

**File Name: ISH 10 - 20th July 2022 (Part 1) - Transcript**

File Length: 01:04:15

**FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)**

**00:00:03:18 - 00:00:13:15**

Good morning. Before I begin, can I confirm that everybody can hear me clearly? And can I also confirm with Mr. Johansson that the live streaming of this event has commenced?

**00:00:14:24 - 00:00:15:20**

I can confirm.

**00:00:15:22 - 00:00:18:13**

That. We can see and hear you clearly. The live.

**00:00:18:15 - 00:00:22:27**

Stream. I'm just waiting for the web page to update and.

**00:00:25:01 - 00:00:47:09**

I can see in here clean a web page and the live captions are running. Thank you, Mr. Johansson. The time is now 9:30 a.m. on this 10th issue. Specific here in relation to the Hornsea project four offshore wind farm is now at today's issue specific hearing we will be considering marine processes and ecology, excluding ornithology, which we will come to tomorrow.

**00:00:48:29 - 00:01:07:05**

My name is Rod McArthur. I'm a chartered architect and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the member of a panel of inspectors to examine this application. Today, I will be managing the events and introductions and my colleague, Mr. Jones will be taking notes of any actions. I would now like to ask my colleagues to introduce themselves.

**00:01:09:17 - 00:01:17:29**

And Mr. MacArthur, my name is Joe Downing. I'm a charter tom planner, and I've been appointed by the Secretary of State to be the lead panel member on this examination.

**00:01:19:21 - 00:01:21:03**

Good morning. My name is Steven Bradley.

**00:01:21:05 - 00:01:27:15**

I'm a charter architect and I've been appointed by Sector State to be a member of this examining authority.

**00:01:29:00 - 00:01:33:02**

Good morning. I'm Gavin Jones. I'm a planning inspector. Uncharted time.

**00:01:33:04 - 00:01:33:19**

Planner.

**00:01:35:06 - 00:01:44:12**

Good morning. My name is Andrew Monaco. I have a background in ecology and Environmental Impact Assessment and I'm a chartered environmentalist and a chartered landscape architect.

**00:01:46:13 - 00:02:12:20**

Thank you all. Together we formed the examining authority. There are three more colleagues from the Planning Inspectorate here today. You will have all spoken to Mr. Johansson, the case manager for this project in the Arrangements conference, and he's assisted today by Caroline Hopewell and Drey Reyes. They are also from the case team. If you have any questions regarding the application process in general, I could ask that you please email these to the case team who will be happy to help.

**00:02:14:18 - 00:02:34:22**

First of all, I'd like to deal with a few housekeeping matters, though I will be, as I will be brief as those of you who were actively participating today have attended previous hearings for this examination. Firstly, can I ask that all audible notifications for electronic devices be switched off? And remember to make sure that your microphones are switched to mute unless you are speaking.

**00:02:36:16 - 00:02:45:01**

No requests have been made for any special measures or arrangements to enable participation at this hearing. But I would just like to confirm that this is correct.

**00:02:48:04 - 00:03:11:22**

And I'm seeing no funds raised, so I won't move on on that basis. Mr. Johansson will have explained what to do if you lose your connection and we are able to adjourn for a short period. If there are any more significant connection problems. If a medical or any other urgent reason anybody requires a break at a specific time, could you please take the case team? No. And we will, if possible, adjust the program to accommodate.

**00:03:13:13 - 00:03:33:15**

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

**00:03:36:17 - 00:03:59:03**

And again, I'm seeing an arms race. So to move on to the digital recording. There is a digital recording being made of this hearing. This will be made available on the project page of the national infrastructure websites. If you take part in the hearing, it's important that you understand that your comments will be recorded and that the digital recording will be published and retained usually for a period of five years from the Secretary of State's decision.

**00:04:00:23 - 00:04:14:20**

The Planning Inspectorate is subject to the General Data Protection Regulation. Examining authority will not ask you to put sensitive personal information such as email addresses and economic, financial, cultural or health related matters into the public domain.

**00:04:16:14 - 00:04:35:15**

Indeed, we would actively encourage you not to do this. Please bear in mind that the only official record of the proceedings is the digital recording that will be placed on the project page of the national infrastructure. Websites, tweets, blogs and similar communications arising out of this meeting will not be accepted as evidence in the examination of this application.

**00:04:38:07 - 00:04:55:06**

Today's hearing is being held by the examining authority to explore a number of matters already in respect of marine processes and ecology. This is a public examination, and if there's a point that you want to make, please raise your hand and switch on your camera. But please wait to be invited before speaking.

**00:04:56:27 - 00:05:19:27**

The hearing today will be a structured discussion, which Mr. Monroe leads based on the agenda that has already been published. Since the agenda and the invitations were issued, we've been informed that Natural England and the RSPB will not be with us today. We will nevertheless run through the agenda as issued and will subsequently issue action points and seek written responses from those organisations in lieu of their participation.

**00:05:21:14 - 00:05:54:28**

Rule 14, two of the examination procedure rules requires the examining authority to identify matters to be considered at the start of the hearing. The agenda for this hearing was placed on websites on Monday, the 11th of July 2020 to. The main items that is up for discussion today are marine geomorphology and process modelling, marine and coastal ecology and effects, including benthic habitats and species, fish, shellfish and marine mammals. But excluding ornithology. Proposed activities in the intertidal and coastal zone and their effects.

**00:05:55:10 - 00:05:59:23**

Dredge sampling. Characterisation of monitoring. And Rock protection proposals.

**00:06:01:12 - 00:06:09:15**

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?

**00:06:14:07 - 00:06:28:01**

And again, I'm seeing better hands. So I will move on to the instruction of participants. I'd now like to take the names of those who will be speaking at this hearing. If you are a representative, please state whom you represent and your role within the organization

**00:06:30:01 - 00:06:34:13**

that you are representing. And I will start with the applicant, please.

**00:06:37:11 - 00:06:51:11**

Good morning, sir. My name is Gary McGovern. I'm a partner with Pinsent Masons. Lawyers for the applicant's team. I have six other potential speakers attending here today. So invite them. No, introduce themselves and tell them, if I may. Thank you.

**00:06:52:00 - 00:06:52:15**

Mr..

**00:06:57:16 - 00:06:58:18**

Dr. Julianne Carman.

**00:06:58:20 - 00:06:59:29**

Concerned project manager.

**00:07:00:01 - 00:07:02:09**

For Hornsea four on behalf of the.

**00:07:02:11 - 00:07:02:26**

Applicant.

**00:07:08:26 - 00:07:13:04**

Dr. Lauren Kirkland from Corby Consultants. I'll be speaking on behalf of the applicant.

