

Unknown Speaker 0:02  
Mr. Smith, you're muted again.

Unknown Speaker 0:06  
One of these days Ladies and gentlemen, I will learn how to do this. And welcome back ladies and gentlemen from that break, and if we can now call ourselves to order and resume our places in the virtual room so that we can start business on time at 1135. My name is Rynd Smith, I'm the lead member of the examining authorities and I'm now in turn just going to briefly ask my fellow panel members to introduce themselves again.

Unknown Speaker 0:36  
Good morning all. Welcome back. John Hockley here.

Unknown Speaker 0:41  
Good morning, everyone. Caroline Jones.

Unknown Speaker 0:44  
Good morning, Jessica Powis.

Unknown Speaker 0:48  
Good morning, everyone. Welcome back guy, Rigby.

Unknown Speaker 0:51  
Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. Now, just a couple of brief preliminary remarks and what I'm proposing that we now do is that we run this session if it needs to up as far as 1pm, when we will aim to break at that point for lunch. And I will announce at that point what arrangements we're making for the duration of lunch. But yes, we'll be running this to approximately 1pm. And can I briefly before we restart, check with the applicant? Has there been any progress on connection issues over the break? Are we in a position to establish video contact with the applicant at all?

Unknown Speaker 1:31  
Yes, Colin Innes speaking. You've got the choice of video or sound and at the moment we're choosing better quality sound would be the right option. At lunchtime, we're going to explore whether we can conjoin the two but at the moment, we are better on sound I think.

Unknown Speaker 1:49  
Yes, all I will remark there Mr Innes, is that there may well be that a combination of more than one type of device will give you what you seek. And it might be possible to add, say, for example, a video connection through a mobile phone using the team's application that will enable you to see and be seen. But use a separate device for your sound connection. I leave that entirely up to you. I think at the moment, you know, we can proceed on the basis that you're connected as you currently are. But if we can get you properly connected after lunch that will assist greatly. Now ladies and gentlemen, before I return us to Agenda Items two and three and return to oral submissions with Richard Turney of council for SASES. I do specifically want to thank Counsellor fellows for what were very clearly made submissions in the session just before the break, and to reassure her in relation to some of her anxieties that her internet connection remained stable and fine and at all stages. We were able to hear absolutely everything that she said. And we trust that it all was able to be recorded and So, again, we do acknowledge that there are potentially some concerns about internet stability, broadband capacity,

etc, in the obrace and surrounding areas. But hopefully, this experiment having proceeded we've at least seen one local representative able to participate in these events. very well indeed. So thank you very much again, councillor fellows. I'm now then going to turn to Richard Turney of counsel for SASES. And if Mr. Turney, you can take us through your principal submissions on examination method with particular reference to virtual as against physical hearings. And if you are intending to make legal submissions to us in detail on this point, if you could flag that at the outset because, again, there are some specific questions that I may need to put to you as you move through your submissions. Mr. Turney,

Unknown Speaker 4:07

Thank you for that. As I turned my video on my stream of view became slightly unstable. And I'm going to try and turn it on again, if I may,

Unknown Speaker 4:17

by all means let's take this as steadily as needs be.

Unknown Speaker 4:22

I can see you perfectly now. So

Unknown Speaker 4:24

thank you very much, sir. Can I say at the outset that by way of introduction, and now it's the first time I'm being asked to comment substantially, that the group I represent Of course, are not formally representing any wider constituency. It is not a town council or a parish Council and so on. And we are of course communicating with others and others may endorse the position that we adopt and of course, we will assist in communicating with others. And But first of all, we're not controlling a larger group of people, we're not formally representing them. And of course, any communication from us to others is not a substitute for what will doubtless be communications from the planning Inspectorate. So I just said that by way of introduction, so it's not thought that I'm claiming to represent some wider constituency, which I'm not. And there are three points, I think. Sir in your requests here, the first one is general approach to examination, then the BEIS review, and then a question about digital exclusion. And obviously, the three overlap to some extent, on the general approach to examination, of course, perfectly, except that the starting point is that this is a written process. That's in the act, of course, but as to the need for oral events here, issue specific hearings I'm talking about here, of course, there'll be open floor discussions and compulsory acquisition hearings. But for issue specific hearings, we do say that those hearings are necessary here. And indeed, of course, when you looked at this matter in March, you were anticipating a fairly rigorous program of issue specific hearings, including 30 hearings on a number of points of considerable importance. So the message that we would wish to convey in the submission would wish to make is that the circumstances of the pandemic, do not themselves alter the need for the rigorous examination of the proposals, including through issue specific hearings. And that's the overall point as to live events versus events via teams. We of course, recognize the restrictions that are in place and We can't say that in any way the examining authority should disregard those. So it will be guided by, first of all the legislative restrictions and then its own view on health and safety matters. And we're not at this stage going to second guess those conclusions. There may be submissions later in the process, if points come up for debate, but we're led, we're led by you in the first instance. And we recognize the restrictions as to whether remote events

mean that oral hearings need to be treated differently in terms of whether they're required, just simply to emphasize that, as you know, sir the Inspectorate more generally, is grappling now with the full range of casework through remote means, and we see no reason why this examination should not be able to do the same in other words, That Matters can proceed, but also they can be heard in the same way, albeit remotely. And there are of course problems, but there are problems with live events as well. And we, we are learning to manage them. And so we do support the idea that there will be a range of issues specific hearings, we've made detailed submissions on what at least they should cover, and that those can be conducted remotely if that remains necessary when they come around.

