```
00:00:00.800 --> 00:00:03.600
Thank you. Good morning. Everybody. It's ten o'clock
1
00:00:03.600 --> 00:00:07.200
 and we're now resuming the hearing on
00:00:06.200 --> 00:00:09.900
 issue specific hearing
00:00:09.900 --> 00:00:10.500
 number four.
00:00:12.100 --> 00:00:15.900
Today we're going to deal with dco matters that's development
consent
00:00:15.900 --> 00:00:16.600
 automatters.
6
00:00:17.200 --> 00:00:20.600
And I check with the IT team that the recording is.
00:00:21.800 --> 00:00:23.600
Now being live streamed. Thank you.
00:00:24.500 --> 00:00:26.200
Can everybody hear me at the back?
00:00:27.300 --> 00:00:28.000
Good. Thank you.
10
00:00:29.500 --> 00:00:33.000
Now, is there anybody registered to
11
00:00:32.500 --> 00:00:36.000
 speak who was not here yesterday?
12
00:00:39.600 --> 00:00:42.100
```

```
Anybody on line?
13
00:00:42.800 --> 00:00:42.900
Who?
14
00:00:45.300 --> 00:00:48.000
Was not here yesterday who is registered to speak.
15
00:00:51.100 --> 00:00:56.100
No, okay. Well in that case and we'll we'll
16
00:00:54.100 --> 00:00:57.100
 proceed.
17
00:00:58.600 --> 00:01:02.800
Without going around the table on this occasion and
18
00:01:01.800 --> 00:01:04.200
but for the benefit of
19
00:01:04.200 --> 00:01:07.400
 the the recording, I'll just say, my
20
00:01:07.400 --> 00:01:10.300
 name is Graham Keen. I'm a planning inspector and solicitor
employed
21
00:01:10.300 --> 00:01:13.300
by the planning inspectorate and pointed by the Secretary of State
for loving
22
00:01:13.300 --> 00:01:16.400
 up housing and communities as lead member of the panel examining
23
00:01:16.400 --> 00:01:20.100
 this application. It's my left is Karen
24
00:01:19.100 --> 00:01:20.500
Taylor.
25
00:01:21.900 --> 00:01:24.600
```

```
Yes, good morning everyone. I'm Karen Taylor.
26
00:01:24.600 --> 00:01:27.100
 I'm a chartered Town planner and chartered member
27
00:01:27.100 --> 00:01:30.600
 of the landscape Institute. Thank you and to my writers
28
00:01:30.600 --> 00:01:31.200
 guy Rigby.
29
00:01:34.300 --> 00:01:36.700
Good morning, everyone. My name is Guy Rigby.
30
00:01:37.900 --> 00:01:40.300
I will try to civil engineer and also
31
00:01:40.300 --> 00:01:43.800
 a member of a pool of qualified persons as you'll
32
00:01:43.800 --> 00:01:45.700
to serve as an examining inspector.
33
00:01:46.500 --> 00:01:49.700
And I'm appointed to this panel and employed by the planning
inspectors
34
00:01:49.700 --> 00:01:51.000
on a fixed term contract.
35
00:01:52.200 --> 00:01:55.500
Thank you, Mr. Rigby supporting us today at Michel Gregory
36
00:01:55.500 --> 00:01:58.100
 and Kailyn Atkins who are here in
37
00:01:58.100 --> 00:02:01.200
 the room. And for those who may need
38
00:02:01.200 --> 00:02:04.100
 online support Louise haraway is online.
```

```
39
00:02:05.100 --> 00:02:08.800
Please check our rule 6 letter on the national infrastructure web
40
00:02:08.800 --> 00:02:11.500
page for procedure in these hearings and
41
00:02:11.500 \longrightarrow 00:02:14.700
 check the website from time to time for communications from
42
00:02:14.700 --> 00:02:16.300
from us the panel.
43
00:02:17.900 --> 00:02:20.900
All hearings are being live streamed and recorded for
44
00:02:20.900 --> 00:02:23.300
those online. Please stay muted unless you're
45
00:02:23.300 --> 00:02:26.400
 speaking. If you wish to speaker to relevant point, please use
46
00:02:26.400 --> 00:02:29.400
the team's hands up function or turn on the camera so
47
00:02:29.400 --> 00:02:30.500
we can see you wish to speak.
48
00:02:31.500 --> 00:02:34.000
The recordings we make are retained and published. So they
49
00:02:34.500 --> 00:02:37.800
 form a public record that can contain your personal information
switch the
50
00:02:37.800 --> 00:02:41.300
 gdpr general data protection regulation applies.
51
00:02:42.200 --> 00:02:45.200
Few housekeeping points the fire alarm
```

```
52
00:02:45.200 --> 00:02:48.200
no fire alarm scheduled today. So if there is a
53
00:02:48.200 --> 00:02:51.400
fire alarm the best way of proceeding is
54
00:02:51.400 --> 00:02:54.400
 out through the main front doors and either left or right
55
00:02:54.400 --> 00:02:57.600
 away from the the Pavements Edge
56
00:02:57.600 --> 00:03:00.300
 if there's a fire at the front of the building
57
00:03:00.300 --> 00:03:03.500
 and the best way is to go out through those double
58
00:03:03.500 --> 00:03:05.600
 doors to my left over there.
59
00:03:08.700 --> 00:03:11.300
The toilets are through the corridors to my
60
00:03:11.300 --> 00:03:11.600
 right.
61
00:03:15.100 --> 00:03:18.300
There will be a break that will take round about
62
00:03:18.300 --> 00:03:21.900
 mid-morning for about 20 minutes and
63
00:03:21.900 --> 00:03:25.600
 if needed mid afternoon lunch may
64
00:03:25.600 --> 00:03:29.200
be Movable Feast. We'll see how we get. I'm I'm
65
00:03:30.400 --> 00:03:33.200
```

```
expecting we may finish sometime in
66
00:03:33.200 --> 00:03:38.300
 the afternoon, but we'll see what progress we make so we
67
00:03:36.300 --> 00:03:39.400
may be flexible around
68
00:03:39.400 --> 00:03:40.300
 about lunchtime.
69
00:03:43.700 --> 00:03:46.500
So any questions on procedure so
70
00:03:46.500 --> 00:03:46.700
far?
71
00:03:47.500 --> 00:03:48.500
Yes, Mr. Steele.
72
00:03:50.100 --> 00:03:53.800
Good morning, sir. Good morning. Madam. Good morning. Says John
steel
73
00:03:53.800 --> 00:03:56.800
 Casey for the Seneca group
74
00:03:56.800 --> 00:03:59.100
 smts. May I just
75
00:03:59.100 --> 00:04:03.000
 say so that I will be here for only part of the day. But Mr.
Kozelco
76
00:04:02.200 --> 00:04:05.200
will take over later on. I just make that point
77
00:04:05.200 --> 00:04:08.500
 at the moment see or aware of that and it is no discourse.
78
00:04:08.500 --> 00:04:11.200
```

```
I hope to the panel then take
79
00:04:11.200 --> 00:04:13.300
 and thank you for letting us know Mr. Steele.
00:04:17.600 --> 00:04:18.600
Okay, so
81
00:04:21.300 --> 00:04:24.100
we'll move on to a gender item six then which is
82
00:04:24.100 --> 00:04:26.700
 the draft development consent order.
83
00:04:27.700 --> 00:04:30.600
And we'll be referring mainly to the latest
84
00:04:30.600 --> 00:04:34.200
 version of the draft dco, which is
85
00:04:34.200 --> 00:04:37.300
 in the library examination reference r e p.
86
00:04:37.300 --> 00:04:40.700
Well the tracked version which is the version I'm looking
00:04:40.700 --> 00:04:40.900
at.
00:04:41.800 --> 00:04:43.000
Excuse me.
89
00:04:43.900 --> 00:04:46.400
Is reference r e
90
00:04:46.400 --> 00:04:49.100
p 6 - 0 1 3.
91
00:04:52.500 --> 00:04:55.600
Now the first item sub-item on
```

```
92
00:04:55.600 --> 00:04:58.900
the agenda. I've entitled compensation
93
00:04:58.900 --> 00:05:01.300
 packages section 106 agreements and
00:05:01.300 --> 00:05:02.400
 side agreements.
95
00:05:03.100 --> 00:05:06.600
And I'm interested to know the progress that's being made on
96
00:05:06.600 --> 00:05:09.700
those matters and I intend to
00:05:09.700 --> 00:05:13.500
 start with the last one with the side agreement.
98
00:05:15.600 --> 00:05:18.200
In its letter to the panel of three February which is
99
00:05:18.200 --> 00:05:22.900
 reference as - 322 the applicant
100
00:05:22.900 --> 00:05:25.300
has drafted the what it
101
00:05:25.300 --> 00:05:28.800
 refers to as the attached to protective Provisions to cover
102
00:05:28.800 --> 00:05:32.400
 the issues that were proposed to be contained within a
103
00:05:31.400 --> 00:05:34.600
 side agreement to can be completed with
104
00:05:34.600 --> 00:05:37.500
the local Highway authorities. The applicant has
105
00:05:37.500 --> 00:05:40.900
```

```
not had the opportunity to discuss the detail of the draft
Provisions
106
00:05:40.900 --> 00:05:43.300
with the lhas before
107
00:05:43.300 --> 00:05:47.500
 submitting them to to the examination. Although
108
00:05:46.500 --> 00:05:49.600
 it's anticipated discussions will proceed
109
00:05:49.600 --> 00:05:50.900
 in in parallel.
110
00:05:53.300 --> 00:05:56.800
So acknowledging that the authorities will
111
00:05:56.800 --> 00:05:59.200
want to consider those protective Provisions. The
112
00:05:59.200 --> 00:06:03.000
 applicant has determined it will not be submitting an
113
00:06:02.300 --> 00:06:05.700
 updated construction traffic management
114
00:06:05.700 --> 00:06:08.300
plan outline at this stage and we'll
115
00:06:08.300 \longrightarrow 00:06:09.700
do so at deadline seven.
116
00:06:10.600 --> 00:06:13.500
To best reflect what has been able to be agreed with
117
00:06:13.500 --> 00:06:16.400
the councils. Does that Mr. Tony broadly reflect
118
00:06:16.400 --> 00:06:18.100
 the applicant's position on that?
```

```
119
00:06:19.600 --> 00:06:24.200
Good morning, Sir Richard Turney for the applicant. Yes
120
00:06:22.200 --> 00:06:25.500
 that reflects the
121
00:06:25.500 --> 00:06:28.400
 position. Could I just explain where
122
00:06:28.400 --> 00:06:31.200
we are in terms of progress since then just
123
00:06:31.200 --> 00:06:34.100
 so you know and I've spoken to
124
00:06:34.100 --> 00:06:37.100
Mr. Bedford this morning about the spell which very
125
00:06:37.100 --> 00:06:37.300
helpful.
126
00:06:38.600 --> 00:06:41.200
Protect Provisions as that letter says have been
127
00:06:41.200 --> 00:06:44.800
 provided in in draft form both to
128
00:06:44.800 --> 00:06:47.700
the examination and to the local Highway
129
00:06:47.700 --> 00:06:50.900
 authorities those Provisions have
130
00:06:50.900 --> 00:06:51.400
not yet been.
131
00:06:53.900 --> 00:06:56.400
Subjects many comments obviously, they've
```

132

```
00:06:56.400 --> 00:06:59.400
 been provided relatively recently. I know from speaking
133
00:06:59.400 --> 00:07:02.600
to both SEC and
134
00:07:02.600 --> 00:07:05.000
CCC that they have concerns about those.
135
00:07:06.100 --> 00:07:09.400
But I think the point to emphasize in terms of progress is
136
00:07:09.400 --> 00:07:12.400
that we are having productive discussions on
137
00:07:12.400 --> 00:07:15.700
 the terms of the side agreement. We're following
138
00:07:15.700 --> 00:07:18.300
 a precedent that has been provided to us
139
00:07:18.300 --> 00:07:22.000
 by SEC from another National significant infrastructure
140
00:07:21.000 --> 00:07:22.300
 project.
141
00:07:23.200 --> 00:07:26.200
And we hope
142
00:07:26.200 \longrightarrow 00:07:29.100
 and expect that that will all be wrapped up
143
00:07:29.100 --> 00:07:31.600
by deadline 8.
144
00:07:32.400 --> 00:07:34.400
And certainly by the end of the examination.
145
00:07:35.500 --> 00:07:38.400
Which should mean that the need for protective Provisions
```

```
146
00:07:38.400 --> 00:07:41.300
for the highway authorities Falls away entirely. So that's
147
00:07:41.300 --> 00:07:44.100
 the route that I think all three parties the two
148
00:07:44.100 \longrightarrow 00:07:48.200
 Highway authorities and the applicant are pursuing with
00:07:47.200 --> 00:07:49.800
vigor.
150
00:07:50.800 --> 00:07:54.300
The PPS will
151
00:07:53.300 --> 00:07:56.400
 provide a fullback if we
152
00:07:56.400 --> 00:07:57.700
 get to the end of the examination.
153
00:07:58.600 --> 00:08:02.200
And the side agreement has not been concluded. Then the
154
00:08:01.200 --> 00:08:04.800
PPS can be in the order. They anticipate
155
00:08:04.800 --> 00:08:07.900
that they can be overtaken by subsequent agreement
00:08:07.900 --> 00:08:10.400
 and however, we settle them that's what we'd expect.
157
00:08:10.400 --> 00:08:13.700
So in other words, they would be overtaken if
158
00:08:13.700 --> 00:08:17.300
 a side agreement was completed later in the process, but we're
159
```

```
00:08:16.300 --> 00:08:19.200
 hopeful that we can avoid the
160
00:08:19.200 --> 00:08:19.600
 need to
161
00:08:21.400 --> 00:08:23.500
to go down the protective provision routes tall
162
00:08:24.300 --> 00:08:27.600
So that's our position. I think that's in common, but I
163
00:08:27.600 --> 00:08:30.000
 know that Mr. Bedford and Pat's Mr. Mohammed as
164
00:08:30.200 --> 00:08:33.200
well once say something about the adequacy of the pp's, okay, so we
165
00:08:33.200 --> 00:08:34.900
 still need to look at the PPS.
166
00:08:37.400 --> 00:08:40.600
I think the side agreement may not be completed by deadline
167
00:08:40.600 --> 00:08:43.400
8 that I think that's right. I think I think
168
00:08:43.400 --> 00:08:46.300
we need to have in mind the possibility that the
169
00:08:46.300 \longrightarrow 00:08:50.300
PPS will be required as a backstop, but I hope
170
00:08:50.300 --> 00:08:54.000
 so that can perhaps in terms of your efforts as
171
00:08:53.200 --> 00:08:56.900
the examining Authority. Perhaps be
172
00:08:57.700 --> 00:09:00.400
It shouldn't be the highest priority because we will
```

```
173
00:09:00.400 --> 00:09:03.400
be able to update on progress a deadline seven
174
00:09:03.400 --> 00:09:06.200
 and we'll be able to I hope inform you
175
00:09:06.200 \longrightarrow 00:09:09.200
 at deadline eight that there's a completed side agreement. Thank
you
176
00:09:09.200 --> 00:09:12.900
Mr. Tony. Well, I'll just ask Mr. Bedford
177
00:09:12.900 --> 00:09:17.700
 perhaps first and then the other authorities
178
00:09:15.700 --> 00:09:18.600
 and/or others
179
00:09:18.600 --> 00:09:21.200
what their appreciation of
180
00:09:21.200 --> 00:09:21.900
the position is.
181
00:09:23.200 --> 00:09:26.400
Morning, Mr. Bedford. Thank you, sir. Michael Bedford Suffolk County
182
00:09:26.400 --> 00:09:29.700
 Council. So Mr. Turney
183
00:09:29.700 --> 00:09:32.400
 has helpfully an accurately
184
00:09:32.400 --> 00:09:35.500
 set out the current state of play.
185
00:09:37.100 --> 00:09:40.200
It is correct that the
```

```
186
00:09:40.200 --> 00:09:44.100
draft protective Provisions that are
187
00:09:43.100 --> 00:09:46.100
 in as319.
188
00:09:47.100 --> 00:09:50.600
Are not currently in a form that if they
189
00:09:50.600 --> 00:09:53.800
were needed Suffolk County
190
00:09:53.800 --> 00:09:56.200
Council would find to be sufficient.
191
00:09:57.400 --> 00:10:00.800
But we haven't yet provided our
192
00:10:00.800 --> 00:10:01.400
 comments.
193
00:10:02.300 --> 00:10:05.900
On that document obviously that
194
00:10:05.900 --> 00:10:08.100
will follow at deadline seven.
00:10:08.900 --> 00:10:11.500
And we will share
196
00:10:11.500 --> 00:10:15.400
with the applicant prior to deadline 7 as
197
00:10:14.400 --> 00:10:16.900
 it were the nature of those comments.
198
00:10:18.900 --> 00:10:19.100
but
199
00:10:20.300 --> 00:10:22.400
```

```
both we and the applicant.
