

TEXT_CAH3_EA1N&2_Session3_18032021

Thu, 3/18 3:49PM • 1:32:41

00:03

Good afternoon, everybody. And welcome back to these compulsory acquisition hearings three for East Anglia, one North and East Anglia to offshore wind farms. My name is Richard Smith, I'm the lead member of the examining authority. Before we go any further, can I just check with the case team that we can be seen and heard that the recordings of commands, the live streams are up and running, and the caption service has been switched back on.

00:32

After and I can confirm that the internal recordings have started, I can see and you and that the last time I started, and the capsules are working perfectly fine. So we're good to go. Brilliant. Thank

00:43

you very much, Mr. Williams. Now, ladies and gentlemen, just briefly before we return to the agenda, where we are at agenda item five, a and item small items for and but before we do that, just to alert that there was a brief outage with the live stream service this morning, if there's anybody who is watching on the live stream now who lost contact at that point, the best way to discover what happened during that very brief period is to go back. And once the recordings are published, I've been assured that the recordings do not drop out. So you'll be able to see anything that you missed, it's only a few seconds. And if there's any need to make any written representation to cover that gap, then please do so at deadline eight. with no further ado, then we will return to the agenda. And as I said item five, Part A and small item four. And here this is essentially to provide just a touch point with the applicants on a conversation that took place at compulsory acquisitions hearings, to on the bend in the cable alignment at wardens trust adjacent to ness house. Essentially, at that point, in summary that the applicants position was that the reason for deviating the cable corridor essentially on two sides of a triangle to come closer to the residential property and to the wardens trust facility was to ensure that relevant impacts to the samplings SPI were controlled to the maximum extent reasonably achievable. It was raised at that particular point that they might wish to go back and check whether there was any, I guess, room for manoeuvre in that location. Because in principle, if it would not materially adversely affect the SBA to draw the cable alignment a little closer to its boundary at that point, it would result in the need to acquire less land or rights over less land. So can I then go to the applicants and just see if we've got a concluded position in relation to that point?

03:18

I'd recommend Brahma Carlos for the applicants. So and consideration of the cable alignments I will then plot number 13. We have considered the the pros and cons are concerned that the logic of establishing the quarter not enough particular alignment, as you correctly say is focused on the maintaining of the 200 metre offer from the somethings SBA were possible, recognising the European designation off the off the SBA, our concern, should we amend the the the alignment that the stage

would be that that would then be considered a material change to the application and therefore potentially delay the the end of examination deleted the ultimately the delivery to the to the project itself.

04:13

Can I just briefly on that very point, because in circumstances where all of the land affected is within a single plot and the party or the affected person rather who is affected by that is essentially already within process. If you were to move to a position where you sought to take less land or a smaller extent of land or rights from that person than you previously did, and nobody else was impacted, that would not necessarily in and of itself constitute a material change even though the alignment physically moved over land that previously wasn't impacted. Now there are a number of contingent considerations, for example, that the condition of the land is understood and that you don't, for example, increase the biodiversity impact by by making that change. But again, from recall from site inspection there, we were looking at essentially a, an indirect or a direct line across planned that was had the same characteristics in both possible locations. So the question of whether or not a procedural delay might or might arise from this didn't didn't strike us as being something that ought necessarily be a major consideration.

05:41

Brammer girls sport the outcomes. Thank you for the clarification. On that point. I think we will take that away and make further submission that that link it with with in that regard?

05:54

I mean, essentially, here, what we're looking at is, you know, as is often the case with these decisions, a trade off, it's a trade off between the need to optimise against one set of values and policy imperatives, which is the protection of the SBA as against also the virtue of minimising the particular residential and business impacts on the other side. And, you know, there there is often no right answer, but through the lens of compulsory acquisition, if there is a way in which the amount of land or rights required can be made more efficient, reduced. With all other matters remaining equal, so to speak, then then of course, that has to be sensibly pursued in order to assure us that the CA tests have been met. Okay. Does anybody else wish to speak on that point? I do see one hand raised, which is in the name of Richard Reeves, but I understand that is Mr. White check. Let's work Hello.

07:04

Hello.

07:06

Yes, we can hear you now.

07:08

Okay, so yes, Tessa Wojciech, resident and effective person. I have a few comments to make here. So I hope the panel can bear with me. And it bears on the cable corridor routing, as it is the buffer zone, the fact of the objection to the root. And finally, American setting national grid, I just like to say I make these remarks without prejudice to my stated position of overall position towards these proposals

07:33

as taken as read throughout these processes.

07:37

Okay, so, yes, we've heard about the making to retain the the distance from the SBA to the west. I just want to raise something the present route, as we have as it first enters into the examination library. That seems to have been set on the 22nd of August 2019. That's a PP hyphen 085. But there is another earlier version of this map, and that's dated the 11th of February 2019. That appeared in the hardcopy of the applicant's documentation. And I'm afraid I've been unable to find it in the examination library. It probably doesn't exist there. But I did include a photo of that map in the hardcopy in my deadline six submission, that's rep six hyphen 212. Now this earlier route,

08:28

yes, just bear with me a second because I'm going to turn that one up. Deadline six, six,

08:40

to one to six to one to

08:46

carry on and I will get that

08:50

this earlier route as mapped it does move slightly eastwards from block 10. But at a much more gradual trajectory it stays west of the pond referenced by Mr. Smith at the last ch on plot 13 rather than east of the pond as it does now. And it joins sighs well, Hall road or plot 14, thereby maintaining a much greater distance from the residences and not coming to directly about one's playing field as it does now. So my question would be what was the reason for altering the route in the period between February and August 2019. The applicant may again state the necessity to observe the buffer zone to the SPL and I'd like to return to that shortly. In the applicants submission of oral case for ch two which is rep six if and 05 1.2 11. Mr. McGregor says earlier explanation is reiterated with the addition of the words were practical in relation to maintaining the buffer zone where practical does imply a degree of flexibility. Point 12 says the applicants do not Consider it appropriate to move the onshore corridor further west. Why not because it was further west. Originally. I do understand the importance of the buffer zone. I mean, I do have the ecological interests there at heart, but I'm concerned about the appropriateness as they say it's not appropriate to move it but I am concerned about the appropriateness of favouring sensitive ecological receptors over vulnerable human ones. So I contacted natural England about the buffer zone, and what flexibility there may be for a promoter in this matter. And in her responsibilities, Burton confirms that to observe it is best practice. But that and I quote, it is for yourselves and the applicants to discuss alternative options to address your concerns, with the onus being on the applicant to propose suitable mitigation. If the 200 metre buffer zone were to be reduced. And Miss Burton does acknowledge that it would be quite challenging for my point is that the option of altering it is not ruled out, and that such discussions are possible. Now, in response to Dr. Jensen's request for change to the route, the applicant stated that the cutoff point for objections was a deadline for and I hope that the panel will know that objections have been raised on this matter