Unknown Speaker 8:32

In terms of so that's the overall approach to examination, emphasizing really the need for issue specific hearings because of the considerable importance of the subject matter. In terms of the offshore transmission network review, announced by BEIS in July, the review, as we see it, and I think as BEIS see it brings these projects into its scope, because this includes in the medium term work stream, those projects which will connect to the onshore network in the near future, primarily those connecting after 2025. So that brings these projects into scope. And we, of course, so your report will go to the person who is receiving the output of that review. So it's impossible to say that it should be somehow siloed. From this consideration. We do say there's a need for you to examine that issue to consider whether there is a broader point about coordination on which you should report to the Secretary of State given the scope of his review, in terms of whether the examination should be delayed for that review. We recognize the impediments to that, although we would from my clients perspective, warmly welcome, such a delay, we do recognize the impediments to causing such a delay at this stage in the process. But if it is not to be delayed pending the outcome of that review, at the very least that review needs to be considered during the course of the examination. And we do say that that should include through issue specific hearing. And it relates to the broader point about the other projects. And we've made a number of observations already about cumulative impacts, but also about issues about site selection, which may in themselves have been informed by looking forward to other projects as well. And so that's the BEIS review. And in terms of digital exclusion, the question you posed was whether we were aware of anybody who was outside of the process, and it because of digital exclusion, in general terms. Yes, we are. We can look for specifics, but we are aware that people in the Friston and areas some people in the Friston area do not have access to digital means of communication on a regular basis. There is an elderly population in the area as one would anticipate. And not everyone has the means to access events or documents online. And if we can provide further information about specifics, we will do, but the general observation is, yes, there is digital exclusion. And there's a broader concern as well as I've been asked to raise which is about email communications. And I know points been raised with the case team, and doubtless there'll be being looked at I'm sure, but a number of communications have not been received from all registered participants through the email notification system and There were also issues yesterday about joining instructions for these events being distributed. And I don't suggest that an answer is provided now, but I do flag it with you sir as the lead examiner, simply because it is an issue which has arisen. And it would be irresponsible of me to say, in a few months time when it becomes a serious if it were to become a serious issue and to say

what actually there wasn't an issue prior to the preliminary meeting, but I didn't think to mention it. So I flag it. I'm not asking for resolution.

Unknown Speaker 12:31

No. Can I specifically respond to that that point? And, you know, I'm extraordinarily grateful for any intelligence that you and indeed, any interested party in these processes can provide us? Because as you'll be conscious, you know, this is only the second pair of preliminary meetings to be held virtually for planning act 2008 processes by the planning Inspectorate. And the logistical challenges of organizing these very large processes are shall we say significant in comparison with maybe the logistical challenges associated with holding a small section 78 appeal with maybe two or three parties. And we're on a learning curve, we openly admit that we are and we don't intend to, in any way willfully exclude anybody, but we also need to continuously improve, and the only way we can continuously improve is if we know of our errors. So, please do let us know and particularly in relation to our decision making around procedure here, if there are specifics that can be put to us by Procedural Deadline C, that would be extremely helpful. And we will, you know, obviously, conducted an ongoing conversation throughout these processes with the case team and the folk who are responsible for administration here to make sure that we are always as far as we are aware, delivering the best possible means of and the most effective form of communication for the parties who are engaged, and if things are dropped, tell us and we will do our utmost to try and un-drop them.

Unknown Speaker 14:11

Mr. Turney, Please continue.

Unknown Speaker 14:13

no, that was all I wanted to say on those on those three broad issues of the overall shape of the examination, the BEIS review, and digital exclusion. So unless I can assist you, sir,

Unknown Speaker 14:25

thank you very much. And, as I have indicated before, we are very much in listening mode today, I'm not going to provide detailed reasoning or responses to these submissions because it'd be unfair to do so we need to deliberate on them. And we need to deliberate on them in the light of that which appears to us in writing the Procedural Deadline C from the people using the live stream and the catch up service. So I'm then going to move on to Save Our Sandlings and Mr. Paul Chandler, and if I could invite him to make submissions on the same topics on the same basis. Mr. Chandler, the floor is yours.

Unknown Speaker 15:03

Thank you very much. Firstly I'd like to just say I concur with the three previous speakers. Everything they have said I would also have said in regards to being digitally disadvantaged we are as was previously mentioned, there are a number of elderly residents in the area and not all of them are IT savvy and we don't have the best of internet connections here on the on the Suffolk coast. So it is quite difficult for people to partake in virtual events. So with regard to open floor hearings, I think it would be appreciated if they can be held face to face. Because a number of people don't feel comfortable talking to a camera, they'd far rather look at someone. Now obviously we have to be aware of the health regulations and what's happening around us in this

brave new world that we're, we're now in. So if it should have to be a virtual open floor hearing. If that could be held in a, in a venue of the sports hall or some form of open area where people can be separated, have social distancing, but can have a camera and a remote microphone that they can talk to. That would be preferable perhaps then doing it from their home. Where again, I say they don't necessarily have the right technical equipment to be able to do that. Now regarding the BEIS review, I totally agree with what councillor fellows has said and the previous speaker. Yes, it's to our minds this application should be subject to that review, because it won't be coming on stream either of these two projects will be coming on stream until beyond 2025 therefore, we feel that that should be subject to whatever the outcome of the BEIS review should be. On regarding of company site visits, I appreciate if they can be held again they are accompanied site visits we can be there and discuss various aspects of the application and the impacts that they will have on the surrounding biodiversity and so on. That would be very much welcomed. I know this is going to come up in item eight and I do feel the company site visits wrong time of year.

Unknown Speaker 17:52

Okay, there are some detail points there sir about site inspections and we will touch those in much more detail in the following agenda items I mean now we're really just trying to land this kind of virtual versus physical versus blended approach and thank you very much for those submissions and again as a reassurance in terms of the examining authorities ability to see and hear what you have said again your internet connection has been excellent so everything should have I am fortunate on to the recording very well and gone to the live stream well are there any other matters that you want to put to us or shall I now just move on to Mr. And Mrs. Courage?

Unknown Speaker 18:36

No, I think they've all been covered previously. Thank you.

Unknown Speaker 18:40

Okay. So can I now call on Charles Courage and Sarah Courage to their points on these questions?

Unknown Speaker 18:49

Oh, good morning, Phil. Just

Unknown Speaker 18:53

thank you. And also we would like to thank Maryam fellows for so They voicing many of our and her constituents concerns. We agree with her wholeheartedly. And also thanks to Richard Turney. We would like to ask if the way the last form was presented could be changed. For example, it will be helpful, very helpful if we could, if the form could be printed out also to see a full copy of the document before completing it. Why not include an option to save it? Has PINs asked a stakeholder to be involved in the planning of virtual events and the design of your forms? If not, why not?

Unknown Speaker 19:54

Are you still hearing me?

Unknown Speaker 19:56

Yes, I'm hearing you perfectly. Yeah. Just you have gone

Unknown Speaker 20:01

We are many of our other locals have found this virtual meeting and training session for teams extremely stressful. We are not professional people, and have very little IT experience, but just care immensely about our part of Suffolk. Thank you.

Unknown Speaker 20:24

Thank you. Thank you very much. Now, just before I move on

Unknown Speaker 20:29

Mrs. Courage, can I just check that

Unknown Speaker 20:32

you you're content with those submissions or just ask whether you have anything further to add?

