

**File Name: ISH 8 - 19th July 2022 (Part\_1)\_Transcript**

File Length: 01:10:08

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:08:11 - 00:00:16:25

Good morning. Before I start the introductions, can I confirm with the case team you can hear me and that the recording and livestream at this event has commenced.

00:00:18:10 - 00:00:23:04

It. Morning, Mr. Mann. I can confirm. We can see and hear you. And the livestream has commenced.

00:00:24:00 - 00:00:55:04

Thank you very much. And it's my pleasure to open and welcome you to this eighth issue specific hearing for the Hornsea Project four offshore wind farm. And this morning we'll be considering onshore environmental matters. My name is Andrew Mahon. I have a background in Ecology and Environmental Impact Assessment, and I'm a chartered environmentalist and a chartered landscape architect. Today, I will be managing the event and introductions and my colleagues, Ms.. Dowling, will be taking notes of any action points.

00:00:56:05 - 00:01:01:07

So could I now ask comes Dowling and the remaining members of the examining authority to introduce themselves?

00:01:03:03 - 00:01:10:13

Thank you, Mr. Wong. My name's Joe Dowling. I'm a charter planner and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the lead member of this panel.

00:01:11:20 - 00:01:13:12

My name is Steven Bradley. I have.

00:01:13:14 - 00:01:16:09

A background in capital project management and I'm a.

00:01:16:11 - 00:01:22:10

Chartered architect. Good morning. I'm Gavin Jones. I'm a planning inspector and a chartered town planner.

00:01:23:18 - 00:01:27:05

Good morning. I'm a broadcaster and I'm also a chartered doctors.

00:01:29:03 - 00:02:00:14

Thank you. There are three more colleagues in the Planning Inspectorate here today. You will have spoken to Caroline Hopewell in the Arrangements conference and KJ Johansson, Drey Reyes, who are also from the case team or beavering away behind the scenes. We also have technicians with us for the sole purpose of recording and livestreaming this hearing. Can I fill first in with a few housekeeping matters? I will be brief. I'm fairly sure that those of you actively participating today have attended previous hearings for this examination.

00:02:01:25 - 00:02:20:11

Can I request that all audible notifications for electronic devices are muted? And please, can you keep your microphones and your cameras switched off unless you are speaking? No requests have been

made for any special measures or arrangements to enable participation in this hearing. But I would just like to confirm that this is correct.

00:02:22:15 - 00:02:52:09

I don't see any indications, sir. Mrs. Hopewell would have explained what to do if you lose your connection and we are able to adjourn for a short period if there are any significant i.t. Problems and if for any medical or other urgent reason, anybody requires a break. Could you please let the case team know and we will, if possible, adjust the programme to accommodate you and that yesterday please do make whatever wardrobe adjustments you feel necessary to deal with the hot weather within the bounds of professional decency. Of course,

00:02:54:01 - 00:03:15:18

for the purpose of identification, for the benefit of those who may listen to the digital recording later. Could I ask that at every point at which you speak, please, can you give your name? And if you are representing an organisation or an individual who it is that you represent? Does anybody have any questions or concerns about the technology or the general management of today's event?

00:03:18:20 - 00:04:00:15

Nothing seen there. So just to move on to explain to you that a digital recording is being made of this hearing. This will be made available on the project page of the National Infrastructure website and a link will be added to the examination library. So your comments during the hearing will be recorded and later published and retained usually for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision. The Planning Inspectorate is subject to the General Data Protection Regulation. Sensitive personal information such as email addresses and economic, financial, cultural or health related circumstances should not be discussed in the hearing to avoid releasing them into the public domain.

00:04:02:09 - 00:04:19:06

Please bear in mind that the only official record of these proceedings is the digital recording on the project page of the National Infrastructure Website. Tweets, blogs and similar communications arising after this meeting will not be accepted as evidence in the examination of this application.

00:04:22:14 - 00:04:41:16

So today's hearing has been held by the examining authority to explore a number of matters aurally in respect of onshore environmental matters. This is a public examination, and if there is a point that you wish to make, please raise your virtual or rail hand and switch on your camera. But please do wait to be invited before speaking.

00:04:43:17 - 00:05:14:29

At the start of a hearing, Rule 14 two of the examination procedure rules requires the examining authority to identify the matters that are to be considered. The agenda for this hearing was placed on the project page of the National Infrastructure website on Monday, the 11th of July 2022. And the items for discussion today are the proposed development site selection and design, including the energy balance, balancing infrastructure and the onshore substation access road landscape and visual effects, and the case for an independent design review.

00:05:15:24 - 00:05:24:14

The onshore water environment including what and back socioeconomic and land use facts. And the approach to within project cumulative effects.

00:05:26:14 - 00:05:35:19

So before we move on to deal with the items detailed in the agenda, are there any questions at this stage about the procedural side of today's hearing or the agenda itself?

00:05:39:07 - 00:05:51:23

No hands there. I'd like now to check the names of those who will be speaking at the hearing and to invite you to introduce yourselves. And I'd like to start with the applicant and his partner. I think you're in charge today.

00:05:53:11 - 00:06:13:09

Yes, that's correct. Good morning. My name is Claire Patrick. I'm a senior associate at Pinsent Masons for the applicant. I'm joined by four representatives for the applicant today. Let them each introduce themselves. With me in the room, I have Mr. Thomas Watts and Ms.. Bridget Hartland Johnson. Mr. Watts, would you like to introduce yourself?

00:06:15:25 - 00:06:23:10

Good morning. Thomas Watts Involvement and Consent Specialist Orsted. On behalf of the applicant, be sure to ask Mr. Wells.

00:06:25:22 - 00:06:41:04

And Mr. Johnson, would you like to introduce yourself? Hello, I'm Bridget Hartland Johnson and I work in Offshore Wind Project Development. I'm responsible for system integration. And related to today, I'm the project development manager for the FBI at Hornsea four.

00:06:41:28 - 00:06:42:13

Including.

00:06:44:22 - 00:06:50:15

Joining separately, we have Ms.. Claire Smith. She would like to introduce herself.

00:06:53:15 - 00:07:03:17

Good morning. My name's Claire Smith. I work for Lord Howe, scanning DHB on behalf of the applicant and I am the onshore EIA project manager. Please refer to me as Mrs. Smith.

00:07:04:14 - 00:07:05:15

Thank you. Good morning.

00:07:08:00 - 00:07:11:10

And we also have Mr. Andrew Ross, who introduced himself.

00:07:15:28 - 00:07:40:15

Good morning. I'm Andrew Ross. I'm a technical director with Royal, has grown in DHB and specialist in transport planning. And I'm here on behalf of the applicant. Good morning. Thank you. Thank you, Ms.. Broderick. And could I then move on to the east riding of Yorkshire Council? And do we have Mr. Sullivan this morning? It's.

