

Unknown Speaker 0:02

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, welcome back. I trust you had a pleasant, if all being a rather brief break. And I'd like to call everybody to order ask you to resume your places in the virtual event. And also if I can just check with Mr. Williams is the live stream back online.

Unknown Speaker 0:23

the live stream is back online.

Unknown Speaker 0:24

online and we have started recorded into a need to stick that's that's excellent news. Now my name is Rynd Smith, I'm the lead member of the examining authorities and then I'm just going to pass through my examining authority member colleagues

Unknown Speaker 0:41

John Hockley here Good afternoon everybody and welcome back.

Unknown Speaker 0:45

Good afternoon everybody. My name is Caroline Jones.

Unknown Speaker 0:49

Hello everyone. Its Jessica Powis here.

Unknown Speaker 0:53

Good afternoon again, everyone. Guy Rigby here panel member.

Unknown Speaker 0:57

Thank you very much Mr. Rigby and Now, now you've seen that the examining authorities have rejoined, I'll just ask Mr. Williams to display the agendas again so that we can locate ourselves there. And if he can bring them down to agenda item five, whilst he's showing the agenda, and I'll remind everybody that this session will end at approximately 3:10pm. That's the rough bargain that we're heading towards. And it appears possible that we may be able to reach the point where we adjourn part one of the preliminary meetings at or around that time. And if it just needs an extra five or 10 minutes to push through to the adjournment and then avoid an additional late afternoon session held for just one or two matters. I'll take a view at that point and we may forego a formal break and just move straight through to the end. But obviously, I will try and do that. Having regard to the possibility that if there are a number of matters that need to be dealt with, we may not One final

question this afternoon. Now, I do notice that during the break, I believe the applicant has managed to rule the applicants rather have managed to resolve that connection issues. Can I just check whether the applicants are attending now digitally?

Unknown Speaker 2:19

sign that should be us attending callers for the applicants.

Unknown Speaker 2:25

Excellent. Can you just switch into your camera turn on

Unknown Speaker 2:29

off on

Unknown Speaker 2:32

access on? Excellent Ah,

Unknown Speaker 2:34

yes, no, I have you not. Yes, that's a thing. Um, and I will also finally flag when we do get to the end of the part one meeting agendas, and the examining authority members will leave the virtual room and the recording of the live stream will be stopped at that point. At that point, as participants in this event, you'll be returned to Mr. Williams the case Manager if you wish you can, of course just leave. But if you want to tell Mr. Williams anything about how you believe today went for you, then feel free to speak to him briefly after the event, clearly noticing that there will be no recording of that and indeed no live stream of that. But Alternatively, if you would rather then please do email the project mailboxes by procedural deadlines C with any comments that you have about the way today has been run. That brings me to the end of my introductory remarks. So myself, my fellow panel members will now switch off our cameras and I will ask Mrs. Powis to lead into agenda. Five.

Unknown Speaker 3:40

Thank you, Mr. Smith. I think we can take the agenda. Deb back off the screen now. Thanks, Mr. Williams. Good everyone. Good afternoon, everyone. This is Jessica Powis panel. Member speaking. I'll take us through agenda item five, which deals with habitats regulation, assessment in relation to the two applications. We have a request to speak on this agenda item from Mr. Rich Turney representing SASES 's which we will hear that shortly. We may have questions and I will give the applicants a chance to speak at the end of the giant agenda item as well. Are there any other parties present who wish to speak in connection with agenda item five today?

Unknown Speaker 4:17

Mrs. Powis, just before we proceed Brent Smith here lead member of the panel, it's come to my attention that for some livestream viewers, during the lunch, the live stream itself may have apparently frozen for you. What I will just remind you of is that if you refresh your browser displaying the live stream, it will return to the projected live stream for the event. So that's a reminder, refresh the browser apologies, Mrs. Powis.

Unknown Speaker 4:47

No problems. I haven't seen anybody indicate they want they also wish to speak on this item. So I think we'll proceed on that basis. Before we move into hearing submissions, I would just like to take this opportunity to outline why they exist. Authorities have put this item on our agenda for today. The relevant representations that we received in January of this year highlights a number of areas in which there is disagreement between the nature conservation body in these cases natural England and the Applicants about whether it's possible to conclude that there would be no adverse effects on integrity of European sites as a result of the projects alone or in combination with other plans or projects. This relates particularly but not exclusively to offshore and mythology effects. There are also a number of other projects in the planning and recent consenting stages, which have the potential to impact some of the same features and European sites as those in dispute in the cases before us. Most notably, in the last few months, there have been decisions made by the Secretary of State to refuse consent for the planet extension offshore wind farm to grant consent for the Norfolk Vanguard offshore wind farm and to issue a minute to approve letter for the Hornsea project three offshore wind farm. Whilst it's not unusual for some remaining disagreement to remain between the parties in relation to habitats around Nations assessment at the outset of examinations for offshore wind farms. The experience and some of those recent decisions I've just referred to indicates that a failure to properly resolve HRA disagreements before the end of examinations and preferably long before that can have a direct impact on the Secretary of State's ability to make a decision about whether or not to grant development consent within the statutory timescales. This means that one of the core principles of the Planning Act 2008 regime mainly predictable decision timescales is undermined, it is clearly not a desirable outcome from anyone's perspective. So an important reason for talking about habitats regulation r assessment considerations today is not to dive into the detailed discussion on specific sites and species that will come later no doubt when we get into issue specific hearings. But simply to highlight that the examining authorities are very keen that these applications don't find themselves in similar situations to those that have been stuck with them delayed decisions.

To this end, we were asking all parties with an interest in Already but most notably the applicants and natural England to front load discussions on HRA within the examination period, also to engage with the statement of Common Ground process, which is a great assistance to us at key stages throughout the examinations. And to set out in full any additional mitigation measures being proposed beyond those measures included within the original applications where the position on HRA cannot be agreed as we go through examination. All parties should be aware that we may ask the applicants to actively engage with the derogation test set out under the habitats, directives and regulations on or without prejudice basis. This is an approach advocated by the Secretary of State following the Norfolk Vanguard and Hornsea project three experiences. We are particularly mindful that if the applicants commit to further mitigation or need to engage with derogation tests, then there is the potential for measures to constitute the change the development consent orders

applied for material or material which could have procedural implications for these examination timetables that we're talking about. Today, not least in the terms of the consultation that may be required. It's also possible that there could be implications for the extent of the order land, which could trigger procedural duties under the compulsory Acquisition Regulations. We'll cover this in a little more detail under agenda item six today. If the mitigation or compensation in the form of legal agreements such as section 106 obligations were to be required, these would also take time to be executed to a satisfactory standards such that we could have regard to them in making our recommendations to the Secretary of State. We have asked some questions of the applicant and natural England as procedural decision 18 on the 16th of July this year, and we are grateful for the responses that we have received. There will be further exploration of this matter, as you'd expect in our first round of written questions due to be issued after part two of this preliminary meeting in early October. Before we turn to taking submissions to the applicants wish to comment on anything I've just said or You'd be content to wait until we've heard through the

Unknown Speaker 9:06

content after you've heard Mr. Turney, thank you very much.

