

## **ISH2\_20 Jan\_Part01**

Created on: 2023-01-20 11:48:36

Project Length: 01:29:20

File Name: ISH2\_20 Jan\_Part01

File Length: 01:29:20

### FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:14 - 00:00:29:10

Good morning and welcome. It is now 10 a.m. and I'm starting the second issue specific hearing for the application made by Ecuador limited for the financial and the wind farm extension project. We will introduce ourselves fully in just a few minutes. But before we do that, just bear with me while I deal with a few housekeeping matters. Can I check if everyone can hear me right at the back of the room?

00:00:33:03 - 00:00:36:03

And can you confirm if livestream and recording have started?

00:00:38:08 - 00:00:41:12

And were there any requests, reasonable adjustments for something.

00:00:42:02 - 00:00:43:00

Okay. Thank you.

00:00:44:07 - 00:00:51:03

And so there are no fire alarm drills today. If the fire alarm sounds, please exit the building via the main entrance

00:00:52:25 - 00:00:59:21

and congregate in the car park in front of the main entrance toilets allocated to the right. When you exit the room.

00:01:03:24 - 00:01:28:18

Right on to introductions. I'm Mr.. I have been appointed by the Secretary State for levelling up housing and community duties as the lead member of this examining authority to carry out an examination of the above application. I'll be contributing to items three seven and moving on item 13 and I will put in as and when necessary, I'll hand over to other members of the examining authority as to what is going on.

00:01:30:05 - 00:01:32:04

Sunday morning, everyone. My name is Mr..

00:01:32:06 - 00:01:35:24

Wallace and I've also been appointed as a member of this examining authority.

00:01:37:27 - 00:01:49:15

Thank you. Good morning. I'm Mr. Money and of Influence by the Secretary of State to be a member of the panel examining authority. I'll be contributing to item three and leading on items 4 to 8 and keep.

00:01:51:01 - 00:01:59:11

Morning. I'm Mr. McArthur. I've also been appointed as a member of this examining authority. And today I'll be leading on items 9 to 11.

00:02:02:11 - 00:02:10:25

Good morning. I'm Mr. Rennie, also appointed by the as a member of the examining party. And I'll be leaving on an item 12.

00:02:14:08 - 00:02:46:16

Also present today are members of the case team and case manager is Ms.. Louise Haraway. Ms. Haraway, supported by Mr. Simon Braidwood here at the venue and by Ms.. Phoebe Challis, Mr. George Harold and Ms.. Her prior call on online. If you have any questions or concerns about today's event, please contact a member of the case team. The audio visual and Internet service today is provided by a team led by Mr. Ryan Ross. That's the end of our introduction and turning to attendees.

00:02:47:27 - 00:03:21:08

Firstly, I want to acknowledge and welcome those who are attending via the livestream. Welcome and thank you for joining us. I would now like to start with introductions from attendees. When I read out the names your team, can all members of the team present in a in person? Please introduce yourselves first, followed by introductions to virtual attendees. My running order will be the applicant enforcement Agency, Norfolk County Council, North Norfolk District Council, South Norfolk and Broadland District Councils.

00:03:22:01 - 00:03:26:26

Alton Parish Council. Derek Aldous. Jonathan Rush.

00:03:29:14 - 00:03:38:09

Norfolk Parishes Movement for an Offshore Transmission Network. Louis Staples. Christopher Bond. Jane Kenny.

00:03:40:08 - 00:03:42:26

Can we start with introductions from the activities?

00:03:44:19 - 00:03:47:08

Good morning, madam. My name is Julian Boswell.

00:03:48:27 - 00:04:03:21

I'm a partner and solicitor with Birgitte Salmon LLP. We are representing Ecuador. There's one person online or a fellow who will introduce herself after the team member sitting up at the time or have introduced themselves.

00:04:07:01 - 00:04:10:20

Good morning, Jennifer and senior associate Simon.

00:04:13:02 - 00:04:16:15

Good morning. Sarah Chandler, the development and consents manager at Canal.

00:04:20:01 - 00:04:24:16

Good morning. My name is. He is Rodriguez and I am the lead for sick and therefore to work in.