00:07:43:04 - 00:07:51:27

Thank you so much. Yes, that's correct. My name is Matthew, so I'm a principal pain officer where the team is running council and unrepresented council.

00:07:52:17 - 00:07:59:27

Good morning. Good morning. Could we go to the representatives of Mr. and Mrs. Transfield from Gordon's LLP, please?

00:08:03:26 - 00:08:17:28

Good morning. My name name's Richard Castle from Gordon's LLP. On behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Transfield. And I do have a colleague, Elizabeth as well. I don't know if she. She's just taking notes, but she might have. Might be able to introduce herself.

00:08:18:14 - 00:08:23:05

Good morning. My name's Elizabeth Watson. I'm a trainee sister at Gordon's LLP, working with Richard Cresswell.

00:08:24:14 - 00:08:31:06

Point you both and those are the only people I have on my list. Have I missed anybody? Is there anybody else in the room wishing to speak today?

00:08:33:20 - 00:08:39:04

Now, in which case I'm now going to hand over to Mr. Jones for item two on the agenda. Thank you.

00:08:41:24 - 00:09:17:00

Thank you very much, Mr. Bond. Bonding with item 2.1, which is the onshore substation access road and the consideration of alternatives. I'll just start by saying that I've read all the submissions on this matter, which include the most recent submissions, deadline five and deadline five. I'm therefore aware of the arguments and the counterarguments that have been made by all parties on the issue of the onshore substation substation access road. I do have a few questions I'd like to put to various parties on this matter, but before I do.

00:09:17:18 - 00:09:30:19

Is there anything that you would specifically like to add regarding the onshore substation access road in the consideration of alternatives? And I'll put that question first to Mr. Cresswell Place.

00:09:34:06 - 00:10:19:24

Thank you, Mr. Jones. And I think, to be honest, we've we've made very detailed written submissions. So if you're if you've read all of those, I'm not sure there's much to be gained points I might raise, given that you've already read all of the relevant information is that when I was going back through all of the information to prepare this morning, I noticed that our most detailed comments about the choice of the access route are contained in an annex to our relevant representation, which is a letter dated, I think the 7th of September 2020, which appears about 22 pages into our relevant representation from December.

00:10:20:06 - 00:10:26:27

So I expect you've already seen that seven, I've just just mentioned it, but otherwise I have nothing to.

00:10:26:29 - 00:10:34:05

I guess I've read that. Mr. Cross and I think we also cited that in our second written questions as well to the applicant.

00:10:34:07 - 00:10:36:23

So yes, indeed. Yes, Tony.

00:10:37:15 - 00:10:51:21

Okay. Thank you. As I said, we do have a few specific questions that really regarding points of detail, but I would just ask Mr. Suleman from East Riding of Yorkshire. Is there anything you'd like to add on the substation access road in the

00:10:53:14 - 00:10:55:01

under consideration of alternatives?

00:10:57:17 - 00:11:02:27

No, I think that's already been covered in our our responses so far, but I've got nothing else to add.

00:11:03:28 - 00:11:16:27

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Suleman. And I'll just put the same question again to the applicant. I'm not sure if it be Ms.. Broderick or Mr. Mr. Ross possibly, or whoever, whoever shows appropriately able to answer the question.

00:11:19:15 - 00:11:41:00

Clark Kent. There is nothing further to add. You'll have seen that we collated all of the responses that we have provided to Mr. Mrs. Transfield representatives in the Appendix two on Rap five, dash 074. So it's all in one place for the purposes of today's discussion.

00:11:41:15 - 00:11:52:12

Okay. Thank you, Ms.. Broderick. In which case, I'll turn to a few questions of what I would think of a more detailed questions. And the first one is to the applicants.

00:11:54:02 - 00:12:24:27

And it's quite a long question, so please bear with me. But on page 78 of 5074, you state that the applicant has recently sourced updated traffic flow and collation data for both the A1 six four and the A1 079 to confirm the data that was obtained at the time of the site selection. But is that still valid or not? And that these data substantiate the information presented in what was IPO three one. So my question is how is this updated traffic data have been submitted into the examination.

00:12:28:24 - 00:12:37:00

Clear budget for the applicant? No, the actual data hasn't been submitted into examination, but we can do so if that would be helpful to the examining authority.

00:12:37:28 - 00:12:49:12

That would be very helpful. I think either submit the raw data or at least a summary of the data, please. And if I could make that as an action points for Mr. Ireland, who's taking notes today? Thank you.

00:12:51:10 - 00:12:55:00

Am I? My next question is also to the applicant.

00:12:56:27 - 00:13:28:04

In Rep 5074 you make reference to a stakeholder working group that discussed the access options at the preliminary stage. I can see the agenda for those meetings. It was the onshore substation consultation group and I can see two agendas on pages ten and 17 of AP 162. And I can say that representatives from a number of parish councils, including Rotary, Skip, Walk and Turn Cottingham were present.

00:13:28:17 - 00:13:52:21

And I can also see a template of the feedback form, but it is just a template. What I can't say is anywhere to substantiate your your assertion that the Working Group representatives actually preferred option four. Is that something that that you've actually submitted into the examination? So it's it's it's from the various parish councils to say that of the five

00:13:54:18 - 00:14:01:22

options for potentially taking the access for the substation road that the option for was that preferred route.

00:14:04:25 - 00:14:19:20

Collaboratively. Atkins We believe the minutes of those meetings are annexed to the consultation report, but we can, in their written summary of today's hearing, will provide the correct page numbers and document reference number so that you can locate those easily.

00:14:19:23 - 00:14:42:28

If you could do please, because I couldn't see anywhere in the minutes that actually worked when you in the minutes you discussed a number of issues. But unless I've missed it, I couldn't actually see where the parish council said, yes, we actually prefer option ful because all, all I'm trying to do is make sure that that that is what the parish council has actually wanted because I don't have specific written representations from most of the parish councils on this or any other matter.

00:14:44:27 - 00:14:49:23

But if the applicant. Yes. Will review the minutes and provide that same posting for you.

00:14:50:09 - 00:14:58:09

Thank you. If that's not available, then if you could let us know because we might have to ask specifically at the parish councils to submit their views on that.

00:15:02:03 - 00:15:04:08

Okay. Thank you. I think that covers that point.

00:15:05:28 - 00:15:11:04

My next question was to East Riding of Yorkshire Council.

00:15:13:23 - 00:15:50:28

And this is basically looking at the timing for the Jock's launch highway improvement scheme in paragraph 7.12 .4.3 of the Traffic and transport chapter of the Environmental Statement, which is 8.31. You probably don't need to find that specific thing, but basically it says it's programmed to commence in 2022, and this jock's launch is scheduled for completion in 2026. However, in 509 ful East Riding refers to condition 22 being agreed by the end of June 2023.