**00:07:24:00 - 00:07:35:04**

So the other applicant speakers are joining us remotely. So if I could perhaps ask and Mr. New Mrs. Sinclair and Mr. Cooper just introduce themselves for the record and please.

**00:07:38:07 - 00:07:40:09**

Bill Nye from Gaming Consultants for the American.

**00:07:43:18 - 00:07:47:01**

Rachel Sinclair from SRM. Are you consulting or the applicant?

**00:07:50:25 - 00:07:54:26**

Bill Cooper, Specialist Coastal Process Borrower for the applicant.

**00:08:08:12 - 00:08:10:10**

Not everyone from the applicant team, sir.

**00:08:10:22 - 00:08:15:17**

Okay. Thank you, Mr. McGovern. Moving on, then, to the Marine management organization case.

**00:08:18:08 - 00:08:34:16**

Good morning. While the Williamson Marine licensing case manager for the Marine Management Organization, I'm also joined by my case officer Greg Smith and John Reese from CFI. So when they introduce themselves and they are both from Centenary Management Organization.

**00:08:35:15 - 00:08:36:07**

Thank you very much.

**00:08:38:16 - 00:08:39:03**

And.

**00:08:40:29 - 00:08:52:08**

Sorry. Please go ahead. Good morning, sir. My name's John Reese on the physical oceanography from CFS and an advisor to the Marine Management Organization. Thank you.

**00:08:58:25 - 00:09:04:06**

And then do we have a representative from the Holding Fishing Industry Group?

**00:09:09:19 - 00:09:16:08**

Good morning. I'm Dr. Mike Roach. I'm officially scientist. I work and represent the ultimate fishing industry group.

**00:09:20:04 - 00:09:32:06**

Thank you very much. I haven't been informed that we have any other participants in today's hearing, but can I just double check that we have heard from everybody who wishes to be heard today?

**00:09:35:01 - 00:09:44:20**

And then I'm sitting there for the hands raised. So I will move on and hand you over to Mr. Mom, who's going to lead on items 2 to 8 of the agenda. Thank you.

**00:09:47:00 - 00:09:53:27**

Thank you, Mr. MacArthur. Shortly before the introductions, Mister MacArthur listed the main issues that we intend to examine today.

**00:09:55:12 - 00:10:19:06**

As with the first round of hearings, we have spread what are quite closely related matters over three days. We will deal with baselines and the environmental impact assessment today and tomorrow and go on to look at the habitats, regulations assessment and its associated tests, derogation and compensation on Friday. Inevitably, there will be a degree of overlap, but we will try to keep any repetition to a minimum.

**00:10:21:00 - 00:10:55:12**

Unfortunately we are without natural England again today and the letter in lieu of attendance has been published as an additional submission and can be seen in the examination library. I do not believe they includes anything of substance that is relevant today. The Planning Inspectorate received a second submission in lieu of attendance with more substantive comments last night that could only be dealt with this morning. And while we see that some parties were copied into that email, this cannot be published on the project web page until today. So in the interest of fairness to all parties, we cannot make reference to the detail today.

**00:10:56:29 - 00:11:33:16**

For your reference, I believe it has just been published thanks to a Herculean administrative effort from the case and support teams which may record the examining authorities. Thanks. And I

believe that it will appear later in the examination library as as. Oh 48. We will make a decision about its potential use in issue specific hearings 11 and 12 later for today. If the applicant has had an opportunity to read the submission, I am content for you to provide indications of any actions and timings relating to those that you intend to take are given the length submission by natural England.

**00:11:33:18 - 00:11:37:19**

We cannot hear any responsive representations of substance in these matters.

**00:11:39:18 - 00:11:54:18**

Nevertheless, I would like to acknowledge the work that has been going on between the applicant and other parties on outstanding matters in parallel with the examination and in particular the progress that has been made in relation to the offshore ornithological baseline, which we will discuss tomorrow

**00:11:56:07 - 00:12:26:12**

in relation to this parallel work, please can I make the obvious observation that the examining authority under the parties to the examination are not involved in those discussions and agreements. So it is imperative that fully detailed meeting notes or reports are submitted into the examination for transparency and for the information of all relevant parties, including the Secretary of State, as well as to stay abreast of an often rapidly moving situation as we approach the end of the examination, the beginning of our reporting.

**00:12:28:24 - 00:12:38:15**

Once again, we will be making a list of action points today and we will be issuing these with a request for written responses from those parties who were invited but did not attend.

**00:12:41:26 - 00:12:50:19**

Unless I have any comments on that general introduction, can I move on to agenda item two, please? And that's geomorphology of marine process modelling.

**00:12:52:12 - 00:13:01:10**

And the first part of this item is the relevant part, the positions of parties on the implications of and the allowance for climate change.



**00:13:04:12 - 00:13:33:18**

The applicant will have your position, but the matter remains as read in natural England's risk log in relation to concern over the effects of climate change and particularly the continuing erosion resulting from infrastructure retained in the intertidal zone and the landfall beyond the lifetime of the project. Could I ask the applicant, is this something that's still under discussion between the applicant and natural England and potentially the MMO? What does the applicant believe the final positions have been reached.

**00:13:37:01 - 00:14:20:23**

Sir Gary McGovern on behalf of the applicant. There are no ongoing active discussions in relation to that specific point in relation to assets at the landfall location and there's been no change in the applicant's position. We've set out a final position in relation to that. And I would just add to that that insofar as the concerned No appears to have evolved and concern about assets remaining in situ beyond the lifetime of the project, then that is a matter that would be appropriately dealt with by way of the decommissioning plan that's already secured by way of the DCO on what works may or may not need to be done as part of the decommissioning process and to render those assets safe and would be determined at that time and in line with all other projects.

**00:14:21:05 - 00:14:21:21**

Thank you, sir.

**00:14:22:24 - 00:14:30:09**

Thank you very much. If you could liaise with natural England on that. I have to go to some sort of conclusion in the statement of common ground would be very useful

**00:14:32:00 - 00:14:39:06**

from the perspective of the MMO. Your deadline five submission just says ongoing. Do you have an updated position at all on this?

**00:14:41:06 - 00:15:16:27**

The weather. WILLIAMSON From the rain management organization, just by way of information warfare to ourselves, was a memo just to avoid us getting tongue tied. And we do have an ongoing position regarding this matter slightly different to natural England in regard to the potential impacts of cable burial, cable replacement and cable remediation activities through the lifetime of the project. We still believe that climate change impacts should be assessed adequately within those, and I am accompanied by our technical advisor, John Rees from CFS, who can add slight clarity to this position.

**00:15:17:23 - 00:15:18:08**

Q.

