

TEXT_ISH2_Session2_NetZeroTeeside_

Welcome back, everybody, it's 1145. So we'll restart all on Item four of this morning's agenda.

Thank you. So the agenda, Item four, scheduled to draft DCO requirements, and schedule 13 procedure for discharge of requirements. It says deference will be asked to provide an overview of the requirements. If you want to do that I'm happy but I think the introduction was given earlier is probably covered enough of that. So quite happy to move straight on.

Sir, if your content with that. So we would only be providing a review to assist you. So if it's not necessarily let's not take time to do it,

we'll move on to the detail then. Thank you. Thank you so good. She scheduled two requirements on the screen. So the first requirements wants to look at was requirements to again timescale for that 14 days is provided

in which this is referenced against at seven days. Perhaps that's something again, that could be picked up in terms of general approach.

So on on the detail of the requirements, it's going to be Mr. Jeff Bullock, from DWSD. He'll be responding. I think on that one, you're simply asking us to take it away and look into this. I've asked him to respond on that. Okay.

Okay. Then, let's move on to requirement three detailed design. Requirements, three, two, and four to 10. Through the relevant planning authorities identified for approving details. Should this be in consultation with others? It's my question, including the Highway Authority. Is that being considered is that appropriate? And perhaps I'll ask the council if they could consider that as well, or at least take that away.

So before before I ask Mr. Burch to respond to that. I mean, generally speaking, my understanding of the approach to drafting requirements and indeed also conditions is, it's generally left to the discretion of the determining authority, who is most appropriate to consult is only if there's a particular requirement to include a specific party as a consultee that they're normally named otherwise, and it's just generally left to the discretion of the good sense of the determining authority. I don't think we have a strong view of it because now we keyed in the consulting

instability also identical to that.

Thank you, Jeff, welcome half of the applicants, I'd probably just echo comments for Mr. Phillpotts on that. I've got something we need to sort of take away and and look at it a little bit more detailed as to see whether it's appropriate to add anybody else.

Okay, that's fine. Thank you. Moving on to requirements for which is landscaping and biodiversity protection

management and enhancement. So here, I was going to ask is it appropriate to consult Natural England but that really depends on the answer. The first question doesn't say perhaps that's for the relevant planning authorities consider. So the answer to the previous question should address that that's fine. Requirements for.

So For one refers to landscaping and biodiversity protection plan. Is there clarity between different documents that are referenced here, there's reference to a to a landscaping biodiversity Protection Plan, which must be in accordance with the principles of the Indicative landscaping and biodiversity strategy. And the application documents also reference an indicative landscape and biodiversity strategy. And the landscaping and biodiversity plan. I think that in shedule, 14 documents to be certified, there's reference to an indicative landscape and biodiversity strategy. So there may be different roles for these documents. But I think there's a degree of leading to the degree of confusion about the different roles. So

Jeff will come after the applicants. So yes, that's something we can look out further. I think in terms of those two documents you've referenced, they are consistent with each other. That I think you're right, there probably is a need for a bit more clarity on that. I mean, the way the requirement is structured, there's there's a plan effectively, that deals with the construction phase, and a plan later that deals we've sort of once things are operational and in place. Okay, that's certainly something we can look at.

Yeah, thank you. And then requirement four, seven, says that the plan submitted must be in accordance with the principles of the Indicative landscaping and biodiversity strategy. Is it necessary to say in accordance with the principles, could that be deleted?

Jeff will come after the applicants? I think the intention of that that wording relates to the fact that it is it is a strategy, it's not sort of the definitive final document. And that's why we refer to principles. It's certainly an approach we've we've taken another similar requirements and other BCAAs as well. Okay.

Thank you. Requirement five, could be right of way and access can my thinking was Natural England would be an appropriate consultation. If they are, if it stands to the relevant planning authority, that's for them to decide whether Natural England and environmental agency are consulted.