200
00:10:23.600 --> 00:10:26.300
Very much see the protective Provisions as
00:10:26.300 --> 00:10:29.600
 no more than the fallback position because positive
202
00:10:29.600 --> 00:10:32.100
 progress is being made on the side agreement and
203
00:10:32.100 --> 00:10:36.300
the part is a focusing their efforts on that rather
204
00:10:35.300 --> 00:10:38.300
 than the fall back.
205
00:10:39.100 --> 00:10:41.600
And we think that's more productive.
206
00:10:42.600 --> 00:10:45.300
and to that extent we didn't think that
207
00:10:45.300 --> 00:10:48.900
the examination in terms
208
00:10:48.900 --> 00:10:51.400
 of this hearing would benefit particularly from
209
00:10:53.600 --> 00:10:56.900
hearing any of the specifics of
210
00:10:56.900 --> 00:11:00.200
 our concerns about the draft PPS. Okay
211
00:10:59.200 --> 00:11:02.400
 in the circumstances where say the
212
00:11:02.400 --> 00:11:03.300
 applicant hasn't yet?
```

```
213
00:11:05.100 --> 00:11:08.500
had those concerns expressed to them informally and
214
00:11:08.500 --> 00:11:11.400
 it may be more difficult to try and say just
215
00:11:11.400 --> 00:11:14.500
 on the hoof here have a discussion about things
216
00:11:14.500 --> 00:11:14.900
217
00:11:16.400 --> 00:11:19.300
In essence you would be coming to a cold the applicants coming to
218
00:11:19.300 --> 00:11:22.400
 it cold. And so we're not really sure that that's
219
00:11:22.400 --> 00:11:25.400
 the best way forward. All right. I said we'll
220
00:11:25.400 --> 00:11:28.500
we'll provide it a deadline seven to the extent. There isn't
221
00:11:28.500 --> 00:11:31.500
 a need for a further response that will come at deadline eight, but
222
00:11:31.500 --> 00:11:34.300
we would hope that it will fall away because
223
00:11:34.300 --> 00:11:37.700
 by deadline eight we're hoping to have a side agreement concluded.
Well,
224
00:11:37.700 --> 00:11:41.500
 thank you for that. I mean if if the scientists
225
00:11:40.500 --> 00:11:43.400
 concluded by then then that doesn't
```

226

```
00:11:43.400 --> 00:11:47.300
 really in a sense become a matter for the
227
00:11:46.300 --> 00:11:49.900
 examining Authority and that's
228
00:11:49.900 --> 00:11:52.700
well and good so long
229
00:11:52.700 --> 00:11:55.900
 as it remains possibility that that the
230
00:11:55.900 --> 00:11:58.600
 protective Provisions will be needed and that's
231
00:11:58.600 --> 00:12:02.300
why they're they've been drafted and they're here now they
232
00:12:01.300 --> 00:12:04.300
 do need to be looked at and I'm happy for you
233
00:12:04.300 --> 00:12:07.500
to both, you know go away and work them
234
00:12:07.500 --> 00:12:10.400
 up with the side agreement negotiations at
235
00:12:10.400 --> 00:12:13.100
 the same time. I had two or three
236
00:12:13.100 --> 00:12:14.900
 points about the provisions.
00:12:16.000 --> 00:12:16.800
rays
238
00:12:18.300 --> 00:12:19.900
The they're not.
239
00:12:20.600 --> 00:12:24.200
they're not some earth-shattering, but
```

```
240
00:12:23.200 --> 00:12:24.800
 I just want to
241
00:12:26.300 --> 00:12:29.900
Clarify. Well, first of all, if it's
242
00:12:29.900 --> 00:12:33.500
 if they go in they'll go in presumably as
243
00:12:33.500 --> 00:12:35.000
 scheduled 12 part 13
244
00:12:36.500 --> 00:12:39.200
At the moment, we have scheduled 12 Part 12 of
245
00:12:39.200 --> 00:12:40.900
the H put Provisions, I believe.
00:12:41.900 --> 00:12:44.000
So I take it that'll be
247
00:12:44.400 --> 00:12:47.000
they will not from Mr. Tony. Thank you. That'll go in
248
00:12:47.300 --> 00:12:51.300
 as schedule 12 part 13 then the second point
249
00:12:50.300 --> 00:12:53.700
 is in paragraph 9.
250
00:13:04.400 --> 00:13:07.700
Paragraph 9 reads if the Undertaker has
251
00:13:07.700 --> 00:13:10.400
 failed to begin to taking steps to comply with the reasonable
252
00:13:10.400 --> 00:13:13.700
 requirements of any notice and it's not subsequently made
```

253

```
00:13:13.700 --> 00:13:16.800
 reasonably expeditious progress towards their implementation
254
00:13:16.800 --> 00:13:19.000
within 28 days beginning with the
255
00:13:19.400 --> 00:13:23.200
 date on which I noticed and respect of any work is served on the
Undertaker the
256
00:13:22.200 --> 00:13:25.600
 relevant lha may do what's necessary for
257
00:13:25.600 --> 00:13:28.900
 such compliance and may recover any expenditure reasonably
258
00:13:28.900 --> 00:13:31.200
 incurred by it in so doing from the
259
00:13:31.200 --> 00:13:34.100
 Undertake now, it's just wondering about the
260
00:13:34.100 --> 00:13:35.200
 first part of that.
261
00:13:36.100 --> 00:13:39.500
Shall read again. If the Undertaker has failed to begin taking steps
00:13:39.500 --> 00:13:42.500
 to comply with the reasonable requirements of any notice.
263
00:13:43.700 --> 00:13:47.100
this refers to paragraph 8 notice of
264
00:13:48.800 --> 00:13:49.700
of works
265
00:13:51.300 --> 00:13:54.300
the and then this phrase and has
266
00:13:54.300 --> 00:13:58.100
```

```
not subsequently made reasonably expeditious progress
267
00:13:57.100 --> 00:14:00.000
within 28 days.
268
00:14:00.600 --> 00:14:03.500
 I'm wondering if that's better
269
00:14:03.500 --> 00:14:04.500
 expressed by
270
00:14:05.800 --> 00:14:08.500
Saying or in any event has not.
271
00:14:09.700 --> 00:14:13.200
subsequently made reasonably expeditious
272
00:14:12.200 --> 00:14:13.800
progress
273
00:14:15.600 --> 00:14:16.800
or something like that.
274
00:14:21.800 --> 00:14:24.400
I'll leave it out there for you to consider
275
00:14:24.400 --> 00:14:27.200
 unless you want to come back to me immediately on it. But I
276
00:14:27.200 --> 00:14:30.300
 think that's yes. It should it should say all or another
277
00:14:30.300 --> 00:14:33.400
 phrase. That's just that it's both because the intention is
278
00:14:33.400 --> 00:14:36.500
 that they give a note is either if yes, they've told us to we
279
00:14:36.500 --> 00:14:39.200
 haven't done it or we started to it and we haven't done it quickly
```

```
280
00:14:39.200 --> 00:14:39.700
 enough. Yes.
281
00:14:40.800 --> 00:14:43.700
Okay, so I'll leave that with with the pasties
00:14:43.700 --> 00:14:48.400
 then thank you. And then the other point was yes paragraph
283
00:14:47.400 --> 00:14:50.500
 10 in the case of emergency.
284
00:14:51.500 --> 00:14:53.900
Now emergency isn't defined.
285
00:14:55.300 --> 00:14:58.200
Paragraph 10 says in the event of any dispute as
286
00:14:58.200 --> 00:15:01.400
 the reasonableness of any requirement of the notice the
287
00:15:01.400 --> 00:15:05.200
 relevant lha must not accept in the case of emergency exercise
288
00:15:04.200 --> 00:15:06.600
 the powers conferred.
289
00:15:07.200 --> 00:15:10.800
By the provisions until the
290
00:15:10.800 --> 00:15:14.200
 dispute has been finally determined. So the
291
00:15:14.200 --> 00:15:18.000
 question is what is an emergency. Do we
292
00:15:18.100 --> 00:15:19.400
 need to Define an emergency?
293
00:15:20.500 --> 00:15:23.900
```

```
Emergency is defined for particular purposes
294
00:15:23.900 --> 00:15:26.300
 elsewhere in the dco. For
295
00:15:26.300 --> 00:15:26.800
 example.
296
00:15:28.600 --> 00:15:32.200
Cadence protective Provisions paragraph 3813
297
00:15:31.200 --> 00:15:35.100
 on page 96 defines what
298
00:15:34.100 --> 00:15:40.000
 emergency works are for those purposes. It
299
00:15:37.000 --> 00:15:40.100
 talks
300
00:15:40.100 --> 00:15:42.700
 about circumstances that existing or imminent.
301
00:15:43.400 --> 00:15:46.400
Which are likely to cause danger to persons or
302
00:15:46.400 --> 00:15:46.900
 property?
303
00:15:48.900 --> 00:15:51.500
and then there is the definition in National Grid
304
00:15:51.500 --> 00:15:54.200
 paragraph 6611 page 109 of
305
00:15:54.200 --> 00:15:57.400
 the dco which refers back to the definition in
306
00:15:57.400 --> 00:16:00.500
 the 1991 Act was that the utilities
```

```
307
00:16:00.500 --> 00:16:03.600
 act so I think some streets new
308
00:16:03.600 --> 00:16:04.200
utilities like
00:16:04.800 --> 00:16:06.000
SO
310
00:16:07.100 --> 00:16:07.500
and then
311
00:16:09.300 --> 00:16:13.300
there's the national highways Provisions. I
312
00:16:12.300 --> 00:16:14.800
think refer to
313
00:16:15.900 --> 00:16:18.400
in the event of an emergency or to prevent
314
00:16:18.400 --> 00:16:21.900
 the occurrence of danger to the public. So if if
315
00:16:21.900 --> 00:16:24.200
 those Provisions are going to go in perhaps the
316
00:16:24.200 --> 00:16:26.600
 parties could consider what
317
00:16:28.600 --> 00:16:31.200
should be there in terms of defining what is and
318
00:16:31.200 --> 00:16:35.300
what isn't an emergency for the purpose of the for the
319
00:16:35.300 --> 00:16:37.700
 local highways authorities protective provisions.
320
00:16:40.100 --> 00:16:41.400
```

```
So I leave that there and
321
00:16:42.500 --> 00:16:45.900
you can deal with that offline. Thank you, sir. Yes Bridge
322
00:16:45.900 --> 00:16:49.100
 anything that seems sensible. There
323
00:16:48.100 --> 00:16:51.800
 is a as one of those Provisions identifies.
324
00:16:51.800 --> 00:16:54.300
 There is a definition in the New Roads and streetworks acts. That
325
00:16:54.300 --> 00:16:56.500
 might be a useful starting point. Yes.
326
00:16:59.900 --> 00:17:01.400
Yeah, I mean one doesn't look for.
327
00:17:02.400 --> 00:17:05.400
Total consistency and Alignment across the
328
00:17:05.400 --> 00:17:08.700
board where there's a pragmatic solution
00:17:08.700 --> 00:17:12.000
 for each set of Provisions. So leaving with
330
00:17:11.200 --> 00:17:14.400
 you anymore bridge to anybody. I think I think that is the
331
00:17:14.400 --> 00:17:19.200
 issues there that obviously protect Provisions have this strange
characteristic
332
00:17:18.200 --> 00:17:22.100
 that they effectively are a negotiated position between
333
00:17:21.100 --> 00:17:24.600
 the various parties, but nonetheless, they're
```

```
334
00:17:24.600 --> 00:17:27.600
 being encapsulated and a statutory order and it
335
00:17:27.600 --> 00:17:30.300
 means that there will be inconsistencies in
336
00:17:30.300 --> 00:17:33.300
 the way in which the parties have chosen to Define their
337
00:17:33.300 --> 00:17:36.500
 terms between various PPS, but the fact I think
338
00:17:36.500 --> 00:17:38.000
 it makes sense for us to look to Define.
339
00:17:38.900 --> 00:17:39.800
the point there
340
00:17:40.800 --> 00:17:44.300
Okay. Okay, right.
341
00:17:46.800 --> 00:17:50.300
Well, I was going to mention the more general terms about the
perspective
342
00:17:49.300 --> 00:17:52.200
 Provisions as to whether or not
343
00:17:52.200 --> 00:17:54.400
 they take care of the
344
00:17:55.700 --> 00:17:58.400
Highway authorities concern us to the need for
345
00:17:58.400 --> 00:18:01.500
 precision as to the costs of damage to
346
00:18:01.500 --> 00:18:05.300
 the local Highway Network. I mean
```

```
347
00:18:05.300 --> 00:18:08.300
 that that unless you particularly want
348
00:18:08.300 --> 00:18:11.200
 to raise that then again, I'll I mean no doubt.
00:18:11.200 --> 00:18:14.400
You've got it in mind as part of the negotiations Mr.
350
00:18:14.400 --> 00:18:14.700
 Bedford.
351
00:18:16.500 --> 00:18:19.200
But so Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council, one of the
352
00:18:19.200 --> 00:18:22.600
 issues that is to be
353
00:18:22.600 --> 00:18:25.900
 discussed with the applicant are entirely the
354
00:18:25.900 --> 00:18:29.500
 basis for indemnities or other
355
00:18:28.500 --> 00:18:31.600
 mechanisms for recompensing.
356
00:18:32.300 --> 00:18:35.300
the local Highway authorities in the event of
357
00:18:35.300 --> 00:18:37.000
 damage to the highway network, but
358
00:18:38.100 --> 00:18:41.400
say without getting into the detail of that. That's really a
359
00:18:41.400 --> 00:18:44.900
matter that we are in dialogue about rather than something
360
00:18:44.900 --> 00:18:47.600
```

```
that we can sensibly usefully bottom out
361
00:18:47.600 --> 00:18:47.700
 now.
362
00:18:49.400 --> 00:18:52.500
Okay, thank you for that. And then just finally I
363
00:18:52.500 --> 00:18:55.500
 don't not sure if this is related or not but picking up
364
00:18:55.500 --> 00:18:59.200
 and no doubt. You'll have had this in mind are the
365
00:18:58.200 --> 00:19:01.400
 Suffolk County council's concerns
366
00:19:01.400 --> 00:19:04.300
 expressed in the lir the local impact
367
00:19:04.300 --> 00:19:04.900
 report.
368
00:19:06.700 --> 00:19:09.600
At 13.142 and
369
00:19:09.600 --> 00:19:13.300
 143 which expresses
370
00:19:12.300 --> 00:19:16.900
 the desire for 7.5% off-site
371
00:19:16.900 --> 00:19:19.500
 costs to be paid up
372
00:19:19.500 --> 00:19:22.900
front. I suppose together with a provision
373
00:19:22.900 --> 00:19:25.600
 for reimbursement for for assessment work.
```

```
374
00:19:25.600 --> 00:19:28.100
 Essentially. I think I don't
375
00:19:28.100 --> 00:19:31.200
 know whether those two items have been
376
00:19:31.200 --> 00:19:34.500
 overtaken by events or not in terms of what's being
377
00:19:34.500 --> 00:19:37.000
 transpired between the parties or not, but
378
00:19:39.400 --> 00:19:39.700
No Doubt
379
00:19:40.300 --> 00:19:43.400
I'd be able to serve those but Michael Bedford Suffolk County
380
00:19:43.400 --> 00:19:46.100
 Council have said I I'm not sufficiently close to the
381
00:19:46.100 --> 00:19:49.500
 stage of the negotiation on the side agreement to
382
00:19:49.500 --> 00:19:52.300
 know whether that's being resolved. But again, that's
383
00:19:52.300 --> 00:19:56.700
 another issue which if we
384
00:19:55.700 --> 00:19:58.200
 need to deal with it, we need
385
00:19:58.200 --> 00:20:00.000
 to be addressed as part of the protective provisions.
386
00:20:00.700 --> 00:20:03.600
And so there are issues in
387
00:20:03.600 --> 00:20:06.300
```

```
relation to those but I say we're hoping that we're making
388
00:20:06.300 --> 00:20:10.400
 progress in the negotiations. All
389
00:20:09.400 --> 00:20:13.100
 right. Thank you very much, Mr. Mohammed. Good
390
00:20:12.100 --> 00:20:14.300
morning. Good morning.
391
00:20:16.200 --> 00:20:17.000
Good morning, sir.
392
00:20:18.100 --> 00:20:21.700
It was just to kind of clarify a couple of things. I'm very
393
00:20:21.700 --> 00:20:24.200
 grateful for my little friends Mr. Tony for sending
394
00:20:24.200 --> 00:20:27.400
us all an email last night to try and narrow some of these points
395
00:20:27.400 --> 00:20:30.500
 and and that was extremely helpful and hopefully what
00:20:30.500 --> 00:20:34.000
 I'm about to say will also assist in terms of just housekeeping
matters.