00:15:51:12 - 00:16:10:00

So on the one hand, you're saying it's scheduled to commence in 2022 and you're saying that you're not going to discharge the condition June 20, 23. And clearly without that condition, being just discharged, works can't commence. So can can you just can you just provide for us an update on the construction timetable for Jock's launch place?

00:16:11:15 - 00:16:29:22

Yes, sure. Um, obviously, unfortunately, due to COVID, that's happened in between and the ongoing problems with with costs of maintenance and the costs of the scheme. And obviously if it's an end to the programme of works, those dates have have now moved. So works are looking to start by the end of 2023.

00:16:31:13 - 00:16:32:05

End of 20.

00:16:34:12 - 00:16:37:23

And in terms of the completion date, would that also slip by the same amount?

00:16:38:14 - 00:16:38:29

Yes.

00:16:42:10 - 00:16:47:22

Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Salmon, if you stay on the line, because my next question is also to you

00:16:50:06 - 00:16:50:21

and.

00:16:52:07 - 00:16:53:15

This is in terms of the.

00:16:55:01 - 00:17:26:18

Special Access Road for Julie Wood Farm. The essay notes that the access for Julie Wood Farm to be provided as part of the Jock's Lodge scheme would also be taken from the A1 079 lay by. We know there's room made available actually at the LAYBY. But am I correct in thinking that apart from this access points of the A1 079a precise route for the access road to Jenny Wood Farm and the other properties including Mason and Blackwood Farm, that would form part of the Jock's Lodge scheme.

00:17:27:02 - 00:17:30:23

I'm correct in thinking that an access precise route hasn't yet been determined.

00:17:32:08 - 00:17:33:00

That's correct, yes.

00:17:34:05 - 00:17:43:03

And if it hasn't yet been determined, then, Mr. Suleman, what would be the process that you would go through before making a determination on the exact alignment of this route?

00:17:45:21 - 00:17:56:08

Well, I wish that would come from our our highway team. It was obviously conditioned as part of the job scheme, but for access to those properties. So something that would we'd look to condition as part of the

00:17:57:23 - 00:17:58:08

solution.

00:17:59:06 - 00:18:15:02

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Salmon. And what would be the process for ensuring that the two accesses would be able to co-exist together during the site if the construction phases were to run concurrently for Hornsea four in Jock's Lodge?

00:18:18:12 - 00:18:22:25

Um, I mean, I thought the answer that I would have to come back to you on that point.

00:18:24:18 - 00:18:45:12

If somebody from east riding could place Mr.. Something that would be appreciated. Thanks. And I just. I think that's all. Mr.. Salmon Thanks. In terms of the same question to Mr. Crespo, is there anything you would like to say about this, this issue of the access road for Julie Wood Farm and a number of other properties not yet been determined.

00:18:53:24 - 00:19:05:23

Sorry. My chemical was turned on. I'm not really beyond what we said already and beyond the obvious, which is that whilst it is unknown and whilst.

00:19:05:25 - 00:19:06:10

We do not.

00:19:06:12 - 00:19:18:15

Know the process for how it is going to be delivered and what it's going to look like, obviously it's not a very satisfactory position for my client or indeed the other people that can be set by this access. But that aside from that, there's nothing specific.

00:19:18:17 - 00:19:24:16

No. Okay. Thank you. Mr.. QUESTION Just before I finish on that question, did the applicant wish to say anything on that matter.

00:19:26:14 - 00:19:35:10

Collaborating with the applicant? I'm going to hand over to Mr. Ross, who can provide some further information about our understanding of the interactions between the two schemes.

00:19:35:24 - 00:19:37:22

Thank you, Ms.. Broderick. Mr. Ross.

00:19:41:26 - 00:19:56:27

Thank you, Sir Andrew Ross, on behalf of the applicant. And just just picking up on your question about the interactions of the the respective projects during construction phase on

00:19:58:12 - 00:20:38:22

the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan, which is Appendix F of the Outline Code of Construction Practice Rep. 4019. Section 4.8 has a has is specifically dedicated to cumulative effects and interactions with other major projects in the. The Jock's Lodge scheme is identified on a series of measures and outline are set out for communication between the two projects and managing those those indirect reactions.

00:20:38:24 - 00:20:45:05

So to avoid things like clashes of road roadworks and conflicts with vehicles, etc..

00:20:46:28 - 00:21:07:12

Yes, I've read that, Mr. Rozen. Just just pick up on that point. So you're confident, then, that there would be enough room within the labour area that should both projects be constructed at the same time, that both projects could be constructed, that there wouldn't be a conflict between the two lots of construction traffic and the needs of both projects. But.

00:21:09:06 - 00:21:42:21

Andrew Ross on behalf of the applicants absolutely confident we went through as you you you'll be aware sir we went through the process of revising the design to the light bites and to move the access point for the onshore substation a clear distance east of the original proposed location. For that very purpose, to remove conflicts and and to ensure that both accesses could interact.

00:21:43:23 - 00:22:13:21

Sorry, didn't interact together, but could coexist. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ross. And just a final question, just in terms of how once both are constructed, how they might work in practice, in terms of security, would that be a a gates for the Hornsea four access road that would be separate to the the access to first part of the access where you would farm and the other properties.

00:22:15:14 - 00:22:45:21



That hasn't yet been worked out in the detailed design. I think I might defer to one of my colleagues on matters of detail on security. But typically a guide is provided I HGV length from from from the public highway to allow a vehicle to pull off if the gate shut. But as I say, I'll defer to my colleague, Mr. Watts. Thank you. Mostly. Mr.. Which I can see. Mr. Watts.

00:22:45:23 - 00:22:46:24

Come on screen. So yes.

00:22:47:29 - 00:23:18:22

I. Thomas Watts about that but can just do just to confirm the correspondence with East Riding of Yorkshire Council previously certainly did indicate a red line boundary for the potential access off the A10 79, which is the exact reason why we amended the location of the access road to be further east. So so we certainly have an idea of exactly where the point of access is taken for delivered from and the access for 24 would be nearby to the east, but certainly not sharing the exactly the same battle miles going off.

00:23:18:24 - 00:23:43:14

So it'd be taking different points of access off the actually by itself in terms of security, it will slightly different between construction and operation, but there will be a gate and it will be located on the access road that's bespoke for and for once you project force, it will not interrupt or impede any access to Mr. Mrs. Jones for property and any access to that road. It will be completely separate.

00:23:44:09 - 00:23:57:00

I think. Thank you, Mr. Watts. And that's what I thought would happen. But I just wanted that confirmed and did any. Before I move on to the next question, did anybody else have any points to raise on that issue of the actual access of the LAYBY?