Unknown Speaker 9:08

Thank you Mr. Morris.

Unknown Speaker 9:11

So I'm keen now that we do hear from Mr. Richard Turney, on behalf of SASSES, who's advised that he wishes to contribute on this item. Mr. Turney, I can see you. So please do go ahead.

Unknown Speaker 9:21

Thank you very much, Madam. Good afternoon. In fact, I would have said, I think you have just said in terms of the need to engage with this question and the potential procedural implications of agreement not being reached on questions of adverse effect on integrity and the need to consider compensating measures as an early stage in examination, reflecting the mind to to decision. So really, I don't have anything to add clearly, as I would expect the authorities ahead of me on those points, so I don't have a further point to make.

Unknown Speaker 9:53

Thank you very much. I would just flag for the benefit of all parties that the timescales for that work happening on the Hornsea three project are such that there's a key deadline on 30th of September this year for the applicants to submit proof of security for the compensation measures in that case. And then there's a final decision deadline for the Secretary of State to have made that decision by the 31st of December 2020. So both of those dead key deadlines fall within the scope of this examination, these examinations. And so we would learn they will be in the public domain, of

course, so we would expect that account is taken of those by our applicants as we go through and if things change that needs to have a knock on effect the implications for these cases than that they aren't they are taken into account. on that, actually, I would just add that for again, for the benefit of all parties, although things may be happening on other cases, and you may take that we would be aware of what's happening other cases we cannot have regard to anything that's happening on other cases unless it put before us and serviced into these examinations. So if there is stuff happening on the Hornsea project three application or any other applications, then we would ask parties to please also submit that to us and explain why they think it's relevant to what is before us. I think Mr. Turney, then does that conclude your submissions today in respect of item five, does

Unknown Speaker 11:17

a bit of a non event, I'm afraid Thank you

Unknown Speaker 11:18

very much. It's fine, though. It's good. It's good to hear from you. And is there anybody else here you'd like to add anything before I come to the applicant? Okay, then in that case, I will ask whether the applicants have a response. What they've heard today for Mr. Turney.

Unknown Speaker 11:41

There's no real need for a substantial response. Other than we've really made progress and continue to engage extensively with Natural England on the issues in the hope of trying to narrow issues that are between us and our statistics, domination, and we'll continue to do so. Apart from that it's We'll update you as soon as we make progress. And we've made commitments in our response to the procedural decision 18. And obviously, we'll, we're mindful of those timescales.

Unknown Speaker 12:12

Thank you very much.

Unknown Speaker 12:15

Just to note, of course, that we have had those two

Unknown Speaker 12:20

deadline 18

Unknown Speaker 12:23

in quite a lot of feedback via audio, I'll keep talking, get resolved. But yeah, we have we have had your responses to the 16th of July deadline. And if parties wish to comment back on what they've seen there, then they can do that by deadline, one in nine examination timetables. And I just have one other question for the applicants if I could while I while I have you.

Unknown Speaker 12:49

Could I ask for the applicants back please.

Unknown Speaker 12:53

Thank you. And just a quick question on the content of those submissions. So in responses you're committing to updating or supplementing the information to support appropriate assessment reports. In light of the sixth section of state decisions I've referred to and in response to the issues raised to the relevant representations, which we welcome. And you've given two key deadlines for those updates to be provided. Some of the information is due to be coming to us, I think around collision risk issues a deadline one, whereas some of the other content is looks like it's timetable for deadline three, and that's particularly in relation to displacement effects of retro dive running after the Thames SBA. So I just wanted to ask why. It's why we're looking at a later date for that that second set of information.

Unknown Speaker 13:44

Yeah, I think the best explanation given is that in relation to the matters that were responded to, and deadline one, there's been continuous and ongoing dialogue. And it's a question of largely updating the tool which we already have through changes in relation to the matters relating to Diver of displacement, there have been developments in relation to the positions of parties. And we're currently working with and responding to matters that have been raised by Natural England. And we anticipate that that will take slightly longer to get us to a position whereby we have clarity between the positions. And I think what will being is more realistic, rather than promising things that we can't deliver? And so it comes fairly late in the day, the change of position and that, therefore, we're working through it and the implications for the examination.

Unknown Speaker 14:37

Okay. Understood. Thank you. But I would just ask that, that deadlines are empty at the moment. I think it's around the 15th of December. If it's at all possible to keep to that deadline, and if indeed anything earlier than please do, of course, submit it at any sooner deadline that is available to you. Thank you,

Unknown Speaker 14:56

and

Unknown Speaker 14:58

does the applicant have any final Comments I'd like to make under the item five

Unknown Speaker 15:04

No Thank you. Thank you. So thanks very much.

Unknown Speaker 15:08

Does anybody else have anything they'd like to add before we move on to item six, then? I'm not hearing anything. So if any party president or anyone watching the live stream or the recording of this event has any further thoughts or reflections on the matters that they've heard today, they can be submitted to us in writing before procedural deadline C which is the 29th of September. I think that does now conclude all the masteries covered under item five. So I'll pass back to my colleague, Mr. Smith.

Unknown Speaker 15:36

Thank you very much, Mrs. Powis. And I trust that everybody can see and hear me Rynd Smith, lead member of the examining authorities once more. And to remind us we are now changing agenda items. We are moving into agenda item six. And can I just before opening on this agenda item, just give me everyone participating a reminder, please, when you do start to speak state your name and organization before you speak big. I know that's incredibly boring, but it does at least enable people who are not in the room today who are looking at the recording after the event to work out who is who and who's saying what. And also just a brief reminder, if you can, if you're in a room with more than one device connected to this event, it's worth turning the sound off on all but one device so that you don't get feedback.

Okay, then Ladies and gentlemen, let's move to agenda item six. Now here I am going to very briefly refer to the draft timetable provisions that are going to be gone through in considerably greater detail in the later agenda items. But I think it would help if Mr. Williams could just briefly put up the rule six letter annex D, the draft timetables and they are identical for both of the examination so doesn't matter which one so that we can just briefly look at those. And if you can scroll to deadline one, which starts at the very bottom of page two of annex D, and then runs for the rest of page three, then there's a tiny little bit of it at the beginning of page four.