So I think this comes back to the point we discussed earlier, where were we on under a separate obligation to consult them? Instantly? They might hands on the article that we were looking at but

yes, I recall you saying there was 113

form helpfully and there might have been this to adult and so because we can't restrict use of or altered or divert any access land without having consulted them first effectively. That has to happen for the reasons I've said before we will be able to get a plan

proved that makes sense both of you. Requirements six, external lighting don't think that references the Indicative lighting strategy, which is a document to be spurs to be certified and sheduled 14 Should it do so.

Jeff Bullock on behalf of the applicant so I think that is referenced three sort of penultimate paragraph it does say in accordance of

intelligence. Yes. Thank you. Requirements seven highway access. Seven one refers to consultation with the Highway Authority does highway authority need defining it is

So they are they are defined in Article Two as having the same meaning as in the 1980. Act so they adopt statutory definition.

Okay. But not the name of the

No it's it's to be derived from the stat that from the main statutory definition or can identify who is the high reliability in each individual case.

Means of enclosure which is requirements aid is there a need for a subsection that to address the removal of temporary fencing? On completion of the authorised development

Jeff Bullock on behalf of the applicant? Yes, I can't see that is there sir. So, I think that's something we need to take away and look at.

I think again iminium had that so we certainly included it on others. Requirements turned by prevention should that be subject to consultation with the Fire Authority or health and safety executive probably with Fire Authority? Because then since that's something you've considered

Jaffna compact for the applicant. It probably comes back to that point earlier about appropriate consultation by the local planning authority but again, that's that's something we're happy to take away and look at

Thank you. Requirements 11 surface and foul water drainage does the Kemp instruction manual plan need to specify this pursuant to requirements 16? And also, there's references in management and maintenance plan. Basically, what that actually covers the two elements that are at least

quality so I didn't quite understand the question Did Did you mean that requirements 16 needs to refer to requirement 3013?

I think because they're both dealing with construction environmental management plan maybe there's a link that needs to be specified. And then the second part is the scope is a management and maintenance plan. That sounds pretty broad does that need to be more detailed? Was that defined somewhere else?

Sir, I think that the management and maintenance planning as referred to in requirements 11 One again, we can we can take that one away and

it's been mentioned there so it says a management maintenance plan to ensure that systems remain fully operational throughout construction to the relevant parts of the authorised development Yeah, I suppose the words after management and maintenance plan explain what it is. So maybe that's enough in this situation

so requirement 13 contaminated land and groundwater should this relates to the construction environmental management plan talks about the principles of chapter 10 of the yes and environmental statement, the referencing the explanatory memorandum is to the environmental statement commitments register

Jeff will come after the applicants. We don't think that should need to, but we're happy to take that one away and look at it a bit further detail.

That's fine, thank you

as a requirement 13, paragraph five, it was a minor point but it's referring to works numbers where they've already had approval by the planning authority or details approved under a condition attached to a planning commission and there'll be deemed to be approved for the purposes of subparagraph one. There's no timescale attached to that. So it could be that the remedial works for approval were done a long time ago when standards were different. So I want to make sure that we can secure an appropriate standard of remediation that it doesn't automatically go through to satisfy paragraph one.

Thank you. Well, we'll look at that one. Thanks

so a paragraph sorry, requirements 16 construction environmental management plan. And then EA had some comments on this as well.

16 two, a specifies some management plans to be submitted. And 515 I think of the country memorandum list some management plans but not the test management plan. noise and vibration management and materials management plan. So again, just looking for consistency between what's in well, pe s and the EM with what's in this requirements itself. And then there's a reference to the commitments register which is appendix 25. A should that be secured through this requirements as well. But does that stand alone as the documents

I'm Jeff Bullock, I'm half the applicant so that the commitments register is intended to be a standalone document

what about the other plans? Is that list A to F there was a gene that was well isn't the is that comprehensive?