00:24:00:25 - 00:24:14:00

Not seeing any hands, in which case I'll move on to my final question on this matter, which is, again, to the applicants, and this is to do with a local nature conservation site

00:24:15:23 - 00:24:49:11

and on sheet 26 of the onshore statutory and non-statutory nature conservation sites document, which is 8.2 and eight. You show the Jilly Wood Lane, local wildlife site boundary and the relationship between that between its eastern boundary in effect and the order limits for the onshore substation access road. Now looking at that plan, it looks as if the boundary of the wildlife life site finishes finishes some metres before the nearest part of the access road.

00:24:49:27 - 00:25:19:22

So can you confirm that that would be the case, that that would in effect be a separation distance between any part of Jilly Wood Lane, local wildlife site and the access road. And can you also tell me what the habitat would be that comprises that very eastern part of the local wildlife site, i.e. the part that would be closest to the access road? That's a question to the applicant, please. I'm guessing it might be Mrs. Smith, but whoever feels able to answer it.

00:25:24:28 - 00:25:29:27

Clap for the Atkins. Yes, I can do that. And Mr. Smith, to answer your question.

00:25:31:23 - 00:26:02:03

A classmate on behalf of the applicant, I can confirm. Yes, Goodwood Lane is a is designated a local wildlife site and there is, as you have referred to, their shown on the plan as being immediately adjacent to and adjoins the proposed onshore substation access track. This local wildlife site is

designated for an intact ancient species rich hedgerow, as well as having a historic designation of being a medieval track and boundary.

00:26:02:25 - 00:26:33:26

As you've mentioned, that, yes, there is a gap and we can confirm that that exact distance. But there is there is a gap between the two and the consultation that we have undertaken has been released writing Natural England and Yorkshire Wildlife Trust to just ensure that the measures around the construction of the onshore substation track would incorporate measures that would be implemented at that specific location to maintain the integrity of that local wildlife site.

00:26:34:02 - 00:26:36:24

So i.e. protective measures for that intact hedgerow.

00:26:37:27 - 00:27:03:24

Thank you very much. Mr. Smith. Yes, it's an action point. If you could confirm just the separation distance as a worst case scenario between the boundary of Julie Wood Lane, local wildlife site and the nearest part of the access road. That would be appreciated. Thank you. Okay. I don't have any more questions on the onshore substation access route layout and consideration of alternatives before I move on to.

00:27:05:18 - 00:27:13:04

Item 2.2 and pass over initially to Mr. McCarthy. Did anybody else have anything they wish to add on this matter?

00:27:17:19 - 00:27:24:22

I'm saying no hands up, in which case I'll pass on to Mr. MacArthur to deal with the first parts of an item to point to please.

00:27:27:19 - 00:27:41:15

Thank you, Mr. Jones. And I will just say at this point, Mr. Crystal, given what else you're dealing with today, I don't think we have anything else for you. And you are free to to to leave us now. And it's probably wise.

00:27:43:22 - 00:28:21:11

Thank you. I'm very grateful for them, that's all. I'm so coming on then to item 2.2 on our agenda today and discussing the energy balance infrastructure. I want to touch briefly to begin with before handing back over to my colleague Mr. Jones on, on the design process carried out for for this element most of all and specifically so to begin with, can I ask the applicant to give us a brief overview of the design process that they've undertaken so far related specifically to the energy balancing infrastructure elements of the proposed development?

00:28:30:23 - 00:28:32:23

I support making sure that yep.

00:28:33:01 - 00:29:06:15

I package it for the applicant. And obviously we discussed in detail at the first onshore specific area relating to onshore environmental matters. The design vision process and the which is AP dash eight for eight and the summary, a written summary of those oral submissions is 4-036. Mr. Watts talk through the design process and the outline design plan. So we're not intending to go through that in any detail today.

00:29:06:17 - 00:29:20:24

But Ms.. Houghton Johnson can explain the actual parameters for the energy balancing infrastructure equipment that are referred to in the outline design plan. If that would be of assistance to you very much.

00:29:20:26 - 00:29:33:29

And you've read my mind, I absolutely didn't want to rehash anything that we've talked through before, but very much we'd like to drill down a little further into the EBI specifically and so some sense just right. Thank you.

00:29:36:17 - 00:30:08:13

Thanks, Bridget. Helen Johnson for the applicant. Okay. So the the design basis that we've got in terms of the dimension at the moment is, is it's based on technology that we know is available today and can deliver some of the services that are required to either stabilise the grid or interact with the electricity market and improve how the wind farm behaves in the market. Technology is changing rapidly and so are the conditions of the grid.

00:30:08:15 - 00:30:44:10

So it's very hard for us to pin down today exactly what technology is going to be the best fit for that project at the time when we and if we go more into detail design. So if you look at what we've included, it's included energy storage and under a group name of energy balance and infrastructure, and that does include some of the technologies that could be used for balancing. The biggest dimension is related to synchronous compensation, which is a big like, you know, rotating machine that is used to, you know, carry out grid stability activities very rapidly.

00:30:44:21 - 00:31:15:27

We might or we might not use it. Probably people that are anyway familiar with energy storage in the UK at the moment, mostly it's been well from since 2016. It was originally installed in shipping container type housings. They've been in response to increased safety needs and things like that move more towards prefabricated modular buildings. But again, we're starting to see as technology changes, they require different building spaces. There's also noise that we have to consider.

00:31:15:29 - 00:31:33:18

So you may need an external building. So we've really tried to make sure that we're able to be able to install the best fit that technology at the time. And that would enable us, you know, like I said, to better interact with the grid and with the electricity market and and improve the performance of the wind farm overall.

00:31:35:03 - 00:31:45:09

Thank you. Is it is it reasonable to say that an energy balancing infrastructure associated with wind farms is something which is relatively novel?

00:31:48:04 - 00:32:22:02

Certainly. Bridget Hartland, on behalf of the applicant. Yes, indeed. But it's becoming more and more of a need. We've we've seen so far in the UK that an imbalance in infrastructure has been able to be installed anywhere in the UK. But there's now discussions about totally change in the way our market is designed in the UK to reflect the locational needs of such technologies. And this is because as we're seeing more and more new variable technologies connected to the grid, to the certain issues that certain parts of the country where you require specific services.

00:32:22:17 - 00:32:49:26

So I think it will become more and more of a need going forward to have this locational installations. But also by locating it as close as we possibly can to the wind farm, it means that we're able to keep it as efficient as possible. So the less that any electricity has to travel through wires and cables and

substations, the more of it we can use to balance. So it means that we end up being able to use more of that green energy than if it was located further away.