throughout the examination. And the further point on that calling in is for the applicant referred at the last compulsory acquisition hearing to the ongoing negotiation on land interests up locked in for the geophysical and archaeological works. And he stated that quote, insofar as the matters are raised, it is clear that the land interest has been a negotiation to the landowner has in principle agreed to the routing of the cable. But I'd said if you look at the land plans, which is rep 100 for the possession of plot 10 within the word doesn't imply that the route is then going to make a southern curve to the east is given the breadth and extent the works six and seven to the south, plopped in would lie on a straight line from landfall to plot 14. It isn't part of the curve at all. So I disagree that entering into negotiation on plot 10 implies any agreements or the routing of cable plots 13. And finally, on this point, I would note again, the wardens playing field is shown to be land for option C for National Grid ventures Nautilus connection on the map included in their July 2019 briefing pack. In fact, a request for surveys to be undertaken on that site has already been made. I'd included the map in my deadline one submission, that's rep one hyphen 377. Figure five. In the letter to the applicants dated the 17th of April 2018 is Suffolk County Council states, it is important that the cable corridor can accommodate both SPR and National Grid projects. And if this cannot be achieved, or will present significant loss of immunity than those site option should be dismissed. This is referenced in William healthfood submission, which is rep 3171. So I would ask the examining authority to seek the applicants confirmation that the cable route selection a plot 13 is not intended to accommodate any interest that national grid ventures may have. For the Nautilus project to this site. We've heard about the width of cable corridors, we've heard about them enabling construction compounds and access routes today. And again, I would say that it's not acceptable that indicate in this case, a buffer zone has not been set within the projects for dwellings and gardens along the cable corridor route. And that's my submission on this point.

13:40

Apologies I had myself switched off. Thank you very much, Miss vertrag. Now I will return to the applicant for their response on that point.

13:57

Conference on behalf the applicants turning to oppose Jack's reference to a document of February 2019. We believe this is the written in the peer document which had wider, wider potential limits. And it wasn't all the limits it was corridors that we considered there. It's in response to the peer representations that effectively that the final order limits have been defined. And clearly as part of that process, one of the issues that arose was to ensure insofar as possible that the corridor or cable corridor did not encroach within 200 metres of the SBA. Insofar as the writting This location is concerned. I will also post observe that in terms of the outline code of construction practice consideration has also been given to locations where more robust mitigation will be provided to receptors. And this is one of the areas that is identified as having a higher sensitivity and therefore, a greater mitigation would be put in place. And equally I note, and there are other properties along the route that are in closer proximity essentially. And insofar weather has occurred, as we discussed last week, greater measures were put in place, and more robust measures in terms of fencing, noise, attenuation, etc, would be provided. And it was thought that that would give a significant reduction in relation to the effect. And the other key aspects of these particular works is that they are temporary in nature, and will last, a relatively limited time period. And those are all factors, which bear on the potential significance of the effect. Insofar as movement of the notes, I mean, the other aspect to it is

the routing through further to the north, is through features that also have to be respected as well, insofar as trying to reduce ecological effects, there is a gap between two habitats that the or that the order limits essentially tried to move between. and that sort of got to be respected. We, I mean, if one looks at the, the length and the the mitigation that's provided, we do believe that effective mitigation can be provided. And that was reflected in the code of construction practice. And it is, say there are other properties and other uses, which are closer, closer, closer to the the route and the alignment than those which we're talking about. And as I say, we've proposed active mitigation, we'll go back and look at the points raised. But I think the non committal answer from natural England in relation to the matter, does not philosopher confidence that our solution would be found, if we suddenly departed from the position which we've previously adopted are not alignment.

17:29

Indeed, and those points are noted, I guess, I just wanted to make sure that it was clear on all sides and yourselves plus the affected persons involved here that I'm, essentially, we're not sheltering behind proceduralism. If there are, on the facts, means of delivering a mitigation that both satisfies the natural environment objectives to remap and also better addresses the human impact plus also reduces the land take and is capable of agreement. There are potential routes forward that don't necessarily have the sort of time bars that some other things that we might consider, would do. So it's important that we just clear here, that we're not just sitting back and allowing additional rights to be acquired. Where there are other means. So if we can come back to that deadline, that would be that would be excellent. Unless there are any further submissions that need to be made on that point, we can then move on to the next agenda item, which is five, a little five. And this is broom cupboard. Which again, is the tying of another loose end. Now. I do just see I have a hand raised from misfire check. Was that is that a residual handle?

19:06

I did just want to make one further remark if I'm able to in response to that. I've just sent a single remark.

19:12

Okay. Well, I have asked I have heard the applicants reply. So let's hear you but I will have to return to the applicant.

19:19

I'm sorry. It was really a clarification more than a remark. Mr. Ennis responded in terms of properties, which may be closer to the cable corridor or route. I had intended to make clear that the concerns here were the protected characteristics of the people at wardens as well as the properties and the fact that it is a community resource. So I just wanted to clarify that point. That's all.

19:44

That's noted and we have identified throughout the agenda item 10 human rights and also public sector cause duty matters are to be raised. Wherever in the agenda we are so that those are noted. I will just read Turn to Mr. Ennis, though, if he wishes to respond on that final point, I trust them. Mr. White check, you are now. done.

20:11

I'm done now. Yes, thank you.

20:12

Okay, if you could just lower your hand, that would be much appreciated. Apologies, Mr. Ennis,

20:18

very, very briefly corners of half the applicant. And the position is that in terms of the the mitigation identified in the outline, cater construction practice, that was specifically for the protected characteristics of of the potential users there because didn't actually wasn't actually triggered on the proximity of application to residential properties. So it was those users that the specific identification in the mitigation plan was identified for. Okay. Thank you.

20:49

All that is noted, in which case, let us then move on to five, a little five brim covers. And as I indicated here, this is the tying of a loose end that actually goes back to a fairly early point in the examinations. And this is an issue specific hearings number two nnb generation the size, we'll see developer suggested in oral submissions that there was land at premium capital, its ownership that might potentially be available to the applicants. I think the question that the points have been raised that by the applicant the land in question was a biodiversity mitigation site required for the size well development. And this and size was response at that point was that they didn't understand that to be the case, and that land was prospectively available. Now subsequently to that deadline, three in rep high rep three hyphen 123. sighs we'll see said that it had included the land referred to within its reptile mitigation plan, the land would be used to accommodate reptiles to be translocated from land to be used for the construction of the size, we'll see power station. This important ecological mitigation land is already providing habitat for a variety of species, as part of the early ecological mitigation that will be relied upon once construction starts and therefore this land remains unavailable my emphasis for development by the applicants now, we've noted that and we just wanted to be clear on the extent of the land, that that applied to and also we wished to put to the applicants, the degree to which the alternatives have a potential connection point at or around broom cupboard and has been rolled out and and the bouncing exercises it will have undertaken in terms of land not operationally required for the size, we'll see development and whether essentially there is any form of unexploded window here for consideration of an alternative that might have enabled a connection to be made at around broom cupboard. Now, the reason why this remains in our mind, and we are probing it yet again, is principally because in relation to the broader requirement to minimise the take of land, if a connection to the transmission system in or around this area is prospectively available at all, then a very substantial body of additional acquisition of land or rights in the corridors beyond this point is possible. So, therefore, we need to be very clear, if we are to take a view that we are looking at the corridors beyond the broom cupboard location that there has been a thorough and robust exercise that has examined all possible means of making connection with that point, and that it has led to a clear and justified exclusion because there is no practical feasibility of making connection that point. So if I can return to the applicant on on that, if other parties wish to speak, I will draw them in but only after I've heard the applicant on the principal point and then I'll provide the applicants with a right of reply.