Unknown Speaker 20:37

No, I think that is everything but we would be very grateful if the form future forms could be more user friendly

Unknown Speaker 20:45

as they are not at the moment.

Unknown Speaker 20:47

Okay. Well, we will look into that. I mean, one of the issues that that we have to deal with, of course, is essentially working with, you know, the range of technology and the solutions that we do have available to us. But, you know, we will look into that we'll see what we can do. Now, we need to move on to the applicants to give them their right of response to these submissions. And what I'm actually just going to do before I do Mr. Innes is I'm just going to draw out two or three matters, simply because they are matters that may emerge in the written submissions. And there are matters that therefore, even though they haven't been addressed already Today, I would like you to turn your responses to briefly whether that be now or in writing a Procedural Deadline C, and so that is in relation to any suggestions around the fact that we might have physical only processes. I did just briefly wish to draw attention to the written ministerial statement, the 13th of May 2020, which sets out expectations as to how the planning system should be operating during the covid 19 pandemic and that In summary terms makes clear the government's view that virtual procedures are allowed by the current legislative framework and should be in, quote, the default method of operation in the vast majority of cases. And the government expects everybody involved in the planning process to engage proactively. Now that written ministerial statement is, as I've said, 13th of May it's quite old, but it hasn't been revised and it hasn't been withdrawn. And so again, if anybody is putting submissions to us on these points in and suggesting that we should be only conducting physical events, and it would be useful if they could address that particular point. I would also draw attention to the latest iteration of the Coronavirus, public health regulations that have emerged establishing limitations particularly the rule of six and the new guidance and asked if anybody is making written submissions of deadline, Procedural Deadline C, they should address those if there is any view that somehow we are legally disabled from holding other than physical hearings. We are aware of a decision in the case of Tingey and the Secretary of State for housing Communities and Local Government in Horsham District Council. And I will ensure the reference to that finds its way into the examination library immediately after this hearing, if anybody wishes to see that

that can be placed on screen by Mr. Williams, which in summary terms and brings forward the view that virtual proceedings are in principle, both lawful and appropriate for a broad range of planning matters and should proceed in preference to further adjournment. And so I just wanted to make sure that those matters were matters that anybody making written submissions after today were aware of and have an opportunity to put their views on in relation to And so what I'm now going to do then is to call on Mr. Innes, for the applicants to respond, should they wish to the matters raised, but if they are able to address the possibility that they might facilitate some additional responses to points of digital exclusion, that would also be greatly appreciated. So Mr. Innes

Unknown Speaker 24:25

Thank you, sir. If I could kick off by looking at the concept of the approach to the examination process. The applicants are open to flexible approach to examination noting the current circumstances respect to covered and evolving guidance. The applicants are keen to ensure a fair examination whereby all interested parties are given the opportunity to participate in the examination, whilst ensuring the health and safety of those participating. The applicants view is that hearings should take place virtually at this stage and the applicants view virtual hearings are more likely to be able to take place in the current circumstances and occur within the examination timetable provided. Virtual hearings would reduce the risk of persons not being able to attend hearings due to any future or local general restrictions, or persons subject to quarantine or shielding, being only able to attend if a hearing were in person in the event that is considered necessary to hold any in person hearings, the applicants review that a hybrid approach should be used providing appropriate [inaudible] is available, allowing both in person and virtual attendance. This would allow persons to attend the venue and participate in hearings in person if they wished, subject to government guidance in relation to coronavirus restrictions at the time and appropriate safety measures have been put in place at the venue whilst also allowing those that are unable to or less comfortable attending in person to take part in the hearings remotely. In the event that it is considered necessary for any physical hearings to take place, which suggests that a virtual backup is provided for in the event that it could not go ahead. I just want to highlight that the applicants have secured Snape Maltings for all the proposed hearing dates specified within the rule six letter should the examining authority decide to proceed with either hybrid or physical hearings. The applicants have also investigated the availability of the Snape Maltings for hearings during the weeks commencing the 25th of January and first February 2021. And in order to assist examining authority, with finalizing Examination Timetable the applicants have temporary serve these dates in case they are required. And that essentially sets out our general approach. And I think it one which broadly accords with how it is proposed for the examination to be conducted. The specific issue that's been raised this morning, is the issue about those that are just disadvantaged by potentially not having access to means of participation through Other means now, in terms of this, from what it suggested the applicant does is the maybe a possibility to set up some sort of facility at Snape Maltings, which would allow a party to participate in, for example, in open floor hearing, with technology available there for them to participate. That's something we would explore and come back to you on. And there's two aspects to that, obviously working out how the technology would be compatible and work with that which was being proposed within the examination. But also Snape Maltings would have to carry out their own

risk assessment and advise us how that might work in practice, but in terms of a positive matter, that seems to us most likely ability to potentially open up an avenue for those who could not participate and other ways to actually participate. But I think I think the important aspect is that it would probably need quite a lot of special measures in place. And hopefully, it would be reserved for people who genuinely need it a forum of access to the examination, rather than just a choice. I think it'd be quite hard. If everyone chose that method. I'm not sure that that would Necessarily afford an opportunity to have an efficient open floor hearing process. But what we will do is we'll we will explore that and come back with and report back to you on that measure to see whether it is possible. We have already taken steps to make the application material hardcopy available and it's currently available on the Leiston-Cum-Sizewell Town Council offices and it can still be physically inspected. So we have that locally if the application documents are available for physical inspection. So that really ends my sort of points in relation to the process. And I was then going to go on and deal with the matter for regarding the BEIS consultation.

Unknown Speaker 29:12

Yes indeed. Thank you very much.