Now, essentially here, the purpose in bringing this agenda item before you is to build on the conversation that we have just had with Mrs Powis, but to flag that not only habitats, regulations, assessment positions, potentially engage the need to make what might be either material or non material changes to either or both applications, but that there is in any major scheme and examination, the potential for some other changes to emerge. And particularly here, we would flag our ongoing monitor Have the BEIS review and any positions that might emerge from that that the applicant might be capable of responding to. And what I would also flag is the fact that a deadline one, we will start to receive, we will receive detailed and written representations from a large number of parties, essentially responding to the circumstances that they have identified in their relevant reps around and the impacts of the applications upon them. Now, these sorts of issues as

they start to become better documented, and particularly as the statements of Common Ground process proceeds, tend to result in an applicant, looking at the forms of mitigation that they might be proposing at design approaches that might arise and to think sometimes about circumstances where they could amend elements of an application to better respond to important and relevant issues that are emerging. So there is again, a bit potential for non material or indeed potentially material change emerging from a number of sources. Now, we are very strongly conscious of the fact that if non material material changes emerge, that in order to be able to make and clear reports to the Secretary of State, and also in order to be able to make unqualified recommendations to the Secretary of State and by that I mean, that we're not asking the Secretary of State to undertake additional consultations during the decision making period unless this is absolutely unavoidable. In order to be able to make such findings, recommendations, we need where any changes we merged to be able to have examined those changes properly, and to have conducted at least an interrogation pirating question and also when necessary interrogation by way of hearings and issues specific hearings, particularly, I'm dealing with the changes. So, in terms of the timetable, and Mr. Williams, if you can scroll down to

Unknown Speaker 20:09

page three of the annex, we're on D one at the moment, if you scroll down to three, and you'll see that deadline one begins at the top, at the bottom of page two, keep scrolling. on page three, you'll see that amongst other deadlines there, there is a request that the applicant should submit any information in relation to intention to make non material material changes. Now, this is not to say that necessarily the full detail of those needs to be ventilated at that point, but what we're asking for is the earliest possible heads up by the applicant around any such changes. And again, if you can just scroll further down the timetables Mr. Williams, until we get to the hearing events at item 11 on page Four apologies, no, no, we need to be on page five the hearing the January hearing events. And item 14 and week commencing the 11th of January.

Now, whether or not that that particular date is sustained for those hearing events, we'll discuss that later. I guess again, what I wanted to foreshadow was that if we are in a position where there are non material or indeed material changes, and we are to examine them properly, sufficient explanation and evidence needs to be in the public domain to enable this target set of hearing events to properly examine those changes. And the reason why raise that again is to ensure that and that that examination can take place and any consequential considerations can take place that changes the statements of Common Ground etc, can then be documented, which in turn, we would very much hope would mean that we would be in a position where We could make concluded findings on any such changes in our reports the Secretary of State.

Now again, returning briefly to agenda item five, and to Ms Powis explanations of some of the matters that have arisen in relation to recent offshore wind farm consenting, were not fully concluded findings have necessarily been made and the secretaries of state have had to engage in consultations during decision and indeed where decisions have been delayed. Well, again, for very, very good reasons, ensuring that we make everything as clear and certain as it can be for the applicants and as clear and as certain as it can be and timely for effective persons and local communities who at the end of the day want to see a decision on both applications one way or the other. As soon as can reasonably be achieved. We are aiming to make sure that if it is possible, to recommend to secretaries of state in terms of do not require further consultations and investigations that is what we wish to do. So I am flagging, therefore the need for the applicants



particularly to ensure that I know it is very hard, but where you are engaged in negotiations, don't just think about essentially securing an agreement if that is what you're chasing, but also think about the time within the examination that you're seeking to secure that and the question of whether there is enough time and examination to properly and fairly examine that change and allow all of the examination process is necessary to draw themselves to a natural close before the statutory six month deadline is reached. Now, and we have had a request to be heard on this specific item from East Suffolk Council. So can I check Firstly, Ms Gould Are you wishing to speak on this? And Mr. Williams, we can probably Now remove the timetable.

Unknown Speaker 24:10

Hello, it's Naomi Gould East Suffolk Council. And no, it was more just putting a marker down there. And we didn't have any comments to raise. But if there was any issues that was brought up during that item, that we have reserved the right to perhaps raise a question, but we don't have any specific questions at this time.

Unknown Speaker 24:29

Okay, thank you very much. Is there anybody else who having heard what I have now had to say, and I will go to the applicant as is now conventional last, but is there anybody else who wishes to respond?

Unknown Speaker 24:47

I see counsellor fellowes.

Unknown Speaker 24:50

Yes, it's just to clarify if I may, sir. So am I right in thinking that the next big deadline on the timetable is by the 29th of September. We need to put in written submissions about matters from recorded from these procedures, and also to request to be heard orally at part two, which is in October.

Unknown Speaker 25:11

Indeed, that is correct. But you'll notice and we will get into the timetable in detail in the subsequent agenda items. You'll notice there's a distinction in the timetable between the bit that's grey, where the deadlines are referred to as procedural. And they are lettered, so A, B and C. But what I have been just talking about, are actually the main examination deadlines in the real timetable that doesn't start until these preliminary meetings are closed. And so when I was referring to deadline one, their council fellowes I was referring to the deadline. And on Monday, the second of November at item eight, in the main body of the timetable that is not highlighted in grey. And is there anything else that you wish to ask at this stage?

Unknown Speaker 25:55

Yeah, so I'd only raise our concerns locally that we come into the timeframe where the DCO for Sizewell C is also beginning. So it may be when you're looking at the main headlines as your main dates, as you mentioned, in November, and then into January, that there may be some potential clashes or restrictions on the amount that we can actually cope with.

Unknown Speaker 26:20

Yeah, we very much hope. And this is something that we'll be balancing very carefully. And once we've considered the written representations that we do receive a procedural deadline C but we very much hope that with care, these timetables can be designed, and indeed, the following timetables for the Sizewell examinations can be designed so that they will inevitably be intense phases of work in both sets of examinations, but that there shouldn't be any direct opposing clashes of events or deadline requirements. We will do our very best. And thank you. Is there anything that anybody else wants to raise on this item before I find Ask if the applicant wants to speak.

Unknown Speaker 27:08

No, in which case in turning finally to the applicant, a reminder that the key references here in terms of guidance are the planning inspectorate's advice note 16, which sets out how to deal with change requests. And if the change requests relate to the need for any additional land, and the compulsory acquisition guidance by CLG, what we still refer to as the CLG guidance, because it was made by that body before it's more recent name changes that should be followed and indeed, the need to draw in the procedure under the compulsory Acquisition Regulations. And so to the applicant, any final observations and this gentleman?