24:32

Cowen's for half the applicant to start with insofar as it's got a bit of a chequered history has proved covert and sense of when we were originally doing the site selection. It was not available yet. We were going through the site selection process. And should we say at overtures were made that it might be available and that we should have a discussion with Sizewell see at that point. There was detailed discussions for Sizewell C, over a number of matters, they included whether or not the land could be made available legally in a way that we have enabled us to progress the project. And that was taken forward through a series of discussions and negotiations to see whether commercial terms could be realised. The background to that was that the advice that the applicants have received was, it was likely that the land which comprised bring COVID may not be capable of being compulsorily acquired without considerable risk, given the nature of what was being held. And the other aspects to those discussions, were effectively even at that stage been identified, that this area would be one which would be needed by Sizewell C for their reptile mitigation. If the applicants for take what to take forward this area, as a potential site, at that point of time, they would have to acquire and provide to Sizewell C land for the reptile mitigation without compulsory purchase powers. So we would have had to as the applicant go and seek somewhere in the general vicinity, a place that would provide effective mitigation for Sizewell C, reptile mitigation, acquire it before we even finished designing, and deciding to bring forward the projects and procure the land. So that sets the context of the sort of, of, of the of the land situation. And ultimately, that amongst other reasons, was taken forward as the reasons why Sizewell C, spring COVID could not be taken forward at that time. Insofar as the other key aspect was the consideration of whether in environmental terms, it would be a suitable site to bring forward. And that is assessed. And I think it's appendix 4.3 and other documentation, our conclusion based on the advice of open, and at that stage, Mr. Denny had also been brought in as a status strategic advisor on amb matters to give a second opinion on the matter, was a very clear conclusion that the scale of development of that particular location could not be undertaken without compromising the RMB. And that ultimately, for environmental reasons why it wasn't taken forward. The land details were never concluded. But there was this residual problem effectively with the having to buy land of the equivalent size and quality first for reptile mitigation without CPA powers. And, but ultimately, those were the reasons why Sizewell C was rejected as a site. And, of course, we had the consultation that 3.5, which very clearly in the consultation phase, compared Friston against Sizewell C. And there were conflicting views in terms of who preferred which site. Ultimately, we had all that information, we considered it and a formal decision was taken. I think it's December 2018, based on all that information. But critical to it was the fact that effectively, we never had resolved the issue of at the reptile land, the Lamb deal, but more particularly in terms of environmental performance. Our conclusions both on the Lamb was such that it engaged the provisions of it. Yeah, and one, and that we've had to potentially see if there are other sites like with it, that would potentially with the amb, which are potentially delivering the project. So in terms of those are the sort of reasons but the fundamental point is that is it available now? I think we've got

29:12

we're probably have to look at the maps, I'm not certain. We would have to take that one away. My initial inclination is there's two points here. One is is the land left for the reptiles, if we were to construct the substation, equally, I'm not so sure about the effectiveness of the mitigation. If we were to construct

a substation immediately adjacent to that, so we'll come back to you on the point about because I think that's a second. Actually, Brian Macross. will have a go to explain the deposition procedure. He's got the plans up now. So I'll hand it over to Mr. McGregor. laughs Thank you.

29:48

Thank you very much, Mr. grellus.

29:51

Prime cross party alkynes just to counter what Mr. Ennis was, was saying, at the time that we were considering the the the room corporate site during phase 3.5, the land had already started to be used by sizewell C for the translocation of reptiles. And that was in consultation with the Suffolk Wildlife Trust and natural England. And we understand that there is a requirements through the agreements that science will see hard with these organisations, that the reptiles translocation process would be undertaken at no less than two years prior to the start of the sysvol. See, construction works commencing science well, science will see has already commenced quite a significant translocation process at that stage, the land what's currently in use by reptiles specifically for for size policy mitigation purposes, obviously, outside the realm of the size of LC VCO, but anticipating the the DC application being forthcoming. In terms of whether there's cohabitation available between the substations and the reptile mitigation, our position is that there there would not be cohabitation available because of the existing use of the land. And the footprint required not only the permanent trip required for the onshore substations and National Grid substation, but also the temporary construction areas that were that would be required to facilitate the the outcomes projects. That's both in terms of construction consolidation sites, but also access professionals coming in through through lovers lane or sysvol, sysvol gap. So our position is that there's no cohabitation, available between our substations and the science of LC, reptile mitigation land.

31:45

Okay, I think, in practical terms, we're not going to get fully to the bottom of this. And until we see that deadline and made submissions, essentially, what we will seek is the clear statement of the underlying facts that demonstrate that submission that you've just made, so that so that we are clear, which land was within scope, which land was not, which which land is subject to the reptile mitigation measures, and that and the balance of any surrounding land that might have been considered as possible. And transmission connection side. Yes, I mean, essentially, to, to be in a position where we are clear about those submissions, we must have a clear view about the underlying facts that support all of that argument. So if that if that's something that can be drawn together, in writing, for deadline out, that will be greatly appreciated. Now, Mr. Ennis, do I need to return to you? Just to draw this to a close?

32:53

Call? It's about that. Yes. Was that the method that I made?

32:57

Excellent. Now, I'm conscious that nobody else has spoken on this item, I will just have a final check around. I suspect it's just an item between the examining authorities and the applicant. I'm seeing now the yellow hand. So yes, Mr. And Miss that that was a conclusion. And we can now move on. So that

has brought us ladies and gentlemen to the end of five, a five. And at this point, I'm actually going to hand carriage of this agenda item back to Mr. Rigby who will take on the next agenda item, little six. And as you can see, my colleague Mr. Hockley has joined on screen and I will take a rest so you will see me later. Thank you very much, ladies

33:44

and gentlemen.

33:45

Thank you very much Mr. Smith. And yes, we're on to five a little six. Briefly looking at the work SAS accesses at over again. This was partly rehearsed already in traffic and transport so hearing earlier, but conscious that there might be different people in this hearing and it's a CA issue. Briefly to the applicants if you could outline the access options that you've got in that area at the moment and why you need to retain them

34:24

regardless for the applicants, so to access cable section, Phoebe which is to the east and west of Alba road, there are three options. One is to take access from science while gap and travel along the temporary haul route to the east side of the 100 River. Option two is to take access from Snape road and travel west. Sorry East fire the temporary on Route and access both the diverted area north for fechas LAN crossover Albee road and access the area to the west of the 100 River. And option number three is to access directly off of the road itself. Originally within the the Oakland access management plan that we submitted with the applications, we had a load for a a bellmouth facility or a bailment arrangement east and west of Alberta to accommodate vehicles travelling north and turning either east or west into the into the work areas. From more recent works that have been been undertaken in discussions with various contractors or potential contractors, we've identified that we can reduce the the the extent of that bellmouth it may not be a complete removal of every almost double D depending on the actual swing of the vehicles entering the next thing along the road. But, but certainly a significant reduction of the bellmouth at an old road that would be complemented by a temporary traffic signal solution at that entrance and exit. And that would facilitate then the an essence to tighter manoeuvring of the vehicles leaving site and entering site Fire Fire alter route. Our preference for access to to that area is via Snape road. So we are updating the art lane access management plan and battling it to some much more refined details of the of the access arrangements of Albert. And also to make the commitment that we would not be using on the road when the whole road the temporary Hollywood is available.