Unknown Speaker 29:20

Well scottishpower renewables welcome the energy ministers announcements on the 15th of July regarding the review into the existing offshore transmission regime. This review aims to address the barriers the regime presents to further significant deployments of offshore wind, with a view to achieving net zero ambitions. This review will be led by the Department of Business energy and industrial strategy, and it splits into two work streams with different timescales. These are defined as return term and long term work streams. An update will be published by the end of this year with a view to providing clarity for an enduring approach in 2021. This update appears to relate to a new regime that enables and incentivizes coordination, however done understand that this update will not provide conclusions to the medium term work stream nor implement changes to the existing regime. No data is provided as to when the output software review will be published or implemented. The timetable for the significant reform required to establish a new regulatory and technical framework for an offshore transmission network is likely to take a number of years. The Applicants have submitted applications for development consent for the projects, and are currently at the preliminary meeting stage of the consensus process, with examinations due to start in less than one month. And as national policy statement Em3 for renewable energy states at paragraph 2.6 point three for the applicants for consent for offshore wind farms will have to work within the regulatory framework regulatory regime for offshore consumption networks established by Ofgem under the regime offshore transmission will be licensed and activity regulated by Ofgem the applicants have progressed the projects in line with the regulatory regime for offshore transmission networks established by Ofgem national grid in conjunction with the offshore developers including scottishpower renewables coordinated a study into looking at an offshore ring main and in 2015. It published its report integrated offshore transmission project [inaudible] final report conclusions and recommendations August 2015. It examined in the context of East Anglia, Hornsea and Dogger bank rain three zones, the potential for offsetting the need for new offshore infrastructure by establishing an integrated design approach to the connection of these generation zones. This approach would include the use of interconnection between offshore zones,



offshore transmission assets, and optimizing connections to the onshore transmission system. The findings outlined a number of issues associated with the potential offshore ring main and It concluded that in relation to the offshore ring main, the project team does not believe it would be economically inefficient to progress with advance on integrative design philosophy or delivery of anticipatory At this time, changes to a coordinated approach on offshore transmission would require regulatory change to deliver it, and it's likely to be subject to public procurement. Given the considerable time periods that would be involved in developing this, the applicants have a legitimate expectation that the applications will be considered within the current regulatory framework. In light of paragraph 2.6, point three four of MPs cn three, the applicant note representations from interested parties requesting a suspension of the project examinations until such time as the BEIS review has been completed. This would result in unacceptable delays to projects, which would prevent them from achieving their objective of delivering much needed renewable energy within the current proposed timescales and contributing to net zero emissions and the UK government's targets of 40 gigawatts of offshore wind energy by 2030. We therefore do not agree that the examinations of a project can or should be delayed until the completion of the BEIS offshore transmission network review. And that really concludes the applicants response and in relation to the matters that have been raised. In terms of the supplementary matters. We propose we've partially addressed those in relation to our submission on process in terms of those, but we note that the matters and will probably amplify our response in relation to our written submission to the deadline.

Unknown Speaker 33:35

Thank you very much, Mr. Innes. On that basis, I'm not just now going to check around the virtual room before I move on to make sure there is nobody sitting in the virtual room believing that they ought be heard on agenda items two or agenda items, three on these organizational matters about events, hearings, etc. in high principle, before I just bring these two items, to a close with some final remarks. And I will give him that some of our connections can lag for 10 or 15 seconds or so just ask again to see raised hands or cameras switched on, or here and introjection by phone if anybody wishes to finally, to speak on these matters. I'm not seeing or hearing anybody. So I will move to bring these two agenda items and to a close with some brief final remarks. And a number of the oral submissions made and raised issues about hearings and critically examinations do require hearings to be held. And the draft examination timetable does include provision for these and those places where witnesses are invited to speak and where the examining authorities gather and test oral evidence and there are three types of hearings that may be held. I will remind you ladies and gentlemen Firstly, any registered interested party can request an open floor hearing to make oral representations about the application. And if they believe this to be preferable to an involvement that restricts their representation to the written form, although again, I do emphasize the both the written representation and an oral representation is an open floor hearing carry equal weight, in principle. And we have already opened up around of requests to be heard at some virtual open floor hearings to be held immediately after the start of the examinations. And now, the reason why we opened those up as virtual because was because at the time again, we did all of the organization wasn't clear they could be held physically at all. And having decided to notify them virtually. We are retaining we believe those as virtual events. And however, and we do note that deadline one in the timetable provides Second, and indeed the main

opportunity to request to be heard in the examinations. And there will be later open floor hearings, which depending on the legal and guidance, circumstances around the pandemic was applied at the time, could be virtual, physical, blended, etc. So, again, if you are sitting there outside the room today thinking that you haven't requested to be heard in the initial virtual events because you'd prefer to be heard physically, please do make a request to be heard at deadline one. However, what I would caution you is that whilst we will endeavor to hear you in person that may not be possible at the time, we'll do our best. open floor hearings do not have subject matter limited agendas. An open floor hearing a participant can say anything that is important or relevant. But in order to be fair to the large numbers, who often asked to use these speaking opportunities, the speaking times are time limited. In these examinations were proposing limits of approximately five minutes for an individual speaker, and 10 minutes for an organization. Now, this then takes me on to an important observation. There are some substantial requests to be heard of the first round of open floor hearings by bodies, including the local authorities, community and environmental campaign bodies, such as SASES. And what I will now flag is that the best use of open floor hearing time is it's used by individual interested parties, typically those who are unrepresented and wish to have their say unconstrained by an agenda. I'll speak shortly about issues specific hearings, but I'll flag that it's our intention that we will in any case invite local authorities, other statutory parties, and the main community and environmental campaigns, including SASES and SOS

Unknown Speaker 37:55

to participate in all relevant issues specific hearings as speaking parties. these hearings will of course have agendas, we will be providing longer advance notice of them than would typically have been the case in the past. They will be about the topics that we already identify are of substantial local concerns such as the selection of the land fall, cable corridors on shore, the transmission system connections, Friston landscapes, the historic and biological environments, transport, social and economic effects to raise the obvious main issues emerging from written submissions. And so we intend that the local authorities statutory parties community environmental campaign bodies will be invited and we'd be full speaking participants of these issues specific hearings, they will be held a little later than we had originally intended. So that we can focus things as much as we possibly can in writing first given the the the Coronavirus emergency that we face, but they will deal with all of the matters that in our original pre COVID timetable We identified will be heard. What I will also then flag is that it may follow that some organizations may not necessarily need the large number of slots or the extent of hearing time that they have been seeking at the early stage open floor hearings. And then very briefly going to remind us that there are other types of hearings that we hold including compulsory acquisition hearings, and, given the applicant has made a compulsory acquisition and temporary possession requests in both applications. Affected persons. These are people whose land or rights are impacted, are entitled to be heard at a compulsory acquisition hearing and these will be held again, in person if possible, and virtually, if not, or possibly using blended techniques. Finally, the examining authorities have the discretion to hold issue specific hearings as I've outlined and These differ from the other two types of hearing and that attendance is by invitation from the examining authorities to address the specific issues that we wish to examine. But, as you've hopefully just heard from me in my remarks on open floor hearings, we intend to structure that invitation process to