Unknown Speaker 27:50

Yes, I think in the spirit of openness and candor, it would be right for me to say, where we close the applicant, be right to say where we are currently at in terms of non material variations to the application, and to give some flavour and feel for what the position is. I mean through the engagement with design teams and equipment suppliers, the applicants have continued to progress and refine the design of the projects since the submission of the DCO applications, and this has presented opportunities to reduce environmental impacts of the projects. This process is complemented by the statement of Common Ground process, which is also identified a number of areas where amendments to the applications could serve to reduce environmental impacts and projects. Yeah, because as I continue to evaluate these changes, we want just to highlight a few at this stage to give an indication in terms of non material change the application, the applicants intend to confirm the following non material changes to their applications at deadline one, a reduction in the maximum wind turbine height from 300 meters to 282 meters above the lowest astronomical tide, an increase in the minimum current above sea level the aircraft from 22 meters to 24 meters above mean a high water springs.

As stated in Applicants' response to the real success of six insured, I submitted a deadline a Yeah, because I tend to submit updates submitted information to support the proper Assessment Report, which will incorporate their draft increase. The applicants are also considering a small number of non material changes the applications to reduce the environmental impacts of the project. And to reflect the ongoing design iterations the projects that can provide an update on these changes that deadline one and acknowledge that there's an old partisan for such changes to be submitted to the examinations as early as possible.

The non material changes under consideration currently include refinements to the onshore substation design to reduce the potential for environmental impacts the project refinements to the order limits and or work areas to remove land which is no longer required due to ongoing refining of the projects, or to reduce potential for environmental impacts. refinements to the order limits to include additional land and temporary rights to provide temporary potable water supply to at number eight landfill and additional temporary diversions to public rights of way. And finally, refinements the order limits to include additional land and permanent base provide alternative surface water drainage infrastructure, at a permanent diversion to public rights of way.

The applicants do not anticipate material changes to the applications at this stage, nor to the applicants consider that any of the above mentioned non material changes alone or collectively would result in a material change to the applications. Other parts of the that I've outlined above also potentially have a requirement for additional land or rights. And in the event that any changes to grass which seek to alter the order of limits, or the right sorts overland, the applicants will liaise directly with any persons with with interest in the relevant land when land rights are not being pursued due to reduction or the limits the parties with an interest in this land will be advised and written confirmation provided the relevant land plots or sphere removed from each DCO and in the book of reference, and finding additional land rights are sought due to an increase in the order limits. The applicants comply with the provisions of the infrastructure planning compulsory Acquisition Regulations by giving notice subscribed parties as appropriate, as well as publicizing the proposed changes as specified in the regulations.

Turning to the timetabling affects the applicants expect that quite a number of the non material changes will be confirmed to the examining authority at the deadline one, it's noted that some potential changes may require further time in order to refine the details of the change due to the need for further supply chain engagement. The applicants will keep the examining authority informed of progress and expect that any final changes would form to be submitted to the examining authority but deadline five latest yeah We'll continue to progress to consideration of these changes our earliest submission as possible, such earliest missions will be made. And that really concludes what they have to say or the information that we currently have on this agenda topic.

Unknown Speaker 32:18

Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Ennis. Again, I think in summarizing this and bringing this agenda item to an end, the critically important watchword around all of this is to front load and to be as transparent as the applicant can possibly be to ensure that we do not find ourselves in circumstances where there are potentially highly productive useful environmental impact reducing mechanisms that are emerging that they emerge so late and examination that the interested parties cannot fully appreciate and what their effects might be and indeed this examining these examining

authorities cannot fully appreciate what their effects might be. So we ended up needing to recommend the Secretary of State to undertake further consultations. We are extraordinarily desirous for very, very good reasons of not traveling down that road unless it is impossible to avoid.

And thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen, on that basis, I believe we have concluded agenda item six, and you will now be very, very pleased to hear that we are gathering a head of steam that takes us into the real mechanics of these preliminary meetings, which is essentially then to review the specific provisions of the draft examinations, timetables. And so I'm going to call on my colleague, Caroline Jones, who will walk you through those and deal with the matters that arise. Miss Jones.

Unknown Speaker 33:52

Thank you, Mrs. Smith. Mr. Williams, could we show the draft examination timetable on the screen for the time being please

Unknown Speaker 34:05

Thank you. My name is Caroline Jones panel member and I'm leading on agenda items seven on dates, which include all remaining matters relating to the draft examination timetables, and to hearing on site inspection events. Agenda item seven deals broadly with written procedures and the deadlines for them. And agenda item eight deals broadly with hearings and site inspections. I propose to pass through the timetables for both examinations in date order, and in doing so cover both agenda items. During these items, I will be referring to the draft timetable. You can find these as annexes D of our rule six letters of the 16th of July 2020. I would encourage everyone to have a copy of this to hand. Mr. Williams who can take the timetable down now. Thank you.

Unknown Speaker 34:56

We are aware of the following requests to speak on agenda items seven and eight, a Suffolk council counsellor fellows, Mr. Chandler, Mr. Turney and the applicants. It may seem obvious, but I will start by making clear that the timetables for each examination are the same. We have adopted the same deadlines and the same structure of events. If there is a need to consider different matters and hearings will be very clear which part of which hearing will deal with which application and if needs be hearing could be split into sessions dealing with each application separately. Everyone is now had the opportunity to read the submissions made a procedural deadline a relating to the draft timetable, there is no need to repeat the requests that you've already made in writing. Rest assured that we will take all submissions into account and we will endeavour to make arrangements to suit all parties.

However, we will need to balance the push and pull of those requests with the need to ensure an efficient and workable timetable that enables us to complete the examination Within the legislative timescale, and there is very limited scope to change the dates significantly. In summary for the parties here present the main requests include deadline two delayed until the 24th of November 2020. The hearings commencing week beginning the 30th of November delayed to week beginning the seventh of December. deadline four delayed to allow more time to respond after the Christmas holidays. Deadline five delayed if the January hearings remain as per the existing timetable. January

hearings delayed until the first two weeks of February and accompanied site visits to take place in late summer, autumn instead of winter. So turning first to East Suffolk Council on do you wish to raise any further points or have any comments on the crest made by other parties?

Unknown Speaker 37:00

Hello, my name is Naomi Goold for East Suffolk Council . And no, they were our main submissions. So it's more than if there were any questions that were for us. I did there was one additional question in relation to the deadline one, which was more a question then a recommendation or move it? Would that be best asked now? Yes. So that was just in relation to the deadline. One, it was set out that the interested parties needed to provide notification of the wish to speak at an issue specific hearings. And it wasn't really a point of clarification as to whether that is just a case that we need to clarify that. Just that that very fact that we're looking to speak further future issues specific hearings, or whether we needed to say which ones we're going to speak on. And the issue related to that was that obviously, we do I don't know at the moment what the issue suit hearings will be on. So providing that clarification is a little bit difficult at the moment.