**00:15:19:25 - 00:15:58:21**

And good morning race here from CPAC Advisory Seminar. Yes, the main issues here are only the recession rate, the cliffs along that area and the lowering of the beach and the need to do remediation activities during the lifetime of the project. So understanding how quickly the beach will will erode under those climate change scenarios in that area. So knowing that there is a whole series of remedial actions that are available to the to the applicant will help mitigate some of these activities.

**00:16:01:17 - 00:16:07:29**

Thank you, Mr. Hayes. Mr. McGovern deciding you want to come back on that? Is it something you can deal with post hearing?

**00:16:10:05 - 00:16:44:16**

Got McGovern for the American. Just a couple of brief comments from myself and perhaps a clarification from Dr. Caroline. So and observations from myself. Firstly, the east riding of Yorkshire Council, as you have seen, have declared themselves satisfied with possession in relation to the landfall and intertidal area. And also just to remind you, I'm sure if you've read the relevant representation response from the Environment Agency, they've also looked at the wave modelling on the implications of coastal erosion and so on, and also declared themselves in time satisfied with the work that's been done by the applicant and 102.

**00:16:44:18 - 00:16:47:10**

Dr. Caroline Snow. Just to confirm from the point.

**00:16:51:18 - 00:16:57:14**

Dr. K On behalf of the applicant, just in relation to coastal erosion rates, we have monitored.

**00:16:57:16 - 00:16:59:12**

The the lighter.

**00:16:59:14 - 00:17:00:13**

Data for.

**00:17:00:15 - 00:17:01:08**

The east riding of.

**00:17:01:10 - 00:17:06:09**

Yorkshire coastline and with recognise that the maximum coastal erosion rate of.

**00:17:06:11 - 00:17:14:06**

1.8 meters per year over the analyzed period over the last 50 years may be used to calculate the.

**00:17:14:08 - 00:17:15:09**

Transition joint bay.

**00:17:15:11 - 00:17:18:07**

On the history day as we had sat back from the active.

**00:17:18:09 - 00:17:20:10**

Coastal zone. We've used up.

**00:17:20:12 - 00:17:35:02**

1.8 meters per year over the 35 year lifetime of the wind farm. On downland a climate change 50% exceedance to the to get a set back of 240 meters from the cliff. And so we don't foresee.

**00:17:35:04 - 00:17:37:14**

That there have been any issue with.

**00:17:37:18 - 00:17:42:09**

Changes to coastal erosion rates or climate change processes that aren't already accounted.

**00:17:42:11 - 00:17:46:05**

For within the design of the offshore wind farm. Within the project description.

**00:17:46:07 - 00:17:48:02**

There's clear definition of the depth of.

**00:17:48:04 - 00:17:50:11**

The hits the de ducts on.

**00:17:50:13 - 00:18:00:00**

They are anticipated to be no shallower than 40 meters below the beach. And while I recognise Mr. Racist comments in relation to beach lowering, I think he.

**00:18:00:02 - 00:18:00:17**

Would agree.

**00:18:00:19 - 00:18:02:03**

Also that it is highly.

**00:18:02:05 - 00:18:03:19**

Unlikely that we would get 40.

**00:18:03:21 - 00:18:06:25**

Meters of beach lawn on the event, irrespective of climate.

**00:18:06:27 - 00:18:08:25**

Change or storm induced.

**00:18:09:08 - 00:18:10:00**

Processes.

**00:18:10:02 - 00:18:11:00**

So as far as we're.

**00:18:11:02 - 00:18:11:17**

Concerned.

**00:18:11:19 - 00:18:19:09**

We think we have designed climate change and coastal erosion rates into the project from the offset and that's all documented within the application.

**00:18:22:05 - 00:18:24:27**

Thank you, Dr. Caroline. Mr. East, do you want to come back on that?

**00:18:27:20 - 00:18:52:23**

Absolutely. John Reshift from the CBS Republican Memo Advisor team. Yes, the average reaches 1.8 meters over that 35 year lifespan. But we know that erosion is very episodic along that particular coastline, depending on the storm severity. It's just a need to have.

**00:18:54:21 - 00:19:25:24**

Procedures in place so that if accelerated erosion does take place, that there is a system in place that can actually go in and rebury the cable because the cable will be only buried to a few meters in across the intertidal, etc.. Okay, it might be 40 meters in the HD pits or the transition base of the shore, but it's the intertidal that I'm concerned about, which may be only a few meters, but.

**00:19:27:12 - 00:19:27:27**

Thank you.

**00:19:29:01 - 00:19:31:25**

Thank you. The opponent wish to take that on board.

**00:19:37:08 - 00:19:57:25**

I got a megaphone for that. So we seem to have shifted away from talking about the profile of the beach onto onto a different issue of of Semitic bank. But what I take from Mr. Ricci's response is the accepts that it's unlikely that the profile of the beach would change and to such an extent that cabling, which is 40 metres below the beach, would give rise to any issues.

**00:19:58:27 - 00:20:09:14**

I think he was potentially talking to the into title, but I think there's a gap between you about the understanding of the depth of the barrier of the cable in the intertitles. So maybe that's something you could take off line and sort out.

**00:20:12:09 - 00:20:17:00**

Yes, sir. We'll take that offline and see if we can resolve that particular point. Thank you.

**00:20:17:20 - 00:20:24:23**

I think that would be helpful. Thank you very much, all of you, for that. Was there anything else wanted. Anybody wanted to add on that particular point about climate change?

**00:20:30:13 - 00:21:09:14**

Which case can I move on to the next part of this agenda item, which is about the marine processes, supplementary report. The reviews that we received on that and the clarification note on marine process mitigation and monitoring falls into three areas. Really, this would be smack bang Farnborough, Brunt and implications of that report for the benthic ecology baseline in the assessment. So I'll take each of those in turn, if I may. Just by way of background, this is clearly a long running threat through the examination and there's quite a long series of documents that record the evolution of the matters.

**00:21:10:21 - 00:21:43:18**

Just very briefly, a series of concerns were expressed by Natural England and MMO, and the applicant submitted a marine processes supplemental report, which I believe was undertaken by Royal has groaning at deadline for how this looks, in particular at Smethwick Bank and the Flamborough front. My interpretation of the overall conclusion in relation to the supplementary matters dismissed assessed Smethwick Bank and Holderness Coast seem to be the effect of installing cable protection on nearshore sediment.

**00:21:43:20 - 00:21:58:20**

Transport pathways would be negligible to minor, and therefore, in accordance with the assessment set out in the environmental statement, I just the applicant believe that to be a fair summary of the Semitic bank content.

**00:22:00:24 - 00:22:04:22**

Going government for the applicant. Yes, sir. We're happy. That's a fair summary of our position. Thank you.