36:43

Thanks, thank you very much for that update, just to put people in the picture. Just looking at the land plan you've got. And option three, and the correction thinking you've got two accesses along the road there you've got plots 53 and you've got plots 51 or 52. So you taking separate access each side of the 100 River

37:19

napkins and just looking at a colleague's monitor who does that the bland plan on screen,

37:25

I was just wondering which access you're talking about about math and I'm wondering if that was a plot 52 or 53 which is to the west of the river

37:39

its plot 56 and 58 that the developments will be located on our

37:45

CSC

37:46

right actually right on the cable route. So the access is shown plots 51 52 53 What are they for? They just work for them. Works vehicles of a smaller size, perhaps Yep,

38:08

out through Brahma Krauss but applicants just looking at land land plots, hot 52 plot 53 and plot obviously third reference sorry.

38:20

Oh, you've got 5353 on the west side of the river and you've got pots. 51 and just by Albarn, you've got pot 52 and they're on the eastern side of the 100 River.

38:32

Yep. So, grammar grounds for napkins today are preconstruction accesses only, we will not be using those accesses during the construction of the of the project. preconstruction accesses will be used for onshore preparation work. So for instance, if you're undertaking archaeological investigation scrying investigations, they would be the accesses that we are seeking rights through good lace on but only during the onshore preparation marks.

38:59

So you're not you're not getting from the look of the size of the plot. You're not envisaging use of any large vehicles

39:05

regardless, but up in applicants. Correct.

39:08

Thanks very much. So just looking at the plans and bear in mind what you've just said, It looks as if you've got options one and two. But actually, you need both those options because you're not going to cross the 100 River. So you'd be you'd be coming in from access to one way and access nine the other way anyway. Is that right? Because you don't want you're not taking the whole road across the river I

39:32

run across many applicants correct. The 100 River is effectively a lock for vehicles.

39:39

Thanks. So really, option three in a way is sort of like a nice to have isn't it because you can get into that those areas for pre construction surveys without any big impact, but the impact really kicks in if you're going to use that as an access As opposed to a crossing plots 56 and 58 during construction, that's sort of where the difference kicks in AS

40:09

Roma crafts for the Hopkins. So given the the length of the the temporary haul road being constructed from Snape road across through all the road and likewise, from sysvol cap down through through all the road to maybe works that we need to undertake both east and west of Albee road prior to that Hollywood beam being available. So for instance, there could be vegetation clearance that needs to be on needs to be undertaken. r&d don't too, based on the seasonality of the of the work should the programme allow the work centre and on the river to be undertaken during the summer season. But the whole route is not in place at that time. And maybe do we try and front load up programme for three undetected works at the 100 river or some works with under river during a more optimal period of time. And that would require the access to be taken from all the route into the into the 100 River area or Western foulbrood into the fitness lane area, we are restricted to the number of vehicles that can use on the road sort of proof projects are constructed in parallel. The rear be restricted to 10 to a vehicle moving essentially v ribbons per day, and for one project and the seven.

41:23

So in terms of what we're discussing today, you've explained why you need those plots that we've mentioned, which is really what I'm getting at. And basically I suppose just following up on what we discussed previously, you're endeavouring to minimise use of all borrowed for jorik either during construction or join pre commencement activities. So you the land site, you've got plots 56 and 58, for instance, and 54. I think it is that's sufficient view to be able to get your access points in should you need one should you need to convert it from an access point or for crossing point to an access point.

42:02

You will make progress or primary graphs but outcomes Yes, all our temporary infrastructure during construction would be contained within plot 58 and 56.

42:13

Thanks very much. Just got one or two other quick things I wanted to clear up in your latest track version of statement of reasons which is rep seven DASH o one three, the paragraph 22. It says that a typical 32 metre working Woods would be reduced to 16.1 metres when crossing the woodland to the west of Marlborough road woodland to the east of arbour road. And presumably the least, and arbour triple si seven is SBA. But on the latest version of the land plan on sheet, five, I think I'm on to do sheet five on one of the land plan. Showing the woodland to the east and the west. The wood seems to be considerably more than that. I noticed in your project notes that plot 54, you are aiming to reduce the size of plot 54. But it still seems to be the same size as it was before. And I wonder if you care to comment, please.

43:14

Regardless are the applicants. So the reduction in the face relates to the reduction of the onshore cable route, so the actual working area, whereas the order limits themselves, and therefore the land plot, land plots or land plans have not changed, the order limits remain the same. It's simply to reduce an actual working space that we have within those limits.

43:36

So what's the need for the land Still, if you're reducing the Working Width, so that's what I'm trying to get out. It's all to do with what you're using the land for really.

43:48

So

43:50

Bram Kraus put out can so around the 100 River as the example. So in terms of macro citing the ability to microsite, the the onshore cable trenches themselves, to avoid any significant trees within that area to identify the optimal point of crossing the 100 River. That's why we need that extra space with an order limits to your life for that micro sighting to reflect the results of your consumption surveys, results of geotechnical surveys that are need to be undertaken pre construction.

44:26

So basically what in a sense making the same argument as you made previously in respect of the standard cable corridor that you want room, although the actual amount of space you need is less, you want to be able to move around within the order limits, which are still as they were before.

44:44

pharmacol spit out cans. Yes, exactly. We're making the commitments to reduce the footprint, but we still require the flexibility to Microsoft.

44:51

Right. Thanks for that. Just one last thing you could help me with. Mary got this wrong, but I was just looking in your latest track version of the statement of reasons Rep 7013 and a paragraph 23. It says the typical 32 metre Working Width will be increased to 34 metres to cross the 100. River. But at paragraph 75, you state that it's been reduced from 50 metres to 34 metres. So I wondered if there was some conflict there and which one was correct, I noticed you're still ending up with 34 metres either way,

45:24

across 40 options? Possibly they're both correct. And we ended up at the same point of 34. So originally within the draft decio, we had a specific provision within requirement 12, I believe, but yeah, identified the the onshore camera at that at that area of 15 metres. And that was subsequently reduced to 40 metres and reduced further to

45:50

an accident of history where you've got the information in several places when it's been changed one place and not somewhere else.