00:32:51:22 - 00:32:59:06

Lucky if you've just answered my next question. Which which was what were the criteria that led you to choose those locations? So well, then

00:33:00:26 - 00:33:07:01

I will just ask as well whether you did consider any other potential locations, notwithstanding what you've just said.

00:33:12:09 - 00:33:30:24

Clear project. The applicant and alternative locations were considered as part of the overall site selection process for the onshore substation. But for the reasons that Mr. Johnson explained, they were considered on a co-located basis for all of the advantages that co-location brings.

00:33:31:18 - 00:33:44:02

So in any scenario, you would have had the GBI co-located, as you say, with with the rest of the eventual substation structures collaboratively.

00:33:44:10 - 00:33:45:08

Yes, that's correct.

00:33:47:10 - 00:34:12:19

So so coming on, then again, a little bit more specifically with reference to safety aspects of the design process. Can you take me through in a bit more detail the measures that you've taken to date to design out any potential risks which may otherwise be inherent in the design, construction and operation of this type of energy balancing infrastructure in place.

00:34:17:28 - 00:34:22:27

But if the applicant handed over to Mr. Watts, he can explain the process taken under State.

00:34:25:14 - 00:35:06:21

Thomas Watts On behalf of the applicant, I would just point to the the main documents in examination at the moment, the most important of which is the outline and as you call it, scheme infrastructure has a report which was provided and is updated as RIP 2029, which was, as you recall, updated to incorporate some of the additional measures that we identified as part of the risk assessment that was undertaken early on in the examination process. And the hazard report has been created to provide an outline structure of how safety measures will be considered in the future design of the EPA as it's designed and requirements.

00:35:06:23 - 00:35:49:20

Seven of the of the development consent order and I mean some of the key sections in there are section 4.3, which summarises the principles of prevention and hierarchy of control. So it really sets out the measures that are obviously intended to avoid the risk of safety issues occurring and then also designing in measures that would avoid avoid the risk of such risks increasing or compounding upon themselves. So there's a certain hierarchy of measures that are secured in that report that would focus primarily on avoidance and design measures and then would also cover of the management measures that would then be agreed with local fire services, etc.

00:35:49:22 - 00:36:24:14

in the event of of an issue arising in terms of the additional measures that were outlined in the risk assessment, these are covered in section 4.4.4. So that was the track changes that were added at

deadline to which covered cover some of the more specific measures that were identified as the risk assessment is being used which are agreed at this time. And this outline report would be created into a detailed version to discharge your client in 26 alongside each riding of Yorkshire Council when the time of the type design comes along.

00:36:26:18 - 00:36:39:01

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Watts. I don't have any further questions on the design aspects at this stage. The uninsured balancing infrastructure slide will hand you over to my colleague, Mr. Jones.

00:36:41:11 - 00:36:42:23

Thank you, Mr. MacArthur.

00:36:44:17 - 00:37:17:00

Just rounding this off. I have a few questions for the applicants and they're really related to one step back, which is the kind of the risk assessment methodology. So we've you've touched on some of those already, but I want to really take take one step back and look at look at how you how you initially assessed risk. So my first question to the applicant is, can you explain how you've assess risk for the energy balance in infrastructure in the absence of a final technology and detailed design being known?

00:37:31:08 - 00:38:00:09

Clear project for the applicant. I will hand over to Ms.. Smith to explain the methodology. But in terms of the parameters used for the assessment, then they have been largely based on battery storage, which Ms.. Houghton Johnson explained has been the most common form of battery storage, energy storage to date. But it's considered that the parameters used would be applicable to other types of energy storage that may come forward. But I'll hand it over to Ms.. Smith to explain the methodology used.

00:38:00:23 - 00:38:01:20

Thank you, Ms.. Broderick.

00:38:04:20 - 00:38:39:06

A classmate on behalf of the applicant, say, just with regards to the methodology that was used for the environmental risk assessment. So this was based on guidance provided by the Environment Agency for preparing risk assessments to support actually environmental permit applications. So whilst our assessment has been used to support a DCO application and not an environmental permit, the applicant does consider that this is an appropriate methodology due to its focus on industrial hazards and associated risks.

00:38:40:02 - 00:39:09:11

So in terms of identifying the potential source pathway receptor linkages, we made reference to the outline energy balancing infrastructure hazard report as mentioned. So that's REC 2029. And also at the guidance such as but not particularly limited to the World Bank, International Finance Corporation, Environmental, Health and Safety. General Guidelines and Pollution Prevention Guidance.

00:39:11:09 - 00:39:49:27

So the approach that was used is different to that which has been applied for the EIA for the Hornsea four project. In terms of the other technical topics, as in what is presented and sets out in the environmental assessment. So in the EIA methodology document annex A 1.5, which is IP 011, in that the environmental risk assessment has defined hazards that have the potential to cause or contributes towards a fire and then identifies the potential control measures to reduce that risk.

00:39:50:08 - 00:40:28:10

And then this approach is considered valid when considering the industrial nature of the proposed onshore substation and EBI and the emphasis there for ensuring the mechanisms are integrated into the design to control the identified risk and to subsequently have in place the protective measures for the receptors. So given the nature and scale of the proposed onshore substation and the API, the specific fire related hazards considered and the associated potential environmental risks, the approach that's been used is considered to be a pipe sorry is considered to be both proportionate and appropriate.

00:40:29:22 - 00:40:39:19

Thank you, Mr. Smith. I've got a few supplementary questions based on on what you've said. And firstly, is the risk assessment. Is that considered to be part of the environmental statement?

00:40:42:09 - 00:40:59:23

A classmate on behalf of the applicant. Yes, it is his party. It was submitted as part of a subsequent deadline. But yes, it's considered it's just not a the same chapter, shall we say, approach that's taken for the other environmental topics.

00:41:00:19 - 00:41:08:17

And therefore, going back to schedule 15, I think, of the draft year that would be a certified document in there and the DCO, would it be.

00:41:09:06 - 00:41:27:03

A class based on behalf of the applicant? Can I just defer to her just to say thank you? I appreciate the opinion. Yes, that's correct. As part of the updates to Schedule 15 that we discussed at the DCO hearing, we will be adding that document to the list.

00:41:27:16 - 00:41:48:28

Thank you. Ms.. Brodrick just made the supplementary question which at the moment, Ms.. Smith, you said you've based it on generally battery storage technology and should that, should the technology change significantly with the risk assessments they need to be repeated, need to be done again? And how is that secured in the outline risk assessment document?

00:41:57:29 - 00:42:28:09

I can I speak on behalf of the applicant? I say it would be a case of if there is a change in technology, there would need to be a review undertaken to ensure that the promises and there's no material change to what's been presented and undertaken in terms of the environmental risk assessment. If there are any changes, then that would in itself trigger a requirement for a review and an update in terms of securing it. Then it would be, as my colleague Mr.