397
00:20:33.200 \longrightarrow 00:20:37.000
 It's worth recording the we finished yesterday without capturing
398
00:20:36.200 --> 00:20:39.400
 the last two bullet points of item 5, but
399
00:20:39.400 --> 00:20:43.600
 that's now being captured as part of what we're dealing with under
item
400
00:20:43.600 --> 00:20:46.600
```

```
six and so far as the County Council on our
401
00:20:46.600 --> 00:20:49.300
 side is concerned. We agree that
402
00:20:49.300 --> 00:20:52.600
we do see the protective Provisions as a fallback and
403
00:20:52.600 --> 00:20:55.000
 they are obviously drafted in such a way that
404
00:20:55.300 --> 00:20:58.600
 they'll be overtaken by events, but it's just worth recording that
we're of
405
00:20:58.600 --> 00:21:00.900
 the view that side agreements is obviously our preference.
406
00:21:01.900 --> 00:21:04.500
We think sufficient progress is being made and
00:21:04.500 --> 00:21:08.000
 we think that we have a realistic timetable to
408
00:21:07.600 --> 00:21:10.400
 work towards the 28th of
409
00:21:10.400 --> 00:21:13.200
 of March, which is currently I think deadline.
410
00:21:14.500 --> 00:21:15.400
at nine
411
00:21:16.500 --> 00:21:19.300
So that that's just worth reiterating on
412
00:21:19.300 --> 00:21:22.400
 that point and then the other point in relation to
413
00:21:22.400 --> 00:21:25.100
what my learner friend had said, I
```

```
414
00:21:25.100 --> 00:21:28.400
don't want to also go through line by line in relation to
415
00:21:28.400 --> 00:21:31.100
our concerns around the protective Provisions, but I think
416
00:21:31.100 \longrightarrow 00:21:34.700
you've picked up quite a few of the ones we had Mr. Bedford
417
00:21:34.700 --> 00:21:37.400
 is also picked up some more and will put in
418
00:21:37.400 --> 00:21:40.300
our submissions any other outstanding matters because
419
00:21:40.300 --> 00:21:42.400
I do think it's worth highlighting those
420
00:21:43.400 --> 00:21:46.200
in the event which we think is the unlikely event that we
421
00:21:46.200 --> 00:21:50.400
don't get the side agreements. It's just worth recording those
issues, but
422
00:21:49.400 --> 00:21:52.200
I don't think we will have
423
00:21:52.200 --> 00:21:53.000
that and so
424
00:21:54.200 --> 00:21:57.200
those are the bits that we have as far as the County Council on our
425
00:21:57.200 --> 00:22:00.300
side, and then the final thing is there are weekly meetings taking
place
426
00:22:00.300 --> 00:22:03.300
with suffer in relation
```

```
427
00:22:03.300 --> 00:22:06.400
 to a lot of this. We are not involved in
428
00:22:06.400 --> 00:22:09.700
 those weekly meetings, but we are liaising with Suffolk on that.
Thank
429
00:22:09.700 --> 00:22:10.000
 you, sir.
430
00:22:14.500 --> 00:22:14.800
Thank you.
431
00:22:16.100 --> 00:22:19.700
And right well unless there are any further comments on.
432
00:22:20.600 --> 00:22:23.500
on those protective Provisions will
433
00:22:25.300 --> 00:22:28.200
will move on to the next matter which is
434
00:22:29.200 --> 00:22:29.300
the
435
00:22:30.800 --> 00:22:33.500
section 106 agreement or agreements
436
00:22:33.500 --> 00:22:34.900
 and compensation
437
00:22:35.900 --> 00:22:36.900
issues
438
00:22:37.900 --> 00:22:38.100
now
439
00:22:41.700 --> 00:22:44.800
For the sections 106 agreement. I'm
```

```
440
00:22:44.800 --> 00:22:45.500
picking up that
441
00:22:47.800 --> 00:22:48.800
basing this on the
442
00:22:49.800 --> 00:22:51.200
local Highway authorities.
443
00:22:52.800 --> 00:22:55.300
Public rights away Improvement plan. There was
444
00:22:55.300 --> 00:22:55.900
a question that we
445
00:22:57.300 --> 00:23:03.600
put 3.9.4. Xq3.9.4 are
446
00:23:01.600 --> 00:23:04.400
the proposals in
447
00:23:04.400 --> 00:23:06.800
the applicants response to our
448
00:23:07.900 --> 00:23:12.600
our earlier question, which was 2.9.14 for
449
00:23:12.600 --> 00:23:16.600
a section 106 agreements acceptable and
450
00:23:15.600 --> 00:23:18.900
the question was how would
451
00:23:18.900 --> 00:23:21.200
the adverse impact of the scheme on local
452
00:23:21.200 --> 00:23:24.500
communities being mitigated by addressing the
453
00:23:24.500 --> 00:23:27.300
```

```
requirements of the council statutory rights of
454
00:23:27.300 --> 00:23:32.000
way Improvement plan as discussed with the Cambridge County
455
00:23:31.700 --> 00:23:35.200
 councilor is H3 and referred
456
00:23:34.200 --> 00:23:38.000
to in the county. Council's D4
457
00:23:37.500 --> 00:23:40.500
 submission and the library reference
458
00:23:40.500 --> 00:23:43.200
 for that is our EP for -
459
00:23:43.200 --> 00:23:44.300
 137.
460
00:23:46.300 --> 00:23:49.900
So the applicant responded and this is exam Library
461
00:23:49.900 --> 00:23:53.800
 reference rep5-056.
00:23:54.700 --> 00:23:57.900
It has not identified any adverse impacts
463
00:23:57.900 --> 00:24:00.500
 from the scheme during the operational phase in
464
00:24:00.500 --> 00:24:02.600
 relation to public rights of way.
465
00:24:03.200 --> 00:24:06.800
The applicant recognizes the comments made by IPS
466
00:24:06.800 --> 00:24:09.900
 and councils in representations and
```

```
467
00:24:09.900 --> 00:24:13.000
 hearings in December in 2022. The
468
00:24:12.600 --> 00:24:15.500
 applicant is therefore willing to enter into a
469
00:24:15.500 --> 00:24:18.800
 section 106 agreement with Cambridge County Council
470
00:24:18.800 --> 00:24:22.100
 and Suffolk County Council to create
471
00:24:21.100 --> 00:24:24.800
 and/or improve existing public
472
00:24:24.800 --> 00:24:27.200
 rights of way within the vicinity of
473
00:24:27.200 --> 00:24:32.000
 the scheme following the hearing in December 2022 ahead
474
00:24:31.100 --> 00:24:34.300
 of terms on this aspect has been
475
00:24:34.300 --> 00:24:38.500
 issued to both councils in January 2023 for
476
00:24:37.500 --> 00:24:39.500
 further discussion.
477
00:24:42.200 --> 00:24:44.700
So if I pause there and
478
00:24:46.600 --> 00:24:46.900
ask
479
00:24:49.500 --> 00:24:51.900
Mr. Bedford from
480
00:24:53.100 --> 00:24:55.300
```

```
the Suffolk County council's point of view
481
00:24:57.400 --> 00:25:00.500
Have you received the heads of terms for you
482
00:25:00.500 --> 00:25:03.500
 responded to it? What's what's the current position on that?
483
00:25:11.700 --> 00:25:14.600
So Michael Bedford Suffolk County Council. Yes,
484
00:25:14.600 --> 00:25:17.400
 we received the heads of terms. Yes. We've responded to
485
00:25:17.400 --> 00:25:19.300
 the heads of terms. Yes.
486
00:25:20.300 --> 00:25:23.400
Today as I understand it we received a draft.
487
00:25:24.300 --> 00:25:24.900
agreement
488
00:25:26.500 --> 00:25:29.100
So obviously moving on from Beyond heads of terms.
489
00:25:30.900 --> 00:25:33.400
We haven't yet responded that I think having received that
490
00:25:33.400 --> 00:25:36.200
 yesterday, but obviously that's helpful as the
491
00:25:36.200 --> 00:25:39.900
 next part of the process. We
492
00:25:39.900 --> 00:25:41.100
will be responding to that.
493
00:25:43.100 --> 00:25:43.300
and
```

```
494
00:25:45.200 --> 00:25:48.600
we think that effectively productive discussions
495
00:25:48.600 --> 00:25:50.000
 are taking place.
496
00:25:56.300 --> 00:25:56.800
Okay, and
497
00:25:58.500 --> 00:26:01.600
is the one Authority leading on this Mr. Mohamed? Well, we
498
00:26:01.600 --> 00:26:04.800
we also have we have our separate head
499
00:26:04.800 --> 00:26:07.600
 of terms on this. And again, this
500
00:26:07.600 --> 00:26:11.100
 is another matter Mr. Tony helpfully alerted thoughts.
501
00:26:10.100 --> 00:26:13.300
 I think so. It's one agreement. I think it's one
502
00:26:13.300 --> 00:26:16.600
 agreement, but we have our own team responding but
503
00:26:16.600 --> 00:26:19.300
 the head of terms have been
504
00:26:19.300 --> 00:26:22.400
 received. We're discussing it where also optimistic that
505
00:26:23.400 --> 00:26:26.400
The deadline eight or nine
506
00:26:26.400 --> 00:26:28.200
 I think will be where we're working towards.
507
00:26:31.400 --> 00:26:34.400
```

```
So discussions ongoing positive and likely
508
00:26:34.400 --> 00:26:36.200
 to reach an agreement is our position.
509
00:26:41.100 --> 00:26:45.400
now that's one section 106 agreement
510
00:26:44.400 --> 00:26:45.900
 that
511
00:26:47.200 --> 00:26:48.700
has parties to it.
512
00:26:50.300 --> 00:26:50.500
being
513
00:26:51.700 --> 00:26:54.100
the applicant the and Suffolk County
514
00:26:54.100 --> 00:26:56.200
 Council and Cambridge County Council is it?
515
00:26:57.500 --> 00:27:00.600
Is it worth just because you had specifically asked about
516
00:27:00.600 --> 00:27:03.000
 the public rights of way aspects of it. I think I'm just
517
00:27:03.100 --> 00:27:06.200
 going to get you get this Mrs. Rhodes to say
518
00:27:06.200 --> 00:27:09.900
 something very briefly to you about that. Yes. Thank you morning.
519
00:27:09.900 --> 00:27:12.200
Thank you Camilla Rose for Cambridgeshire County
520
00:27:12.200 --> 00:27:16.500
 Council. So just to clarify I'm liaising
```

```
521
00:27:15.500 --> 00:27:18.900
very close to with my counterpartic suffer
522
00:27:18.900 --> 00:27:21.100
County Council Claire Dixon who's the area
523
00:27:21.100 --> 00:27:24.400
 rights of way manager. She's on on leave at
524
00:27:24.400 --> 00:27:27.700
the moment because it's half term so I kind
525
00:27:27.700 --> 00:27:30.500
of covering for her as well that we yes. So
526
00:27:30.500 --> 00:27:33.200
we've we attended a meeting with Seneca last week
527
00:27:33.200 --> 00:27:36.300
to discuss the heads of
528
00:27:36.300 --> 00:27:39.700
terms and it was constructive.
529
00:27:39.700 --> 00:27:42.000
So I think yes, we are hoping that we
530
00:27:42.300 --> 00:27:45.100
will achieve the agreement by the
531
00:27:45.100 --> 00:27:46.700
end of the examination.
532
00:27:47.700 --> 00:27:50.800
and which would be necessary in order for us to be
533
00:27:50.800 --> 00:27:52.000
able to withdraw our
534
00:27:52.700 --> 00:27:55.800
```

```
objections and around the concerns
535
00:27:55.800 --> 00:27:58.700
 about adverse mitigation adverse impact
00:27:58.700 --> 00:27:59.900
 on the enemies.
537
00:28:00.800 --> 00:28:01.700
and communities
538
00:28:02.900 --> 00:28:05.800
I would like to just comment that to
539
00:28:05.800 --> 00:28:08.500
 be absolutely clear our position is that which
540
00:28:08.500 --> 00:28:11.600
 is slightly contrary to the applicant's position and
541
00:28:12.400 --> 00:28:15.300
our view is that the section 106 package is
542
00:28:15.300 --> 00:28:18.700
 in Mitigation Of The adverse
00:28:18.700 --> 00:28:21.600
 impact of the landscape scale
544
00:28:21.600 --> 00:28:25.100
 of the scheme on local communities and
545
00:28:24.100 --> 00:28:27.800
 the enemies and also others
546
00:28:27.800 --> 00:28:29.100
 such as Trail Riders.
547
00:28:30.800 --> 00:28:34.000
Which can never be totally mitigated against and
```

```
548
00:28:33.500 --> 00:28:36.200
 so and so it's
549
00:28:36.200 --> 00:28:39.400
not shouldn't be viewed as just a benefit for
550
00:28:39.400 --> 00:28:42.500
the local communities. It is in admitigation of
551
00:28:42.500 --> 00:28:46.000
 the adverse impact and I think there's a site difference.
552
00:28:47.700 --> 00:28:48.700
there between us
553
00:28:49.600 --> 00:28:52.200
and we have asked for the the tone of
554
00:28:52.200 --> 00:28:54.500
 the assessment to be to reflect.
555
00:28:56.200 --> 00:28:57.900
that that
556
00:28:59.200 --> 00:29:02.500
Feeling by the local communities rather than it being just a
00:29:02.500 --> 00:29:03.200
benefit to them.
558
00:29:04.100 --> 00:29:07.600
So but that's a wider context point. Just
559
00:29:07.600 --> 00:29:10.100
wanted to make but the agreement. Yes, we hope that
560
00:29:10.100 --> 00:29:11.800
will proceed and complete.
561
00:29:19.600 --> 00:29:22.200
```

```
So, can I just add sorry Michael Bedford Suffolk County
562
00:29:22.200 --> 00:29:24.800
 Council in terms of the yes.
00:29:31.200 --> 00:29:34.400
Well, sorry, it was simply a factual point, which was that
564
00:29:34.400 --> 00:29:37.300
 the part is to the draft agreement at the moment is not
565
00:29:37.300 --> 00:29:37.700
 merely.
566
00:29:38.700 --> 00:29:41.200
The county council's and the
567
00:29:41.200 --> 00:29:41.700
 applicant.
568
00:29:42.500 --> 00:29:45.100
The district councils are also intended to be parties.
569
00:29:45.800 --> 00:29:48.400
And in order for it to be effective as a
570
00:29:48.400 --> 00:29:51.200
 sexual 106 agreement. It's also intended that there
571
00:29:51.200 --> 00:29:54.700
 will be landowners bound but I think there is still some
572
00:29:54.700 --> 00:29:58.300
 discussion about how that part will work.
573
00:30:01.800 --> 00:30:04.500
So that was I said that was just factually the point that I
574
00:30:04.500 --> 00:30:07.600
 didn't want you to think that it was only between the counties and
the applicant.
```

```
575
00:30:11.300 --> 00:30:14.100
Thank you Mr. Bob. I was going to ask what the
576
00:30:14.100 --> 00:30:17.400
 elements of the of the heads of terms are
577
00:30:17.400 --> 00:30:18.700
 on on the 106.
578
00:30:22.100 --> 00:30:25.200
At this attorney it might help if I say because
579
00:30:25.200 --> 00:30:28.800
 one of one of the points I think is bit beyond SCC. So
580
00:30:28.800 --> 00:30:29.100
 there's two
581
00:30:30.200 --> 00:30:31.800
two contributions
582
00:30:32.500 --> 00:30:35.300
One of them is the public rights of way
583
00:30:35.300 --> 00:30:38.600
 and connectivity contributions, which sorry Collective.
584
00:30:38.600 --> 00:30:43.000
 Sorry the public rights away and connectivity contributions.
00:30:44.600 --> 00:30:46.400
Which of the two counties?
586
00:30:48.300 --> 00:30:51.300
and then the other obligation which we are assuming is
587
00:30:52.400 --> 00:30:55.800
What's described as the stone curly research contribution?
588
```

```
00:30:56.900 --> 00:30:59.300
And that is an obligation to pay a summer
589
00:30:59.300 --> 00:30:59.400
 money.
590
00:31:00.400 --> 00:31:01.900
to the local authorities
591
00:31:03.100 --> 00:31:05.800
Which will then be paid on to the rspb?
592
00:31:06.900 --> 00:31:08.600
Just to explain that briefly.
593
00:31:10.200 --> 00:31:13.600
In the last round of issues specific hearings, we
594
00:31:13.600 --> 00:31:16.800
heard quite a bit about Stone curly including
00:31:16.800 --> 00:31:19.300
 reference to I think now
596
00:31:19.300 --> 00:31:23.000
 lapsed rspb research
597
00:31:22.200 --> 00:31:25.100
 project which had been
598
00:31:25.100 \longrightarrow 00:31:29.300
 surveying areas. I think outside of the special protection
599
00:31:28.300 --> 00:31:31.700
 areas to make assessment of
600
00:31:31.700 --> 00:31:34.700
 functional linkages and how the
601
00:31:34.700 --> 00:31:37.500
 stone curly population outside of the special protection area
```

```
602
00:31:37.500 --> 00:31:40.600
 could be supported and the proposal
603
00:31:40.600 --> 00:31:43.400
 is to provide funding for that project to
604
00:31:44.200 --> 00:31:47.100
Continue will be resurrected. I think there's some doubt
605
00:31:47.100 --> 00:31:49.000
as to how active that project was.