make sure the main community representative bodies are always around those tables. My colleague Caroline Jones is going to lead agenda item seven and eight, where we're going to speak in detail about the new arrangements for hearings and including issue specific hearings. And however, and whilst we're currently proposing to commence the interrogation of issues in writing and have deferred issue specific hearings until a little later in the examinations, and again, I cannot emphasize too much that the issues that drover in principle draft proposals to hold these when we are now proposing to hold them do not mean The issues are anything other than just as important and relevant as they were at the outset. So I wish to reassure you on that point as it is risen, arisen repeatedly in oral submissions today, and we will remain alive throughout matters that the parties are likely to wish to raise with us, including work by Ofgem and the BEIS review of offshore connections. These are matters that will be fully ventilated to the extent feasible throughout the examinations. I'll finally before I conclude my closing remarks on hearings remind you that we do normally hold issue specific hearings on the draft development consent order, it is normal practice to hold these on a without prejudice basis. This means the parties can suggest modifications and amendments to draft development consent orders proposed by the applicants without prejudicing their overall position on the application, which might be that the applications should not be granted.

Unknown Speaker 41:57

I'll then briefly draw together some remarks. In relation to site inspections responding to various of the issues raised orally. And there are two types of site inspections that can be undertaken by members of the examining authorities as part of the examinations processes. These are known as unaccompanied site inspections and accompanied site inspections. The purpose of any inspection is for the examining authorities to see features of the proposal within the context of the evidence put forward. And you'll note that we've already undertaken a number of unaccompanied site inspections. And we have published notes of these on the project pages of the planning inspectors national infrastructure website landing pages for both applications. And we will be undertaking further and unaccompanied site inspections in due course. Now I raised that because clearly it is much easier for us to conduct a covid secure and unaccompanied site inspection with the rule of six as it is currently in force. What I will then flag is that interested parties have The opportunity to ask us to visit particular places on a unaccompanied basis, even if they do not attend themselves now flag deadline one. In the drafting examination timetable is the place where such requests should be made. Accompanied site inspections are only necessary to view land to which there's no public right of access, or that cannot easily be seen from nearby locations with open public access. And again, we've included the deadline, deadline one for submissions, requesting that we undertake a company site inspections. And to the extent that the COVID regulations allow us to do so we aim to do so and because these are outside typically, we very much hope that they will be able to proceed. But what I do wish to is wrap a little bit of guidance around I guess, is to flag that accompanies site inspections, therefore familiarization, not debate. They're not here. hearings, they're not a place where there's a discussion about the merits of the proposed development. Essentially, they're just there to make sure the examining authority has seen the right place, and the right physical features of the place relevant to the issues that are raised. And the issues should be raised either in written representations or orally, in an open floor

or issue specific hearing. So, ladies and gentlemen, that draws me through to the end of my remarks about the process of the examinations, it takes us to the end of agenda items three, at the conclusion of the examinations, we will be providing recommendation reports, two of them, one for each application to the Secretary of State for business, energy and industrial strategy. And that Secretary of State will consider the evidence in relation to both applications and review our recommendations before making final decisions on the application. Now, that concludes all of my remarks about the examination process. I trust that anything else that people wish to find out about? It is made clear in our frequently asked questions, or in annex B to our rule six letter. Does anybody who is here today need any additional clarification or wish to make any final oral submissions on those general matters? bearing in mind that the later agenda items go into those in much more detail and so matters, for example, in relation to the specific dates or times of events or things that we will deal with? Later on in the agenda? I will just check. Are there any hands raised? Are there any cameras switching on? Is anybody intervening by telephone? Again, I'm not seeing I'm allowing a little time to pass. And I'm not seeing raised hands. I'm not seeing new cameras, and I'm not hearing any telephone interjections.

Unknown Speaker 45:53

And so then, ladies and gentlemen, one final remark is to touch on Legislation policy and guidance. And just to remind you all that we operate within the overarching framework of national policy statements for energy, also known as MPs En1, and the policy statement for renewable energy MPs En3, and to the degree that the proposals affect and amend the transmission system, or the policy statement for energy networks, MPs, En5, those apply to these examinations. And the suite of policies are now approximately nine years old or more. But it's clear to ask that they're intended to remain in force and less withdrawn or suspended in whole or part by the Secretary of State and none of those steps have yet occurred. If they occur during the examination. Ladies and gentlemen, we will have to deal with those facts. And again, we will be reporting to the Secretary of State under Section 104 of the Planning Act of 2008, which provides in subsection three of the secretary must decide the application in accordance with any relevant national policy statement, except to the extent that specific exceptions apply, which in summary terms are that a decision in compliance with this, the national policy statement could lead to the United Kingdom being in breach of any of its international obligations, that it would breach domestic law under any enactment, that it would be unlawful. And, again, it would breach any duty rather in relation to any enactment and the adverse impact of the proposed development would outweigh its benefits and that's a key consideration. That's one that we will be continuously alive to, and or that the Secretary of State is satisfied with any condition prescribed for deciding an application is otherwise than in accordance with a national policy statement. So those are the terms in which we would potentially recommend the Secretary of State not Decide in accordance. I thought it was worth leaving this item with that clearly on the table. So I've now reached the end of my remarks. Again, a final check around the room. Before I hand on to my colleague, Mr. Rigby, who will take us through agenda item four, and give us the opportunity to consider the initial assessment of principle issues. No further questions as I see it, Mr. Rigby, the floor is yours. Thank you.

Unknown Speaker 48:34

I hope everyone can hear and see me okay. My name is Guy Rigby. And I'm leading on agenda item four, which is our initial assessment of principle issues. For those of you with a screen, we're going to show this document on your screen for a short time now, so that you can be sure that you've got the right document in front of you. There we go. You should be able to see it shortly. It would assist us greatly if I One could have this document to hand for this agenda item. This initial assessment was set down in writing as annex C to each of our rule six letters. And it's the same document for both applications. The clues in the name, it's our initial assessment. It's a snapshot in time, and it's taken during our preparations for the examination of these applications. This is the start of a dynamic process, which we'll develop as we examine these applications. This initial assessment is simply the starting point for our assessment of the applications. We now take the document off the screen please Mr. Williams, thank you. As the examinations progress, we may add to or remove items, we may need to consider greater levels of detail for some items for either or both applications, whereas other issues may require less attention, or indeed be resolved altogether as the examinations progress. We're discussing our initial assessment here today in case there's a principal issue arising from either of these applications, which you think we've missed. You'll see that the main subject headings are in alphabetical order. This is because there's no hierarchy of importance in the list of issues at this stage. We thank everyone who's written to us and assure you all that your comments and suggestions as to the topics which needs to be included in the examination of these applications are all being considered. Now we're aware of the following requests to speak on this agenda item. Firstly, I have East Suffolk council, Secondly, I have SASES and I also have the applicants and we'll hear these interns shortly and will reflect on any suggestions for Amendments to this initial assessment. We're also aware following this morning's introductions that there are others who may wish to speak. And I'll invite them to do so if they wish. I'll then give the applicants the opportunity to speak at the end of the agenda item. Do please remember to identify yourself each and every time you speak. This is both for the recording which we're making, and also for the benefits of those on the telephone, including the applicants at the moment I understand or those who are listening on the live stream. So firstly,

Unknown Speaker 51:40

to East Suffolk Council, could I hear from the Suffolk Council, please?