We'll review that search just to make sure that it is

Thank you. Requirements eight You So, Mr. Philpott congrats your comments about the highway authority that would cover both the local highway authority and national highways with it

this is as drafted it's deals with construction traffic management plan consultation with the Highway Authority. I think one of the things we just have to look at whether in that context that would embrace both of those bodies or wants I suggest we just take that away to confirm my

position and three B which is the reference to abnormal indivisible loads should that be referenced that water transport?

And Jeff will come after the applicant sir I think the the intention with the project is that those loads would come in by water

coming by water anyway

yeah

b b talks about loads to be delivered by road mitigating traffic impacts

sorry, just to clarify surfing the intention is that loads will come in by water that this requirements element is to cover those that would not be able to I see able to come and borrow Yes. Okay. Good.

Requirement 19 paragraph four, it says the approved plan, which is the construction workers travel plan must be implemented within three months of commencement of the authorised development, why wait three months? Why not do it right from the beginning?

Jeff will come after the applicant, I think we may need to come back on this one in writing. But I think part of the intention is to sort of allow a periods of establish things like working numbers, so the more sort of accurate plan can be developed that will provide some further clarification on that. Thanks.

Next one is chronic 20 working hours, there's a reference there to be given it's 22 a as reference to requirements 22. Is that the correct reference or should it be requirement 21. Does it cover I suppose the issue is whether it covers construction or operation.

Jeff, welcome half the applicant? Yes, sir. I believe that should be requirement 21 rather than 22.

And requirements 21. So I need that to be referenced to be in accordance with chapter 11 of the s and the framework, construction environment management plan.

Jeff Wilkie on behalf of the applicant, sir I think we would be prepared to include wording to that effect and makes things more more precise and clear.

Requirements 22 Then there's a reference there to put into commercial use following commissioning. Think this at the start to bond, is that more appropriate to pay the date of final commissioning?

Jack Welch accom after the applicants say well, we'll take that one away to review. That's okay. Thank you. Thank you.

Again. Could you look at the reference to being in accordance with chapter 11? The vs same principle as the previous requirements, please? And I think the same applies really to requirement 23 as well.

Requirement 24 Waste Management on site construction waste should the plan submitted and approved to be in accordance with the principles set out in the framework construction environmental management plan that an appropriate reference

Jeff Allah compiled for the applicants so yes, we're happy to make that amendment and

requirements 25 to this period of three years restoration of temporarily used land what is the justification for the three year period please?

chappelow compact for the applicants, sir, I think we have based this on other orders. But in terms of the justification for that period, I think we do need to take that away and provide some further clarification on that for you is, is clearly to allow sufficient time for the relevant things to happen but as to the justification for three years we'll look at that further.

Question 26 same phrases in requirement 22 rautins commercial use following commissioning. So again, look at the date of final commissioning on day one please.

Then requirement 31 The next one? Perhaps could perhaps could stop asking for comments on the objectives of this requirements because it does seem to be quite key one I think Mr. Hunter Jones may want to come in at this point because I think it relates to his relevance representation as well. Was not for this particular requirements. It's a related point. are supposed to

take some instructions. In so far as 31 is concerned, this design standard. The query arises from the client Earth query stream, which has also I think arisen in other examinations. I think at the moment, what I would say is that we're considering that we're considering the issues that arise from it. And we're going to come back with a written answer. So if I might ask for the opportunity to deal with that in writing rather than dealing with it now.

That's fine. Thank you. Mr. Hunts Jones, did you want to come in at this point in time you wish to add? Thank you, sir. No, I think that's satisfactory from planners perspective as well. Thank you. That's good. Thank you. I suppose. Mr. Potts, if you're going to come back in writing, perhaps I can just outline couple of other things that my thoughts on this as well.

So that would be very helpful. Obviously, the more we understand what's on your mind the more we can address it, okay.