Unknown Speaker 38:07

Yeah, I think it would be best in this instance, if you could just indicate your intention to speak at future issue specific hearings, and you're not held to that at all. And of course, as Mr. Smith pointed out earlier, we intend on sending an agenda out in advance of those hearings. So at that point, you could you will have a further opportunity to confirm whether or not you wish to attend once you've seen that agenda.

Unknown Speaker 38:33

Okay, thank you very much. Thank you.

Unknown Speaker 38:38

Counsellor fellows. Can we hear from you now, please?

Unknown Speaker 38:45

Thank you, Miss Jones. Um, yeah, so the principle is that offshore development shouldn't cause considerable or irreparable damage to coastal communities or the environment and Aldeburgh town council believes that there is an opportunity if this timetable was looked at, to actually ensure that the BEIS review is taken into account, so that that principle that there shouldn't be considerable imperishable damage to the coastal communities in the environment could actually be taken into account. So although we need to give people notice of what the timetable is going forward, as the review takes place, how much flexibility will there be to ensure that we can incorporate anything that comes out of that review. And then the second point I'd like to make is that for the public and for my constituents, it's quite hard when there's an overlap. So for example, we all had to register to

speak at the open floor hearings before this event took place. And I think if people had seen this event and heard the very useful information, that the examining authority has been able to give us in your reassurances that might have changed their ideas about the open floor hearings. But that's opportunity's gone now, that's in the past. So not only the timetable for the hearings, but I would ask you to consider the time frame and the deadlines you impose for actually registering to take part in each of these opportunities. Thank you.

Unknown Speaker 40:29

Thank you. Just before I respond, I can see my colleague, Mr. Smith would like to come in at this point.

Unknown Speaker 40:34

Just j very brief, briefly, counsellor Fellowes, I mean, I, I just wanted to refer back to essentially the last opportunity point, because clearly, one of the balancing considerations that we had to take into account was the balance between the need to have everything clearly and fully explained in Act preliminary meetings before we start anything and also the very notable desire that we could feel emerging from the many, many relevant representations for people to unburden themselves and to get matters off their chest and to speak to us as soon as they possibly could, at the very start of the examination, if possible, about the issues that they wish to bring to the table.

Now, I do then note that we decided on balance that we would bring forward some very early open floor hearings where people can do that, but that we wouldn't make them the only open floor hearings. So in other words, if there were people who didn't know what was going on, weren't sure what they wanted to do, then they don't have to take that opportunity and we can hear from them later. And similarly, I would note that in relation to the explanation of procedure that I hope we provided in these preliminary meetings, the live streams available as we speak, the recordings available and if you are able to use your good offices and share with colleagues and friends Due to the fact that those are available until, for them procedural deadline, see, if they are interested parties in these examinations, they have an opportunity by procedural deadlines C to put anything to us that they wish to, but also critically, they can think about how they interact with the other procedures that we're offering as part of the examination once it starts. So in the light of this advice that emerges from these meetings, so I trust that yes, it isn't an entirely missed opportunity that the we can play some catch up as a result of playing this meeting on catch up.

Unknown Speaker 42:41

or return you to Ms Jones, thank you.

Unknown Speaker 42:45

Thank you, Mr. Smith. I'm just returning to the timetable and and the flexibility we are required under Rule eight of the infrastructure planning examination procedure rules 2010, to state at the pm or as soon as practicable after the event that we must set a timetable for the examination of the application, and that is why we have got the timetable at this point. That said, we There is also there

are also powers within those rules to amend the timetable if needs be, and that does sometimes have to happen. So we do have the ability to do that, although we would prefer not to have to do that so that everybody has advanced notice of the dates and deadlines, and everybody can stick to that. So it will just will be a case as Mr. Smith spoke earlier. We are aware of the BEIS review and we will just have to keep an eye on that as is everybody else.

Unknown Speaker 43:43

Thank you.

Unknown Speaker 43:44

Does that answer all your questions?

Unknown Speaker 43:46

Yes.

Unknown Speaker 43:48

Thank you could I hear from Mr. Chandler now please?

Unknown Speaker 43:56

Thank you, Miss Jones, Paul Chandler save our sandlings. Yes, my point was about site visits. And I put in a request that there should be some more site visits. Preferably during the summer in the late autumn must we have some decent weather because

Unknown Speaker 44:15

appearing over the winter months is not the best time.

Unknown Speaker 44:19

noticed you've done three unaccompanied site visits, two of those have been working around the perimeter of the applications area. And most notably, twice you've gone up Sandy lane and looked broom covert which is not part of the application. This is really what was the forming of save our sailings when they wanted to all they're applying to build a

Unknown Speaker 44:48

the substations on the OMB broom covert

Unknown Speaker 44:53

that is now going to be happening potentially at Friston. So just wondering why Sandy Lane and Broom Covert was inspected twice. And I have written and requested that other areas should be examined because these are going to be more directly impacted. Now, obviously from the previous comment by Mr. Smith, we can request further on a company site visits, which I shall be doing so pointing you to areas which we feel would be beneficial to your examination.

Unknown Speaker 45:32

Yeah, absolutely. I think in the first instance, yes, I would just encourage everybody to have a look at those unaccompanied site notes and to see where we have already inspected before making further requests at deadline one. As Mr. Smith pointed out earlier, a company's site inspections are normally only needed if the examining authorities need to access private land or if there is a new feature at any of the sites that we've visited before, that you would like us to see. And just to remind people that the purpose of those accompanied site inspections are for site familiarization and that no discussion of the merits will be entertained whilst they are undertaken. The third on a company site visit that you refer to Mr. Smith and Mr. Hockley visited and on the 13th and 14th of August and that was in response to and the responses that we received for the preliminary involvement forms because we, we looked at and we saw that a lot of people had asked us to visit in the summer months and bearing in mind we had already set the dates for the preliminary meeting. We felt that it was important that Mr. Smith and Mr. Hockley visited at that point, I think in terms of Broom Covert the reason why there were two site visits to that particular site and perhaps Mr. Smith can correct me if I'm wrong. Was that Mr. Hockley? Obviously, Jones was appointed as a member of the examining authorities after the rest of the panel. And so there was a further opportunity for Mr. Hockley to revisit the sites that the rest of the panel had already been to. Mr. Smith, is that correct?

Unknown Speaker 47:17

Almost correct.