00:42:28:11 - 00:42:33:15

Projects advised, because it's listed on that certified document, that's where it would be met.

00:42:35:19 - 00:42:52:00

So collaboratively, I guess. Yes. I was just going to add so that you can follow it through on in the actual draft DCA, the actual hazard report that Mr. Watts referred to is secured by way of requirement 26 and then requirement 30

00:42:53:21 - 00:43:01:25

relates to amendments to details. And that has a proviso that then any amendments can be made

00:43:03:19 - 00:43:20:00

such that they're unlikely to give rise to any materially greater environmental effects from those assessed in the environmental statement. So it need to come back to what had been assessed in the environmental statement, which, as we just discussed, that definition would include the risk assessment methodology.

00:43:20:20 - 00:43:35:25

And just in terms of that judgment of whether they are materially greater or not, I presume then that that would be a judgment that you would make first, but you would need to consult with the Environment Agency or relevant organisation on that to see whether they would be material or not.

00:43:36:20 - 00:44:02:12

And that the decision as to whether it's material or not will be for east riding of Yorkshire Council as part of the discharge of that requirement. But there would be consultation undertaken as part of that discharge of requirement process. And I would add that applicant would also obviously have discussions in advance, but East Riding would also consult with the relevant stakeholders as part of the discharge of requirement process that set out in the DCI.

00:44:03:07 - 00:44:08:29

Thank you, Ms.. Project. Mr. Salmon, was there anything you wish to add on that consultation process?

00:44:11:18 - 00:44:17:05

Nothing. Nothing further. So I just to agree, as part of the discharge requirements, we will consult when necessary.

00:44:17:20 - 00:44:37:25

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Salmon. In which case, if I can go back to the applicant, please. And if I'm not looking at the environmental risk assessment for the onshore substation in the FBI, which is as of to oh, and on table one of ASIO to

00:44:39:18 - 00:44:51:21

you, we've basically shown a matrix approach to the scoring and rating of risk and that depicts a low, medium or high risk, which is calculated by multiplying the likelihood of an occurrence by the severity of the hazard.

00:44:53:10 - 00:45:18:00

And in table two, you indicate that both are low, which is a coloured green and a medium which is coloured orange. A risk rating means that the actors activity is considered acceptable and can be screened out of the need for assessment. Can you please can you please set out the established methodology on which this is based? And I'm thinking in particular in terms of the medium orange risk rating.

00:45:30:15 - 00:45:51:19

Clear Project, the Atkins. We all need to respond in writing to that particular point because we don't have the technical lead. Who drafted the risk assessment methodology available to provide oral submissions today? So is a more technical query than the overwriting methodology that Ms.. Smith has already outlined to you. So we'll respond in writing, if that's okay.

00:45:51:21 - 00:45:54:26

Okay. Thank you. Ms.. Projects that could be noted as an action point, please.

00:45:56:19 - 00:46:18:12

And my final question, which is again, on ASO, to which you may or may not be able to answer today, Ms.. Broderick and your colleagues. In terms of table three, and I'm looking at the residual severity. Particularly looking at a fire or. In particular, an explosion.

00:46:21:06 - 00:46:24:23

And you've got those diners being reduced from a.

00:46:26:16 - 00:46:29:26

A three to a two for a fire

00:46:32:00 - 00:46:43:12

and for an explosion from a five to a two. So it's not the likelihood of the events taking place. It's it's the.

00:46:45:14 - 00:47:13:07

It's the severity should dots in a highly unlikely event happen. And I'm particularly wanted to query about the explosion. So what risk management techniques have you? Put in place or why have you considered that could be put in place to reduce the residual severity of an explosion from a five to a two? So not the likelihood of the explosion taking place, but the severity if it does take place.

00:47:23:25 - 00:47:25:01

Collaboratively at Kent,

00:47:26:23 - 00:47:31:27

Mr. Johnson will give an initial response, but we can provide a more technical answer in writing.

00:47:32:18 - 00:47:33:15

Thank you, Ms.. Broderick.

00:47:40:01 - 00:47:56:29

Bridget Johnson on behalf of the applicant. In general, the industry's move towards smaller compartmentalization of technology so that there is a minimal risk or if if something does happen that small. But I think, like Claire said, will we can provide more data around that.

00:47:58:08 - 00:48:19:02

If you could please, that would be much appreciated. And if that could be noticed as an action point, please. Thank you. Now, I don't have any thing else to aunt. As regards to the issue of the API and the assessment of risk. Unless anybody else does. I'm just a final call for Hans.

00:48:20:19 - 00:48:26:23

I can't see any. In which case I shall hand over to Mr. MacArthur to deal with item three.

00:48:29:17 - 00:48:34:00

You, Mr. Jones. So, yes, as you said, coming on citing three.

00:48:35:15 - 00:49:14:19

And to begin with, as the agenda says, the requirement for independent requirement or otherwise for independent design review of the onshore buildings and structures. And I will come to Mr. Sun and first phase from east riding of Yorkshire Council. In your response to action points arising from issue specific hearing number two which is correct 4-065. It sets out the view that and I will quote the benefits of a design review process would be very limited given that the design of the substation buildings is driven by the technical requirements and the scientists have limited sensitivity.



00:49:15:26 - 00:49:30:23

Do you believe that this view is compatible? And if so, how do you believe it's compatible with the recent decisions made by Secretary States and also Vanguard and Borges, which determined that both of these proposals would benefit from an independent design review process?

00:49:33:16 - 00:49:38:04

Well, obviously those are separate schemes. Obviously it's not the same as here.

00:49:39:21 - 00:49:41:21

Obviously, we stand by the comments that we've already provided.

00:49:43:22 - 00:50:16:12

So in reaching that conclusion, the Secretary of State recognised that the development buildings particularly would have significant adverse landscape and visual impacts and that that was the. The significant concern, the overriding concern in terms of landscape and visual effects. Do you believe that's not the case? Yeah, and it's a puzzle. We don't. But obviously that's obviously for the vessels to make that final call.

00:50:19:01 - 00:50:29:13

So just because you don't believe that there there are significant landscape and visual impacts there is resulting from this proposed development or that there would be no. Okay.

00:50:31:16 - 00:50:34:27

Thank you very much. I will ask the same question to the Applicant.

00:50:36:15 - 00:51:24:18

Clay Project for the Atkins. And I think it's important to note that whilst East Anglia and the Norfolk Vanguard Norfolk Press D'CRUZ did include provisions relating to independent design reviews. That is quite an unusual approach. It's not a standard requirement in previous offshore wind, discos or in other energy ECAS that have significant onshore infrastructure such as energy from waste developments. I think it's important to look at some of the additional reasoning behind the examining authority and the Secretary of State's decision to impose, in particular on the Norfolk press the Norfolk and the Norfolk Vanguard schemes, the decision to impose such a requirement.