Unknown Speaker 51:50

I am Naomi Goold, East Suffolk Council.

Unknown Speaker 51:54

Essentially and we just had a really a point of clarification and we're well aware that the initial assessment of principle issues is not an exhaustive list. And, and but we just wanted to clarify one point, which is a key concern for both the local authority and also the local community which rates, the effects the construction and operational noise. And its impact on local residents as well as the environment. And we just wanted to see clarification as to where that matter would be addressed. I think from reading the principal issues, it looks like it. It's all but Under Item 14, and racing, construction, maintenance, decommissioning noise on marine and terrestrial environment. And, and also Under Item 10, which is residential meaning, and really, it was just a point of clarification on that, that that issue in terms of the impact of noise on the local community will be addressed by those two methods.

Unknown Speaker 52:56

Thank you for that. Yes, we do. have that on our radar will be dealt with. And under Section 14, I had particularly in my sights, nuisance and other public health effects where there's an impact on human health elements of that. I also take your points about item 10, in relation to residential immunity. So thank you very much for that. Is there anything else? There's not any other matter you want to bring to our attention?

Unknown Speaker 53:25

No, I think the other matter which I originally had written in about, I've been saying that that's the dress so that that's all

Unknown Speaker 53:33

thanks very much indeed. So yes, I think I can say at this point that those issues are addressed. So is the Suffolk Council content with our understanding and Is that okay with you? Just to double check before we move on?

Unknown Speaker 53:50

Yes.

Unknown Speaker 53:51

Thank you very much. So now if I could turn to SASES, and I understand Richard Turney, please

Unknown Speaker 54:00

Good morning, sir. We put in our written submissions, we identified a number of points on the issues. And it's really just confirming in large part the scope of those issues. So first of all, on issue two, we identified the need for further sub issue to address and the need for an assessment of the adequacy of compensator II measures, particularly in light of the minder, to decision of Hornsea three. And obviously, that's an issue which the examining authority is already aware of and has already posed some initial questions to Natural England about but just set it as firmly in the list of the issues. And moving on on issue six and again, this touches on something which we have already discussed. It struck us that issue six the scope of that should be expanded to include not just the relationship with other major projects, but also the scope and implications of the BEIS review, which we have already discussed this morning.

Unknown Speaker 55:09

And issue seven

Unknown Speaker 55:14

concerns the environmental statement and identifies two sub issues within that, we say that there is a third sub issue that should be added to that which is the adequacy of the consideration of cumulative effects in the environmental statement and then, turning to issue 15 the consideration of other projects and proposals. We suggest that the interface with other offshore energy projects should be identified under that issue and that includes The greater Gabbard wind farm extension galloper wind farm extension, as well as a series of interconnect projects, Nautilus, Euro link, and SCD one and SCD, two national grid interconnect projects. So it is expanding the interface questions or other projects proposals question to identify specifically, those projects which are in issue. And I'll just add that, certainly in terms of the noise issue that the Council

have just raised, our understanding was that that be covered in the way you suggested and obviously, it's important to my clients as well as it is council.

Unknown Speaker 56:50

Thank you Mr Turney Is that all you wish to raise at this point?

Unknown Speaker 56:54

Thank you very much. Yes, it is.

Unknown Speaker 56:56

Thank you. If there's anything you refer to written submission As you've already made, if there's anything that you've just mentioned just now, that's not already covered in what you've made as written submissions, perhaps you could put that in as an additional submission following this part of the preliminary meeting.

Unknown Speaker 57:16

Yes, I think all of those issues are whether all of those issues are sets out and what we put in, but by way of a list of the matters that we wanted to raise,

Unknown Speaker 57:24

thank you very much indeed. We will take those and consider those. Thank you very much. I'll now ask the applicants for any comments, but before I do, does anybody else wish to add to this discussion? If so, please make yourself known by turning your camera on. I see Mr. Chandler I think from Save Our Sandlings, Mr. Chandler, we like to add anything.

Unknown Speaker 57:51

Yes, thank you. Paul Chandler Save Our Sandlings.

Unknown Speaker 57:55

On item two.

Unknown Speaker 57:58

There are a number of customers About the fragility of thoughtless cliffs, I wonder whether that is going to be specifically addressed, when we have asked the applicant about the potential effects on this cliff, which is very unstable about any effects of the horizontal or direct drilling will take place there, they have always come back and said this is the responsibility of the drilling contractor. And they will advise accordingly, we feel that this is a little too late in the day to start looking at that particular problem. If the applicant has already received permission to go ahead. We feel this certain amount of work should be done prior to the application being awarded. consent to go ahead, because the stability of the cliffs is a known. issue. It has caused, unfortunately, a fatality in the very recent past and is subject to continual collapse and withdrawal. So we feel this is an area that should be a specific item to be

Unknown Speaker 59:18

addressed.

Unknown Speaker 59:20

Thank you very much, Mr. Chandler. It's a very useful submission. Again, I would invite you to put that in writing if you would care to do so. So

part of the preliminary meeting, thank you very much indeed. Is there anybody else here who would like to add to the discussion at this point?

Unknown Speaker 59:46

Just giving a little bit of time here because things sometimes take a wee while to happen.

Unknown Speaker 59:51

thing. Yeah. Can I just check I did see a hand from Councillor fellows.

Unknown Speaker 59:58

Thank you very much. fellows, would you like to speak please? Thank you.