Unknown Speaker 47:20

Describe it. And

Unknown Speaker 47:24

the rest of the palette fact hadn't been to, to the Oh, hang on a minute. No, no, no, just let me correct myself. need to go back to it. Yes, no, no, no, though. It is correct. Broom Covert, essentially there. And we have found that it's critically important amongst other things to view equivalent infrastructures to the ones that are before us in these applications. And the reason we want to do that because we want to hear about what have practically been and have particular impacts have been addressed in design terms. And so although Broom Covert isn't within the scope of, of these



particular applications, we feel that they're a very important guide to us. As to the way in design terms previous applicants have dealt with reasonably similar issues. And that is also the reason why we have looked at the connection point for the East Anglia one project in the environs of Ipswich. And that was my brief confusion at the beginning of this because I was I was probably mixing up the two sites in my mind. Now in timing terms. You'll be conscious of the fact that we did have a former panel member who had you know, taken a number of efforts to inform himself about the physical setting of the applications who left us to go to other employment and that Mr. Hockley joined us Mr. Having joined us, Mr. Hockley had quite a challenge, which is that he had to inform himself very rapidly indeed, of the settings of these applications and undertaken number of investigations. So he initially went alone to view places that he had already visited. But he additionally went to the Ipswich site to view the East Anglia one connection and him having visited that it became evident that other members of the examining authority should also undertake that visit. And so when we went back for a second visit, we decided that we would view both broom covert again, and the Ipswich side again, because on another company basis as an examining authority, we could then have a comparative discussion and walking across the fields on the bridleway about both of those sides. So that's essentially what we did. Now moving forward We would very much hope that when you nominate sides and deadline one, and that we'll be able to fit unaccompanied inspections in as quickly as maybe, which means that we should still see them before the autumn season is too deeply advanced. And, you know, we're very, very conscious that in relation to natural environment impact, one of the issues is seasonal. So we'll be looking at carrying out some additional on site inspections very quickly. Indeed. Sorry. I didn't mean to trespass on your time, but I thought it would be useful to give some explanation.

Unknown Speaker 50:34

Thank you, Mr. Smith that time, and can we hear from sorry, Mr. Chandler was that was that answer

Unknown Speaker 50:40

your question? That was very useful. Certainly from our perspective, when we saw that broom covert have been inspected, or had a site visit again, it raised all sorts of ominous flags. That was this now coming back onto the agenda of a potential site. I think If that had been made clear as to why you were making a second visit that site it might have allowed quite a few people's fears because they obviously could read things potentially weren't. They're

Unknown Speaker 51:17

very clear and open turns as the lead member of these examining authority. There is no proposal of which we are aware to bring those locations back in scope for these applications. Any visit that we made there, or indeed to any other substation or transmission system connection point for any other offshore wind farm, anywhere in the country, is about us informing ourselves about existing practice and design.

Unknown Speaker 51:45

Then another comment I would make is that the substation that's being proposed is an order of magnitude probably five times larger than those already established at the Gallup sites. So even though they have bonded them and tried to hide them in the woods and so on. It would be impractical to try and do a similar procedure with the proposed substation.

Unknown Speaker 52:12

If you could put those kinds of primarily relate to merits rather than procedures. So yes, that's the kind of comment that we'd prefer you to put in a deadline one if that's all right.

Unknown Speaker 52:23

Yes, certainly we'll do I'll be sending something to fairly soon. Okay.

Unknown Speaker 52:30

And now, can we hear from Mr. Turney, please?

Unknown Speaker 52:37

Madam, thank you very much. We made a number of points in writing on agenda item eight in particular. First of all, in respect to accompany site visits, and I think there's a procedural deadline in any event provide a list of locations. So we will do that and record the number of locations sizes will need in respect of the issue specific hearing timetables, we make the general point which I've made already, which is the need for issue specific hearings, particularly on the impacts in Friston of the substation, and separately in respective grid connection, location and subset sites and alternatives, the other projects that they interrelate with and that as was previously suggested that the other developers should attend those errands will be asked to attend. And we also identified the need for issue specific areas on the development consent order which I'm sure will be in the examining authorities mind. So those were the points there in writing and I went labor them earlier but on Can I just pick up two further points the first one is in respective East Sussex councils. Request for moving dates of hearings. I understand that that's driven by their impasse, at least driven by their availability issues. But of course, for other parties who would expect to attend issue specific hearings, the proposed new dates may not be convenient. And indeed, I know now that we would have some problems with the week of the seventh of December. And therefore, I think the examining authority obviously will want to accommodate where it can. But clearly, there's a risk that other parties will be prejudiced if one party says, Well, I can't do that date. So please, can the hearing dates be moved? Because it may just simply move the prejudice to another party. So that's the

Unknown Speaker 54:48

first point. And then on those hearing dates, having seen those sorts of requests in the Initial submissions. Our observation is that it would assist greatly if the examining authority could identify at an early stage, which parts of those reserved weeks are likely to be used for onshore versus

offshore elements, at least to provide some guidance as to when those parties who are directly affected by onshore infrastructure are likely to be required. Obviously, at the moment, there isn't a clear view about what hearings are needed and so on. But if an indication can be given to those facts, that will certainly assist in avoiding availability issues. And that that's on hearings. There's a further point which is in respect of the statement of Common Ground deadline, a deadline one. This isn't a point which we raised previously. But it's essentially arisen because of correspondence between the applicant and stages. And it's this really The proposal in the timetable is the first draft of statements of common ground to be provided by deadline one. The applicant has asked that said that it can draft the statement of common ground it should receive from us, our expert reports on technical matters. And, of course, we will provide those, but those are themselves due at deadline one, and we are unlikely to be in a position to provide them to the applicant before deadline one. So our suggestion to the applicant has been that what should be filed at that deadline is a structure for a statement of common ground, which will then be populated once each party is considered each other's representations. So we just flagged that because it won't be a substantial draft because of the way in which it's proposed to be approached and on that issue, can I just make one further point on statements of common ground because 70 common ground was requested by the examining authority from my clients and the applicant on a range of topics. The proposal that we have is to provide an engaging Common Ground discussion on the areas where we have engaged expertise. So that's limited, in our case to landscape heritage, flood risk and noise matters. And we don't propose to seek to negotiate technical common ground on areas where we don't have that expertise in place. So I just flagged that obviously, it's a matter that will be considered the adequacy of those concepts common ground will be considered during the examination, but I flagged it now, just from a timetable perspective.