45:56

Possibly, but we will, we will check that out. And if there's any updates that we need to make, we will make that a deadline. And, Steven, I see Stephen number is coming in, you may have a clarification that he can give you. Just

46:10

thank you very much. Yes,

46:11

I guess. If that's why Mr. Steven happened over the weekend, I just want to sort of try to explain. The reason is because, in fact, the the reference was confusing is to two different elements of the Working Width. So what is being said is that the general Working Width through the corridor is 32 metres, but on the hunter river increases to 34 metres. That's what the first statement is supposed to mean. And then later on, as you've mentioned, the Working Width and reduced at the hunter river from what was planned to be 14 metres down to 34. So it is consistently 34 metres Thunder River, but in one case, it's an expansion from the standard width of 32 metres. And the other references to say we have managed to reduce it further from the originally citation of it being 14 metres. I hope that assists.

47:04

Yes, it does. Thanks very much for that. That's that's very helpful. He just I read through it. I thought Hang on a minute, it doesn't quite doesn't quite. At least I'll ask you know, because it's easy to get confused. I know. Thank you very much. That's very helpful. Is there anyone else? Any other parties want to say anything on this item?

47:25

Four,

47:27

we move on to the next item. If not, if the applicant is satisfied that you've said everything you want to say we'll move on to the next one. Which is the seventh points in part A of the enormous item five, Part A, which is works at wellsford. And that's Yes, that came up previously, as well. So we've noticed to the applicants, we've noted your latest track version and statement of reasons for each application, which is rep 7013 which says a paragraph 138 that I quote, plots 1772182 solely related to transportation of abnormal and divisible loads, and would only be required if the reception porters to the south

48:25

of the onshore development area.

48:26

I Felixstowe if the reception port is to the north I Lowestoft, then these plots on the right sort over them are no longer required. It's not possible at this stage to confirm which reception port will be utilised. Now we note what you said in your submissions regarding the water preferred policy, and therefore the likelihood that Lowestoft would be the port that you would be actually directed to use effectively by Department of Transport. But at what point in the construction programme will you know which port you'll be using? Are you able to give us any indication of how that actually works in terms of how long it will be?

49:19

Call us about the applicant. And the position is that until we had all the Transformers there, we would not want to relate potentially that being utilised as a route. And there are reasons for that insofar as the route to the north could have had a problem. And therefore, we would then take future routes in from the south. So in terms of actually determining when it would no longer be required. It would be if it's a single project, that's the delivery of the second transformer or alternatively, if it was both projects, the last transformer of of the projects Just the reason we would have to keep the option open until all had all had been safely delivered to site. So unfortunately, there's there's not really a solution to that until until the end of the end of the delivery of the fourth, or the last transformer.

50:15

Now quite understand Thanks Thanks for clarifying that. So we're talking about those plots, how do those plots actually relate to the transport of abnormal indivisible loads them to the applicants

50:34

ram grass for the applicants. So the plot number 37 was at monster bridge is required for inspection purposes at the bridge, but also for any facilitation work. So we need to undertake in order to accommodate the AI while travelling over Marsan bridge itself from our discussions with AI freight all years, it's it's considered highly likely that that solution would be a temporary bridge structure over the martson Bridge, Mr. Ross in the previous hearing, your attitude at the bridge being 6.1 metres long, the spanwise. So so that that that is more than achievable in terms of a bridge structure. Looking at the the deliveries for East Anglia one offshore wind farm, potentially a slightly smaller transformer believe the standard was around 260 270 tonnes. And we're are assuming that the transformer were three standard thermal norf is 283 tonnes. If we were to take that East Anglia one transformer over the Marsa bridge on the same same transport unit that was used for delivery to use Angular one, we would have around 80 or 90 tonnes weight on that bridge at any one time. That's because of the axle weight and the distribution of the weight of the transformer over for all all accesses. So again, not that lends itself to do actually a temporary bridge structure over the existing bridge, the weights are more manageable from from that temporary bridge structure. So based on based on that temporary bridge arrangement, we require areas close to the bridge to through the store materials through through to assemble materials to the bridge materials for car parking for welfare, nor to facilitate the either the two Transformers for for one project and for Transformers for for both projects. So that was the logic behind including the the field just to the to the north of our large west of Marshall bridge with the New York limits.

52:50

And so yeah, so if looking up the bridge will get assessed, it's looking likely you have to do something and therefore you need obviously to get away from the busy road. Do you think you've got quite a big area there? within the order limits, do you think you're going to need the whole of that area within the the order limits

53:13

are brown cross for the applicants. So the excluding the highway itself for the remainder of work number 37 is earned by 12 enough 12 and a half 1000 square metres and footprint again from speculated that the heavy load holders, we estimate that we would want to be at least not to your own half of that area for the actual to facilitate the works itself. But there are constraints within that, that area in terms of flood zones in terms of works and the rainwater etc. So again, let's state the physical footprint of the off our activities would be up to half of the of the of the of the footprint itself, we would seek to return the door limit size presented to your life for micro siting. And to accommodate any subsequent permits. For instance, we require from the Environment Agency and the environmental requirements, our water flood permits to accommodate even those temporary works.

54:13

Right, so you'll need some of the land but maybe probably not all of it. I'm just thinking given what we've discussed here. And the length of time is going to be before you even know whether you'll be using this route. Whether it's proportionate to include those plots in the auto land for these applications, given that you might not be using Felixstowe. Anyway, there's a good chance you won't. And it's some time before you'll even know whether you need to do any works on the bridge. It's just a question to put to you just to be thinking about at least because that's what's going through my mind at the moment.

54:54

Colin is involved with the applicant? This is an answer. We need to be able to deliver it and As we've seen, abnormal loads, what we're talking about here is different ports and availabilities. For those, there is no guarantee that lower stuff will be available, or at that point in time be capable of handling the particular load in question with therefore do need to retain the flexibility of either bringing it in from the north or the South. And it is, if we did not have the powers, effectively what you would have created as a ransom situation, down the line in relation to an inset project. And that that simply would be not something you would wish to have an equally the secondary point to this is yes, the applicants do or will have powers under the electricity act, potentially acquire land to support their operations, etc. But it's the time that takes to exercise. If at the end of the day, we were building a substation, and we brought it in from Rick north, and it didn't go well. And we had to bring it in from the site. We can't wait a year in order to go through all the statutory procedures that have been necessary to acquire potentially those rights. And it's that fundamental point of being able to deliver is fundamental to an end set project. Because I think it's trying to the context is the onshore element cannot be divorced from the massive offshore infrastructure that's also been developed at the same time. And one of the critical aspects of these projects is trying to manage them to make sure that everything comes together, and that the onshore substation is constructed, available and capable of operating by the time that the offshore infrastructure is delivered. And I think, given the scale of what we're talking about here, it is absolutely essential that we can deliver. And this is considered fairly critical. In the sense of this whole project.

Neither the projects are operating Transformers getting to the substation. And that's why it's so important and integral to the delivery of the project.

57:03

Thank you for that. So given that, given that which I quite understand and board has taken, is the some way communications wise that you can give comfort to the people whose lands affected as to how things are going and to what likelihood there is that it will be needed or what will be needed in the event that it is needed.

57:28

candidates have half the applicant absolutely will be part of our landholder engagement strategy to make sure Londoners are kept up to date, both with the project, and also the elements that might impact upon their land holdings. And that's absolute critical and equally understanding that actually, it's unlikely that this will be required, or alternatively, ultimately, maybe a voluntary deal. But I mean, in these circumstances, active communication is critical to to working with landowners, because they need to know for example, is the language to be available for agricultural use for the following year, or is it the potential but that's going to have to change and that was to manage. So yes, it's critical, but that engagement happens. And the team, it's a critical part of the process.

