respond briefly on any of those points?

1:22:00

callers have a half the applicant? I'm just turning to a number of matters of clarification. Mr. Turney. That's right raised regarding national grid. I think a lot of questions have been answered earlier in hearings with very clear answers. But in terms of the matters raised today, we will certainly contact national grid and encouraged that response to those questions of clarification, particularly around the electrical infrastructure that's required to connect these projects. We've provided our explanation of our understanding, but we will certainly encourage national grid to fully respond in relation to those matters. In terms of Finnick Gilmore's comments above the SE C's, whilst we've had an extension, extensive discussion about flooding, flood risk. The fundamental point about the flooding infrastructure provided is that in extreme events, which climate change may give rise to the factors that infrastructure associated with this development would actually result in a betterment from the area and of the catchment, to which feeds into Freston. So, I think it can get lost in the whole debate. But there is opportunities through this development, in essence, to provide a betterment for extreme flooding events. And that is what we have said throughout the process is all our flood risk assessment. And our discharge were based on not making the situation worse. I A Cuba discharge, a secondly, in terms of the bigger risk, the larger event, putting in place infrastructure, which would manage that and result in a button in terms of production. So I just want to make that position clear, because it can get a bit lost in the context of the some of those discussions. And obviously, matters for Friday have been settled in an agenda. And it's entirely a matter for the panel should on any other matters that you might might want to discuss at that hearing on Friday. I've got nothing else to add. Thank you.

1:24:11

Thank you very much, Mr. Innes. Okay, that brings us to item five of our agenda, which is procedural decisions, review of actions and next steps. We haven't identified the need to make any procedural decisions today. We do have a list of actions arising from these hearings. There's 10 of them at present. We've tried to flag down as we've progressed, and we'll aim to publish these on the national infrastructure planning website by the close of play on Friday. And as I've mentioned a couple of times these will include questions two and get that we were unable to ask directly today. 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. And I'm now going to hand back to my colleague Mrs. Jones to take you through the next step and to close the hearings.

1:24:58

Thank you Mr. Hockley. This has been issue specific hearings number 16. Our next and final hearings in these examinations will be issue specific hearings 17, on the topic of the draft development consent orders, and that starts at 10am. On Friday, the 28th of May. That brings us to agenda item six. I would like to thank all of our speakers today for your attendance and all of your contributions. We are hugely appreciative of your time today. I'd also like to thank our case team who was led by Mr. fedden today for supporting these hearings. So I'll have a final check that there isn't anything else that anybody wishes to raise before we close? No. And so in that case, I will ask my colleagues to say their goodbyes.

1:25:48

Thank you, Mr. Jones, and thank you to everybody for your contributions today. It's been most useful. Thank you.

1:25:55

Thank you very much, again, from my sufferings for the panel aid. Everybody's contributions have been greatly appreciated. And it's goodbye from me. Thank you very much, everybody. Good afternoon.

1:26:10

Thank you all again, the time is now 1656 on these issues, specific hearings 16 are now closed. Okay, bye.