Unknown Speaker 57:52

Well, thank you. Thank you very much for letting us know that and with regards to your comments on suggestions by other people And how those requests may not fit with yourself, I did mention that we would have to balance the push and pull of of all the requests, because some of them do clash with each other. I would just request that you could put that to us in writing by procedural deadline C that we can take those comments into account with all the original requests as well. Thank you. Thank you. Yes. Oh, and in terms of offshore onshore, I think as we said earlier, our intention would be to send out headline agendas, approximately four to five weeks prior to the hearings. And I would anticipate at that point, it would be clear from those headline agendas, which issue specific hearings related to onshore matters and which were offshore. But

Unknown Speaker 58:47

I'm very grateful for that. I was. I suppose I know that I know, this may be a step too far, but I think I was. I was suggesting something more than the four to five week notice of agenda but more a And identification of which of those which parts of those windows might be broadly allocated between those two areas simply because they provide for us a clear delineation. But I appreciate that you want to populate the agendas near the time once you've seen the contents of written representations and answer the question.

Unknown Speaker 59:20

Okay, we'll take your points on board. Thank you.

Unknown Speaker 59:24

Before we hear from the applicant, is there anybody else that would like to raise any anything on any of the matters that we have discussed? I'll take that as a no. And so could we hear from the applicants if you have any final comments to make on the matters we've covered under agenda item seven and eight?

Unknown Speaker 59:48

Yes, conners on behalf of the applicants. Well, first of all say that we're in agreement with stances on the general point if we can get some Much Prime Minister says to when issues specific hearings are likely to be arranged. It's very helpful for organizational basis. But we fully appreciate that that also has to be mindful of the fact that there are issues that will develop during the examination. But as much Prime Minister's would be very helpful in terms of the potential timetable changes, and I didn't propose in any way to get through all these, apart from to say that in terms of I've got three broad points, there is the potential I presume, in terms of hearings towards the end of November, spitting out the compulsory purchase hearing acquisition hearings, which may be necessary initially specific hearings, and that might afford an opportunity to perhaps deal with some timetabling conflicts. In relation to deadlines four and five. I think there is a certain sympathy with the representations have been made around those but having looked through the other deadlines, it looks to us that if those are substantially moved, it looks quite challenging to fit the rest of the programming. And as a general point we'd wish to make that be there is not a lot of room and some of the timescales for delay in those particularly hearing dates potential. Looks like it could actually compromise the ability to come to cover all the matters. And I think that's the challenge of always an examination that will always be in a six month period, something that comes whether it's summer holidays, whether it's Christmas holidays, etc. But there is a limit to how much of a gap you can have without having to source the rest of the timetable and potentially not have sufficient time. So those are our general points regarding

Unknown Speaker 1:01:53

the timetabling.

Unknown Speaker 1:01:58

In terms of

Unknown Speaker 1:02:04

The matters relating to site inspections, we are obviously in a difficult period in terms of potentially having a company site inspections. The process for actually holding such an event would be quite

difficult. But we are also again, sympathetic with ensuring that the views of the interested parties and the timings of science back to take into account. I think those have already, in part been recognized and already been taken account by examining authority. I would say that we've also been looking at methods whereby virtual site inspections using technology could assist, but currently investigating options to support site inspections, potentially throw the material and we continue The habit can be conducted. And if that should be potentially examining towards you wants us to take forward, we'd be able to perhaps come back at deadline one with what we've been able to, to ascertain of how we could assist in that matter. Apart from that, I don't think I have anything further to add in relation to the topics raised.

Unknown Speaker 1:03:24

Mr. Smith.

Unknown Speaker 1:03:26

Yes. Last point. Particularly I'm very grateful to Mr. Ennis, for raising that because I think one of the issues that we have to think about very carefully across this entire exercise of timetabling for these examinations is contingency contingency contingency and we cannot predict what Coronavirus is going to throw at us next, or what indeed science may deliver to us next in terms of solutions. We may find that by the end of these examinations were in a very different and better place, but we may find conditions equivalent to current or even worse, we hope not, however, that last offer to investigate potential virtual methods of site inspection, we will strive our utmost not to need to use such methods because the physical engagement between us and the site, our ability to actually see it in person is necessary and indeed dear to us professionally. It's something that is very important that we do. However, if the virus were to run away from us, and we may find ourselves in very difficult circumstances, and so any measure of sensible contingency planning, I think is necessary to think about, even if we very, very much hope not to use it at all. Again, I'll return you to Miss Jones.

Unknown Speaker 1:04:57

Miss Jones apologies. This microphone is on

Unknown Speaker 1:05:01

Sorry. Thank you for all your contributions. Today we will be considering these alongside the written submissions on this matter if any party present or indeed anyone watching the live stream or later, the recording has any further thoughts or reflections on matters relating to the draft examination timetable, they can be submitted in writing before procedural deadline C, just before we move on, and whilst we are within the timetable section of the agenda and for the benefit of those watching the live stream would just like to thank everyone who has either completed the open floor hearing involvement form or requested to speak in writing one of the open floor hearings that are due to take place on the seventh, eighth and ninth of October. We are currently considering those requests and it is our intention to publish the agenda and running orders for those hearings by Monday the 28th of September. I'm now going to hand over to Mr. Smith to do just the final agenda items.

Unknown Speaker 1:06:02

Thank you very much Miss Jones. And what I'm also going to do now is call upon all members of the examining authority to join us and just introduce themselves once again briefly by voice. So my name is Rynd Smith. I'm the lead member of the examining authorities.

Unknown Speaker 1:06:21

My name is John Hockley. I'm a panel member.

Unknown Speaker 1:06:25

Caroline Jones panel member,

Unknown Speaker 1:06:28

Jessica Prowis panel member.

Unknown Speaker 1:06:31

Hello again. Everyone Guy Rigby member of examining authorities.

Unknown Speaker 1:06:36

And my reason for asking my colleagues all to join me on screen is that probably was great relief on your part, you'll note that we are moving now very rapidly towards the point of which we need to adjourn these preliminary meetings and allow people to complete their written submissions and also most importantly, to allow us to deliberate before we return to the second part The preliminary meetings part two, where we will be engaging with the procedural decisions that we have to make.

And, again, to reiterate, if you're watching the live stream or listening to this recording, please raise any final points in writing by procedural deadlines on the 29th of September 2020. Because when we move into preliminary meetings, part two, we will not be entertaining submissions about new issues, we will be making decisions about and balancing all of the issues that have been brought on to the table today.

Now, in terms then of agenda items, nine and 10, they are essentially an opportunity nine to raise any matters that are relevant in terms of decision making about procedure and decision making about the timetable, but that for whatever reason, were not brought out in advance in writing before today. And then item 10 is any other business anything that we need to talk about? Before we move into a gentleman, and so I noticed that nearly everybody has raised the possibility that they may wish to speak on this on these two items, and so what I'm actually going to do then is just to move through everybody in order, and just check whether there are any particular items upon

which they now wish to speak before we adjourn, and I'm going to start with a East Suffolk Council and Naomi goold

Unknown Speaker 1:08:36

Naomi Goold East Suffolk Council and no further points of clarification me.