00:51:24:27 - 00:51:56:06

And if you refer to paragraph 5.3.17, one of the Norfolk Brass Recommendation Report, the Examining Authority acknowledged that imposing an independent design review went against the views of both the applicant and the local authority. But I made the recommendation anyway because of the strong representations made by the community, by the fraught nature of the engagement, by concerns raised about the local authority's resource constraints.

00:51:56:22 - 00:52:38:21

Because here you had two separate substations for two separate, although interrelated schemes together, and there was a need for a holistic approach to be taken to base projects. And the applicant's position is that none of those particular circumstances actually apply for the Hornsea four scheme, and therefore we maintain our position that we don't consider it necessary in light of the extensive design work that has been undertaken to date that we set out in detail at the previous onshore environmental hearing and supplemented in the written summary and for the reasons that East Riding of Yorkshire mentioned today.

00:52:39:26 - 00:52:43:21

Thank you, Mr. Broderick. So I will. I would just come back to.

00:52:45:16 - 00:52:47:27

That same decision, if I may, then

00:52:49:23 - 00:53:15:17

Section 4.75, that section states decision notes certain sector states are aware of the development of substations that connect and either North Korea alone or cumulatively with Norfolk Vanguard. So stand alone or in conjunction with will have significant adverse landscape and visual impacts. Is it that genuinely not the case with with four.

00:53:17:13 - 00:53:59:06

But if the Atkins are understanding it, the decision is that the requirement and the specific requirement to have an independent design review was not led by the significance of the impacts, but rather the circumstances that had arisen both during examination relating to design and objections raised, but also the lack of design detail that have been undertaken pre application for those schemes. So we our position is that that requirement is not an automatic response to the level of significance of a fact, but rather the particular circumstances of those projects.

00:54:02:02 - 00:54:19:06

I understand. And stuff like that. Thank you. I think that the past with all of these things, I think the the reality is that that everything assessed together leads to a decision, is it not? But I take your points and I.

00:54:22:10 - 00:54:28:22

I think I will move on. I will come to that. Come back to try to give your counsel.

00:54:30:08 - 00:54:57:14

To a photo on points that somewhat legitimate but first separates is the Secretary of State reminds to grant consents to the proposed developments and any starting of Yorkshire Council provide an overview of the level of engagement and resources that it expects will be required post consents and to make that a fairly general overview. You don't need to go into to. To find it to.

00:54:59:21 - 00:55:11:12

They just mean the resources that we have available to consult as the resources you expect to require and the kind of key milestones, if you like, through through the post consent process.

00:55:13:18 - 00:55:29:19

Yes. Well, we do have the resources to deal with the requirements. Obviously, it depends who we have to console and what they entail in terms of of of their discharge. But yes, we do we will have the resources available to to deal with those.

00:55:31:14 - 00:55:40:21

And what is what would you assess the timescale of consent to be put to the work that you need to undertake?

00:55:42:24 - 00:55:48:03

It's difficult because it depends on what what details that we need to discharge, because obviously some things are easier than others.

00:55:50:13 - 00:56:09:23

It depends. It's a bit of an open ended question, really. Let me know what the details are. We can't really give a timescale, but I mean, the local authorities have made it clear that you are you have significant experience in dealing with projects of this scale. I would expect that you have a decent understanding of an approximate timestamp.

00:56:11:08 - 00:56:38:00

Well, like I said, it depends how long it takes. It depends on the information that we need to discharge. I mean, if it's something relatively straightforward, then a timescale of, you know, five, five, six weeks may well be you know, it is enough to turn it around. But it depends on the level of detail that that is required to be discharged as part that requirement and and officer time and and on the back of house time required for that is that one officer full time

00:56:39:22 - 00:57:10:07

part part time for those four weeks let's say. Well, hey, we just fed into an officer's workload and we wouldn't dedicate necessarily one person just to, you know, just to deal with was one thing. It would be a case of picking up along with with everything else, you know, as applications, free ups and appeals, whatever else that we need to do, it would just fit in with our normal daily work. And but again, you're clear that that you have the resources. You have the resources to deal with it.

00:57:10:14 - 00:57:33:24

Yeah, I recognize the applicant has their hand up, but I will just continue with this line of examination for a little while longer, please. Yesterday's issue specific hearing on the draft DCO, you confirmed that, as we said, you confirm that you have the resources in place to properly deal with the consenting process and.

00:57:35:27 - 00:58:01:27

This is so, so, so. In addition, you noted that there was a planning performance agreements in place which would provide means additional support required if it were to transpire that at some stage in the future, the local authority finds it didn't have the resources in place to deal with the post consent process. How might such a problem be addressed? I'm referring, I suppose, specifically to the TPA, which you mentioned yesterday.

00:58:04:13 - 00:58:30:09

Um, well, generally those are set in place so that, you know, we have a good idea of, of damage costs that would be associated with dealing with that level of work. So the pay is obviously there in place to deal with that, which is obviously, like I say, we'll just have to see where we would find the resources to deal with there with the requirements that it would need to do. We would have the resources to do it with. Um, and how does the PPA or does the PPA assist you in that

00:58:32:03 - 00:59:05:04

exercise of finding the resource? It provides an additional supply of money to to deal with with the requirement of that level of work. So like I said, we do have the resources. You know, it would be dealt with. Yes. But so as I am as as I mentioned that sort of question somewhat hypothetically. But if it transpires that you didn't for some reason and, you know, I'm conscious that during the course of this examination, we are we are not dealing with the same person with any striving HRH or counsel that we have that we began with changes of resources happen.

00:59:05:06 - 00:59:37:15

That's so I want to drill down and understand whether whether essentially the people that you have in place is sufficient to deal with that type of scenario. Yeah, we had a previous case officer actually joined upon an inspector. But yes, we do. We do have the resources. We've, we do have is quite large planning department. We do have a principal partners who can step up. So if someone leaves, we are continuing to be in place. You know, we would have the resources to deal with the requirements.

00:59:38:21 - 00:59:44:16

Okay. Thank you very much. And I will come back to that, too. Then he has patiently waiting with our hand up.

00:59:47:05 - 01:00:36:19

I project the Atkins? Yes. It's just to add a little more detail to the discussion that's taking place, obviously, as you'll be aware. Part four of Schedule One of the DCI sets out the procedure for the discharge of requirements, and there are quite set timescales for that, an ability for the discharging authority to request further information, etc., in order to keep a large scale project such as Hornsea four. On programme, there is significant work undertaken in the planning process and post consent in order to develop a detailed discharge programme for the requirements to ensure that there is appropriate pre submission consultation and also to ensure that the discharging authority has sufficient resource.