58:14

Thank you very much for that. Is there anything any parties want to say on this point? I'm thinking of Mr. Cooper, I think is here. Yes. Mr. Cooper, would you like to address us?

58:28

Thank you, sir. Richard Cooper on behalf of the Kenyan family of malford. When we were in the traffic and transport meeting last week, there was an indication from the applicant that the area required for this for the works of the bridge would be relatively small. I think what's just been described amounts to about 1.5 acres now. I wasn't quite sure from what Mr. Ennis was saying whether that whole area as defined the to 12,500 square metres is going is still going to be required, or whether the smaller area, the 1.5 acres would be required. Sorry to meet my measurements. Is it possible to clarify that and is it possible to explain to the Kenyans exactly what the applicant is looking for? Because, contrary to what Mr. Nunez was saying, I don't believe that Kenyans have had recent direct communication with the applicant. Thank you.

59:44

Thank you, Mr. Cooper. To the applicant. could you address those points, please?

1:00:04

primakov Smart applicants I'll hand over shortly to Mr. Hyde to cover the latest in terms of discussions with landowner. In terms of areas, I was just very quickly doing a conversion to green metre squared and acres. So the 50% area that we're referring to so that's 6250 square metres, that is the area that we would anticipate being required on a temporary basis to facilitate the crossing of the bridge itself.

1:00:37

Really, that's about one.

1:00:39

Yep. about one and a half acres according to my Yeah, converter. So, so yeah, and that error, recover, date, the bridge structure itself, storage and assembly carpark and welfare areas, etc. So yeah, the updated detailed design is still true still to come. That area may reduce when we were engaged formally with all years, and they've actually got boots on the ground and a non tech service etc. But for the for this point in time, where we're assertion is that up to 50% of that work at work number 37, would be at least on temporary basis. I can pass across through Mr. Hyde to talk through the discussions with the landowners.

1:01:23

Thank you.

1:01:27

Good afternoon, very high double turn half the African just to say that our direct communications with Mr. Kenyans appointed land agent. Clark and Simpson have been communications as early as this week actually about certain fee payments, and so on so forth to do with licences, that are undertaking for survey access for the land for ecological mitigation works. survey to be under communications going back to last year with the connotations to explain that we would like a temporary agreement over that land, should it be found that the land is required for the projects? And the extent of that, that was returned back to us to say yes, understood when, when it is now what you require? My clients were willing to discuss commercial terms with us at that point. So too, we obviously clearer as to what is required for the project by project teams to the extent of the land that's required within that area, we will go forward and get consent or grievance which say

1:02:41

thank you.

1:02:43

Anything else you'd like to say applicants before we move on to the next item?

1:02:55

No, thank you comments about applicants? No, thank you, sir.

1:02:58

Thank you very much indeed. So right. So if we move on now to the eighth point on the agenda, which is a relatively short and general one is basically looking at the need to justify costs off gem as part of the evaluation process. Where the applicants put the first compulsory acquisition hearings, the projects will be subject to evaluation by off gem as part of the officer divestment process, which would act to discourage the applicants from incurring costs which kind of would properly justified.

1:03:33

So

1:03:35

I'm just thinking per the earlier points in this item, and perhaps in other areas as well. For instance, solving and B retaining three access options to section three B the cable routes, and we've just discussed miles furred. Then we've also got the issue of the order lamb being larger than you require to allow Mark reciting. Also, I'm thinking that the costs that we're talking about, which I think is 16 point 4 million in total, and the funding statements are actually not very large in comparison with other project costs. So do I take it the you would argue that they will be justifiable anyway, given the relatively early stage of the projects so that if you've requested a centimetre wide cable corridor when you require it, because you don't need 32 metres, all you're going to say is that you're actually only incurring costs in respect of the 32 metres and not the 70. And if you've requested compulsory acquisition of land itself, as opposed to REITs at a substation site, that you'd be able to put argument as to why you needed compulsory acquisition of the freehold as distinct from Just the rights is that sort of making any sense?

1:05:07

Yes coins will have the outcome. What we'd set out was that it insofar as the process is concerned that effectively, the applicants here, will consent build, and then be legally obliged to transfer the, the offshore assets to a third party. But it's through a process, which is overseen by off gem. And as part of that process, we have to go through a series of vetting procedures at various stages of the process. So we'll have an initial transfer value, which sets out the the likely the likely costs and that kicks off an initial valuation, when it gets the stage of the first part of the tender process, that then has to be an indicative transfer value provided at that stage off gem and its advisors, pour through all the figures associated with the project, to make sure that they're validly incurred relative to the obligations that are in place. And then ultimately, there is a final transfer value, which is essentially what is paid for as part of the tender process. The fundamental background to this is it's it is it is a legal regulatory framework, that the tender process is undertaken in a particular way. And that derives from the electricity competitive tenders for offshore transmission licences, regulations. 2015, and as part of that process of gem are obliged and must calculate the economic and efficient costs, which ought to be ought to have been in the sense of whether it's been built, incurred in connection with developing and constructing the transmission assets and respect for qualifying projects. So there is that legal framework that derives from the government's ambition to essentially introduce competition in offshore transmission. And part of that key part of the process is ensuring that the costs incurred up front, which are actually ultimately transferred to a third party are economically and efficiently incurred, and are therefore consistent with the wider electricity framework, and the processes that we then have to demonstrate through information that we provide to off gem that these costs have been are efficient. And economic. And as part of that process, the land costs will be part one part.

1:07:45

Yes. So this stage, having order limits, which are greater than the land, you will actually eventually need at the end is not not a big deal, and really, is what you're saying? Well, because I'll just be that it'll just be the land you actually need. In the end. That's all that matters.

1:08:06

Well, there's two points to call us up after two points, that will probably get a bit more to that funding statement. But in essence, the costs that we as the applicant will occur will be the extent to which we interfere with with parties land. And there will be that compensation, also the acquisition of the actual rights and acquisition of land. In terms of of that, those processes, it is understandable that in terms of the actual substation sites, that outright purchase is the more appropriate mechanism, given the land change that's occurring there. Whereas its rights elsewhere. And largely speaking, it divides into land costs for the for the onshore substation, and thereafter, in relation to interference with land costs associated with the balance in terms of our interference with the operations during construction. And obviously, if there's any residual, diminishing in the ability of yields, etc, associated the land. But insofar as these costs are concerned, we obviously have to justify them to too often, and part of that process will be they will, they will have a lot of other data from other schemes. What they're looking for us is that we're within the bounds of, of all the, you know, the length of cable, it will probably be relatively crude, but they will have a fairly good measure in terms of what it should roughly cost. But equally if if our if we answer mine, we have to go back and justify and say why on costs maybe 5% or 10%, above what they've seen at another project and that that's perfectly realisable in relation because it depends on what sort of land you go through and the compensation to pay. But you have to you have to go through that process of justifying.