606
00:31:49.900 --> 00:31:52.600
So that is a the additional contribution.
607
00:31:55.200 --> 00:31:55.300
So
608
00:31:57.200 --> 00:32:00.100
I just if I may briefly those are essentially the two
609
00:32:00.100 --> 00:32:03.700
 elements says the two elements. Yeah, I'll just briefly explain
610
00:32:03.700 --> 00:32:06.000
 just briefly respond to
611
00:32:07.800 --> 00:32:11.300
To Mohammed Mr. Bedford and Mrs.
612
00:32:10.300 --> 00:32:12.500
 Rhodes in terms of what they have said
613
00:32:14.600 --> 00:32:18.400
that it's a it's a sum of money the details
614
00:32:17.400 --> 00:32:20.900
 of the the need
615
```

```
00:32:20.900 --> 00:32:23.400
 for it is identified through
616
00:32:23.400 --> 00:32:26.500
 the right way Improvement plan. So that
617
00:32:26.500 --> 00:32:29.600
matters that have been referred to that the
618
00:32:29.600 --> 00:32:32.900
precise detail of how it will be expended will
619
00:32:32.900 --> 00:32:36.500
 rest with the councils. It's
620
00:32:35.500 --> 00:32:38.200
 some of 200,000 pounds
621
00:32:38.200 --> 00:32:41.400
 for rights of way contributions to
622
00:32:41.400 --> 00:32:42.300
 rights of way improvements.
623
00:32:44.300 --> 00:32:48.400
I completely understand Mrs. Rhodes
624
00:32:48.400 --> 00:32:51.200
 point that the council's view is that it is
625
00:32:51.200 \longrightarrow 00:32:54.100
 necessary mitigation, but it's helpful to see
626
00:32:54.100 --> 00:32:55.400
 that it's mitigation that they
627
00:32:56.300 --> 00:32:59.500
Consider will go some way to addressing their concerns
628
00:32:59.500 --> 00:33:02.100
 about rights of way impacts and impacts on the local
```

```
629
00:33:02.100 --> 00:33:03.700
 communities, obviously.
630
00:33:05.900 --> 00:33:07.200
It's commonplace for.
631
00:33:09.200 \longrightarrow 00:33:12.100
Mitigation through section 106 agreements also to be
632
00:33:12.100 --> 00:33:15.600
 presented as a benefit because there will be elements of
633
00:33:15.600 --> 00:33:19.000
 mitigation and elements and benefit. But in
634
00:33:18.300 --> 00:33:21.300
 any event, we hope that this goes
635
00:33:21.300 --> 00:33:24.800
 some way to addressing some of the county council's concerns
636
00:33:24.800 --> 00:33:28.000
 about rights of way impacts and Severance
637
00:33:27.200 --> 00:33:30.900
 of communities following those
638
00:33:30.900 --> 00:33:33.400
 those helpful exchanges we had last year.
639
00:33:35.100 --> 00:33:38.700
Um, yes, I think that's probably all said, the only
640
00:33:38.700 --> 00:33:40.300
 other point is it doesn't much matter I think.
641
00:33:42.100 --> 00:33:44.100
Just in terms of progress. It's slightly more.
642
```

```
00:33:45.500 --> 00:33:47.600
It is fairly well progressed in the sense that
643
00:33:48.700 --> 00:33:49.900
we've disclosed title.
644
00:33:50.800 --> 00:33:53.100
We've identified the land that will be
645
00:33:53.100 --> 00:33:56.900
 bound by the obligation and it
646
00:33:56.900 --> 00:33:59.500
 is the document is is with the
647
00:33:59.500 --> 00:34:03.200
 relevance list as so it's a
648
00:34:02.200 --> 00:34:05.700
 it's a fairly Advanced stage of negotiation of
00:34:05.700 --> 00:34:08.800
 the 106 and we hope to conclude that yes, are
650
00:34:08.800 --> 00:34:12.600
 you in a position just now to say broadly
651
00:34:12.600 --> 00:34:15.800
what the the second element is of
652
00:34:15.800 --> 00:34:16.500
 the contribution.
653
00:34:19.700 --> 00:34:22.900
Right, very distant curly research project
654
00:34:22.900 --> 00:34:25.500
 the rich only
655
00:34:25.500 --> 00:34:28.500
 the applicant. So in terms of the the Quantum
```

```
656
00:34:28.500 --> 00:34:31.600
 of the contribution, it's a hundred and forty thousand
657
00:34:31.600 --> 00:34:31.800
 pounds.
658
00:34:38.300 --> 00:34:41.100
Right, so that's that's in progress at the
659
00:34:41.100 --> 00:34:41.200
 moment.
660
00:34:44.200 --> 00:34:48.000
It just approximately how many landowners are involved
661
00:34:47.400 --> 00:34:48.500
would you?
662
00:34:49.200 --> 00:34:50.000
that there are
00:34:51.200 --> 00:34:55.100
I don't have the precise number. There's quite a few landowners
involved.
664
00:34:54.100 --> 00:34:58.400
There will
00:34:58.400 --> 00:34:58.400
be.
666
00:35:11.400 --> 00:35:14.300
It's a rich Journey for
667
00:35:14.300 --> 00:35:17.500
 the applicant. I can say a substantial amount of the the land
668
00:35:17.500 --> 00:35:20.900
which is proposed for development will be bound. There may
```

```
669
00:35:20.900 --> 00:35:23.200
be some parts the land that where a provision will
670
00:35:23.200 --> 00:35:27.200
 be made for them the land being bound in the future because
obviously
671
00:35:26.200 \longrightarrow 00:35:29.900
 as you somewhere there's
672
00:35:29.900 --> 00:35:32.300
 at least one part of the site where we don't yet have an agreement
673
00:35:32.300 --> 00:35:35.400
 to acquire that land but there's a substantial
674
00:35:35.400 --> 00:35:36.300
 element of the land.
675
00:35:37.200 --> 00:35:39.900
Underneath the footprint of the scheme will be bound.
676
00:35:50.400 --> 00:35:53.900
At Ridge Tennessee. I've just say just so you have a sense of the
word
677
00:35:53.900 --> 00:35:56.700
 that's been done at the moment. I think there are 26 parties
678
00:35:56.700 --> 00:35:59.600
 on our side for the section 106 agreement,
679
00:35:59.600 --> 00:35:59.900
 which is
680
00:36:01.100 --> 00:36:04.100
is obviously taken some effort and it means
681
00:36:04.100 --> 00:36:07.400
 it's it has a complexity agreement has a complexity on that front.
```

```
682
00:36:08.400 --> 00:36:11.300
It's quite simple in terms of its operative
683
00:36:11.300 --> 00:36:14.400
 Provisions. It's the land ownership position that gives it makes
00:36:14.400 --> 00:36:15.100
 it a bit of a hard job.
685
00:36:16.200 --> 00:36:17.300
Right, okay.
686
00:36:24.100 --> 00:36:28.800
Do you agree then with cambridge's estimate
687
00:36:27.800 --> 00:36:30.200
 that deadline eight or nine
688
00:36:30.200 --> 00:36:32.500
 is a realistic estimate for completion.
689
00:36:36.200 --> 00:36:39.300
All right, get that wrong mister. Sorry Mr. Mohammed on behalf. We I
thought
690
00:36:39.300 --> 00:36:42.200
 it was realistic before I heard the numbers.
691
00:36:42.200 --> 00:36:46.100
 I don't know whether the numbers are quite accurate
692
00:36:45.100 --> 00:36:48.300
 and the Bedford will say something about it first, but
693
00:36:48.300 --> 00:36:49.700
 I'll let Mr. Tony just respond.
694
00:36:54.700 --> 00:36:57.800
Well, it was said I think that it was
695
```

```
00:36:57.800 --> 00:37:00.000
 suggested that deadline eight or nine
696
00:37:00.400 --> 00:37:03.600
would be a realistic. Yes. I
697
00:37:03.600 --> 00:37:04.800
 think I think that remains.
698
00:37:05.600 --> 00:37:08.900
Realistic for settling the section
699
00:37:08.900 --> 00:37:11.900
 106 agreement. Yes, right. So do
700
00:37:11.900 --> 00:37:13.300
 I through the counties want to respond?
701
00:37:15.100 --> 00:37:18.700
So I am the point that we just
702
00:37:18.700 --> 00:37:19.300
want to make.
703
00:37:21.400 --> 00:37:25.400
You aware of but I don't know that we can resolve in
704
00:37:24.400 --> 00:37:28.700
 terms of the the
705
00:37:27.700 \longrightarrow 00:37:31.000
 hearing this morning is that
706
00:37:30.200 --> 00:37:34.100
we don't recognize the figures
707
00:37:33.100 --> 00:37:36.400
 that Mr. Turney referred
708
00:37:36.400 --> 00:37:39.600
 to in relation to the quantum for
```

```
709
00:37:39.600 --> 00:37:42.400
 the rights of way improvements as a
710
00:37:42.400 --> 00:37:46.500
 true reflection of the negotiations and
711
00:37:46.500 \longrightarrow 00:37:49.100
 discussions and what we thought was an agreed position.
712
00:37:50.100 --> 00:37:53.400
Through those negotiations. I don't
713
00:37:53.400 --> 00:37:56.100
 think it's probably helpful but to go into
714
00:37:57.300 --> 00:38:00.000
Absolutely detail of that. But I just I agree with
715
00:38:00.200 --> 00:38:03.500
 you absolutely missed Mr. Bedford. If the discussions aren't
716
00:38:03.500 --> 00:38:07.200
 going then that their Nation be ongoing outside the absolutely
717
00:38:06.200 --> 00:38:09.500
 just just so that you know, I said
718
00:38:09.500 --> 00:38:12.600
we don't recognize the figure that yes was
719
00:38:12.600 --> 00:38:14.300
 referred to well. All right, and
720
00:38:16.200 --> 00:38:19.000
I won't say that gives us a broad idea because I
721
00:38:19.500 --> 00:38:22.000
 simply don't know so we'll we'll see what
```

722

```
00:38:22.800 --> 00:38:25.300
 transpires but what what I'm now interested in
723
00:38:25.300 --> 00:38:27.000
 is if the parties could just
724
00:38:28.100 --> 00:38:31.700
think about how the how the
725
00:38:31.700 --> 00:38:32.900
 examining Authority
726
00:38:34.800 --> 00:38:37.500
can or should weigh in
727
00:38:37.500 --> 00:38:40.500
 the balance any any failure to
728
00:38:40.500 --> 00:38:42.700
 complete such an agreement?
729
00:38:45.300 --> 00:38:47.200
So it's not Mr. Bedford, perhaps.
730
00:38:50.500 --> 00:38:54.500
Well, so I think it would be appropriate for
731
00:38:54.500 --> 00:38:57.100
 you to adopt in a sense of conventional.
732
00:38:59.700 --> 00:39:02.400
Approach if you are
733
00:39:02.400 --> 00:39:05.300
 persuaded by what we have
734
00:39:05.300 --> 00:39:09.600
 been saying through our various representations that there
735
00:39:09.600 --> 00:39:11.000
 are residual impacts.
```

```
736
00:39:11.800 --> 00:39:15.400
Which need to be either mitigated
737
00:39:14.400 --> 00:39:17.100
 or compensated for?
738
00:39:18.800 \longrightarrow 00:39:21.600
For the reasons that we've set out in our representations.
00:39:22.700 --> 00:39:26.300
Then if a 106
740
00:39:25.300 --> 00:39:28.000
 agreement that was concluded.
741
00:39:28.900 --> 00:39:32.100
Provided a mechanism to
742
00:39:31.100 --> 00:39:34.500
 address those residual impacts in a
743
00:39:34.500 --> 00:39:37.100
way that the authorities thought was satisfactory.
744
00:39:38.500 --> 00:39:41.500
That would be material to your conclusions.
745
00:39:43.600 --> 00:39:46.700
But if as it turned out there wasn't
746
00:39:46.700 --> 00:39:49.400
 a concluded agreement on those matters.
747
00:39:50.600 --> 00:39:54.000
So that the residual impacts would remain outstanding.
748
00:39:54.800 --> 00:39:58.000
and not either mitigated for or compensated
749
```

```
00:39:57.000 --> 00:39:58.300
 for
750
00:40:00.400 --> 00:40:03.400
that would also be material to your conclusions that obviously that
751
00:40:03.400 --> 00:40:05.100
would be a factor that would weigh against.
752
00:40:07.500 --> 00:40:10.400
The Proposal quite where
753
00:40:10.400 --> 00:40:13.700
 it would sit in the planning balance is a
754
00:40:13.700 --> 00:40:16.100
 little bit open-ended at the moment because we don't quite know
755
00:40:17.700 --> 00:40:21.000
What we're talking about at this stage, but clearly. Well,
756
00:40:20.300 --> 00:40:24.100
 I mean suppose I mean hence the applicants what
757
00:40:23.100 --> 00:40:26.300
 I anticipate to be the applicant's position, which is
758
00:40:26.300 --> 00:40:29.300
 more on the on the benefits side than the mitigation side.
759
00:40:29.300 \longrightarrow 00:40:33.400
 But but yes, Mr. Tony Richard
760
00:40:32.400 --> 00:40:35.700
 only for the applicant. I think it's my analysis
761
00:40:35.700 --> 00:40:38.200
 is pretty much the same as Mr. Bedford because
762
00:40:41.500 --> 00:40:45.400
If the section 106 agreement is not concluded you get
```

```
763
00:40:45.400 --> 00:40:48.400
to that at the end of your reasoning I think because you will make
764
00:40:48.400 --> 00:40:51.700
 an assessment of whether or not the county council's
765
00:40:51.700 \longrightarrow 00:40:54.700
 respective positions on impacts on
766
00:40:54.700 --> 00:40:58.500
 rights of where users and Community severance.
767
00:41:00.100 --> 00:41:01.200
way against the project
768
00:41:02.900 --> 00:41:05.100
You will then consider whether or not
769
00:41:05.100 --> 00:41:08.400
 if the 106 was completed you
770
00:41:08.400 --> 00:41:09.900
would consider whether or not.
771
00:41:10.800 --> 00:41:13.400
Those concerns should have reduced weight
772
00:41:13.400 --> 00:41:15.100
 in light of the proposed package.
773
00:41:16.100 --> 00:41:19.800
And it doesn't much matter there whether it's mitigation
compensation or benefit,
774
00:41:19.800 --> 00:41:22.500
but you just have to make it planning judgment
775
00:41:22.500 --> 00:41:25.400
 on that if the package is not there and you
```

```
776
00:41:25.400 --> 00:41:28.400
 conclude there are those adverse impacts Mr. Bedford says
777
00:41:28.400 --> 00:41:31.800
 then that ways against the development and
778
00:41:31.800 --> 00:41:34.500
 you will consider that in the planning balance
779
00:41:34.500 --> 00:41:37.600
 in the normal way having regard to the terms obviously most
780
00:41:37.600 --> 00:41:39.100
 importantly of the mps's
781
00:41:39.800 --> 00:41:42.300
so that that is the
782
00:41:42.300 --> 00:41:45.100
 that's the consideration.
783
00:41:46.300 --> 00:41:49.300
Okay. Thank you Mr. Mohamed. You
784
00:41:49.300 --> 00:41:52.400
want to add anything? I I agree with both Mr. Tony and
785
00:41:52.400 --> 00:41:55.100
Mr. Bedford in relation to the analysis of the
786
00:41:55.100 --> 00:41:58.400
 approach you take but just to give you an idea from our perspective
787
00:41:58.400 --> 00:42:00.000
of the scale.
788
00:42:01.600 --> 00:42:01.900
of
789
00:42:04.100 --> 00:42:08.100
```

```
the mitigation or compensation package what it means to the
790
00:42:07.100 --> 00:42:10.700
 authorities. I've just done a very quick.
791
00:42:11.700 --> 00:42:14.400
Back of the fact packet kind of analysis of you're dealing
792
00:42:14.400 --> 00:42:17.900
with 14 Parishes across the two authorities.
793
00:42:19.600 --> 00:42:19.600
and
794
00:42:20.700 --> 00:42:23.200
this is a significant package.
795
00:42:25.200 --> 00:42:28.400
not just about mitigation compensation and so on
796
00:42:28.400 --> 00:42:31.600
 so in in so far as it weighs against
797
00:42:32.900 --> 00:42:35.600
The the development we we
798
00:42:35.600 --> 00:42:38.600
 suggest that think of it as well in the in
799
00:42:38.600 --> 00:42:39.800
the picture of what it actually means.
800
00:42:40.700 --> 00:42:43.300
To the communities and the authorities and
801
00:42:43.300 --> 00:42:46.300
 then that is a factor for for you
802
00:42:46.300 --> 00:42:50.100
 to then carry out your balancing as part of your balancing
```

```
803
00:42:49.100 --> 00:42:51.300
 planning balance exercise.
804
00:42:54.100 --> 00:42:54.700
Thank you very much.
00:42:57.400 --> 00:43:01.200
Right. Okay, we done with
806
00:43:01.200 --> 00:43:02.200
 that item then.