Unknown Speaker 1:00:03

Yes, I think you you very kindly agreed in the introduction that I could speak on on item four. So in terms of the initial assessment of the principal issues, I welcome the fact that you say it is a snapshot in time. And as matters progress, I would request that your communications to and from stakeholders, hopefully don't suffer the same problems we've had to date. And perhaps there should be some assistance from planning aid England to mentor or advocate or provide some assistance for us to translate what we need to say to you so that it does come across in the way that it needs to in terms of specifics so reference referencing your document on item for construction. over town council believes this should also include significant traffic impacts. On the wider area, both work and materials coming from the north, the South and the West. In terms of 10 land use, we believe that land should actually be valued not just for recreation, but the general health and well being, especially during COVID-19. And all year round in this area. It's about quiet lanes quiet not dark nights, open spaces, wildlife habitats, habitat CO, MB and the sssi. It's about people's wider connection with nature. And in fact, work we've done in the past with the Environment Agency changed the valuation of whether coasts should be protected based not on the number of people or properties in an area, but the value for land in its own right. And it's about the inspiration for artists and musicians. As well here in terms of 2, 11, 15, and 17, we feel that all these should actually include the community of impact. And as Mr. Turney mentioned earlier, on specifically 15 This means that Nautilus and euro link, and SCD one SCD two the greater Garrard wind farm extension, the goutpal. Wind Farm extension, as well as size or C should actually form part of your deliberations and examination on 2, 11,15 and 17. In terms of human health 14, we would request that This also includes mental health and well being not just physical health and also the impact on the tourism industry. both of actual disruption and perceived disruption. For 18. We think this should not just be landscape and visual. There's a huge impact on tourism of traffic issues, and also fly parking, and the irreparable loss of wildlife. The other big issue for us is specifically in 6 and 16. But also I would question whether it needs to be a separate item in its own right. And that is the role of national grid.

Unknown Speaker 1:03:38

There are claims that there's not enough information in the public domain about all these additional infrastructures and interconnection projects, yet the applicant scottishpower renewables has entered into a grid connection agreement with national grid to design and construct the associated connection to the 400 Hundred kV grid line and use them as a partner. But as you know, sir, and your fellow team members, if this goes ahead, that NGV project will actually then be used for others, not just



the twin application we're seeing today, which is the EA one north and EA two. So, in fact, it's their national grid's intention that this building will be future proof. So even if even to a sorry, EA one north and EA two don't go ahead, they will still want to build this building. And I would say in overtime counsel would say that actually the siting question and the rationale of this project would be completely different if we were considering the impact of six projects at the same time in the same area. Not just examining EA one north and EA two. So rather than the others trickle on afterwards or get approved by stels we would suggest that your examination should look at the role of national grid, National Grid ventures and je s and GT in fact all the subsidiaries and look in fact at how perhaps this project should be viewed differently.

Unknown Speaker 1:05:33

Thank you very much cancer fellows that's made a lot of very useful points for us. Again, if I may ask if you are able to put that in as a written submission that would help us a great deal

Unknown Speaker 1:05:48

is that's okay for you.

Unknown Speaker 1:05:50

It is but um, as I said at the beginning, I'm might sound it I know what I'm talking about or a little bit confident, but I'm not And it's so difficult to understand where to bring up points and how to actually put it in a language that enables you to receive what you need to hear. So yes, I'll try and put it into writing. But I think if we could look at some assistance, even if someone was an independent party like planning aid England, was able to review a written document and provide some critique or assistance, if,

Unknown Speaker 1:06:28

if I can briefly respond on that particular point by making an observation that one of the particular in my view, slightly strange, but nevertheless benefits of the inquisitorial system for the examination of national infrastructure projects is that there is a degree to which you bring what you see before us. It is for us as an examining authority to understand it, and so we have to form a view As to whether it's important and relevant. We have to interrogate it, we have to drill down to the bottom of it. We'll be asking you questions. But one of our key objectives in doing that will be to make sure that we are clear that what is relevant is drawn out. So, unlike maybe some more traditional forms of public inquiry, where you might feel that you have to have formal advice in order to participate. And because it isn't the inspectors job or indeed in front of the court, it isn't a judge's job, to drill into the detail and find out what's going on. Actually, in this case, in front of this examiner, in examination in national infrastructure, it is our job to drill into the detail and find out what's going on. So, again, hopefully we by giving you that reassurance, we can give you a sense that as we move through the examinations, whether or not you're formally advised or supported. It's our job to find out What the key and relevant points are from the issues that you bring to the table and rest assured we will be doing that.

Unknown Speaker 1:08:07

Okay, the only thing I would add, though, is that throughout the documentation and the spirit of inserts is front loaded, and we're told you can't bring up new matters later on, it has to be put at this stage

or you mustn't miss this deadline, you must do this by this certain time. And it's only in participating in the early stages, that things may then develop that need to be addressed. Or bring up new matters.

Unknown Speaker 1:08:42

Ah, I think Mr. Smith may briefly frozen again. But yes, very much counselor fellows. That's point well made. I was simply seeking to ensure that we had captured all the important and relevant points that you've made. I have made some notes As well as listening to you, but it would assist us greatly if you were able to put it into writing. And as Mr. Smith says, rest assured that no particular skill is required. Basically, what you said is very useful to us. And it would be great to have it in written form so that we can, as Mr. Smith said, go through it carefully and make sure that we've got things taken into consideration in the right place.

Unknown Speaker 1:09:27

Because overturn counsel did go into this with as much effort and openness as it could to engage with the applicant, but National Grid hasn't come to the table. And he's not seen as an applicant in its own right. Yet, what they're proposing to build it for Easton will actually be the thing that then the vehicle that then brings along not just a one north, not just a two, but six other major projects connecting to the same area with their own individual substance. needing to be within five kilometers of Reston. I think that is the the point that individuals and parish and town councils feel is not being addressed. In fact, 53 parish and town councils wrote a letter stating just that two BEIS. So I, if I'm overstating this, I apologize. But I think this is the community of impact. And the way this is all structured as a process in terms of not being open and honest about what will follow into the same area causing intense industrialization and irreparable damage and impact on the people here is the thing that is crucial.

Unknown Speaker 1:10:46

Thanks very much indeed. Thank you. Do you have anything else you wish to say about this particular item?

Unknown Speaker 1:10:52

No, thank you very much, sir.

Unknown Speaker 1:10:54

Thank you very much indeed. Is there anybody else here other than the applicants who are Anything they wish to add to the discussion before I move on to the applicants?

Unknown Speaker 1:11:09

I'll take that as a no. and move on to the applicants, please. Now are you understand you're still on the phone? Is that Mr. Innes, on the phone, please?