00:04:27:17 - 00:04:31:07

Good morning. I'm Ellen Shields from Rolling Stone in DHP.

00:04:31:09 - 00:04:32:27

I'm here on behalf of the applicant.

00:04:35:08 - 00:04:42:18

Morning. I'm Sam Taylor and I'm an associate transport planner, and I'm here on behalf of the applicant.

00:04:49:19 - 00:04:50:11

Good morning.

00:04:50:13 - 00:04:55:00

Laura SYDELL. Senior Sessions Just judges to someone representing the Gaskins.

00:04:58:28 - 00:04:59:16

Thank you, Ms. for

00:05:01:26 - 00:05:04:14

inviting now attendees from Environment Agency.

00:05:06:22 - 00:05:11:29

Good morning. I'm Bobby's helper, Ms.. Taylor, representing the Environment Agency.

00:05:16:05 - 00:05:19:21

And Friedman representing the environment. So.

00:05:22:22 - 00:05:25:19

Thank you. Welcome. Norfolk County Council, please.

00:05:29:18 - 00:05:36:26

Hello, madam. It's Stephen Faulkner, Norfolk County Council and the principal planner and National Structure Planning lead.

00:05:38:15 - 00:05:54:27

My colleagues John Becker and Martin Dixon will be here for item seven because traffic and transportation and my colleagues are in love representing the lead. Local flood authority will be here on item eight. I'll try to maintain a presence throughout the day. Thank you.

00:05:56:19 - 00:05:57:21

Thank you, Mr. Faulkner.

00:06:00:13 - 00:06:02:05

North Norfolk District Council.

00:06:04:12 - 00:06:11:09

Good morning. My name is Jeff Lyon. I'm a development manager and I'm representing on behalf of North Norfolk District Council.

00:06:13:15 - 00:06:14:15

Thank you, Mr. Lunn.

00:06:16:29 - 00:06:19:14

South Norfolk and Broadland District Council.

00:06:22:08 - 00:06:33:14

Good morning, madam. I am Claire Curtis. I'm an area manager and lead officer for and steps for South Norfolk District Council and Broadland District Council. Thank you.

00:06:36:03 - 00:06:44:21

Thank you. Alton Parish Council apologies. Do we have another introduction from. Sorry. Sorry.

00:06:44:25 - 00:06:45:10

Yes.

00:06:45:12 - 00:06:51:23

I am good. I am Catherine on the ecology and biodiversity of Surf Port District and South Norfolk Council's.

00:06:57:20 - 00:07:02:02

I'm Alex Kramer on the Environment Management Officer for Broadland South Norfolk Council.

00:07:11:23 - 00:07:12:28

Alton Parish Council.

00:07:13:20 - 00:07:15:12

Good morning. My name is Susan, and

00:07:17:16 - 00:07:20:15

I'm representing Alton Parish Council this morning.

00:07:20:17 - 00:07:23:19

Thank you. And welcome, Mrs. Mother.

00:07:26:13 - 00:07:27:12

Derek. Aldous.

00:07:28:28 - 00:07:29:13

Thank you.

00:07:30:02 - 00:07:32:23

Thank you, madam. And good morning. I am. I'm Derek. I'm a.

00:07:43:24 - 00:07:46:24

Mr. Jonathan Rusch from Brown and Company.

00:07:47:19 - 00:07:58:03

Has a morning Madam Jonathan Rush Brown and co land agent for several landowners and also part of the land interest group with Ms.. Kenny and Mr. Bond.

00:08:02:02 - 00:08:07:01

Thank you, Mr. Roche. Norfolk Parishes Movement for an Offshore Transmission Network.

00:08:08:17 - 00:08:14:01

I'm Jonathan Betts. I represent the movement for an offshore transmission network.

00:08:15:16 - 00:08:16:14  
Thunder fits.

00:08:16:16 - 00:08:17:21  
Representing the.

00:08:17:23 - 00:08:19:15  
Knockout Punches movement and.

00:08:19:17 - 00:08:20:26  
Also representing.

00:08:21:10 - 00:08:23:05  
The crumpling against them.

00:08:23:29 - 00:08:24:14  
Thank you.