So 31 One addresses construction and operation of a site for the storage of carbon dioxide captured or collected by the authorised development has been granted. Now should this include to commencement the dependence on the operation of the carbon dioxide network? Sorry, that's not an issue on the on B. But there was one point. So essentially, what we've been looking at as an examining authorities, whether the DCO should make the operations of the power station dependent on the licencing construction and commissioning of the offshore elements of the project. Requirements 31 deals with storage concerns, but not with the transmission pipeline.

So just in terms of that narrow point on on the drafting, consent required to enable construction and operation of a site for the storage of the carbon dioxide capture collected, I would understand that as embracing because it embraces operation to the operation is not going to be possible without pipelines. And essentially, it's rather all or nothing. When it comes to the offshore elements. If that drafting can be improved upon, we'll look at that and see if there's any clear form of words. But the intention, it seems really must be that the consents that are required to operate the storage side?

Yes, yes. So we were thinking in terms of the link is in relation to the approval of the offshore storage, but as you pointed out, is the operation. So that provides a closer link, which is means that two elements can't function separately, although they couldn't anyway, but the link is closer together. That is fine.

So I will look at the draft, because I'm not saying that the drafting can't be improved upon, will consider your point and see whether it can Okay, thank you.

Think in terms of drafting, perhaps the use of the word enable could be confusing, because it means that you've got the ability to do it. But you haven't necessarily completed it. So that might be the bit that we could do with tightening up on a bit.

Because I think the consent will always be likely to enable facilitate allow, choose your preferred term construction operation, it's unlikely that the the consent would require it to be constructed and operated because there might be a myriad of reasons why an individual consent or application DCA wouldn't be implemented. As I understand the underlying concern, it's whether or not the development authorised by this DCO should be able to go ahead if the offshore elements are not in fact, going To be operated as opposed to the potential for them to be operated. So I suspect that is not so much the words to enable. It's more and more over arching principle point as to the effect of that, whether it should go further. I think I understand the point. But I think what I'm saying is that I don't believe that the particular words focused on necessarily the ones that would need to change I think it would be a wider redrafting if we have to make it more onerous in its effect. Thank you

Okay, I think that covers the climate 31 We may return to this. So it seems to be quite an important requirement in terms of the link between the offshore and the onshore and but we welcome your further comments on that thank you Carmen 32 deals with commissioning decommissioning. Think so needs to that's

the requirements 32 paragraph one. I was wondering what the purpose of this is when I'm not sure it's enforceable anyway, because it's dependent on the undertaker deciding to do something and we don't know when that decision is going to be made or if it's been made. But if you've got paragraph two, which says that no decommissioning works can be carried out until the planning authorities approved the decommissioning environmental management plan anyway, and wondered if there was any requirement for paragraph one.

Jeff Bullock and half of the applicants. Madam, thank you for that. And we were aware there's a number of submissions very similar submissions on this requirement, which we looked at. So we do anticipate that we will be amending, amending it to sort of reflect those those submissions. So we'll look at those those two paragraphs from where we're doing things

that deals with all the requirements that we had sheduled 13 Then is the procedure for the discharge of requirements could just turn to that please. Just wondering about the ordering of this scheduled weather section of paragraph three should come before for Google, they should be reversed. And whether to enforce should be combined. Or linked or at least paragraph to be made subject explicitly to paragraph for another expecting responsibility. And I think perhaps that's the main takeaway. Just look at the structure of that sheduled as a whole could please.

Um, Jeff will come after the applicant. So we're happy to take that away. We are conscious that we do need to discuss the shedule in more detail with the local authorities, authorities, which we'll be doing in due course

that's good to hear. Thank you. I think looking at in being wherever the GCOS not sure the structure is the same as others but not as necessarily to say that others only better. This this could be looked at again. Hopefully. Thank you. Okay, so I think that finishes off item four on the agenda. Does anyone else have any questions or comments before we move on to Item five? Yes, Mr. Hanson

Thank you. So Tom Henderson for SDDC. Just seeking confirmation that you don't want a summary of the points we've made in our relevant rep. At this juncture.