**00:22:05:09 - 00:22:40:21**

Thank you. So subsequently MMO and Natural England, together with SIF as obviously the advisors to MMO presented a joint review of the Marine Processes Supplement Report at deadline five in the form of a memo. And we do understand that the technical panel had met on the 10th of June and that the memo had been given to the applicant following that meeting. The review raises some matters of disagreement, omissions and some mitigation and monitoring suggestions for Smithy Bank, which are listed in the summary as points eight F.

**00:22:41:28 - 00:22:51:09**

The applicant has responded to these points, including A2, A4 DEADLINE five in the clarification note on marine processes, mitigation and monitoring.

**00:22:53:01 - 00:23:11:00**

Just as a matter of very minor clarification, could the applicant first please confirm that the references in several places in Section 3.3 on the clarification note and I'll let you find that should be correct. 4114 should be 25114 and not direct four one and four.

**00:23:15:06 - 00:23:26:02**

So I've got a megaphone for that. Can we believe? You may be right, but if we could have a minute, we'll just double check that. If you could be told by a very swift colleague that you are indeed correct, sir. So thank you for that correction.

**00:23:26:11 - 00:23:36:03**

Another Herculean effort. I think I'm satisfied. Just clears that up. So can we move on to Smithy Bank in particular?

**00:23:38:16 - 00:24:04:29**

Could the applicant for my benefit provide a summary of its position in relation to rock protection on the bank? My belief is that the maximum design scenario remains of 5%, which was originally proposed, I believe, in the deadline three submission clarification note justification of offshore maximum designed scenarios. If you could clarify, this still is the case and could you also confirm how this 5% is secured through the draft DCO?

**00:24:11:29 - 00:24:29:16**

Got a McGuffin for the applicant. Yes, sir. Possession remains at 5% of the length of the cable within the boundary of of Smith Bank. And that is secured. And the updated version of the DMS, it was submitted at deadline five and it's condition,

**00:24:33:06 - 00:24:39:14**

condition three of part two of Schedule 12, which is the marine licence for the transmission assets.

**00:24:40:06 - 00:24:42:24**

Thank you. That's very helpful.

**00:24:49:05 - 00:25:20:22**

But we also look at Commitment 189 in the Commitment Register, where I believe we are committing to ensure that the Dogger Bank, A and B cable crossing is positioned as far east as possible, past the 20 metre depth control east of Smethwick Bank, I believe. Could you provide a summary of your position on this and explain your more recent commitment to review the proposed mitigation at the point when all the necessary information is available and how this would be secured?

**00:25:24:22 - 00:26:04:02**

But it got to McGovern on behalf of the opposition. And yes, this particular commitment is secured by means of the cable and installation plan. And the commitment at this stage is to ensure that the crossing point is seaward of the 20 metre depth line, and that would ensure that the dog crossing does not encroach on the smethwick boundary as described in the applicant's documents. And it may be the case, and you have seen from the more recent submissions that other information and understanding of the actual positioning of the dog crossing it is crystallised that that location could move further offshore.

**00:26:04:12 - 00:26:32:28**



But we cannot make a firm commitment to that until the adult position has been confirmed to the applicant. So that's not something that could be confirmed at this stage. And there are also further decisions in relation to the transmission technology. Well, that's each BDC are each and the number of sockets that would be required as a result. And there's also the further cable very risk assessment work that would inform all of the consideration around making that decision which would happen. Post consent, sir.

**00:26:35:00 - 00:26:43:18**

Okay. Thank you. So you're looking at a position at least 20 metres east of the Smithy Bank boundary seaward of the Smithy Bank boundary.

**00:26:44:16 - 00:26:46:19**

That's correct. So that's the minimum position.

**00:26:47:09 - 00:26:47:24**

And. Q

**00:26:49:17 - 00:26:57:05**

Has the outline plan been amended to reflect this in any way? The Cable specification installation plan updates and return to.

**00:26:58:18 - 00:27:10:29**

Guardian government for the applicant. No, it hasn't as yet, sir. But I believe and the deadline for the clarification notes section at the end, which outlined the way forward, we did say that we would update the plan for deadline six.

**00:27:12:08 - 00:27:12:23**

Thank you.

**00:27:22:09 - 00:27:32:28**

So in relation to monitoring and Smoothing Bank, you set out proposals in Table six and Section four of the deadline five. A clarification of note.

**00:27:34:17 - 00:27:45:18**

I believe some of the proposals in that table are new and that you intend to incorporate these into the updated outline. Marine Monitoring Plan Deadlines six could use confirmer.

**00:27:48:29 - 00:28:17:00**

And so, yes, we do intend to incorporate the monitoring that has been described in table six, seven and eight of that document and an updated version of the outline and a cable and installation plan. I'm being instructed now that the updated version of that may be submitted at deadline seven, and the reason for that would be the very recent advice that's been submitted by Natural England, and we would obviously wish to take the time to consider advice.

**00:28:18:07 - 00:28:22:05**

It's understood. Sorry, can I just confirm which planet is. We're talking about that.

**00:28:24:29 - 00:28:27:24**

Is that the installation plan or the outline marine monitoring plan?

**00:28:28:13 - 00:28:39:27**

I'm confusing my plans with so many of them, sir, and I'm sure you'll forgive me. It's the outline monitoring plan that would secure the monitoring proposals and the commitment in relation to the dog crossing, as in the cable installation plan.

**00:28:40:19 - 00:28:42:23**

Thank you. That supported my conclusion as well.

**00:28:51:02 - 00:29:02:00**

Okay. Thank you for that. And turning to the turning to MMO, do you have any further comments or advice in relation to Smithy Bank and the proposed mitigation in particular?

**00:29:06:20 - 00:29:07:05**

Oh.

**00:29:09:09 - 00:29:26:27**

The Weather Alliance and Marine Management Organisation. Apologies. Having some slow internet here. Luckily I'll be passing ave has John Reece from C fast to cover last minute bank points. However, it will leave background me slightly at the end of his comments to confirm some more administrative positions regarding the bank.

**00:29:27:23 - 00:29:28:08**

Thank you.

**00:29:29:28 - 00:30:02:12**

It generates help from CPS on behalf of the MMO. Yes, it has been a long process in trying to come to a mutually convenient or agreed position on the location of the crossing point between Docker and Hornsea for export cables. But I think we we finally got there because of some recent work that the applicant has done, has used the definition of the suite.

**00:30:02:14 - 00:30:39:00**

The cemetery has been undertaken in the earliest surveys to really identify where the boundary of the Smethwick Bank is. And I think that's a key point for us as come through. And in fact, that aligns really nicely with the genuine CC definition of the the bank that has been made previously. So we now know that the crossing point is going to be 2.9 kilometres from the northern crossing points and about 3.6 kilometres from the the southern one.