807
00:43:03.500 --> 00:43:05.500
Thank you for your contributions on that.
808
00:43:07.300 --> 00:43:10.500
We will now look at
809
00:43:11.800 --> 00:43:13.500
Because there's another issue.
810
00:43:14.500 --> 00:43:16.200
I think in relation to
811
00:43:19.800 --> 00:43:23.000
Compensation package, I think it was termed appropriate mitigation
812
00:43:22.700 --> 00:43:25.800
 compensation package. Now that was first
813
00:43:25.800 --> 00:43:28.500
 raised I think in the local impact report, which
814
00:43:28.500 --> 00:43:31.200
 is our ep-1-024.
815
00:43:33.200 --> 00:43:37.100
under the subheading Community impacts 12.95
816
00:43:39.200 --> 00:43:42.600
```

```
What was said there was that given the scale of this proposal
817
00:43:42.600 --> 00:43:45.300
 the council's expect the applicant not only
818
00:43:45.300 --> 00:43:49.000
 mitigate the tangible and more easily defined impacts,
819
00:43:48.900 --> 00:43:51.700
 but also address the intangible but
820
00:43:51.700 --> 00:43:54.200
 real residual impacts on the
821
00:43:54.200 --> 00:43:57.700
 community and locality the council's
822
00:43:57.700 --> 00:44:00.700
 expect an appropriate mitigation compensation package
823
00:44:00.700 --> 00:44:03.800
 for local communities. This would be in addition
824
00:44:03.800 --> 00:44:06.600
 to any potential Community benefits from the
00:44:06.600 --> 00:44:09.400
 development including any to be introduced us
826
00:44:09.400 --> 00:44:12.900
 announced in the government's British energy security
827
00:44:12.900 --> 00:44:14.200
 strategy.
828
00:44:14.900 --> 00:44:17.900
So I'd like to ask the parties.
829
00:44:17.900 --> 00:44:21.200
 Where where are we on this
```

```
830
00:44:21.200 --> 00:44:21.600
please?
831
00:44:24.400 --> 00:44:27.100
So shall I take the lead on this Rich attorney
832
00:44:27.100 --> 00:44:31.600
Guest House attorneys. The applicant is
833
00:44:31.600 --> 00:44:35.200
 proposing a community benefit
834
00:44:34.200 --> 00:44:35.900
 package.
835
00:44:36.700 --> 00:44:38.400
It's a
836
00:44:41.600 --> 00:44:41.900
not
837
00:44:42.800 --> 00:44:45.700
An obligation that we
838
00:44:45.700 --> 00:44:49.100
 say goes to the planning balance strictly
839
00:44:48.100 --> 00:44:49.300
speaking.
840
00:44:50.500 --> 00:44:54.200
But it will result in a substantial fund
841
00:44:53.200 --> 00:44:57.100
being made available for it
842
00:44:56.100 --> 00:45:01.200
to be administered by a local organization
843
00:44:59.200 --> 00:45:04.300
```

```
to further
844
00:45:02.300 --> 00:45:05.600
 the community
00:45:05.600 --> 00:45:08.600
 interests in the area that's affected
846
00:45:08.600 --> 00:45:11.700
by the development. So there's
847
00:45:11.700 --> 00:45:11.800
 some
848
00:45:17.500 --> 00:45:20.400
There's some
849
00:45:20.400 --> 00:45:23.100
I think the sum I think is in in dispute at the moment
850
00:45:23.100 --> 00:45:27.600
between the councils and the applicant. But
851
00:45:27.600 --> 00:45:30.200
 in any event, the applicant is going to make a
00:45:30.200 --> 00:45:35.000
 commitment to provide a substantial Community
853
00:45:33.400 --> 00:45:36.100
Fund not to be
854
00:45:36.100 --> 00:45:40.800
missed by the local authorities, but to be administered by a local
organization,
855
00:45:39.800 --> 00:45:42.400
 so there will
856
00:45:42.400 --> 00:45:43.900
be a Community Fund.
```

```
857
00:45:44.700 --> 00:45:47.400
the other point which we've been exploring with the councils
858
00:45:47.400 --> 00:45:50.600
 and hopefully they can take this
859
00:45:50.600 --> 00:45:51.500
 on board is that
860
00:45:52.400 --> 00:45:55.600
when we're looking at the benefit the financial benefits
861
00:45:55.600 --> 00:45:57.300
 for the community of this scheme.
862
00:45:57.900 --> 00:46:01.300
The district councils will receive very very
863
00:46:00.300 --> 00:46:04.000
 substantial income by
864
00:46:03.200 --> 00:46:06.900
way of business rates from the
865
00:46:06.900 --> 00:46:09.000
 operation of the solar panels and under the
866
00:46:09.300 --> 00:46:10.100
new regulations.
867
00:46:11.300 --> 00:46:15.200
Those business rates will be retained locally. So I think
868
00:46:15.200 --> 00:46:18.400
 on our calculation the business rates that will
869
00:46:18.400 --> 00:46:21.400
 be received are in the order of millions of pounds per year
870
```

```
00:46:21.400 --> 00:46:24.300
 business rates from the Generating Station,
871
00:46:24.300 --> 00:46:27.800
which will be retained locally.
872
00:46:28.600 --> 00:46:32.500
To those regulations anticipate how
873
00:46:32.500 --> 00:46:36.000
 those funds will be redirected. No, they
874
00:46:35.200 --> 00:46:38.400
don't because they go into the the
875
00:46:38.400 --> 00:46:41.300
 business rates rules as
876
00:46:41.300 --> 00:46:44.100
 you know, so but the general presumption as it goes to
00:46:44.100 --> 00:46:47.400
 central government, but there's been more recent regulations for
certain types
878
00:46:47.400 --> 00:46:51.200
 of development for local retention of business rates and renewable
879
00:46:50.200 --> 00:46:53.300
 energy generating stations for within that
880
00:46:53.300 --> 00:46:57.900
 category. So for those for
881
00:46:56.900 --> 00:46:59.200
the solar panels and
882
00:46:59.200 --> 00:47:02.400
the race rating of the solar panels those local those rates
883
00:47:02.400 --> 00:47:05.400
```

```
will be retained in in large past. I understand
884
00:47:05.400 --> 00:47:08.300
 it in the by the district authorities as
00:47:08.300 --> 00:47:12.700
 the rating authorities, but then it goes into their General
coffers,
886
00:47:12.700 --> 00:47:15.400
 so they will obviously be able to decide
887
00:47:15.400 --> 00:47:19.600
how they spend that whether it's goes to
888
00:47:19.600 --> 00:47:22.300
 the allocation of the budgets will be a decision for them on an
889
00:47:22.300 --> 00:47:26.400
 annual basis. Thank you use a
00:47:26.400 --> 00:47:27.400
 slightly weasel phrase.
891
00:47:28.700 --> 00:47:31.700
Around notice this respect intended. You
892
00:47:31.700 --> 00:47:34.500
 said strictly speaking. It's not strictly
893
00:47:34.500 \longrightarrow 00:47:36.900
 speaking part of the planning balance.
894
00:47:37.600 --> 00:47:38.300
Would you?
895
00:47:38.900 --> 00:47:41.700
Care to elaborate on that. Well, I
896
00:47:41.700 --> 00:47:44.100
 probably shouldn't said it's really speaking. I think I go
```

```
897
00:47:44.100 --> 00:47:47.400
 further. It's not it's not part of the planning balance see
898
00:47:48.900 --> 00:47:51.200
Write and Forest of Dean in the
899
00:47:51.200 \longrightarrow 00:47:54.800
 Supreme Court. I think you've got to put to
900
00:47:54.800 --> 00:47:57.700
 one side these wider Community benefits
901
00:47:57.700 --> 00:47:58.500
 and
902
00:48:00.200 --> 00:48:00.800
say
903
00:48:02.000 --> 00:48:02.300
that
904
00:48:03.700 --> 00:48:04.500
it can be noted.
905
00:48:05.300 --> 00:48:09.000
But and they may they may fall
906
00:48:08.400 --> 00:48:11.300
 objectors such as the local
907
00:48:11.300 --> 00:48:14.800
 authorities. They may assuage their concerns. So the role
908
00:48:14.800 --> 00:48:17.100
 I think in these processes is it might be
909
00:48:17.100 --> 00:48:19.000
 enough to persuade an authority that actually
910
```

```
00:48:20.200 --> 00:48:23.600
In the round, they can say they are content, but for
911
00:48:23.600 --> 00:48:26.500
you advising the Secretary of State on the planning decision
912
00:48:26.500 --> 00:48:30.300
making at the moment, I think strictly legally
913
00:48:29.300 --> 00:48:30.700
 irrelevant.
914
00:48:32.200 --> 00:48:35.200
Thank you, Mr. Tony. And I just wondered whether
915
00:48:35.200 --> 00:48:38.200
Mr. Bedford and Mr. Hamid might want
916
00:48:38.200 --> 00:48:41.300
to add anything Mr. Bedford. Is
917
00:48:41.300 --> 00:48:44.200
 that reflect your understanding but particularly with
918
00:48:44.200 --> 00:48:48.000
the guy and of the what's what's
919
00:48:47.300 --> 00:48:50.300
 on offer, but also in relation to
920
00:48:50.300 \longrightarrow 00:48:53.100
 to where the we should be looking
921
00:48:53.100 --> 00:48:56.600
 at that it's all really in the planning balance. Yes. So
922
00:48:56.600 --> 00:48:59.200
 I think the simple part of
923
00:48:59.200 --> 00:49:02.400
 it. Is that as we see it. Sorry, it's Michael Bedford Suffolk
```

```
924
00:49:02.400 --> 00:49:05.200
 County Council. We do not see it as relevant to the
925
00:49:05.200 --> 00:49:06.700
 planning barrels.
926
00:49:07.400 \longrightarrow 00:49:11.500
Because we consider it relates to a non-planning
927
00:49:10.500 --> 00:49:12.700
 consideration.
928
00:49:14.800 --> 00:49:17.400
And therefore to that extent you don't
929
00:49:17.400 --> 00:49:20.200
 need to concern yourself or your cells
930
00:49:20.200 --> 00:49:21.400
with the point.
931
00:49:22.100 --> 00:49:26.300
So that's the simple part and then if you
932
00:49:26.300 --> 00:49:29.600
 stop there you can stop there in our
933
00:49:29.600 --> 00:49:32.600
view perfectly legitimately. Were you
934
00:49:32.600 --> 00:49:35.600
to consider anything wider than that? We do have some serious
935
00:49:35.600 --> 00:49:38.900
 issues with the suggestion of effectively
936
00:49:38.900 --> 00:49:41.900
hypothecation of business rates
```

937

```
00:49:41.900 --> 00:49:44.500
to a particular project.
938
00:49:45.500 --> 00:49:48.300
The business rates regime is a separate set of
939
00:49:48.300 --> 00:49:51.400
 legislation with its own requirements and we
940
00:49:51.400 --> 00:49:54.500
 don't accept certainly as matters stand
941
00:49:54.500 --> 00:49:57.600
the as it were the Nexus that
942
00:49:57.600 --> 00:50:00.800
 the applicant is trying to draw between the business
943
00:50:00.800 --> 00:50:04.200
 rates liability of a commercial Venture and
00:50:03.200 --> 00:50:07.300
 a community benefits
945
00:50:06.300 --> 00:50:09.700
 package. We think the two things should be kept separate
946
00:50:09.700 --> 00:50:12.500
but I say, we don't
947
00:50:12.500 \longrightarrow 00:50:15.300
 think you really need to get into that because
948
00:50:15.300 --> 00:50:19.300
 of our first point which is we just don't see this as material to
949
00:50:19.300 --> 00:50:22.400
the planning balance that you will have to undertake that's fair
950
00:50:22.400 --> 00:50:25.500
 enough that that's noted. Thank you, Mr. Bedford Mr. Mohammad.
```

```
951
00:50:25.500 --> 00:50:28.400
Yes and his position. Yes, I agree with everything that
952
00:50:28.400 --> 00:50:31.500
 is the benefit and I also agree with what Mr.
953
00:50:31.500 \longrightarrow 00:50:34.100
Tony was saying and the case that he referred to
954
00:50:34.100 --> 00:50:37.300
 right in the Supreme Court was dealing with
955
00:50:37.300 --> 00:50:40.200
 the Wind Farm or winter buying a car remember which and it was
956
00:50:40.200 --> 00:50:43.700
where they took into account monies that were going to be paid as
957
00:50:43.700 --> 00:50:45.300
 part of that balancing planning balancing.
958
00:50:45.500 --> 00:50:48.400
Side with the Supreme Court said you shouldn't have so that point
959
00:50:48.400 --> 00:50:51.400
 that Mr. Bedford talks about there. If keeping this two separate
960
00:50:51.400 --> 00:50:52.700
 is really really important.
961
00:50:54.100 --> 00:50:55.400
Good. Thank you very much.
962
00:50:57.500 --> 00:51:01.100
Oh, sorry. Yes, good morning Ritchie
963
00:51:00.100 --> 00:51:03.200
 Barry for West Africa cancel. So just to
```

964

```
00:51:03.200 --> 00:51:06.200
 reiterate what's been said and I don't think you need to go as far
as looking
965
00:51:06.200 --> 00:51:09.700
up the company looking at the compensation and as part
966
00:51:09.700 --> 00:51:12.600
 of the planning balance because you would not be it would
967
00:51:12.600 --> 00:51:15.400
be wrong to do so, but we are concerned about
968
00:51:15.400 --> 00:51:18.300
 this link being made with the business rates because as Mr. Bedford
969
00:51:18.300 --> 00:51:21.200
 said that's a different regime and we can come back on this
970
00:51:21.200 --> 00:51:24.200
 in writing, but it it may not be helpful to
971
00:51:24.200 --> 00:51:27.000
 do so given that we're seeing it's a separate natural together.
972
00:51:30.300 --> 00:51:31.100
Thank you very much for that.
973
00:51:32.700 --> 00:51:33.400
This is steel.
974
00:51:34.300 --> 00:51:37.300
Are you one it's just to go on record if I may say and I
975
00:51:37.300 --> 00:51:40.500
was going to say exactly what Mr. Bedford has just said that
976
00:51:40.500 --> 00:51:41.400
we agree entirely.
977
00:51:42.900 --> 00:51:45.200
```

```
as far as the local action group is
978
00:51:45.200 --> 00:51:48.400
 concerned representing significant part
979
00:51:48.400 --> 00:51:51.800
 of the local population, and we will therefore
980
00:51:51.800 --> 00:51:52.500
 ignore
981
00:51:53.400 --> 00:51:56.100
this in our representations not have to deal with it.
982
00:51:59.100 --> 00:52:00.700
Okay. Thank you, Mr. Steele.
983
00:52:02.200 --> 00:52:06.900
so we'll move on then to the dco
984
00:52:05.900 --> 00:52:08.400
 itself and the
985
00:52:08.400 --> 00:52:09.900
I'll start with the
986
00:52:11.100 --> 00:52:14.500
a general issue which was
987
00:52:14.500 --> 00:52:16.500
 raised by the
988
00:52:17.500 --> 00:52:21.300
I think it was these Cambridge District Council relation
989
00:52:20.300 --> 00:52:23.500
to Provisions about the temporary use
990
00:52:23.500 --> 00:52:23.900
 of land.
```

```
991
00:52:25.700 --> 00:52:28.400
Psoriasis from library reference R
992
00:52:28.400 --> 00:52:31.900
 ep5-073 and the
993
00:52:31.900 --> 00:52:34.500
 district council's comments at
994
00:52:34.500 --> 00:52:38.800
 D5 on the revised Eco. The council
995
00:52:38.800 --> 00:52:41.800
has previously indicated concerns about the flexibility of
996
00:52:41.800 --> 00:52:44.100
 the phrase temporary use of land which is
997
00:52:44.100 --> 00:52:48.000
 found throughout the revised draft dco those concerns
998
00:52:47.200 --> 00:52:50.900
 about the lack of precision remain.
999
00:52:51.800 --> 00:52:54.900
So what I'd like to know
1000
00:52:54.900 --> 00:52:59.300
 from East Cambridge is have
1001
00:52:57.300 --> 00:53:00.300
 they give him any further
1002
00:53:00.300 --> 00:53:03.800
 thought to what time limits if any might
1003
00:53:03.800 --> 00:53:06.600
be appropriate to stipulate in respect
1004
00:53:06.600 --> 00:53:09.900
```

```
of specific uses of land referenced in
1005
00:53:09.900 --> 00:53:11.100
 in the dco.
1006
00:53:17.600 --> 00:53:21.200
Yet you've you've summarized our concerns
1007
00:53:20.200 --> 00:53:23.300
 accurately. So I don't need to repeat that.