Now, we've read the resin rep in detail, and we'll be waiting, because you will, the applicants response to that, and then we'll take those matters further.

Thank you. Just one point then, which may assist you and the applicant on the point that was discussed about restoration. And I think that was requirement 25 points of contrast. And it's article 31, on temporary session of land and bat at paragraph four, requires the land to be relinquished within one year of commissioning. Yes, and at that point, the lands have been restored to the reasonable satisfaction of the landowners. So the two provisions are not consistent. Our submission would be that the normal position is one year. And the reasonable satisfaction of the landowner obviously, then allows the parties to discuss ongoing arrangements after that. So just on that point, we would, you'd be seeking that to be trained as when you

think you feel good twins come back a while.

So we think there are precedents for three year restoration periods. We'll look at the point that's been raised, and then identify those and our response. Thank you.

Okay, moving on to Item five, which is scheduled 12, the DCO protective provisions and scheduled 12. It comprises a number of parts. Fancy closer to 19 parts. Perhaps it be useful if I could just have an overview of where discussions have got to in terms of these provisions? I don't think they need to go into in detail and discussion today. But an overview would be helpful.

And thank you, sir. Well, as you as you said, the DCO and scheduled. Five contains 19 sets of protective provisions. And two of those are for the protection of particular types of statutory undertakers. So that's electricity, gas, water and sewage Undertaker's who were dealt with in part one, and electronic communications code networks and are dealt with in part two. And then there are 17 that are for the protection of particular named entities. So that's parts three to 19. And in addition to those, which you find in the current draft, the Applicants are currently in discussion with four additional parties on protective provisions. Those are in Eos, UK SNS limited. Teesside wind farm limited, both carbon limited, and Huntsman polyurethanes. UK Limited. And we're anticipating that draft protective provisions for these parties would be included in the deadline to version of the draft DCO. Negotiations are taking place in respect of the draft protective provisions in the current DCO. Now, we've had no comments so far on 11 of those. We think that 10 are either largely agreed and or negotiations are too well advanced stage. But I would want to emphasise and I'm sure this is understood anyway, that the negotiations on protective provisions are proceeding in parallel with negotiations of the need for and contents of signed agreements with some parties to sit alongside the protective provisions and also negotiation for the acquisition of land interests. They sit together as a package, and will of course update the examining authority on negotiations as we go through the examination. But we anticipate that deadline one will be able to provide an update on the position then through our comments on relevant representations where that's appropriate and relevant statements of common ground and also the status of negotiations. schedule so you get a picture of where we are at deadline one and walking keep that updated as we're moving through. I hope that helps by way of an overview.

Definitely. Thank you very much is helpful. Does anyone else wish to comments on Item five? Yes.

Thank you, sir Scott McCallum for state Hornsey project for limited. And Sir on protective provisions, we consider that provisions may well be necessary and appropriate for the benefit of Hornsey project four as discussed at the first issue specific hearing yesterday sir, in the horn C for development consent order is currently an examination. There have been a number of submissions within that examination centred on whether the Hornsey for wind farm and the carbon capture and storage scheme can coexist in the overlap area offshore. Were set Hornsey for have offered protective provisions for the benefit of the storage operator and BP as the proposed operator of the storage facility has proposed alternative protective provisions for the benefit of the normalcy for DCO. It Mr. Phillpotts set out the three possible scenarios for the MC for DCO application yesterday that are potentially relevant to this carbon capture and storage project. It briefly started the three scenarios the first is that Hornsey for DC was refused and in that instance, there will be a new interface between the projects. Scenario two is BPS proposed protected provisions are applied. And again as we discussed yesterday, sir, that would exclude wind