1:09:54

Yes, thank you very much for that. It's very helpful. And just to finish off here, Quite a bit of what we've been discussing today points to the possibility of some kind of falling away provision in the order. This is sort of a foot in both camps. I think it may well have been discussed in the decio hearings. But

1:10:18

in

1:10:20

relation to the compelling case argument, perhaps that's assisted by some kind of falling away provision in the order so that if it turns out votes, land, which is being asked for is no longer needed, then there's some mechanism for the compulsory acquisition to fall away in the order so that people are left not left with any uncertainty the people whose land and rights are being requested, we'll know where they stand. But smiles for is in these is an example if and if at the end, it falls away because you don't need to use Felixstowe, you're going to use Lowestoft? Is there a mechanism in the order that deals with this?

1:11:10

I'm calling about the applicant. The way it's draft the order, the current timers were only allowed to take what is required. One of the there, there may be circumstances and certain projects were falling away provisions may be quite important and relatively material. Insofar as this scheme is concerned, effectively, as I understand it, almost all the land holdings run east west. And insofar as there's any falling away, all it does is it slightly narrows the land take within the holding of the landowner in question. There's not a question of people falling out of the order through change in the area have taken decree insofar as the positions concern, as I understand it, none of the landowners affected have felt particularly strongly about this matter to come on and say that you're actually taking too much. The

reality of the situation is that if only one project were to be consented, we, the time at which the falling away with potentially apply would be at the time when we've done a detailed design, and are able to work out exactly what land is required. But that is in fact no different from the current order limits where we will equally have to design and tell people exactly what we require in terms of the temporary possession. If it were to utilise those powers. So in essence, there's not really a lot of time difference between finding out which parts of the land are going to be taken or not taken. If you if you've got a falling away provision, does anyone fall away from us indicate what we actually need? Yeah, yeah, and I say, the maybe some projects, I have been involved in other projects where the London trusts are so broken up and fragmented, that actually a change in the lateral extent of an order limit, or a land taking would potentially remove a particular land plot of land past people from it. But in this in this instance, it tends to be fairly relatively large land holdings, through which we are traversing across largely speaking arable agricultural land, and that's why it is of that nature. So I'm not particularly particularly where we're talking about the order limits being at the full 70. Yeah, once you move into quite a few of the pinch points, actually the order limit so the the the land take is already relatively pinched, because it's a pinched lantic already. So the winder order limits are tend to be applying through relatively large scale arable fields.

1:14:02

Yeah, so there's no doesn't that is that where the holdings are, there's nobody's gonna nobody's gonna drop out if you move because they're quite large. Anyway. Now that's clarifying all that. Thanks very much indeed. Let's see how we're doing it. So we got all the way to go a quarter past three. So what are tiebreak? Maybe for us three. Just moving along on item five here. What I'm going to suggest is I'm just going to recite the various bits and see whether in view of who's here and who's not here in the hearing, whether the applicants want to add anything further in respect of how each order operates in the context of other nearby projects, including other projects with agreements to connect at Friston and the sizewell c project in the Ferris consent, construction and operational situations. Part C covers Whether the orders exclude the application of a compensation provision or modify it beyond what's necessary to enable it to be applied, I think that was probably referred to the neighbourhood at originally and at Part D is whether the protective provisions are in a satisfactory form and one of us would agree with all the relevant parties. Now in respect to Part D. I was envisaging that Saturday, Undertaker's would speak here. But I think I'm right in saying that there aren't any statutory undertakers here presence.

1:15:37

So we are assessed to the undertaker national,

1:15:41

national good, you are still here. I do apologise. I thought you had gone at lunchtime.

1:15:45

Well, no. So we

1:15:47

do like to speak first, because I understand you had some time pressure. And you were wanting to?

1:15:53

Yes. What I think No, not at all. So what I think I can say on item five D protective provisions is that the protective provisions in the latest version of the draft DCA, which you have as rep 7007 in sheduled, 10 are now agreed. So that's we have nothing else to add on those we support the protective provisions that are there and at the DCS are made urged that those protective provisions are included. We are very close now to finalising the site agreement with SPR that was mentioned at the last compulsory acquisition hearing. And when that happens, we expect that to be shortly, then I anticipate that we will write saying that we no longer have any representation or objection in relation to the section 127138 matters. That's compulsory acquisition of statutory undertakers land or interference with our operators, which is agenda item nine on your agenda. So that's all good. I don't know whether there is anything that you wanted to ask us on agenda item five B. But as far as we were concerned, we'd said everything we thought we needed to say in relation to that composer acquisition, to and in in our summary notes. So the only other place I'm trying to wrap up everything very quickly as you're

1:17:38

very useful. Thank you very much.

1:17:40

The only other place where potentially we were would be mentioned is agenda item six, see Roman two and three, which are the, again, the more farm and the end get said substation points again, but there I think the only reason that arises again is, you know, are the statutory tests complied with? we've explained? Yes, what we need to do and what land we want, it's obviously for SP are to then formally make the submission to you about that amounting to a compelling case, but we've explained why we need that land and and indeed the power to possess in order to construct what we want to do. So I'm hoping we're having wrap things up in an omnibus sort of where we can come off the naughty step and be allowed to go home.

1:18:42

Yeah, that's that's if you're happy that you've said what you want to say, particularly in respect of the protective provisions on the side agreement? Is it really handy for us to have something nailed in by deadline aid? Yes, we do. Leftover at the end of the examination,

1:18:58

I believe that's absolutely the intention, as I say that I'm not involved in the discussions on the side agreement, but I'm told that that is very close to completion. Once that is done, we will simply formally write to you saying look, as far as our relevant representation may have raised a representation that goes to section one to seven, are able to withdraw the one to seven representation insofar as this is composer acquisition interfering with our apparatus. We no longer have any objection, there is no reason why you should not grant compulsory acquisition powers in relation to that are existing operators. And we think therefore, that that will tick those two boxes. I notice Mr. Moen, he has his hand up. So you may want to say something so I won't sign off just for a moment. But otherwise, that's all we wanted to say.

1:19:59

Thanks. That's what I that's what I really need to know, particularly in terms of those agreements that they're not left hanging after the event as it were. Because tomorrow, do you have your hand up?