1008
00:53:23.300 --> 00:53:26.900
 I think we were thinking 24
1009
00:53:26.900 --> 00:53:29.700
months was the figure and the
1010
00:53:29.700 --> 00:53:32.200
time period we had in mind and I
1011
00:53:32.200 --> 00:53:35.600
 don't know whether the Appellate the applicant has has agreed
1012
00:53:35.600 --> 00:53:38.200
with that or thinks that that's appropriate but I
1013
00:53:38.200 --> 00:53:38.300
think
1014
00:53:39.300 --> 00:53:42.400
That's what they've suggested and I think that that could
1015
00:53:42.400 --> 00:53:45.700
be appropriate subject to others what other
1016
00:53:45.700 --> 00:53:48.200
 parties make of that but those are the our contributions on
1017
00:53:48.200 --> 00:53:48.400
 that.
```

```
1018
00:53:57.100 --> 00:54:00.400
I think you mentioned yourself Mr. Mohammed that
1019
00:54:02.300 --> 00:54:05.200
the phrase temporary appears, but is it
00:54:05.200 --> 00:54:06.300
 some 60 times?
1021
00:54:07.100 --> 00:54:07.600
also
1022
00:54:09.900 --> 00:54:12.300
I mean when you say 24 months is that
1023
00:54:12.900 --> 00:54:15.300
is that good for all times and
1024
00:54:15.300 --> 00:54:16.100
 for all purposes?
1025
00:54:17.400 --> 00:54:17.500
Who's that?
1026
00:54:18.900 --> 00:54:21.900
It's I'm at the
1027
00:54:21.900 --> 00:54:24.800
 moment. I'm more thinking about if we
1028
00:54:24.800 --> 00:54:28.600
 look at the interpretation paragraph 27.
1029
00:54:27.600 --> 00:54:30.100
Yeah, which is what I
1030
00:54:30.100 --> 00:54:33.500
was just looking at and to take temporary possession
1031
00:54:33.500 --> 00:54:33.800
```

```
of
1032
00:54:35.300 --> 00:54:38.200
I'd like to say that the 24 months would be
00:54:38.200 --> 00:54:38.900
 adequate.
1034
00:54:40.200 --> 00:54:41.400
if suitably worded
1035
00:54:42.200 --> 00:54:45.500
for all times, but I'll just double check that and see because
1036
00:54:45.500 --> 00:54:47.800
 it may be the temporary.
1037
00:54:48.600 --> 00:54:52.100
Use of land in one context 24 months
1038
00:54:51.100 --> 00:54:54.100
 might be just perfect but you're not in another
1039
00:54:54.100 --> 00:54:57.400
 context. It might be too much. Well quite yeah.
1040
00:54:59.200 --> 00:55:02.800
Um, okay Mr. Tony.
1041
00:55:02.800 --> 00:55:05.400
 I don't know whether you've had any
1042
00:55:05.400 --> 00:55:06.200
 thoughts about this.
1043
00:55:11.900 --> 00:55:14.100
So Richard Turney for the app can I don't think
1044
00:55:14.100 --> 00:55:17.600
we're going to be able to agree with the
```

```
1045
00:55:17.600 --> 00:55:19.400
proposals that are made in respect of this.
1046
00:55:20.300 --> 00:55:23.900
As we've explained already the purpose of the temporary use
1047
00:55:23.900 --> 00:55:26.500
 provisions is to minimize the amount of compulsory
1048
00:55:26.500 --> 00:55:26.900
 acquisition.
1049
00:55:27.800 --> 00:55:30.600
And restricting those temporary use
1050
00:55:30.600 --> 00:55:33.300
 position Provisions in
1051
00:55:33.300 --> 00:55:39.700
the way. This is suggested by ecdc
1052
00:55:36.700 --> 00:55:40.000
1053
00:55:39.600 --> 00:55:41.700
 going to
1054
00:55:43.800 --> 00:55:47.700
potentially have to cause us to use more CA
1055
00:55:46.700 --> 00:55:49.800
 Powers because if the
1056
00:55:49.800 --> 00:55:52.400
period doesn't prove to be adequate then
1057
00:55:52.400 --> 00:55:55.800
you need to acquire more land permanently. So the
1058
00:55:55.800 --> 00:55:59.100
```

```
idea is to look at areas
1059
00:55:58.100 --> 00:56:02.300
 of the scheme where we can temporarily use
1060
00:56:01.300 --> 00:56:04.300
 land and not have to acquire it
1061
00:56:04.300 --> 00:56:07.200
 permanently for the scheme and it's precisely what we should be
doing in terms of
1062
00:56:07.200 --> 00:56:08.600
minimizing land take
1063
00:56:09.300 --> 00:56:10.800
restricting that power
1064
00:56:11.800 --> 00:56:14.300
Increases land take or runs the risk of
1065
00:56:14.300 --> 00:56:17.600
 increasing than take so we don't propose
1066
00:56:17.600 --> 00:56:20.600
 to have that sort of limitation on
1067
00:56:20.600 --> 00:56:23.300
 it with the the impacts of
1068
00:56:23.300 \longrightarrow 00:56:26.600
 using that land for the in the manner proposed.
1069
00:56:27.200 --> 00:56:30.500
Obviously have been assessed and that in
1070
00:56:30.500 --> 00:56:33.200
 our submission is what the council should be concerned with
1071
00:56:33.200 --> 00:56:36.700
what the impacts of using that land rather than concerned
```

```
1072
00:56:36.700 --> 00:56:39.900
with what really is a CA
1073
00:56:39.900 --> 00:56:41.700
 question between the landowner.
1074
00:56:42.400 --> 00:56:44.300
and The Undertaker
1075
00:56:45.200 --> 00:56:48.700
Should the Undertaker be compelled to acquire land outright when
1076
00:56:48.700 --> 00:56:51.700
 it could instead use it temporarily
1077
00:56:51.700 --> 00:56:52.000
 for?
1078
00:56:53.300 --> 00:56:55.300
Might be a longer period than Mr. Muhammad's address.
1079
00:56:56.500 --> 00:56:59.300
If you restrict us if we need the land for 25 months and
1080
00:56:59.300 --> 00:57:01.500
 the temporary use provision is for 24 months.
1081
00:57:02.300 --> 00:57:05.100
Compulsory acquisition outright acquisition of the land will be
1082
00:57:05.100 --> 00:57:08.600
 required. It's just not a good idea in compulsory acquisition
1083
00:57:08.600 --> 00:57:10.800
 terms. No, I mean I suppose.
1084
00:57:13.900 --> 00:57:16.100
Discretion proportionality amongst other things I
1085
```

```
00:57:16.100 --> 00:57:17.100
 suppose you.
1086
00:57:21.200 --> 00:57:22.600
but also certainty
1087
00:57:23.900 --> 00:57:25.000
and thank you.
1088
00:57:25.900 --> 00:57:28.300
So just listening to Mohammed just to thought on
1089
00:57:28.300 --> 00:57:31.200
that I can see why my learner friend says
1090
00:57:31.200 --> 00:57:34.000
 it causes us issues in terms of the compulsory purchase aspects of
it. But
1091
00:57:34.800 --> 00:57:37.400
 yesterday for example, and I'm just thinking out loud here
yesterday.
1092
00:57:37.400 --> 00:57:40.300
For example, we were told that they only need two years to
1093
00:57:40.300 --> 00:57:40.600
be able to
1094
00:57:41.700 --> 00:57:44.300
build out and complete the development and I'm
1095
00:57:44.300 --> 00:57:45.800
 just wondering in that.
1096
00:57:47.600 --> 00:57:50.400
If we're thinking about it in that context the two years the 24
1097
00:57:50.400 --> 00:57:50.900
months.
1098
```

```
00:57:51.700 --> 00:57:54.200
Why do you need the temporary use of land
1099
00:57:54.200 --> 00:57:57.300
 for longer than that Beyond just the context
1100
00:57:57.300 --> 00:58:00.300
 of the compulsory purchase. That's what I was just trying to
understand and I'm
1101
00:58:00.300 --> 00:58:03.000
 sorry to have misled you earlier the references that I had in my
1102
00:58:03.500 --> 00:58:06.600
 post submission hearings of 63 mentions. Well
1103
00:58:06.600 --> 00:58:09.300
 that was actually in relation to the word maintain which will come
1104
00:58:09.300 --> 00:58:12.800
 back to later. I'm sure no that was my filter and we're
entertaining
1105
00:58:12.800 --> 00:58:15.500
 is what I counted. I don't think I counted temporary and
1106
00:58:15.500 --> 00:58:16.800
 it wasn't that board.
1107
00:58:20.000 --> 00:58:20.300
0kay.
1108
00:58:24.700 --> 00:58:26.500
Well, I think Mr. Hamid.
1109
00:58:27.100 --> 00:58:29.300
If you're pursuing this.
1110
00:58:30.700 --> 00:58:33.500
Do you have a you set
```

```
00:58:33.500 --> 00:58:34.400
 your intention to?
1112
00:58:35.600 --> 00:58:38.300
Put forward specific proposals in relation
1113
00:58:38.300 --> 00:58:42.100
to the use of the the word in in the drafting.
1114
00:58:52.400 --> 00:58:55.500
Can I ask in so far
1115
00:58:55.500 --> 00:58:55.700
as?
1116
00:58:56.800 --> 00:58:59.200
Changing the wording of the temporary aspects of
1117
00:58:59.200 --> 00:59:02.600
 it or in suggesting a time period or
1118
00:59:02.600 --> 00:59:05.100
making allowances for the points that I
1119
00:59:05.100 --> 00:59:08.500
 might learn a friend has mentioned in terms of compulsory purchase.
Well, they're yes,
1120
00:59:08.500 --> 00:59:12.700
 I mean bearing in mind the different function that
1121
00:59:12.700 --> 00:59:15.600
 the word has as
1122
00:59:15.600 --> 00:59:18.300
 it variously appears in in the
1123
00:59:18.300 --> 00:59:18.500
order.
1124
00:59:19.400 --> 00:59:23.000
```

```
I think we would be looking for a robust
1125
00:59:22.000 --> 00:59:23.700
 justification.
1126
00:59:24.600 --> 00:59:29.200
for using a different a different
1127
00:59:29.200 --> 00:59:33.000
form of wording that that gave us specific time period
1128
00:59:33.800 --> 00:59:37.400
And I just wondered if yes, I I
1129
00:59:37.400 --> 00:59:40.200
will definitely have a thing but I just if we just
1130
00:59:40.200 --> 00:59:43.600
 look at the where the consequences of the lack of provision comes
1131
00:59:43.600 --> 00:59:46.100
from from our part if you
1132
00:59:46.100 --> 00:59:49.400
you know, if you look at page 23 of the dco as
1133
00:59:49.400 --> 00:59:50.900
currently drafted, for example
1134
00:59:52.700 --> 00:59:55.700
And we look at paragraph 27 temporary
1135
00:59:55.700 --> 00:59:58.700
use of land for constructing and the authorized development.
1136
01:00:00.100 --> 01:00:01.100
It just seems
1137
01:00:03.400 --> 01:00:06.700
it gives the applicant the right to remove buildings
```

```
1138
01:00:06.700 --> 01:00:09.400
 and vegetation without seemingly any limitations to
1139
01:00:09.400 --> 01:00:12.400
this as to how long for what period
01:00:12.400 --> 01:00:12.800
of time.
1141
01:00:14.400 --> 01:00:14.600
1142
01:00:16.900 --> 01:00:19.100
notwithstanding what we've heard and I don't
1143
01:00:19.100 --> 01:00:22.500
 immediately honestly have an alternative to
1144
01:00:22.500 --> 01:00:25.400
 suggest off to top of my head. It's just
1145
01:00:26.900 --> 01:00:27.800
it just seems
1146
01:00:28.700 --> 01:00:31.200
Limitless in a way that we're concerned about
1147
01:00:31.200 --> 01:00:34.200
 is essentially where we are and I know that's not helpful because I
1148
01:00:34.200 --> 01:00:37.300
 don't have an immediate answer to what an
1149
01:00:37.300 --> 01:00:40.200
 alternative looks like, but that that's where we are at the
1150
01:00:40.200 --> 01:00:44.000
 moment and that's the best week the best I can do. I'm afraid.
Okay. Well look
```

```
01:00:43.800 --> 01:00:46.200
 shall we leave it
1152
01:00:46.200 --> 01:00:49.800
 to to you and and those
1153
01:00:49.800 --> 01:00:53.000
 instructing you if you wish to pursue it to to
1154
01:00:54.600 --> 01:00:56.000
specifying what changes
01:00:57.500 --> 01:01:00.100
are desired and if you
1156
01:01:01.200 --> 01:01:02.000
send it.
1157
01:01:02.700 --> 01:01:05.700
Deadline seven I think will be helpful if not by way
1158
01:01:05.700 --> 01:01:06.800
 of postering submissions.
1159
01:01:19.300 --> 01:01:22.700
Okay, thank you. That's right,
1160
01:01:22.700 --> 01:01:23.500
Mr. Attorney. We
1161
01:01:24.600 --> 01:01:27.500
and that thanks a rich Journey for the applicant. I think that
1162
01:01:27.500 --> 01:01:29.700
would be helpful. Just
1163
01:01:30.600 --> 01:01:33.000
it just to pick up the point about the scope of
1164
01:01:35.700 --> 01:01:38.300
article 27 one B to
```

```
1165
01:01:38.300 --> 01:01:41.300
 F in terms of those works. Of course, if you
1166
01:01:41.300 --> 01:01:44.200
 restrict the scope of those works and we need to do them
1167
01:01:44.200 \longrightarrow 01:01:45.500
 then we have to take
1168
01:01:47.100 --> 01:01:50.200
Compulsory the land and do those Works. Anyway,
1169
01:01:50.200 --> 01:01:53.300
 that's all that happened. So you just turn it from being a
1170
01:01:53.300 --> 01:01:56.300
temporary interference with the landowners rights to being
1171
01:01:56.300 --> 01:01:59.400
 a permanent interference to the landowners' rights, which I don't
see why
1172
01:01:59.400 --> 01:02:00.500
the District Council
1173
01:02:01.100 --> 01:02:04.500
wants us to go down that route if they're
1174
01:02:04.500 --> 01:02:07.500
 concerned about construction impacts duration of construction
impacts the
1175
01:02:07.500 --> 01:02:10.500
 removal of particular buildings. Those are environmental impacts.
1176
01:02:11.500 --> 01:02:14.200
Those really should be points made on the Kemp and so on
1177
01:02:14.200 --> 01:02:17.700
 rather than about this provision, which is a step down
```

```
01:02:17.700 --> 01:02:20.300
 from what would otherwise be a permanent, right?
1179
01:02:20.300 --> 01:02:23.400
There's one exception that I think which is the oversail plot.
1180
01:02:25.200 --> 01:02:25.900
spot on
1181
01:02:28.700 --> 01:02:31.300
sorry, so can I yes she Barrett West
1182
01:02:31.300 --> 01:02:32.900
 that's bear with me with.
1183
01:02:37.500 --> 01:02:40.400
Yes, Ms. Park. Yes, and we had
1184
01:02:40.400 --> 01:02:43.200
 some specific proposals for article 27. I see it's
1185
01:02:43.200 --> 01:02:46.200
also later in your agenda. So you happy first to bark it for now
and
1186
01:02:46.200 --> 01:02:49.100
 come back or do you want to deal with it? There will come on to
that. I
1187
01:02:49.100 --> 01:02:49.500
 think yeah.
1188
01:02:50.400 --> 01:02:51.500
Thank you for reminding me.
1189
01:02:54.200 --> 01:02:57.500
Okay. Thanks everyone for that. We will now.
1190
01:03:04.600 --> 01:03:07.100
Right, and I'm going to go through the rest of
```

```
1191
01:03:07.100 --> 01:03:10.300
 the Articles. I'm going to go through I'm going
1192
01:03:10.300 --> 01:03:10.900
to go through them.
1193
01:03:12.700 --> 01:03:14.100
as regards articles that
1194
01:03:15.100 --> 01:03:19.800
I have something to say on myself, but as
1195
01:03:19.800 --> 01:03:22.400
 I go on to the next article, if if I've
1196
01:03:22.400 --> 01:03:25.200
missed out articles that anyone feels that they have.
1197
01:03:26.300 --> 01:03:29.900
To say about and please raise your hand and let
1198
01:03:29.900 --> 01:03:32.300
me know that you want to to raise an
1199
01:03:32.300 --> 01:03:32.500
 issue.
1200
01:03:34.300 --> 01:03:34.600
S0
1201
01:03:35.500 --> 01:03:38.300
But I just wanted to mention an
1202
01:03:38.300 --> 01:03:40.600
 article to the definitions section.
1203
01:03:41.500 --> 01:03:43.800
Are there any particular matters?
1204
```

```
01:03:44.800 --> 01:03:48.500
That I'm going to come straight on to the maintain
1205
01:03:47.500 --> 01:03:52.400
 issue but apart
1206
01:03:50.400 --> 01:03:53.800
 from that other
1207
01:03:53.800 --> 01:03:54.200
any other.
1208
01:03:55.400 --> 01:04:00.000
Issues with the definitions section. So Michael
1209
01:03:59.600 --> 01:04:02.200
 Bedford Suffolk County Council, there is
1210
01:04:02.200 --> 01:04:02.200
а
1211
01:04:03.800 --> 01:04:07.000
point in relation to the
1212
01:04:08.900 --> 01:04:12.200
definition of permitted preliminary works
1213
01:04:13.700 --> 01:04:13.900
Yes.