Unknown Speaker 1:08:43

If I can just check. Does Suffolk County Council Mr. Graham gunby wish to say anything further? No further points for me, sir. Thank you very much. Alldeburgh town council counsellor Marianne fellowes

Unknown Speaker 1:09:02

Thank you, Mr. Jones. I've just moved on. I'm just trying to adjust it a bit. I just changed position because of the afternoon lights, but I'll just so take that down a bit for you. Okay. Is that better?

Unknown Speaker 1:09:17

Yes. So I'll just get my notes back up.

Unknown Speaker 1:09:23

Right. So, I would like to raise just two brief points, and would hope that your examination as timetabled at the moment, could also include consideration of project projects which weren't future proofed by the applicant or project perhaps changed by the applicant. So for example, there are existing links from Europe, to Suffolk and to other parts of the UK. There are other national grid connection points that have been discounted by national grid. The reason I asked These are part of the process is that I think that's the only way that you could actually, that will enable yourself sir and the examining authority to ensure they look at the local impact versus the national good is by saying, Well, why actually does it have to be here.

And then secondly, I would thank you for the opportunity today and the great lengths you've gone to to make this as successful as possible for myself and other participants. I do think though, there is still an under or under playing or not a full understanding of the impact that covid 19 has had on councils and individuals. A lot of our resources were switched to helping people at a very basic level of survival and doing roles we haven't done before. And in my written submission, I did mention what's called Maslow's series of E hierarchy. And basically what that says is that individuals are an art organization, if they're dealing with basic elements like food, water shelter, can't actually free up their minds or their time to progress on higher actualizations of public life. And if you look at what we're being asked to do in this process, if we don't have basic survival, food, water, shelter, safety, enough sleep, you know, I don't have enough sleep at the moment to actually be doing this today. If we don't have security in our lives or our loved ones, if we don't feel that those needs are being met, it's actually quite difficult and stress can actually shake that entire pyramid and the pyramid

topper. The thing that that's what anyone would aspire to do is things like this process, representing other people standing up what you feel is right, being part of your community. And the basic and intermediate needs, you know, have to be met first. So, although I think we could say that as a nation, we are getting back to some normality. I think Mr. Smith, you did actually say slightly earlier this afternoon, that you thought that everyone would want to be getting on with this decision and would welcome an early decision. Well, expediency really for us is just for the benefit of the applicant, who wants to take up their options, which would lapse with the crown estate if it's not done by a certain timeframe. So I would ask you to remember that we are under considerable pressure, both as a town council as individuals as family members, and we would want to engage and support you in your decision and in your final recommendation to the Secretary of State. And we would thank you sincerely for what you've considered today. And the opportunity to continue to work in partnership with you.

Unknown Speaker 1:13:12

Thank you very much. Of course, we're going to give very careful consideration and balance all of these submissions. Can I now ask Mr. Chandler save our sandlings. If there are any final remarks that you wish to make under agenda items? Eight or nine?

Unknown Speaker 1:13:32

Nine or 10? Yes. No, I don't think I think all points have been covered. I would just like to thank you all for making this quite a relatively painless experience. And I hope those people who are listening in who haven't elected to take part will now feel confident in partaking in future events.

Unknown Speaker 1:13:54

And indeed, Mr. Chandler, thank you very much for that final comment because again, we are conscious that we Many people until they have seen this will have absolutely no idea what participating in a virtual or indeed a physical set of examination processes might be like. And we hope, we hope very much with this event to essentially set out a stall upon which you could see that all other things being equal. We do not mean to make this a difficult or onerous process for people to participate, and we very much hope that everybody feels that they have had due involvement today, and this is the style in which we intend to continue. So thank you very, very much for that.

Unknown Speaker 1:14:35

Well, certainly it was a first me anyway.

Unknown Speaker 1:14:38

Now, can I then come to Mr. And Mrs. Courage? Is there anything further that you either of you wish to say? I'm not seeing any particular request. I will ask one more time. In case the network is slow Mr. or Mrs. Courage I'm now going to go to Richard Turney counsellor for SASES.



Unknown Speaker 1:15:13

Nothing more from me, sir. Thank you very much.

Unknown Speaker 1:15:18

Now before I come to the applicant, also noting that we do have observers here today from the marine management organization and before we move to the adjournment I do wish to check whether anybody else here observing is suddenly thinking I wish I had said.

Unknown Speaker 1:15:40

Thank you, Mark Qureshi FML

Unknown Speaker 1:15:42

here, nothing further to add and thank you very much for today.

Unknown Speaker 1:15:47

Thank you very much Mr Qureshi and I take it that there's also content. Okay, in which case, I am going to move then finally to Mr. Ennis for the applicant, are there any final concluding?

Unknown Speaker 1:16:07

behalf the applicants? Thank you. So I have nothing further to add. It's been a very constructive meeting. And I think it's the issues have been very well ventilated. Thank you.

Unknown Speaker 1:16:21

Excellent. Thank you very much, then.

Unknown Speaker 1:16:25

Let's see if I could just ask you to switch off your microphone. Thank you very much. Excellent. And so we are now going to adjourn these preliminary meetings and the purposes of the adjournment are principally to achieve two things to enable those who are watching this event on the live stream or catching up afterwards using the recordings to have the same opportunity to have their say as those of you physically here today have had by making written submissions by procedural deadlines C which can include a request to be heard orally at the part two preliminary meeting Not on any new matters, I hasten to add only in relation to the matters heard today or brought out in writing. And I would emphasize that there will be virtue in those of you who were here and made oral submissions

here today, if only for completeness to be with us at the printer in meeting part two, and any submissions made by deadlines. He will of course, then be published, and then anyone will be able to read and respond to those, which in turn enables you to fully prepare for the preliminary meetings, part two to be held on Tuesday, the sixth of October 20. Okay, I believe I've now covered everything else that I need to cover with possibly one remaining exception only. Are there any questions remaining about how preliminary meetings part two will be run, I can indicate that they will be run almost identically to this pair of preliminary meetings, part one today. So unless I see any hands in the air, or cameras coming on, or hear any cops from telephones, I am then going to move to save it. Our business for today is at the point where we should adjourn. We will adjourn. So these preliminary meetings are now adjourned until Tuesday, the sixth of October 2020 at 10am. If you wish to speak to Mr. Williams, the case manager about your experience today, down the line, have that conversation with him. But I would now as the recording to end the livestream to end and formally adjourn these meetings. Thank you all for your patience, preparation and participation today.