**00:30:39:05 - 00:31:07:13**

So this is starting to become less of an issue for, for, for the marine management organisation because we see that there is going to be good separation between the bank and the the crossing zone. So that's where we are at the moment in terms of the 5% sky protection for the bank itself. I think we want to see justification for the location of that. So sky protection

**00:31:08:29 - 00:31:20:25**

reasons are why it needs to be there and the volumes of material that's going to be placed. So I think that's where we need to be. It's good justification for for that use of that sky protection.

**00:31:23:04 - 00:31:26:10**

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Race. I'm going back to Mr. Williamson.

**00:31:28:03 - 00:32:18:19**

Thank you. Yeah. Just to clarify that final point that John made there and regarding the 5%, so we know the applicant has updated the DMT conditions, which is fairly separate from our brief review. We are aiming to provide comments on the updated HTML guidelines six formally, but from what I've been able to review, it does seem to be quite clear in terms of how they're defining their maximum design scenario. However, and I think we are aligned with natural England on this point. So luckily, if the applicant has seen natural England submission, that is there, but essentially we would like to see some tighter control around the rock deployment in this music bank area because whilst we're allowing a maximum, we've come to this maximum of 5% of cables being protected using rock protection in this music bank area.

**00:32:19:04 - 00:32:49:26**

We would like to see that detailed pre-construction surveys and that cable burial risk assessment for the bank where it will hopefully show the exact percentage of cables that we've buried using rock tank protection before construction commences. This would be something we'd like to review before construction commences. So essentially it's a way for us to see the maximum allowance not as an allowance, but more as a worst case. So we can see what actually is intended to be deployed in that smooth bank area only.

**00:32:50:04 - 00:32:58:27**

And that's what we're interested in. So we'll be putting out an outline SEC submission as well more clearly, because that's essentially how we would like to see that being tighter controlled.

**00:33:00:12 - 00:33:34:12**

The additional monitoring that I know that naturally and definitely have proposed. We also support around this metric bank monitoring. So we have advised the high resolution pre-construction surveys undertaken and then this is followed by a post cable installation survey every six months for the past two years, which will include two and two periods and one summer and then a further south every five years for the duration of the project. This will allow comparison reports to incorporate comparison with the existing BATHYMETRY survey data, so align with what they've already been undertaken.

**00:33:34:20 - 00:33:43:01**

We'd like to see those throughout the lifetime of the project and like I said, I think it's been submitted by Natural England formally already and we'll be submitting that deadline six.

**00:33:44:21 - 00:33:45:13**

You very much.

**00:33:47:17 - 00:33:49:21**

Mr. Gordon said. I think he wished to say about that.

**00:33:53:04 - 00:34:25:22**

I got a McGovern for the Applicant. Yes. So just to clarify, in relation to the volume and the 5% figure, I think there is a difference though between their always position in natural England and that natural England position is that there should be zero cable protection on Smith Bank, whereas what I'm hearing from a member of this morning is that the 5% is accepted in principle, subject to tighter controls and clarification, our own location and which should be something to be looked at at the post consent stage and what they've asked for there.

**00:34:25:24 - 00:34:42:24**

Certainly something we'll take away and consider and see whether we can give them some further comfort in that regard and will also consider the points are in the monitoring as well as I think what we're suggesting by way of monitoring may not be so far away from what's being asked for, but we'll certainly look it up. And following this evening, sir.

**00:34:44:10 - 00:34:54:16**

Thank you. I'm encouraged by what appears to be some progress between yourselves and MMO on that. So if you could take that further, be great. But in relation to your comments there about natural England.

**00:34:56:26 - 00:35:08:29**

Given their absence, what we intend to do now to make sure that the mitigation proposals and their final position on the 5% maximum design scenario scenario are hammered out between yourselves.

**00:35:10:23 - 00:35:24:00**

I think there probably will be something within their additional submission. Oh 48 about this. Do you believe you may be close to a full resolution and relationships with the bank, or is it likely that differences will remain at the end of the examination?

**00:35:27:07 - 00:35:51:01**

Gary McGovern for the applicant, we may be able to close the gap between us, but I do not believe. My understanding is not that we'll have a full resolution. Certainly not with natural England's position. What we would be looking to do our best is to align as closely as we can with

with CFR and more in respect to these issues where we're the R&D lead regulator. And thank you, sir.

**00:35:51:25 - 00:35:52:15**

Thank you very much.

**00:35:54:11 - 00:35:58:08**

Does anybody wish to add anything else about the bank part of the report?

**00:36:00:06 - 00:36:05:00**

Which case can we move on to the consideration of the Flamborough friend? Sorry.

**00:36:05:22 - 00:36:40:17**

Sorry. It's really about Collinson from the satellite line. Yeah, sorry. On my end? Definitely. No problem. Just. Just a slight complication there. Just around the 5%. The applicant we appreciate the applicant has been pushing for this 5%. The natural England's position is more zero. Just to confirm the marine management position is that we would like this percentage driven down as much as possible. So that is really the basis behind our request for the sort of submission of where the cable protection will actually be going in this area to sort of limit that 5% as much as possible.

**00:36:40:19 - 00:36:58:14**

Because we do understand, like we do align in many ways natural England's concerns around the 5% in that area still. However, we can appreciate as a few more operational nuances involved. So that's really the driving behind that request. Just to clarify that, in case it was unclear earlier.

**00:36:58:27 - 00:37:27:09**

And I have you then could I just I mean, my understanding of what you're telling us is that you would prefer, presumably like natural England to have no rock protection, which I fully understand. But you also understand that the realities of laying these cables sometimes means that kind of be avoid in construction operational terms. But you prefer to see the evidence that 5% is still required, and you would prefer to deal with that through the Marine licence later on in the process?

**00:37:28:07 - 00:37:52:16**

Correct. So in an ideal world, the submission we would receive would show that it was less than 5% because it's just the absolute minimum that they actually require, whereas the 5% is their maximum allow. Again, it will be seen as allowance. It's not clarified that it's the bare minimum they need to ensure that's operational. Jon, you want to pop in here with some technical clarifications for me just on need at the moment.

**00:37:54:18 - 00:38:27:28**

It generates them C.P.S. advice with them? Absolutely. They would try to drive these numbers right down to the one piece of information that we really don't know is in great detail, is the the structure of that bank itself. But we do have Dogger Bank A and B going to go across this zone in the next year or two. So hopefully they'll be sufficient information from the ploughing across that particular cable route.