1214
01:04:14.800 --> 01:04:15.200
and
1215
01:04:20.400 --> 01:04:24.000
that sets out a series of Works, which
1216
01:04:23.200 --> 01:04:26.800
would be excluded as
1217
01:04:26.800 --> 01:04:29.800
 you know from the definition of commence.
```

```
1218
01:04:30.900 --> 01:04:32.100
and
1219
01:04:34.300 --> 01:04:36.200
the definition of prelipped
1220
01:04:36.500 --> 01:04:40.400
permitted preliminary works also draws
01:04:39.400 --> 01:04:41.400
 attention to
1222
01:04:43.500 --> 01:04:46.400
Sorry, the follow-on definition is the definition
1223
01:04:46.400 --> 01:04:49.000
 of permitted preliminary Works traffic management plan.
1224
01:04:49.800 --> 01:04:52.800
Which is a matter that's dealt with by requirement 16
01:04:52.800 --> 01:04:53.500
 3.
1226
01:04:55.800 --> 01:04:57.000
and the issue
1227
01:04:58.400 --> 01:05:00.700
is that so far as
1228
01:05:02.300 --> 01:05:04.700
Permitted preliminary works are concerned.
1229
01:05:05.400 --> 01:05:05.700
some
1230
01:05:06.800 --> 01:05:09.700
of the items that would be within that
```

```
01:05:09.700 --> 01:05:12.600
 definition certainly have the potential.
1232
01:05:14.300 --> 01:05:14.500
to
1233
01:05:16.600 --> 01:05:17.400
include
1234
01:05:18.800 --> 01:05:21.400
either new or altered access
1235
01:05:22.600 --> 01:05:25.900
to Parcels in order to undertake those
1236
01:05:25.900 --> 01:05:27.600
 permitted preliminary works.
1237
01:05:30.600 --> 01:05:33.400
Now unless there was clarification.
1238
01:05:35.600 --> 01:05:38.700
In that definition that there could
1239
01:05:38.700 --> 01:05:39.800
be no.
1240
01:05:40.500 --> 01:05:41.500
alteration
1241
01:05:42.700 --> 01:05:45.700
or creation of a new access in order
1242
01:05:45.700 --> 01:05:48.300
 to deliver the permitted preliminary works.
1243
01:05:49.100 --> 01:05:50.600
What we would want to see.
1244
01:05:51.800 --> 01:05:55.200
Is that the definition of permitted preliminary
```

```
1245
01:05:54.200 --> 01:05:58.000
Works traffic management plan is
1246
01:05:57.000 --> 01:05:59.000
 expanded.
1247
01:06:00.500 --> 01:06:03.700
So that it's dealing not simply with traffic
1248
01:06:03.700 --> 01:06:04.400
 management.
1249
01:06:06.100 --> 01:06:08.400
but also with access Arrangements
1250
01:06:10.300 --> 01:06:14.800
because if you go to requirement 16
1251
01:06:16.000 --> 01:06:16.900
1252
01:06:18.500 --> 01:06:18.800
Yes.
1253
01:06:23.100 --> 01:06:26.500
We've got a page for that page 45 in the track change
1254
01:06:26.500 --> 01:06:27.200
 version. So
1255
01:06:33.900 --> 01:06:35.800
Requirements 163 yeah.
1256
01:06:37.400 --> 01:06:38.900
That mechanism is fine.
1257
01:06:39.900 --> 01:06:42.200
To regulate the matters that it regulates.
```

```
01:06:43.700 --> 01:06:46.300
But certainly would not appear to
1259
01:06:46.300 --> 01:06:49.800
be couched in terms of addressing creation or
1260
01:06:49.800 --> 01:06:52.400
 alteration of access what it's
1261
01:06:52.400 --> 01:06:55.500
 couched in terms of it is in terms of traffic management.
1262
01:06:55.500 --> 01:06:58.200
I movements on the highway
1263
01:06:58.200 --> 01:07:02.000
 itself rather than the creation of access into Land from
1264
01:07:01.100 --> 01:07:02.400
the highway.
1265
01:07:04.400 --> 01:07:07.300
Let's say if you go if you go back to the definition of
1266
01:07:07.300 --> 01:07:11.900
 permitted preliminary works on page seven it
1267
01:07:10.900 --> 01:07:13.400
 certainly conceivable that some
1268
01:07:13.400 --> 01:07:13.600
of those
1269
01:07:14.600 --> 01:07:17.600
In AC possibly EF or
1270
01:07:17.600 --> 01:07:17.800
G.
1271
01:07:18.500 --> 01:07:19.100
could require
```

```
1272
01:07:20.400 --> 01:07:23.100
access works and if that is the
1273
01:07:23.100 --> 01:07:23.400
1274
01:07:25.100 --> 01:07:26.300
Then we would want to see.
1275
01:07:27.800 --> 01:07:30.600
The permitted preliminary Works traffic management plan expanded
1276
01:07:30.600 --> 01:07:33.400
 in scope. So as to make make it
1277
01:07:33.400 --> 01:07:36.200
 clear that any such access Works had to
1278
01:07:36.200 --> 01:07:38.600
 be the subject of a consent from the
1279
01:07:39.500 --> 01:07:42.200
local Highway Authority. Yes. Yes.
1280
01:07:42.200 --> 01:07:45.100
 Is that something that could be taken on
1281
01:07:45.100 --> 01:07:46.000
board Mr. Attorney?
1282
01:07:47.100 --> 01:07:51.300
Which turning for the applicant? Yes, it can
1283
01:07:51.300 --> 01:07:54.400
 be I don't think it requires change the order because
1284
01:07:54.400 --> 01:07:57.800
 the side agreement so in any in any event the side
1285
```

```
01:07:57.800 --> 01:07:58.000
 agreement
1286
01:07:59.100 --> 01:08:02.300
Will provide that the highway authorities approval is required for
1287
01:08:02.300 --> 01:08:06.800
 any access to the highway and the
1288
01:08:05.800 --> 01:08:08.100
 details will need to be approved through that
1289
01:08:08.100 --> 01:08:11.600
 mechanism. So in a sense this point is is
1290
01:08:11.600 --> 01:08:14.200
 usurped by the fact that we are willing to agree to
1291
01:08:14.200 --> 01:08:16.300
 the protection of the highway Authority in that means but
1292
01:08:17.200 --> 01:08:20.700
if it if it would help for the permitted preliminary
1293
01:08:20.700 --> 01:08:22.100
Works traffic management plan.
1294
01:08:22.800 --> 01:08:26.900
To in that requirement 16:3
1295
01:08:26.900 --> 01:08:29.100
 to expressly say including details of any access
1296
01:08:29.100 --> 01:08:29.600
 then.
1297
01:08:30.300 --> 01:08:33.700
I can't imagine that that will be difficult for us. So I
1298
01:08:33.700 --> 01:08:36.600
 think that should address the concern that's
```

```
1299
01:08:36.600 --> 01:08:39.200
 raised as just by way of
1300
01:08:39.200 --> 01:08:40.000
 overarching point.
1301
01:08:40.900 --> 01:08:44.500
As as you've seen the the
1302
01:08:43.500 --> 01:08:46.200
 concerns about the council's concerns
1303
01:08:46.200 --> 01:08:50.600
 about permitted preliminary Works more generally have been
addressed by bringing into
1304
01:08:50.600 --> 01:08:53.800
 scape a number of the other requirements so
1305
01:08:53.800 --> 01:08:57.400
 that they are triggered even though commencement hasn't occurred.
1306
01:08:56.400 --> 01:08:57.900
So that's
1307
01:09:00.200 --> 01:09:03.600
the requirement 16 that you've seen but also requirement hate
1308
01:09:03.600 --> 01:09:07.300
 on the on landscape matters requirement 13 and
1309
01:09:06.300 --> 01:09:09.800
 require on archeology and requirement 14
1310
01:09:09.800 --> 01:09:13.700
on the camp so
1311
01:09:12.700 --> 01:09:14.100
 that there's
```

```
1312
01:09:15.400 --> 01:09:18.700
provision for a preliminary information
1313
01:09:18.700 --> 01:09:21.100
to be provided to reflect the
01:09:21.100 --> 01:09:22.300
 preliminary nature of those works.
1315
01:09:23.600 --> 01:09:25.300
Okay. Thank you.
1316
01:09:27.700 --> 01:09:30.700
I'm good. Well, I think that that should be
1317
01:09:30.700 --> 01:09:33.200
 resolvable one way or the other and yes, I
1318
01:09:33.200 --> 01:09:36.300
 agree with that and I just thought if we are
1319
01:09:36.300 --> 01:09:39.400
 going to move on from I agree
1320
01:09:39.400 --> 01:09:42.800
 with what Mr. Bedford said and I'm I'm grateful for my Mr.
Attorney's
1321
01:09:42.800 --> 01:09:43.200
 response just
1322
01:09:44.100 --> 01:09:47.400
Thinking about a few articles later.
1323
01:09:48.600 --> 01:09:51.200
In particular article 27 and
1324
01:09:51.200 --> 01:09:54.800
 article 36. So the removal of vegetation trees
```

```
01:09:54.800 --> 01:09:57.500
 some of those points that we have later
1326
01:09:57.500 --> 01:10:01.600
May well bring us back to article to
1327
01:10:01.600 --> 01:10:04.700
 interpretation points just so just to
1328
01:10:04.700 --> 01:10:08.100
 alert you at this point because I
1329
01:10:07.100 --> 01:10:10.700
 think we're happy to move on, but I just thought it may
1330
01:10:10.700 --> 01:10:11.800
 we might Circle back later.
1331
01:10:13.300 --> 01:10:14.000
Okay. Thank you.
1332
01:10:21.900 --> 01:10:24.600
Right. Let's deal with this issue
1333
01:10:24.600 --> 01:10:27.000
 of definition of Maintenance and then we
1334
01:10:27.100 --> 01:10:30.300
 might take a break Article 5.
1335
01:10:31.200 --> 01:10:34.300
Deals with the power to maintain
1336
01:10:34.300 --> 01:10:35.600
 authorized development.
1337
01:10:37.800 --> 01:10:39.700
And I think the issue here.
1338
01:10:41.600 --> 01:10:44.800
Was raised by East Cambridgeshire as to
```

```
1339
01:10:44.800 --> 01:10:50.500
 the definition of Maintenance and the references re-p5-073
1340
01:10:47.500 --> 01:10:51.700
 comments
1341
01:10:50.700 --> 01:10:53.300
at deadline five on
1342
01:10:53.300 --> 01:10:54.500
the revised dco.
1343
01:10:56.000 --> 01:10:56.300
1344
01:10:58.800 --> 01:11:02.400
maintain as defined includes
1345
01:11:01.400 --> 01:11:05.400
 inspect repair adjust alter
1346
01:11:04.400 --> 01:11:07.900
 remove refurbished reconstruct replace
1347
01:11:07.900 --> 01:11:10.600
 and improve any part of but not
1348
01:11:10.600 --> 01:11:13.500
 remove reconstruct or replace the
1349
01:11:13.500 --> 01:11:16.900
whole of the authorized development and maintenance
1350
01:11:16.900 --> 01:11:19.600
 and maintaining are to be construed accordingly.
1351
01:11:21.900 --> 01:11:22.200
So
1352
```

```
01:11:23.800 --> 01:11:24.200
I think
1353
01:11:26.700 --> 01:11:29.500
they proposal is to take out
1354
01:11:29.500 --> 01:11:33.800
 some wording in that definition essentially
1355
01:11:32.800 --> 01:11:36.500
to take out the wording those
1356
01:11:35.500 --> 01:11:39.600
words remove refurbish reconstruct
1357
01:11:38.600 --> 01:11:43.100
 and replace and
1358
01:11:41.100 --> 01:11:44.500
then to add a
1359
01:11:44.500 --> 01:11:48.000
 new requirement as to as to
1360
01:11:47.200 --> 01:11:51.900
 placement which the
1361
01:11:50.900 --> 01:11:53.700
 amended wording would
1362
01:11:53.700 --> 01:11:56.500
 effectively require a new application to
1363
01:11:56.500 --> 01:12:00.100
 be made for any any replacement if I
1364
01:12:00.100 --> 01:12:03.200
 got that right Mr. Hamlet, is that do you want to elaborate on
that? I don't
1365
01:12:03.200 --> 01:12:06.600
```

```
summarized our
1366
01:12:06.600 --> 01:12:10.100
 position. Thank you. Thank you. So have
1367
01:12:09.100 --> 01:12:12.300
you had an opportunity to look at that Mr. Sunny?
1368
01:12:13.400 --> 01:12:16.100
I have thank you very much, sir, Richard Tony for the
1369
01:12:16.100 --> 01:12:19.200
 applicant. So if I just give a broad.
1370
01:12:19.900 --> 01:12:22.200
Response on this we consider the definition of
1371
01:12:22.200 --> 01:12:23.800
 maintain is appropriate.
1372
01:12:25.600 --> 01:12:28.300
Put very simply if it was necessary to
1373
01:12:28.300 --> 01:12:31.600
 replace a component of this very large Generating
1374
01:12:31.600 --> 01:12:34.800
 Station. We would not expect to
1375
01:12:34.800 \longrightarrow 01:12:37.400
have to seek new development consent to
1376
01:12:37.400 --> 01:12:37.700
 do so.
1377
01:12:38.500 --> 01:12:40.600
Remembering this is a 40 year life.
1378
01:12:41.400 --> 01:12:44.800
An example which I know has been relevant on a
```

think I need to elaborate a single word. That's perfectly

```
1379
01:12:44.800 --> 01:12:47.700
 scheme elsewhere is a portion of a cable
1380
01:12:47.700 --> 01:12:50.700
 failing and it needing to be replaced. We would
1381
01:12:50.700 \longrightarrow 01:12:53.300
 not expect to have to go through the process of
1382
01:12:53.300 --> 01:12:57.100
 authorizing a new development consent for
1383
01:12:56.100 --> 01:12:59.000
 the purposes replacing that not least because of the
1384
01:12:59.600 --> 01:13:02.200
 substantial delay that would be caused by it.
01:13:02.200 --> 01:13:05.400
 So what we have done
1386
01:13:05.400 --> 01:13:08.700
which I think is satisfied at least one of the local authorities,
1387
01:13:08.700 --> 01:13:11.600
but not he's Cambridge here.
1388
01:13:12.300 --> 01:13:13.400
is to
1389
01:13:15.200 --> 01:13:16.900
is to try and look at ways in which
1390
01:13:17.800 --> 01:13:22.200
the environmental effects of Maintenance
1391
01:13:20.200 --> 01:13:23.900
 can be anticipated.
```

```
01:13:25.100 --> 01:13:28.300
We have proposed that the
1393
01:13:28.300 --> 01:13:31.900
 through the outline operational Environmental Management
1394
01:13:31.900 --> 01:13:34.800
 plan the OM in its revised
1395
01:13:34.800 --> 01:13:39.200
 version at rep 5-009.
1396
01:13:40.100 --> 01:13:43.600
that we will provide an annual schedule of plan maintenance so
1397
01:13:43.600 --> 01:13:46.800
 that that can be considered by the
1398
01:13:46.800 --> 01:13:49.300
 authorities and
1399
01:13:51.900 --> 01:13:55.800
we have also also emphasized
1400
01:13:55.800 --> 01:13:59.600
 and obviously this is in the on the face of Article 5 that
1401
01:14:00.400 --> 01:14:03.400
the concern about effects of Maintenance and
1402
01:14:03.400 --> 01:14:06.200
 the breadth the definition maintenance is really aren't so by
Article 5
1403
01:14:06.200 --> 01:14:06.800
 3
1404
01:14:07.700 --> 01:14:10.400
Which is makes clear that the article does not authorize the
1405
01:14:10.400 --> 01:14:14.000
```

```
materially
1406
01:14:13.200 --> 01:14:17.000
 new or materially different effects that
1407
01:14:16.400 --> 01:14:19.900
have been not been assessed in the environmental statement.
1408
01:14:19.900 --> 01:14:22.100
 So the councils can
1409
01:14:22.100 --> 01:14:25.900
be reassured that this is not looking at any new
1410
01:14:25.900 --> 01:14:28.900
 or materially different
1411
01:14:28.900 --> 01:14:31.100
 effects than those which
1412
01:14:31.100 --> 01:14:34.600
have already been assessed and necessarily through the granted
development
1413
01:14:34.600 --> 01:14:37.800
 consent being found to be acceptable.
1414
01:14:38.900 --> 01:14:41.600
So our preference remains
1415
01:14:41.600 --> 01:14:44.500
 that this is dealt with through the oemp that that
1416
01:14:44.500 --> 01:14:48.200
 obligation to provide an annual schedule
1417
01:14:47.200 --> 01:14:51.100
 of Maintenance means that the authorities will
1418
01:14:50.100 --> 01:14:53.900
```

carrying out of any Works, which are likely to give rise to any

```
know and be able to comment on the proposals as
1419
01:14:53.900 --> 01:14:56.300
 they come forward each year through the operational life
1420
01:14:56.300 --> 01:14:59.300
 rather than at this point constraining us
1421
01:14:59.300 --> 01:15:01.000
 in what we can do by way of maintenance.