00:08:27:00 - 00:08:28:11  
National Farmers Union.

00:08:36:18 - 00:08:48:11  
Good morning. It's three staples from the National Farmers Union, representing all NFU members affected by the scheme and working with the land Interest Group. Thank you.

00:08:50:03 - 00:08:50:19  
Thank you,

00:08:53:02 - 00:08:53:22  
Bidwell.

00:08:55:27 - 00:08:56:12  
The money

00:08:58:26 - 00:09:05:03  
printing at the various landowners is affected by the scheme and as a member of the land interest group.

00:09:10:00 - 00:09:15:27  
Samples. Good morning, Jane Kenney from samples representing landlords affected by the.

00:09:15:29 - 00:09:17:15  
Scheme and part of the large.

00:09:17:17 - 00:09:29:01  
Interest group. Thank you very much. I think that concludes the introductions, but if I've missed anyone, could you please raise your hand either online or in the room?

00:09:32:14 - 00:09:33:01  
Okay.

00:09:38:14 - 00:09:45:18

Moving on to agenda item two, I have five brief points to make here to set out the procedure for the running of the hearing today.

00:09:48:09 - 00:10:15:27

Firstly, just a few words to acknowledge the format of the event. This is a blended event. It allows attendance both in-person and virtually through Microsoft teams. It's expected that both blended and fully virtual events will form part of the planning Inspectorate's future operating model. With the examining authorities attending this meeting in Norwich, as are several other attendees for those attending virtually. Please be rest assured that you have a full attention at all times, even if you're not looking at the camera

00:10:17:29 - 00:10:23:15

to avoid visual and noise distractions. Please keep your cameras and microphones off unless we invite you to speak.

00:10:25:21 - 00:10:56:27

The second point is about the proposed timings. I will take a 15 minute break at approximately 11:30 a.m. lunch break around 1:15 p.m., an afternoon break around 3:45 p.m. with the aim to finish around 5:30 p.m.. But we will keep this under review. These timings are approximate. If you are joining for a particular agenda item, we recommend that you join at the start of the session that the agenda item is in. You can keep in touch with the case team who can tell if the sessions are running a few minutes late

00:10:58:14 - 00:11:14:01

for virtual attendees. If you decide to leave the meeting place during the breaks, you can rejoin using the same link provided in your email. And of course, if you're watching the livestream, please refresh the browser to resume each subsequent session.

00:11:15:25 - 00:11:50:18

Just a few points to make you aware that this event is both being livestreamed and recorded. The digital recording that we make our retained and published, they form a public record that can contain your personal information and to which the General Data Protection Regulation GDPR applies. The Planning Inspectorate practice is to retain and publish recordings for a period of five years after the Secretary of State has made that decision. Consequently, if you participate in today's issue specific hearing, it's important that you understand that you will be recorded and that you therefore consent to the retention and publication of this recording.

00:11:51:07 - 00:12:26:00

It's very enlightening that the examining authority will ask you to put sensitive personal information into the public domain, and in fact, we encourage you to not do that. However, if you feel that for some reason it's necessary for you to refer to sensitive personal information, we encourage you to speak to a member of the case team in the first instance. We will then explore with you what information could be provided in a written format which might be rejected before being published. The fourth point is about the substantive matter of today's issue specific hearing, which is titled Onshore Strategic Onshore Matters.

00:12:27:17 - 00:12:47:10

An agenda for the hearing was published in the Planning Inspectorate National Infrastructure Project web page on Tuesday 10th of January 2023. Those are those are the only matters for discussion today. To be clear, it's not intended to discuss all matters relating to onshore environment. For some, matters will be pursued through.

00:12:47:18 - 00:12:48:03

A.

00:12:48:05 - 00:12:50:09

Grant of written questions or at future hearings.

00:12:53:03 - 00:13:15:11

We've had a request from Norfolk County Council to consider a part of Agenda Item 12, which has cumulative effects. After item seven, Traffic and transport. We propose to deal with the transport related aspects of item 12 alongside other transport, traffic and transportation matters. Does anyone have any concerns with that?