**00:38:28:06 - 00:38:44:15**

But we can then have some more confidence in the the scope and section or the lack of spot protection from Hornsea four going across that area. So I would like to learn from Dogger Bank A and B, if that's possible.

**00:38:45:14 - 00:38:47:03**

Thank you. Right. Understood.

**00:38:49:25 - 00:38:52:08**

Was there anything else on the bank, Williamson?

**00:38:55:09 - 00:38:58:28**

The Williamson Marine Management Organization know that everything must. Thank you.

**00:38:59:13 - 00:39:02:29**

Thank you. Then we will move on to the Flamborough front, unless anybody else has anything to say.

**00:39:05:04 - 00:39:49:05**

Okay. So in terms of the front, I particularly like to discuss the applicants monitoring proposals this morning. So the first question is the applicant and in relation to the monitoring, we've seen your proposals for near-field monitoring in Table seven and Section 442 of the clarification note.

Can you confirm our understanding that the results of this near-field monitoring will be used to decide whether additional far field monitoring was also required? Should and near field monitoring confirmed turbulent wakes and exceedance of those predicted in the EIA, and that this would be the additional monitoring set out in Table eight and Section 443 of the clarification note.

**00:39:50:13 - 00:39:54:12**

Yeah. Kind of McGovern for the applicant. Yes, that's entirely correct, sir.

**00:39:55:11 - 00:40:01:21**

Thank you. How would any trigger for the instigation of the farcical monitoring be established?

**00:40:16:19 - 00:40:22:17**

Kind of McGuffin for the applicant. Dr. Caroline can confirm how that would be addressed and came.

**00:40:26:02 - 00:40:31:24**

Dr. Jennifer Husk, half of the applicant, affirmed. The monitoring confirmed that.

**00:40:32:02 - 00:40:32:25**

The extent.

**00:40:32:27 - 00:40:39:17**

Of the turbulent works was monitored on the gravity based foundations, if they were used, exceeded what was assessed.

**00:40:39:19 - 00:40:40:04**

In the.

**00:40:40:06 - 00:40:43:17**

Environmental statement and not what triggered the requirement for far field boundary.



**00:40:45:03 - 00:40:53:17**

So is that literally the physical extent of the wakes that you're going to be monitoring? Exactly. Yeah. But with those not early on.

**00:40:53:19 - 00:40:54:08**

Vertically.

**00:40:54:10 - 00:40:54:25**

So.

**00:40:55:04 - 00:41:00:28**

I'd say surface so their spatial extent as seen early from above on within the water column.

**00:41:02:12 - 00:41:07:09**

And he's intending to clarify that in any way in terms of the plans and monitoring plans.

**00:41:07:25 - 00:41:12:23**

We can clarify that the and the monitoring plans were still awaiting to get formal feedback from naturally and and.

**00:41:13:05 - 00:41:13:20**

The.

**00:41:13:22 - 00:41:19:20**

More on safeguards in relation to our proposals at deadline five and we'll update them and the outline monitoring plan.

**00:41:21:05 - 00:41:34:27**

That's understood. I think at the end of the day it will be clear for everybody if those figures those extend to the could be carried through from the environmental statement into the marching plans. Everyone's clear about what would trigger that far field monitoring.

**00:41:36:03 - 00:41:36:18**

Yet.

**00:41:37:12 - 00:41:54:27**

Do you believe that the monitoring you've put forward fully addresses natural England and the memos request for a programme that would record and I'm quoting any changes to stratification and primary productivity during preconstruction post-construction and for the lifetime of the project.

**00:42:13:21 - 00:42:30:22**

Garry McGovern for the applicant. Monitoring proposals do not align with exactly what natural England are asking for and we are not proposing to undertake monitoring for the life time of the project and the way that natural England are suggesting.

**00:42:32:09 - 00:42:32:24**

Thank you.

**00:42:34:23 - 00:42:40:12**

Can you tell me what length of time you intend to do this monitoring? I'm sure that's in the documents. But to remind me.

**00:42:52:16 - 00:42:53:01**

The

**00:42:54:11 - 00:42:57:24**

Guardian government told the applicant, I believe it's one year, so we're just checking that as well.

**00:43:16:29 - 00:43:17:23**

Gary McGovern for the

**00:43:19:16 - 00:43:28:09**

standalone report will be prepared covering a pre construction baseline characterization one year construction one year and of course construction and so total that would be three years.

**00:43:30:18 - 00:43:40:21**

And you believe that gives? Is that sufficient to cover the sort of natural variation one might expect to get in the being the physical process conditions?

**00:44:07:22 - 00:44:17:17**

I got him a gift for the applicant. So I think we'll take this point. We just to make sure that the answer we give you is as clear as it can be. But

**00:44:19:03 - 00:44:43:01**

our position is that the monitoring that's being proposed is a very reasonable and proportionate and appropriate monitoring package in the context of an undesignated feature and in the context of the scale of the impacts as we assess them being negligible. So in the context of non-significant effects, we believe the monitoring proposes as reasonable and proportionate.

**00:44:44:12 - 00:44:57:13**

Q And could you just have we talked about the trigger point from the near field to the far field? Does the overall package include a series of trigger points which would allow any interventions or remediation if required?

**00:44:59:03 - 00:45:03:04**

If so, can you summarize what they are and if not, explain why not?

**00:45:08:07 - 00:45:18:02**

Got him a girlfriend for. There are no interventions or remedial proposals and as a result of the far field monitoring that's proposed in Table eight.

**00:45:18:06 - 00:45:23:03**

So that's another difference between yourselves and the request from natural England.

**00:45:23:28 - 00:45:30:00**

Regrettably, that's another area of difference. We cannot agree to what Natural England are requesting in that regard.

**00:45:30:02 - 00:45:31:09**

So thank you.

**00:45:39:08 - 00:45:48:09**

And can you just confirm again which part this will be captured in the updated outline marine monitoring plan and whether this will now be a deadline six or deadline seven?

**00:45:55:05 - 00:46:18:13**

So Gary McGovern for the outgoing. So the monitoring proposals which are set out in table six, seven and eight of the deadline five clarification will be incorporated into the outline monitoring plan. The next update, which we are proposing for deadline seven in light of natural England's late submission last night, so that we have time to consider their further advice.

**00:46:19:14 - 00:46:26:23**

And you're happy that that alongside the draft decision would secure both the near field and far field monitoring proposals?

**00:46:27:12 - 00:46:28:15**

Yes, that will be the case.

**00:46:29:16 - 00:46:30:23**

Okay. Thank you.

**00:46:33:28 - 00:46:43:06**

Does the memo have any general points to raise in relation to this additional information about Fran Front and in particular, the applicant's proposals for monitoring?