farm infrastructure from the overlap area. And in that scenario, again, there would be limited interface. Scenario three however, sir, we are states proposed protected provisions are applied for the benefit of BP involves a scenario where the fate of those protected provisions in broad terms would be to require your state, Hornsey for a to refrain from wind development and overlap area unless and until a suitable coexistence agreement is agreed with BP or determined by the Secretary of State by an arbitration mechanism. So in this third scenario, sir, there may well be both parties coming forward with infrastructure within the same overlap area. If indeed that that through the protective provisions can be demonstrated to be feasible and appropriate, is therefore in that context that the need for proper engagement to manage that and interface risk arises. As noted on C four's proposed protective provisions puts hold on wind development and overlap area and four C's are stare towards the floor to the table to establish the degree to which turbines can be accommodated within the overlap area. The missing piece of the jigsaw, in practical terms just now, sir, is a reciprocal obligation on the carbon capture and storage operator to also come to the table. And that reciprocal obligation triggered only in the event that, as I say, in your state's position is preferred by the Secretary of State and there is the prospect of coexistence. And that reciprocal potato provision could interview be achieved, perhaps best achieved by a commercial state agreement. But the other way to achieve that, sir, in our submission would be via appropriately worded potato provisions in this development consent order. Those would put a pause effectively on the DCO elements authorised by this this development consent order. Unless and until the offshore interface issues had been agreed or determined. We will seek to discuss these matters with applicants and but in the event that that agreement cannot be reached on that point, we would propose submitting a err preferred draft protect provisions for for your consideration in due course.

Thank you. Thank you. Phil.

Yes, thank you, sir. We have the benefit of a brief discussion before we started today. So what's been said doesn't come as a surprise, rather than going into the merits of all of this now, which I know is not your intention for today. And what I would say is two points. First point is we've suggested stating common ground would be a useful way of crystallising some of this working through the scenarios working through what each party might say would would arise and identifying in there In what drafting might be appropriate for different scenarios. And I don't want to prejudge what that might say. That seemed to us to be a convenient way of crystallising for the benefit of the examining authority, what might or might not be relevant for the purposes of your judgement and so far as the need or otherwise, for protective provisions to force us to the table or anything like that, whether or not that can be dealt with through the other examination or whether it has to be dealt with here, we can deal with all of those matters through that mechanism. The second point is in relation to the written representations, which of course, are shortly going to be coming forward. No doubt, all of the additional drafting, which is suggested as a fallback will be included in the written representations in the way one would expect. So that that can properly be grappled with. And we can respond to it. That also should help keeping the examinee authority abreast of the the essential positions of the parties as we negotiate the statement of common ground behind the scenes as it were. So I don't want to go further at this stage into the merits. But hopefully that gives you an idea of the mechanisms that we have in mind in order to bring this to some sort of set of crystallised issues that you and your colleagues can consider.

Thank you very much. See, Mr. Graves got his hand up, wishes to speak on this point.

Grateful so there was just one point that I wanted to add just to sort of draw out that's not in our not apparent from our relevant representation. Although I think we've made it in earlier consultation responses, and it's simply that our clients primary concern here is in relation to the impact on its Wilton international site, and on the associated pipeline corridors that are vital to the operation of the Wilton site. And we have been in correspondence with the applicants solicitors in relation to the protective provisions that are included in the order. And we've provided them with a marked up version of those protective provisions that suggest some amendments. And the simple point is, I just wanted to make so that the examiner authority is aware is that what we've tried to, to do is to improve the standard of protection in those protective provisions so that it's in line with a previous DCO that dealt with impacts on on the Wilton site, and that is the Dogger bank, T side A and B offshore wind farm or to 2015. And in part six of sheduled 12 of that order, there is protective provisions relating to owners and operators at the Wilton site. So the simple point made by our client is that, you know, there is that precedent that deals with the degree and standard of protection that should apply to the Wilson site. And given that the impacts are effectively the same in this case, as they were in that the protective provisions should reflect those that have been previously granted by the Secretary of State. So it was just to make that point, sir.