1:20:08

Yes. Please apologise. I was intending to raise this under 62. And obviously, I'm not so keen about trauma. Mr. Humphrey should be left off the notice that but it was really a question on purpose. And I probably misunderstood the agenda here. And I apologise and I apologise for that. But I just wanted to clarify the purpose for which National Grid requires rights over plot plot 116 and it's sort of you need to look at various different places in the in the description of the authorise project in part one of shedule one of the decio it is stated that word number 43, which occupies the words plans occupies the bulk of my land, it is stated that this is for temporary working areas for the purpose of constructing works number 39 and 40, including access work number 39. is the is the is the realignment works and work number 40 is the temporary realignment works. So, that gave me a certain degree of comfort as to what the purpose was of my lack of temporary occupation to my land. However, it then gets rather confused both in the statement of reasons and in the decio. itself, in which it seems to think seems to appear that the purpose is rather broader than that. It's probably easier to refer to the statement of reasons and the decio. But the second reason is that paragraph 115. And 116 says that the same terminal language, plot 115116, but it stated, the land will be used temporarily for areas of works associated with National Grid infrastructure and access to those works. Now, my concern with that is that national grid infrastructure includes the substation and cable ceiling ends. And my view is that the assembly occupational and that's fine when it comes to realignment works, but it shouldn't be used as a general construction site for all of national grids works. And there's a very serious point here, because the construction period for the realignment works is something like I think 12 months in a three month period, whereas the forecast period for the National Grid works is is potentially 48 months. So there seems to be a sort of confusion between how the authorised project is described in part one of schedule one. And then what is said in the statement of reasons and in the purposes set out in the sheduled, nine of the decio. And I'm really seeking a point of clarification to the effect is that the plot 116 can only be used for the purposes of the temporary alignment works and the permanent realignment works. And that's the point I'm seeking to have clarified.

1:23:08

Thank you very much.

1:23:11

National Grid, could you clarify that please? I think it's best to go straight to you rather than by the applicant. Tracking Mr. Humphries?

1:23:20

Yes, I mean, it is okay. I know I keep saying this, but it's not our decio I didn't drop this. I didn't know why. So statement of reasons. Or any other part of it. We've described what we intend to do, as far as I'm aware. Mr. Mehra guanica, will tell me if I'm wrong, the construction activities that we would want to carry out on? Block 116, I believe, simply relate to the diversions of the overhead lines. The substation is obviously further over and I imagine I'm not the engineer that the construction areas lay down areas

and so on for that would be further over there. Having said that, you know, that's obviously a detailed engineering matter. But that's that's my expectation.

1:24:23

Thank you. To the applicant. Could you please offer some clarification here, please.

1:24:39

Good afternoon Kia Marina for the applicant. Just to give that clarification. The access that we were referring to Mr. Mahoney was referred to it plot on one six is for the temporary and permanent line works only. We can make that more clear in an updated version of the statement of reasons submitted at deadline eight.

1:25:04

Thank you very much for that clarification. Mr. Mani, does that address your concern?

1:25:13

I would just do like to be made sure we were being completely clear here. In that it's understood and appreciate there'll be some drafting to be done. But that both in the in the decio. And in the statement of reasons, it will be clarified that the purpose for which plots 115 and 116 are required, are simply in relation to those three works are two words, namely the temporary and the permanent realignment, because at the moment, when you get into the detail of the dcl, in terms of sheduled, nine and also centuries, it would it could apply to the entirety of the National Grid infrastructure. So if it's clear, that it's just a temporary and permanent realignment, then I'm done on this subject. But I do want that absolute clarity.

1:26:02

Thank you. Mr. Maroni. Is that something that you can offer now the applicants or do you need to respond in writing to confirm that? Are you in a position to confirm that now?

1:26:18

Yeah. Tomorrow for that for the applicant? I again, I think it's just about updating the documentation to make that completely clear.

1:26:27

Right. Thank you very much. If you could do that, if we could just perhaps include that as an action to be sure we've captured it. I think referring to the statement of reasons, aren't we in relation to those particular plots?

1:26:43

Humana for the outcome. Correct.

1:26:45

Thank you very much. I've just got a quick question on item five E, because I'm just conscious of time. So we just

1:26:53

got on text. I don't want to go without formally having your Mr. marijuana. And my could we both now leave this hearing, please? Yes,

1:27:06

I think yeah, that's very kind of you to ask Mr. Humphreys? Yes, I reckon we're done. Thank you very much for that.

1:27:10

Thank you. Thank you.

1:27:11

Well, thank you both. Thanks. And good. Thanks for appearing for us. Thank you. I'm just looking at the article mind time limit for the exercise of compulsory acquisition powers, and the amended requirement one, and I wondered whether the applicants had anything to say in respect of the reasoning or the rationale behind the time limits now being different. Thank you, Mr. Hubner. Sorry,

1:27:48

I regret to say Miss droopy to steamed up in here. And if the applicant, that mind neck collapsed again there and I'm afraid I have no idea if you're talking to me. So I do apologise

1:27:57

right and not a problem. It's quite understandable. We're sort of used to it. Basically, it's to do with the fact that we started out with article 19 time limit for exercise of compulsory acquisition powers been seven years instead of the normal five. But requirement one is being amended now. So that that is five years. Yes. What the rationale behind moving one one way and moving the other one the other way was if you could just maybe clarify that for us.

1:28:31

Thank you strictly, I didn't have enough the applicant. Yes. And there is a discrepancy. The the reduction in the period in which the project's would be commenced is one that has been accepted by the applicants, we have maintained the seven year period for the exercise of compulsory acquisition powers, because of the way in which we hope to carry out the construction of and final reinstatement of land and respect of the project, if you can bear with me and will give me just a few minutes, and I got a slight tangent here if that's all right. The reason being that what we're seeking to do is to take land under temporary possession in order to carry out majority of the works, if we ignore the substation site for the moment is really the cable route I'm talking about here. Now, you've heard earlier about the discussion about the the width of the corridor and the Working Width, the Working Width is in the main 32 metres if we have that in our minds that moment. However, once the cables are actually laid, the land over which permanent rice would be required reduces down to 20 metres unless there are other engineering reasons why it has to be slightly wider. So we can reduce the land in respect of which There are cables laid, in respect of which there are restrictions on the future use of the land and the extent it should not be ploughed deeper than point six millimetre, that sort of thing. What we therefore

want is to have a seven year period in which to conclude the work is not just commenced on but conclude that works, and then be able to go to landers should this be necessary, I'll come back to that point with an ability to acquire rights in land only. And only on my sense was that for what is actually laid, and that's the reason for preserving the post acquisition rights for a longer period, it gets that opportunity to finish all the works. And now that we've narrowed the scope down, rather than inadvertently taking a 32 metre width area, for example, because we have to because the time is running out. I do say if we have to use these powers, because as I think you're aware, in the vast majority of the route, we already have terms agreed with landowners, which would reflect this this sort of period in any event within which to carry out works. And then we do also include with them a commitment to produce as laid plans and reduce the land of which we have permanent rights down to that level. I'm sorry, if that went on a bit.

1:31:23

That's fine. So if you've got it, right, basically what you're saying is you you only want to see a what you actually need. And so you want to have good possession first to go in and have a proper shufti at what's there and work out what you actually need. Do some more surveys,

1:31:38

exactly runs rugby, and then we can narrow it down. And we can make sure that when we have the cables laid, we take the the rights in land. Yeah, if necessarily compulsory, but only voluntarily only for the small area. Once it's happy.

1:31:53

That's fine. That's that. Thanks for clarifying that. Right. Is there anything else anybody wants to say on anything left in item five? Before we take a break? Are we done on item five? Basically, we included each of these headings to make sure that we were fully heard on all of them. So if everybody's happy that we're fully heard, then I'm going to suggest we take a break now. It's just gone half past three as Mr. Hockley has kindly reminded me to get my kettle on. And if we come back for item six, at 10 minutes to four, please. Thanks very much, everybody. 10 minutes to four