**00:46:45:28 - 00:46:58:19**

Well, the Williamson Marine Management Organization. I'm just going to briefly touch on the monitoring that I'm going to home to John for the technical areas. Unless, John, you'd like to provide some context fast. I'm happy to let you take lead if you'd like.

**00:46:59:06 - 00:47:14:27**

Okay. John Reese here from CPS, MMO team. Yes. We welcome to the table eight, especially in terms of monitoring the far field effects. However, we feel that.

**00:47:16:14 - 00:47:49:21**

The far field effects should be driving the near field effects monitoring, because one of the things that Mike Elliott's report does and emphasize is that the Flamborough front has considerable variability in its position, its strength and the meanders that the front exhibits. So you could quite easily monitor one particular gravity based structure, and the next one in the line would have no potential impact.

**00:47:49:23 - 00:48:20:19**

So we would want to see the far field impacts being used as a reconnaissance tool to identify those particular gravity based structures or structures in in total that exhibit some of these features or don't, you know, keeping an open mind. So certainly the sentinel satellites are very good at producing regular information. And the nice thing about Sentinel three is that goes back to Q2 2017.

**00:48:20:27 - 00:48:50:28**

So identifying the variability in terms of where the position of the the front is is quite easily extracted from that particular system. We would also like to see Landsat eight and Landsat nine included in the assessment because they have infrared sensors that go down to 100 meters of resolution. So you'd be able to see individual plumes very much more easily with with the Landsat eight and nine.

**00:48:51:05 - 00:49:15:20**

And when combined, they have a 16 day repeat period, but the offset between eight and nine means you have an eight day offset. So you can get really good temporal resolution of these plumes over time. So so what we want to see is the the far field driving the near field monitoring rather than the other way around.

**00:49:17:01 - 00:49:24:19**

So are you talking about a substitution of the two? You're talking about feedback from far field monitoring, feeding back into near field monitoring.

**00:49:25:01 - 00:49:48:25**

Yeah, absolutely. Yes. So, you know, using that as a reconnaissance tool to find out if there is an impact in those areas and if there is an impact to go in and use that. So Mr. Change, which they're proposing to use to actually monitor the extent, both vertically and horizontally of the cold water plumes which may be coming to the surface.

**00:49:49:10 - 00:50:15:18**

And we believe there's a difficulty here in that the proposal is only to undertake near field monitoring unless there's an exceedance of the predictions. And given the fact you just mentioned, there's variability potentially not just in the position of the front, but also between the gravity based structures that are used. Is the intensity of monitoring sufficient to pick up any likely variation?

**00:50:16:18 - 00:50:22:24**

Well, that's the key reason of having that reconnaissance survey so we can identify those likely

**00:50:24:17 - 00:51:02:03**

positions where there is an impact on the fronts or not. You know, so I think having that reconnaissance tool is a really useful way of a relatively low cost, high resolution. So good confidence in the data, but, you know, making sure that you don't send out, you know, physical survey teams to go out and measure something that was not there. So I think that having the survey first and assessing it there makes both good scientific sense and logistical sense as well.

**00:51:03:08 - 00:51:08:21**

Thank you. I'll come back to Applicant for any comment on that shortly. But I think, Mr. Williamson, you wanted to add to this.

**00:51:12:06 - 00:51:51:09**

Yeah. And I think John covered the definitely more her high technical level than I would have. I've spoken to it. I think ultimately he's captured it now, which is the in opposed to the monitoring of three distinct locations. We'd rather see the full extent of the array first. Some slight nuance, I guess, and administrative sense. We would expect the timing of the monitoring to cover where we would see stratification. So spring, summer, autumn. And as John outlined there, we propose that

we await the first set of monitoring of this fall field, in fact, to then review before we can assist or help the applicant.

**00:51:51:11 - 00:52:06:14**

Now, with the other indication of a more refined monitoring proposal going forward to it, away from the outputs of the first monitoring program to then refine the programme going forward. So that is suitably tailored for what the effect show.

**00:52:08:18 - 00:52:11:06**

Thanks much. It's very useful.

**00:52:13:14 - 00:52:15:15**

This program. Do you want your team to come back on that?

**00:52:17:26 - 00:52:52:25**

Got a megaphone for the applicants? Yes, sir. I may look to bring in Mr. Cooper in a moment on this. I mention that now just to give them time to prepare. He may have some observations on what you've just heard from members. Representatives. I'm simplistically in my mind, at least my understanding of our position on this is, is that what's being proposed and from our perspective is to put the cart before the horse, if I can put it crudely. And that way our understanding is a particular issue is the gravity based foundations.

**00:52:52:28 - 00:53:23:19**

They, of course, are not proposed across all of all of the array and the number of gravity based foundations has been further reduced. You have seen in the recent for the clarification. So it's considered entirely logical, unreasonable to focus on the gravity based foundations and look to and determine and validate whether or not the conclusions are correct at the near field scale before then going on to the next stage of looking at any possible or scale effect.

**00:53:24:00 - 00:53:34:19**

That's our position on it. And as I said, unless Mr. Cooper has anything from a technical perspective that would probably leave leave things there. Thank you.

**00:53:35:08 - 00:53:35:23**

Thank you.

**00:53:38:02 - 00:53:38:21**

Mr. Cooper.

**00:53:40:22 - 00:53:44:17**

Thank you, sir. Dale Cooper for the applicant. It's just.

**00:53:46:13 - 00:54:02:27**

Think a little bit about the practicalities of working this all together. And I think it is a good idea to do a survey planning where, you know that the effort that you're going to undertake in the near field is timed with

**00:54:05:05 - 00:54:38:16**

the development of stratification. And the locations that you're going to sample are within an area, the stratification. So using satellite data will be helpful at the reconnaissance level. But the potential limitation here is that we would be lining up a survey ready to go out and respond to that reconnaissance level. So where is everything happening? Near real time, maybe a day or two, and then send the survey vessels out.

**00:54:39:02 - 00:55:11:21**

But the limitation with satellite data is that cloud cover could negate the potential use of that data. And we need to be careful that we're not tied into something we're having to push back to say because there's no clouds or it's too many too much cloud cover. So I think in the survey planning is everything that we would want to do to accommodate that. We're going at the right time of the year and surveying in the right place. But we don't want to put too much dependency on getting satellite data to tell us about that.

**00:55:12:01 - 00:55:36:26**

If cloud cover doesn't give us a picture, I think also if we have that reconnaissance level information, it will be there to prime the deployment of the survey. So we would expect if that that if that information was to be shared with with others, that there was a fairly immediate turnaround on that and say, yes, you're going in the right place. Support the survey and

**00:55:38:22 - 00:56:02:24**



go ahead. So if we were sending some information to MMO, we would need a very rapid turnaround on that to try its with a survey. Otherwise, if you separate those two right in a period, then your reconnaissance is generally not as solid as it should be. I'm just thinking about the practicalities here. We have some dependencies on that we don't want to tie ourselves into.