1422
01:15:03.300 --> 01:15:03.500
Thank you.
1423
01:15:04.600 --> 01:15:07.600
So an annual schedule of
1424
01:15:07.600 --> 01:15:10.000
 planned maintenance I suppose would be one
1425
01:15:10.000 --> 01:15:10.600
 thing.
1426
01:15:12.800 --> 01:15:15.600
when one looks at the definition of maintain
1427
01:15:17.100 --> 01:15:19.200
just going back to that.
1428
01:15:23.200 --> 01:15:26.700
It's interesting. I mean, it's quite outside the town of
1429
01:15:26.700 --> 01:15:29.300
 country planning acts concept of
1430
01:15:30.400 --> 01:15:34.400
development and maintain I think so did either
1431
01:15:33.400 --> 01:15:35.000
 a party's
```

```
1432
01:15:36.600 --> 01:15:39.700
look at precedence in the dco in dcos
1433
01:15:39.700 --> 01:15:40.000
 for this.
1434
01:15:43.800 --> 01:15:46.700
We we haven't double checked
1435
01:15:46.700 --> 01:15:50.400
we may have looked at it in some respects, but just to reiterate
1436
01:15:49.400 --> 01:15:52.800
 a couple of things just by way
1437
01:15:52.800 --> 01:15:55.900
 of helping Mr. Turney, perhaps get what
1438
01:15:55.900 --> 01:15:58.200
we are paragraph six of that.
1439
01:15:59.100 --> 01:16:02.400
Post submission hearing we mentioned that there
1440
01:16:02.400 --> 01:16:05.400
 is this failure to distinguish between routine repair
1441
01:16:05.400 --> 01:16:08.500
 replace a few panels and works that
1442
01:16:08.500 --> 01:16:12.800
 entirely replace a whole field or phase
1443
01:16:11.800 --> 01:16:15.600
 of panels. So in in
1444
01:16:14.600 --> 01:16:17.400
 one sense, I suppose
1445
01:16:17.400 --> 01:16:20.400
```

```
my learner friend might say well every year we'll put
1446
01:16:20.400 --> 01:16:24.200
 in a schedule of works but in the course of 25 30
1447
01:16:23.200 --> 01:16:24.700
40 years.
1448
01:16:25.700 --> 01:16:28.100
It is an inconceivable that that sort of
1449
01:16:28.100 --> 01:16:28.900
 approach.
1450
01:16:30.200 --> 01:16:33.300
If indeed it does work out to be a parcel here or there
1451
01:16:33.300 --> 01:16:36.300
 could necessarily mean that it will be a whole.
1452
01:16:37.100 --> 01:16:40.400
A way of a whole new reconstruction of the process. So I
1453
01:16:40.400 --> 01:16:43.300
think that we've covered it there and then there's the other issue
of
1454
01:16:43.300 --> 01:16:46.800
 the 63 references of of maintain in
1455
01:16:46.800 --> 01:16:49.600
 the dco many many of those references.
1456
01:16:50.700 --> 01:16:53.300
Are in relation to the statutory Undertaker's equipment
1457
01:16:53.300 --> 01:16:56.300
 and not to the proposed development at all. And that's another
1458
01:16:56.300 --> 01:16:59.300
 issue that that we're facing. So I appreciate this
```

```
1459
01:16:59.300 --> 01:17:02.600
 is a really good attempt and I know that we're Suffolk are engaging
with
1460
01:17:02.600 --> 01:17:05.300
 that but it still doesn't get away from the
1461
01:17:05.300 --> 01:17:08.100
 simple fact that the definition is just too far and
1462
01:17:08.100 --> 01:17:11.200
 too wide that allows for during the course
1463
01:17:11.200 --> 01:17:14.300
 of the life of this project to effectively have the
1464
01:17:14.300 --> 01:17:17.400
 opportunity to replace whole Parcels under the
1465
01:17:17.400 --> 01:17:19.500
 guise of repair I suppose.
1466
01:17:20.800 --> 01:17:23.100
One question or example might be if there were
01:17:23.100 --> 01:17:23.500
 a whole.
1468
01:17:24.600 --> 01:17:27.200
A whole field or two Fields or three fields that
1469
01:17:27.200 --> 01:17:31.500
were scheduled for replacement wholesale
1470
01:17:30.500 --> 01:17:34.100
 replacement. How would
1471
01:17:33.100 --> 01:17:36.800
 that not be something that had been
```

```
1472
01:17:36.800 --> 01:17:40.300
 assessed in the environmental statement
1473
01:17:39.300 --> 01:17:42.400
 as part
1474
01:17:42.400 --> 01:17:45.700
 of part of the works? I mean, do you see five
1475
01:17:45.700 --> 01:17:48.200
 three as a weakness then?
1476
01:17:48.900 --> 01:17:49.600
He's not.
1477
01:17:58.900 --> 01:18:01.300
The point about that is I guess it could
1478
01:18:01.300 --> 01:18:05.200
 go two ways couldn't I mean if you could went through the
Demolition
1479
01:18:04.200 --> 01:18:07.200
 and then the replacement and
1480
01:18:07.200 --> 01:18:08.500
 you have this two-way traffic.
1481
01:18:11.000 --> 01:18:11.300
where
1482
01:18:13.500 --> 01:18:14.000
you're
1483
01:18:15.300 --> 01:18:18.700
getting rid of some panels and some batteries and then you're
replacing them
1484
01:18:18.700 --> 01:18:20.100
with new panels and new batteries.
```

```
1485
01:18:20.900 --> 01:18:22.400
within that definition
1486
01:18:24.200 --> 01:18:27.400
then to what extent is that repairing and to
01:18:27.400 --> 01:18:29.400
what extent? Is that whole sale replacement?
1488
01:18:31.200 --> 01:18:34.200
but replacement is I mean if
1489
01:18:34.200 --> 01:18:34.200
 you
1490
01:18:35.800 --> 01:18:38.600
I mean I suppose you either accept that replacement is
1491
01:18:38.600 --> 01:18:40.600
 part of maintenance.
1492
01:18:41.400 --> 01:18:44.300
Or you say that
1493
01:18:44.300 --> 01:18:47.900
 comes a point when replacement is actually a new
1494
01:18:47.900 --> 01:18:48.200
 project.
1495
01:18:50.900 --> 01:18:53.600
If you see the definition that we
1496
01:18:53.600 --> 01:18:56.700
have given we say maintain includes inspect
1497
01:18:56.700 --> 01:18:59.500
 repair adjust Altar and improve
1498
01:18:59.500 --> 01:19:02.700
```

```
any part of the authorized development and maintenance
1499
01:19:02.700 --> 01:19:05.400
 and maintaining are to be construed accordingly and
1500
01:19:05.400 --> 01:19:09.200
as you've already identified we're trying to get away from words
1501
01:19:08.200 --> 01:19:13.200
 such as refurbish reconstruct.
1502
01:19:14.500 --> 01:19:15.300
replace
1503
01:19:16.200 --> 01:19:19.600
in a way that we don't necessarily see in the
1504
01:19:19.600 --> 01:19:21.700
ordinary English meaning to
1505
01:19:23.600 --> 01:19:26.500
relate to words such as inspecting and
1506
01:19:26.500 --> 01:19:29.500
 repairing and adjusting and altering for the purposes of
1507
01:19:29.500 --> 01:19:30.000
maintaining.
1508
01:19:32.100 --> 01:19:35.200
So that's I mean for our part that's the
1509
01:19:35.200 --> 01:19:38.700
 issue really and we've tried to offer a different version and it
1510
01:19:38.700 --> 01:19:41.400
 comes down to are you ultimately
1511
01:19:42.900 --> 01:19:45.400
Distinguishing between routine repair and
```

```
1512
01:19:45.400 --> 01:19:48.700
 replacement of a few panels and entirely replacing whole
1513
01:19:48.700 --> 01:19:51.700
fields of phases of panels. That's
1514
01:19:51.700 --> 01:19:54.200
that's really as simple as we see it. Okay. Thank
1515
01:19:54.200 --> 01:19:57.700
you. And Mr. Attorney is a with reference
1516
01:19:57.700 --> 01:20:01.300
also to any previous Turney for
1517
01:20:01.300 --> 01:20:04.700
the applicant. There is there is Preston I think little crow soda
1518
01:20:04.700 --> 01:20:08.000
Farmers most recent one. The definition of maintain there is
1519
01:20:07.400 --> 01:20:10.500
effectively the same it
1520
01:20:10.500 --> 01:20:14.000
 includes additional word upkeep but includes all
1521
01:20:13.400 --> 01:20:17.000
to remove reconstruct and replace it doesn't
1522
01:20:16.600 --> 01:20:19.600
 include the Proviso.
1523
01:20:20.300 --> 01:20:22.700
but not remove reconstruct or replace the whole of
1524
01:20:23.300 --> 01:20:27.000
but it does include the Article 5
1525
01:20:26.500 --> 01:20:29.400
```

```
3. Yes Article 5
1526
01:20:29.400 --> 01:20:32.400
 3 exception in the definition of
1527
01:20:32.400 --> 01:20:35.400
maintain so just slightly restructured. So little grow
1528
01:20:35.400 --> 01:20:40.300
 is a good example of where that's been included the we're
1529
01:20:39.300 --> 01:20:42.400
not trying to give addictionary definition
1530
01:20:42.400 --> 01:20:45.600
 of the word maintain. That's not the purpose. We're trying
1531
01:20:45.600 --> 01:20:48.600
 to Define maintain for the purposes of what he's going to be
authorized under
1532
01:20:48.600 --> 01:20:51.400
the order. So telling us that it doesn't fit the dictionary
1533
01:20:51.400 --> 01:20:54.400
 definition. It doesn't go anywhere. We know it doesn't otherwise we
wouldn't Define
1534
01:20:54.400 --> 01:20:57.300
 it. So what we say,
1535
01:20:57.300 --> 01:21:01.100
we should be authorized to do as a
1536
01:21:00.100 --> 01:21:02.100
 statutory Undertaker.
1537
01:21:03.300 --> 01:21:06.700
delivering a grid scale renewable energy
1538
01:21:06.700 --> 01:21:07.000
```

```
project
1539
01:21:08.100 --> 01:21:08.600
is to
1540
01:21:10.300 --> 01:21:12.100
reconstruct replace
1541
01:21:13.200 --> 01:21:17.100
Any part of the authorized development
1542
01:21:16.100 --> 01:21:19.300
 should it be necessary to do so?
1543
01:21:20.200 --> 01:21:23.500
To communicate clearly with the local authorities when we intend to
exercise those
1544
01:21:23.500 --> 01:21:26.200
 powers and to do
1545
01:21:26.200 --> 01:21:29.900
 that without having to go through the process of seeking
1546
01:21:29.900 --> 01:21:32.400
 and new development consent.
1547
01:21:33.100 --> 01:21:37.200
That's the that's what we're trying to avoid having
1548
01:21:36.200 --> 01:21:41.300
to seek a new development consent which in
1549
01:21:40.300 --> 01:21:43.100
Practical terms. I think
1550
01:21:43.100 --> 01:21:46.400
 in reality for the district councils, it would be better not to
1551
01:21:46.400 --> 01:21:49.000
 have to deal with a new application for development consent to
```

```
order
1552
01:21:49.300 --> 01:21:52.500
 if some aspect to the scheme needs to be replaced. It would be
better for
1553
01:21:52.500 --> 01:21:55.300
them to approve it through the process of
1554
01:21:55.300 --> 01:22:00.000
 looking at the outline the
1555
01:21:59.800 --> 01:22:02.900
 operational management plan.
1556
01:22:03.700 --> 01:22:06.700
So that's the route that we're we think
1557
01:22:06.700 --> 01:22:09.200
 is better. It's clearly pressed ended up.
1558
01:22:09.200 --> 01:22:13.800
We'll find some other examples for our written submissions and we
1559
01:22:12.800 --> 01:22:15.100
think really the breadth of
1560
01:22:15.100 --> 01:22:18.200
 this power is is appropriate and that the changes to the OM
1561
01:22:18.200 --> 01:22:20.200
 should address the concerns raised.
1562
01:22:21.100 --> 01:22:23.400
Okay. Thank you very much. So, can I sorry?
1563
01:22:27.500 --> 01:22:30.300
if you see that section where it
1564
01:22:30.300 --> 01:22:31.000
 says maintain
```

```
1565
01:22:31.700 --> 01:22:34.400
but not remove reconstruct or replace
1566
01:22:34.400 --> 01:22:37.300
 the whole of that could easily be read as you
1567
01:22:37.300 \longrightarrow 01:22:40.100
 could remove 99% of it and still be
1568
01:22:40.100 --> 01:22:40.400
 fine.
1569
01:22:41.100 --> 01:22:43.300
We're not as my learner friend keep saying.
1570
01:22:44.200 --> 01:22:47.200
We don't want to have to deal with another dco. He's absolutely
right on
1571
01:22:47.200 --> 01:22:47.500
 that.
1572
01:22:48.300 --> 01:22:51.200
But we're not asking for a whole new dco. All we're asking
1573
01:22:51.200 --> 01:22:54.800
 for is a requirement and what will effectively become an
1574
01:22:54.800 --> 01:22:57.500
 updated Kemp that's it. So this
1575
01:22:57.500 --> 01:23:01.300
 characterization of our insistence on
1576
01:23:01.300 --> 01:23:04.600
 the maintenance word being better defined is not
1577
01:23:04.600 --> 01:23:07.700
 a rod of our own back of wanting to deal with another dco.
```

```
1578
01:23:07.700 --> 01:23:10.300
What we're effectively talking about is another
1579
01:23:10.300 --> 01:23:13.500
 requirement that will lead probably an updated Camp
01:23:13.500 --> 01:23:16.000
 rather than a whole new dco. So I don't think
1581
01:23:16.100 --> 01:23:19.200
 it's we can disagree on what we mean by maintenance, but I think
it's fair
1582
01:23:19.200 --> 01:23:22.100
to say that the net result will be that you will they will
1583
01:23:22.100 --> 01:23:25.400
 need a whole new dco. Yes. I mean that goes hand
1584
01:23:25.400 --> 01:23:28.200
 in hand with your proposal to require the application to be
1585
01:23:28.200 --> 01:23:29.300
made to the LPA.
1586
01:23:32.300 --> 01:23:35.000
Okay. Does anybody want to
1587
01:23:35.400 --> 01:23:35.700
add anything?
1588
01:23:36.600 --> 01:23:38.900
As this, correct?
1589
01:23:40.600 --> 01:23:43.200
Richie barriegwassa for cancel, so I just wanted
1590
01:23:43.200 --> 01:23:46.800
to pick up on the last point that Mr. Johnny made about the
notification proposals
```

```
1591
01:23:46.800 --> 01:23:49.200
 in the OM. So that's
1592
01:23:49.200 --> 01:23:52.200
 the less effort proposal and we've gone back at
1593
01:23:52.200 --> 01:23:55.300
 our deadline six submissions to kind of tighten the wording
1594
01:23:55.300 --> 01:23:58.300
 and also build in provision for notification of
1595
01:23:58.300 --> 01:24:01.600
 Emergency on planned Works after the event. I understand
1596
01:24:01.600 --> 01:24:04.500
 from Mr. Johnny that that's possibly agreed and so
1597
01:24:04.500 --> 01:24:07.600
 it provided that's in place then we would be satisfied with
1598
01:24:07.600 --> 01:24:09.200
 how notification works.
1599
01:24:10.200 --> 01:24:12.000
That that's very helpful. Thank you.
1600
01:24:16.300 --> 01:24:19.500
okay, can we leave it then that the applicant and
1601
01:24:19.500 --> 01:24:19.900
 and
1602
01:24:21.600 --> 01:24:25.200
Mr. Mohammed for East Cambridge
1603
01:24:24.200 --> 01:24:25.800
will
1604
01:24:26.500 --> 01:24:31.000
```

```
produce for post hearing submission deadline any
1605
01:24:29.000 --> 01:24:32.900
 specific examples
1606
01:24:32.900 --> 01:24:35.300
any specific extracts from from the
1607
01:24:35.300 --> 01:24:35.900
wording that
1608
01:24:36.600 --> 01:24:38.700
a nice system in the
1609
01:24:39.700 --> 01:24:40.800
in their positions
1610
01:24:42.700 --> 01:24:43.700
Thank you. Thanks.
1611
01:24:46.200 --> 01:24:46.300
1612
01:24:48.400 --> 01:24:50.000
See, what's next?
01:24:56.900 --> 01:24:59.700
I think we'll take a short break now. It's 11 just
1614
01:24:59.700 --> 01:25:02.600
nearly just gone 25. So we'll we'll
1615
01:25:02.600 --> 01:25:05.900
break now until quarter to twelve.
1616
01:25:06.600 --> 01:25:08.700
So we'll adjourn now till quarters to try. Thank you.
```