Thank you very much. Mr. Graves. Thank you. Mr. Phillips? Yes, Mr. Cole particular ones competitive. And

you know, so just to confirm, we are considering that and discussing the protective provisions as has been indicated. Great. Thank you.

Okay, so that completes item five. Let's move on to item six, I think we're just a couple of items should be able to finish by one o'clock. Item six sheduled fourteens of the TCL documents and plans to be certified. I don't think I have any questions on this now. I think this may evolve as the examination precedes maybe it has with the change request anyway. Maybe further evolution. I don't think we have any questions at this point as to what's trending on Santa.

No. So we have looked at this we are currently content that it does what it's meant to do and includes the documents it's meant to include but as you say it's possible as the examination goes on, others may need to

be added. And so the only other comments I had on the TCO documents itself was the explanatory notes. Just the final page, it says a copy of the audit plans book of reference may be inspected free of charge during working hours at at Thanks. So it could ask that you fill in the X when appropriate, please. Nick would ask the applicant. Yes, sir. We'll complete. That's fine. Thank you very much. So I think that completes Item six on the agenda less than anyone has any other comments. Okay, so let's move on to item seven, which again, I think can be brief. This concerns consents, licences and other agreements, the documents or the consents and licences, which is a PP o 77. Table 2.1. That lists 23 of the consents and licences, which may be required, while table 2.2 lists for offshore consents and licences, which we heard about yesterday. Mr. Philpott? You're welcome to provide a brief update on

progress on these. But if you're content with what's in the documents that don't necessarily need to do further

work, that's help. So I've got Dr. Lowe, who's able to provide an update, but we're equally happy to provide it in writing if it's convenient for you.

I think, given the silent let's have that in writing, please. I don't think there's a need to question anything on that so very well. So we can take that further. Thank you very much. That completes item seven to item eight. Statements of common grounds relevance TCO. So we've set out in the real six letter tonics i a range of statements, common grounds, which have relevance track DCO. And Mr. Hill point, you mentioned yesterday, a number of other statements that you're working on, which is good to you want to send in further this point, home progress. So again, up to you that's in writing,

perhaps us in writing, seven, the matters are moving along, as one would expect and hope. And we're we don't have any, any particular issues to report. So happy to provide an update in writing.

That's helpful. Thank you. Any other comments on that point? So Mr. Henson,

thank you. So I suppose it's just to say that, from our perspective, the socg isn't moving. Fast as certainly we would like we're awaiting the latest draft, which is now coming up close to the deadline. So we just want to record that we can urge the applicant to expedite the drafter that to us so that we can have time to consider it.

Thank you. Sure the applicants have heard and will respond.

Well, absolutely. So I'm told it's it'll be with SDDC. Very shortly. It's undergoing final review as we speak.

Thank you very much. Thank you. So that's concludes item eight on the agenda now. Mrs. Hunts nine thing.

Thank you. I've been taking down the actions from today's hearing. There are numerous so I won't go through them now. But we will be writing those up tonight and publishing them ASAP.

Does anybody want to raise any other matters relevant to this hearing? Samsung.

Thank you. Yes. Just one small final point. The registered address for STD C has changed. So it's not the one that's currently in the order. So we exchanged emails with the applicant, we can give them the the new registered address.

Thank you. Any other matters? Anybody wants to raise? Online? Which case may I remind you that the timetable for the examination requires that parties provide any post hearing documents on or before Thursday the 26th of May which is deadline one on the timetable. They also remind you that recording of this hearing will be placed on the inspectorates website. And that leads me to say thank you very

much everyone for attending today and for your participation. We shall consider all of your responses carefully will inform our decision as to whether further written questions or further round of hearings will be necessary. The next hearing for the project will be the compulsory acquisition hearing which is due to commence at two o'clock this afternoon. Once again, thank you the time is now 1245. Less issues specific hearing on the draft development consent order is now closed.