**00:56:05:05 - 00:56:06:21**

Okay. And you understand that.

**00:56:09:14 - 00:56:16:21**

Is it something you can? Having heard what a member of, said Mr. McGovern, is that something you can take away and see whether there's any?

**00:56:18:18 - 00:56:23:03**

Benefit from some of the proposals you've had this morning. Your overall proposed monitoring plan.

**00:56:36:14 - 00:56:48:03**

Got him for napkin. So we'll certainly take away the comments that we made by the memo and reflect on them. So. On if there's any scope for us to do more than we proposed then then we'll certainly engage with them.

**00:56:50:07 - 00:56:59:21**

Thank you. And whilst your Mr. McGovern, have you had any feedback from Natural England and the RSPB on these monitoring proposals? Clearly we've got to

**00:57:01:09 - 00:57:12:02**

ASIO 48, which I think probably makes some reference to it, but we need to come back to that in your headlines. Six or seven, has the RSPB involved at all?

**00:57:16:03 - 00:57:32:15**

Got him a government for now. I'm not aware of any engagement or discussion with the RSPB on these matters. We do have natural England's submission from last night, which, as I say, we've we've not had proper time to consider and we will comment on that. DEADLINE seven.

**00:57:34:01 - 00:57:34:22**

Okay, fine.

**00:57:37:13 - 00:57:42:24**

Before we leave it, is there anything further that the MMO wished to add on the clarification note?

**00:57:47:19 - 00:57:53:27**

Williamson Re management organization. Nothing for me, unless anything's jumping front of John's mind.

**00:57:56:15 - 00:57:57:22**

Mr. Ace. Anything to add?

**00:57:58:08 - 00:58:00:00**

No, nothing for me. Thank you very much.

**00:58:00:18 - 00:58:01:04**

Thank you.

**00:58:04:04 - 00:58:25:24**

Okay. So we will make an action point, particularly for the RSPB to provide feedback on the clarification note and when we've all had time to digest what natural England have told us in our SO 48, it may be that we have a further action point for natural England there as well, and those would relate to the applicant's proposals for monitoring of effects on the FLAMBOROUGH.

**00:58:30:21 - 00:58:41:02**

If there's nothing else on Flamborough friend for now, can I move on to the implications of the documentation for the benthic ecology baseline and assessment?

**00:58:42:23 - 00:59:11:23**

We noted very early in the examination that natural England and MMO reserved comment on the benthic ecology baseline, pending the resolution of what they described as inadequacies in the assessment of marine geology, oceanography and physical process. Does the applicant now believe that the additional detail and information which has been submitted over recent deadlines, including the marine processes supplemental report, has any implications for the benthic ecology baseline and assessment.

**00:59:14:24 - 00:59:32:18**

Gordon McGovern For now, the short answer is no. So we do not believe there are any implications for the bass line. And other than of course, to the extent that we have further made further commitments to reduce certain aspects of the design, and those would reduce impacts such as they may arise. But no implication, sir.

**00:59:33:25 - 00:59:39:05**

So effectively they are additional work and the report has demonstrated that the assessment in the act was correct.

**00:59:39:27 - 00:59:42:07**

And not sought position. Yes, sir. Thank you. Thank you.

**00:59:43:23 - 00:59:51:00**

A similar question then to MMO. Do you believe that the recent additional information has had implications for the benthic ecology baseline in assessment?

**00:59:53:23 - 01:00:04:27**

Liberal Williamson Marine Management Organisation. And this has meant we're still liaising with our technical advisors on and so we hope to provide comments, closing our original concerns or at least updating them at the next deadline.

**01:00:05:18 - 01:00:25:09**

Target deadline six. Yes, thank you. And can we also make an action point today for natural England to respond to deadline six with the same question? Any opinion on the implications of the updated marine processes? Information for the reliability of the benthic ecology baseline?

**01:00:27:07 - 01:00:35:28**

We'll take a break shortly by one small final point in relation to marine processes, and this goes back to some of the natural England concerns.

**01:00:38:26 - 01:01:12:14**

Question for the applicant, you will have seen that the review provided by Natural England and the memo that was wrapped 5114 includes references to Christiansen as Owl and Turrell et al in relation to the potential for large scale hydrodynamic changes due to clusters of wind farms in seasonally stratified areas. These two papers do not seem to have been taken into account in the applicant's report. So my question is, should they and are there any material implications of their emission?

**01:01:24:07 - 01:01:36:22**

Got a McGuffin for the applicant. My understanding is that we are aware of those papers, notwithstanding that specifically reference and not considered at those papers, but that's perhaps something we can take away to confirm and writing.

**01:01:36:24 - 01:02:20:21**

So yeah, if you could just confirm or otherwise a deadline six, that would be very handy. Thank you very much. And finally, the most recent version of Natural England's risk lock still includes a number of red and amber rated entries, including some fundamental issues relating to the identification of receptors for the assessment and others in relation to the matters we have just discussed now much longer could change some of these colour coatings at deadline six in response to your deadline five and five reports and pending your examination of ISO 48, which you only saw last night, can you just give me a general indication of your intention in relation to resolving any outstanding differences in terms of marine processes and natural England?

**01:02:25:05 - 01:03:00:10**

Got him a government for the. So we believe we've gone as far as we can to try and resolve months with natural England. We're firm still in our position that all the appropriate receptors where identified and where necessary were assessed. And by way of of the EIA process. And we also take comfort from the expert peer review undertaken by Professor Elliott, who, on a reading of his report and agrees with our position that the appropriate receptors were identified and notwithstanding, they may all not have been identified.

**01:03:00:12 - 01:03:08:21**

And and the one place, when you read the totality of the suite of the documents and all relevant receptors have been properly assessed. Thank you.

**01:03:11:07 - 01:03:25:24**

In terms of the process you're go through, presumably are still in consultation with natural England and you do intend to try and narrow some of these gaps further? Or are we at a case where the statement of common ground is going to identify a series of differences between you?

**01:03:28:02 - 01:03:58:00**

Gary McGovern for the update. We are still engaging with natural England through the statement of common ground process. We will, as I've said, review the advice that was submitted last night and respond to that deadline seven. And we will endeavour best endeavours to close out any issues so far as we can and to the statement of common ground. But I think your you're and you are correct that there will be outstanding issues where we simply remain apart from natural England. Thank you.

**01:04:00:10 - 01:04:10:00**

I am conscious, we keep on longer than I have. We will take a short break. Could we reconvene at 1045, please?