01:00:36:21 - 01:01:11:06

And the planning performance agreement that has previously been mentioned enables east riding to appoint external consultants should they need to if they don't have sufficient in-house resource to deal with matters. There is a funding mechanism such that they can increase the resourcing capabilities of their departments. So as Orsted knows from its previous projects, this is the fourth project it has taken through the process. It's got a great deal of experience in terms of ensuring that local authorities have sufficient resources to discharge requirements on programme.

01:01:11:23 - 01:01:15:23

And there is no reason why this project will be any different to those that have gone before.

01:01:17:05 - 01:01:32:10

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Novak. I have no further questions on this topic unless there are any other interested parties who would like to say anything. And I'm single on. So I will move on.

01:01:35:27 - 01:01:53:21

I'm going to just come to the end of this this line of questioning, and then I think we will take a break. So we will move on to item 3.1, which is not in the agenda, but is an additional question that I'd like to pursue. And I think we will go through it quite quickly.

01:01:55:16 - 01:02:37:08

The applicant survives for two months, five years, submitted by 55010. Welcome by that essay and we thank the applicant for the additional work carried out to produce a few points which illustrate the option. In particular, the apparent relative difference in visual impact between the two options is also noted by the Examining Authority. We welcome. We also welcome the additional information provided by Applicant in the written presentation of their oral case made at issue specific hearing to which is read 4036, which included additional information requested during the hearing and provides further detail of the massing studies carried out and provides further precedent.

01:02:37:10 - 01:03:01:14

Examples of the use of color on the external envelope of the buildings and in the first instance, is the applicant able to provide an overview of the time scale it or an update, perhaps in the timescale for the expected decision on which technology might employ might be the HTC or AC if their application for development consents is successful. Almost perfect.

01:03:06:15 - 01:03:11:12

Clear project. The applicant know we can't provide any more certainty at this stage in the process.

01:03:12:18 - 01:03:24:13

Thank you. And so in simplistic terms, I'm looking at the the differences as as illustrates it's similar diagrammatic reports

01:03:26:17 - 01:03:55:24

to the level of detail they have to provide at the moment. Is it correct to say and this this may pardon me if this is an incorrect assumption, but is it correct, say, the primary factor which contributes to the need for such significantly larger onshore substation buildings in the DC option. The primary factor which contributes to that difference in size is the need to house equipment to convert the power from HP DC to HP AC.

01:03:59:14 - 01:04:00:08

Again this project.

01:04:05:18 - 01:04:10:29

Collaboratively. I can. Yes, that's correct. The converted building is the largest building for the HTC Solution.

01:04:12:04 - 01:04:42:03

And again, I'm only. Putting this in layman's terms, which are the terms that work for me and the ones that I understand and some of this technology, if the wind turbines themselves generate AC power during their operation. In what way or in what ways is it beneficial to convert this AC power to DC to transmit to the onshore substation? The resulting onshore enclosures would have such a significantly greater visual impact than their counterparts.

01:04:49:17 - 01:05:18:18

Clare Atkins there hvdc is more an efficient transmission method over a long distances for those offshore wind farm developments that are located further offshore. But there are a variety of reasons, as I think we've already set out an examination which will provide the references to in the written summary as to why there is still a need for that flexibility, notwithstanding the difference in effects from a landscape and visual perspective.

01:05:21:12 - 01:05:31:02

But notwithstanding that, your your your design clearly takes account of the the possibility of of using HP see. And.

01:05:33:06 - 01:05:36:04

And implements booster stations within the offshore

01:05:37:20 - 01:05:40:18

or the within the OECD, the export cable corridor.

01:05:43:13 - 01:05:52:12

And you've led me onto my next point as well, which is and returning to the studies carried out to date in looking at the external appearance of those buildings.

01:05:54:12 - 01:05:58:15

Have these studies been applied to the AC option?

01:06:05:12 - 01:06:39:19

Thomas Watson on behalf of the applicants. I can just confirm that the design measures that we've progressed for the onshore substation have accounted for the maximum design scenario for the onshore substation buildings which are set out in the project description. And as part of that process, we have obviously developed the AC and DC indicative models and as presented in the, in the design documents that we that we've presented. But, but the overarching message to design because the, you know, the largest buildings for the for the PDC are, you know, larger than the AC.

01:06:39:21 - 01:07:07:05

The actual approach to the design of the buildings is is considered to be similar because they're very typical similar type of industry development. So the principles have been have been the same. And I take that point as to what said. But they are. There is there's nevertheless significant difference between HIV and HIV options, particularly in terms of missing bulk and I suppose rhythm of buildings.

01:07:09:27 - 01:07:14:03

I understand the reasoning for for pursuing or demonstrating

01:07:15:23 - 01:07:26:10

your proposed solutions as they apply to the M.D.s. But the reality is that that may not be what comes forward. And I wonder how much

01:07:28:06 - 01:07:31:07

work has been done in terms of.

01:07:33:16 - 01:07:40:20

Coming to coming to the correct design solution as much as possible at this stage for for an option which which may come forwards.

01:07:42:11 - 01:07:52:03

It strikes me that the the precedent images that you've shown on the options that have come before us don't appear to address.

01:07:54:20 - 01:08:03:07

The difference in scale, rhythm and massing of of HBC buildings to the same extent that they do actually city.

01:08:07:02 - 01:08:21:02

And I wonder whether whether that work has been done, whether you believe that what more what could be done at this stage to address the specifics or. Or is it the case that you believe that it's not necessary because it's really not an option you're going to take forward?

01:08:23:25 - 01:09:02:01

Thomas Watson power of the applicant. I can confirm that the measures that we've identified which as you'll you'll note primarily the colour application on the buildings themselves, we have included in the design review document considerations or some text on how the color selections will be dependent on the height and massing of the buildings themselves. So dependent on how tall they are would depend what colors are selected because it would differ in terms of the backgrounds and perceiving color around them in addition to the, for example, the directions that are being taken for those buildings.

01:09:02:03 - 01:09:24:12

So so there's nuanced considerations like that, but we consider that's very much a point for the detailed design. What's the actual building parameters? A locked and the and the technology choice is chosen. We feel that we've provided the appropriate overarching design principles that would be commensurate with a point in the development consent order as we as we currently stand.

01:09:26:17 - 01:09:37:24

Thank you very much, Mr. Watts. I will. Before moving on, I will just ask whether any other interested parties have anything further that they would wish to add at this stage.

01:09:42:11 - 01:09:44:04

And I'm seeing their hands. So.

01:09:45:29 - 01:10:04:09

I will. I will move on. I'm. I think. And by moving on, I think we will move on to a short break times nine, 1040 or propose that we break for 10 minutes. So we will resume this issue specific hearing at 1050.