Unknown Speaker 1:11:17

Yes, indeed, it's Mr. Innes on the phone. So,

Unknown Speaker 1:11:22

obviously, in terms of the matters that are potentially relevant, that's an entirely matter for you, sir, on the panel. I don't reserve the slot here in terms of whether we need to respond to any matters. And in that regard, the one matters that seems to have been raised quite a

significant degree is the extensive issue regarding national grid. And in terms of that, the new national grid substation National Grid overhead line realignment works together to refer to as the National Grid infrastructure are required to connect the East Anglia TWO an East Anglia one North projects, onshore substation. snatch national electricity grid is against that background given the critical nature of the National Grid infrastructure that affected the applicants have sought to include the necessary works within the DCO applications. By including that national grid infrastructure relevant to these projects within the draft DCO, the applicants can ensure that necessary consents are obtained within the required timescales to reduce the risk of any delays to delivery of the projects, as well as well as risks the viability of the project, and this entire from the spirit of the legislation. Any delay to the consenting of national grid infrastructure could result in offshore wind farm projects themselves being delayed, potentially jeopardizing the competitiveness contract for different sorption and delaying financing of projects and ultimately delaying the development of the project against that background. But the decision was taken to incorporate the National Grid infrastructure within these applications. And by incorporating the National Grid infrastructure within the projects, the DC the initial design in Africa infrastructures progress in parallel with the wider projects initial design. This has led the Applicants to undertake the full and robust environmental impact assessment of the National Grid infrastructure. As part of the assessment to the project, as opposed to relying on a national grid infrastructure has been considered an assessment of cumulative impacts with other projects for the more incorporation of the National Grid infrastructure within the applications, has also allowed for more effective mitigation measures and developments of the substation area as a whole, including the mitigation. And that really explains the background as to why National Grid infrastructure has been incorporated within the DCO applications. And we're fully prepared in due course and examination to discuss the merits of that infrastructure and, and etc. But I thought it was helpful just to set that background on behalf of the applicants as to the National Grid infrastructure incorporated within the application. I don't really have anything further to respond to Apart from there are a number of matters raised about cumulative projects, which I think given the matters raised, best responded to, for me in due course and writing.

Unknown Speaker 1:14:17

Thank you very much indeed. Mr. Innes. That's very helpful. I have no more points or questions on this agenda item. Are there any other thoughts that anyone needs to raise now on this item? Before we move on?

Unknown Speaker 1:14:38

take that as a no thank you. Thank you all for your contributions.

Unknown Speaker 1:14:44

I think you missed councillor fellows.

Unknown Speaker 1:14:48

Sorry, I can't see anything here. I can't see her councillor fellows. Yes. So did you wish to add something? I can't hear you would you be able to answer mute yourself.

Unknown Speaker 1:15:02

Um,

Unknown Speaker 1:15:02  
oh, that's awesome. Thank you very much.

Unknown Speaker 1:15:04  
I do apologize. Certainly, we respect and thank the applicant for engaging in the process and providing information. I found that quite hard to hear. And he also spoke quite quickly. Well, will there be a transcript? Or is that a document he was reading from that could be shared? Before I have to put my submission back in?

Unknown Speaker 1:15:26  
Thank you. There is a recording being made. And I understand that will also be a transcript variable as well. Perhaps Mr. Smith may be able to add to what I've just said,

Unknown Speaker 1:15:39  
Indeed, look, I'll confirm for everybody and we have a number of measures in place the live stream which is going out in real time, so people can watch and see us as we currently are. And then the the live stream itself has been recorded. So they will be the equivalent of the catch up service. So anybody who He's familiar with BBC iPlayer or more for more services like that, we'll be able to log on to our website

Unknown Speaker 1:16:07  
after the events, and they'll be able to click on and view

Unknown Speaker 1:16:11  
a video that will capture everything that happened today. So you'll and you'll be able to pause that and go back and re listen to bits. And so if something maybe wasn't completely clear, but can be listened to again, and one of the other facilities that is available to us is that a written transcript file is being taken from the material. Now, you know, we have to put a little bit of a caveat around that these systems use artificial intelligence, they do not necessarily always perfectly capture every single word, but they are enormously better than not having a transcript available. So that will also be available and will be published. So drawing all of that together by Procedural Deadline C you have a number have resources that will enable you to listen carefully to think about and check up on what happened here today before you have to make your response. I trust councillor fellows that addresses your query.

Unknown Speaker 1:17:22  
Yes. Thank you so much.

Unknown Speaker 1:17:24  
Excellent. Mr. Rigby

Unknown Speaker 1:17:27  
Thanks. Thank you, Mr. Smith for explaining that in more detail. I'll be shortly handing back to Mr. Smith. But before I do, just to say if any new matters relating to our assessment of the principal issues, that is things that we've not already discussed just now, do arise in anybody's minds, particularly those of you who are watching on the live stream or listening to the recording later. Please do put them to us for our consideration in writing. Before Procedural Deadline C, which is choosing The 29th of September 2020, at which point we will be considering all the matters that have been put before us. Thank you very much everyone for your participation on this item. And I will hand you back to Mr. Smith.

Unknown Speaker 1:18:17

That's directly Thank you very much. Now I trust you can all see and hear me Rynd Smith speaking lead member of the examining authorities. Now keeping a very careful eye on the time here, I did indicate that we would be breaking for lunch at or around one o'clock. One of the things that I think it's important not to do is to move just a few minutes into an agenda item and then cut it off at the knees. So you'll note that the next agenda item is agenda item five habitats regulations assessment. And if I could ask Mr. Williams to briefly just put the agenda onto the screen so that we can all just review it and see where we are. But whilst he's doing that, And I will indicate that I think rather than asking my colleague, Mrs. Powis to take us only five minutes into that item, that in fact, it makes sense to stop now. And it's it's five minutes to 12. Can I ask us to resume at five minutes to one apologies, can I ask us to resume at 1:35pm and that hopefully provides everybody time to rest, take a little bit of lunch, and hopefully also will enable the applicant to continue work on resolving their various technical issues. Now, before we break, I do just see again, a hand from Councillor fellows, Councillor fellows, did that relate to your previous point on agenda item for the hand has gone down. So

Unknown Speaker 1:19:47

I think that's technical issue. Sorry,

Unknown Speaker 1:19:50

don't worry, don't worry. Ladies and gentlemen. Let us now break. Let us resume at 1:35pm having taken lunch. We will be proceeding them directly with agenda item five. Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for me. See you after the break.