00:13:21:18 - 00:13:22:03

And

00:13:23:13 - 00:13:41:15

it is a full and ambitious, ambitious agenda. Mr. Manning and Mr. McCarthy. Mr. Brennan. I will keep this under review and we may request that certain aspects be held over and addressed as part of responses to our first tranche of written questions, responses for which are due on the 20th of February

00:13:43:16 - 00:14:18:00

fifth. And final point regarding post hearing actions should they arise during this hearing. Mr. Wallace will pitch in with questions and comments as we go and will also be noting down hearing actions as they emerge at the close of the meeting. We intend to go through the entire list of hearing actions which will be issued as soon as practicable. The assumption is that the post hearing actions will be expected at the next deadline to find one which is 20th of February. However, acknowledging any resourcing constraints you will end if you feel that you are unable to meet that deadline, please raise that at the hearing itself.

00:14:19:05 - 00:14:25:27

If it is possible, we will accommodate that as we set out the deadlines in the post hearing. Actually it is

00:14:27:22 - 00:14:42:00

given responses to written questions is also expected at at line one. It's likely that the examining authority will place many of the post hearing actions in written questions. If it is felt that it is appropriate to do so and in order to avoid duplications.

00:14:44:18 - 00:14:51:02

If you have any questions about the matters that I've raised in agenda item two, please raise your hand.

00:14:55:20 - 00:15:02:05

Okay, let's come to agenda item three. I will ask the first question before handing over to Mr. Manning.

00:15:04:19 - 00:15:09:20

I'm assuming everyone has a copy of the agenda, so I'm not going to read out questions. And therefore.

00:15:14:24 - 00:15:48:24

So the first question here is in reference to scenario statement app dash 314 and the draft development consent order. The questions to the applicant, as you stated, that is the first issue specific hearing. You do feel that a lot of the information under this agenda item has been provided in the scenario statement and we will refer to this document throughout this agenda item. But the reason this matches up for discussion today is because the working of the four scenarios and how they narrowed down to the one preferred option is not clear enough to us.

00:15:49:08 - 00:16:16:19

So I would just like to go through each question in turn. And the first one is the can you highlight when the preferred scenarios would be decided? Preferred scenario would be decided. I understand that inference support. This is reliant to the CFD bidding process, but if you could tell us step by step what the applicant is intending to do and when, and at what point will it be in a position to make a decision?

00:16:19:24 - 00:16:59:16

To impossible for the applicant. If I may, I just like to set the scene before answering that direct plea. Just as it was going back to the beginning. The starting point here is to recognize that sharing and touching the existing offshore wind farms were promoted entirely separately of their own grid connections and substations and their own consenting processes. And so the default position, when the extensions opportunity came forward from the Crown estate, would have been for the same to happen again for each extension project to come forward on its own,

00:17:01:23 - 00:17:16:04

particularly because or because they have separate ownership groups. There's one common shareholder which is equitable, but they have separate ownership groups. And so that that is, as it were, the starting point.

00:17:17:22 - 00:17:57:06

And therefore, we would have been making separate applications. We would have had potentially separate cable groups and certainly separate substations, albeit doubtless nearby at Norwich and or in the vicinity, and separate DCO processes, which may or may not have run in parallel. And assuming that those consents had been granted, there would then have been a multiplicity of scenarios that could have played out as to when exactly those projects were were constructed and that that would have been well and in essence was was an arm's length relationship between those projects.

00:17:57:18 - 00:18:40:27

Yes, I'm sure that would have been a good relationship between the projects because they've got the common owner with common shareholder, with with Equinor and so on, so forth. So it was in contemplation of that scenario that Ecuador and its partners asked themselves the question back in 2019 whether they wanted to go down that route or whether particularly because there was increasing encouragement from from government in different, different respects with with the emerging grid's agenda, whether they were prepared to be brave enough to do something that no one else has done before, which was with two different ownership groups, to put the two projects into the same application.

00:18:41:09 - 00:19:35:23

Because whilst there have been a number of examples as we set out in the scenario statements of other projects or other applications, having you actually to, there is one example where I have potentially three and sips in an application. It's always been in the context of the same ownership group promoting that application and that makes a world of difference in terms of how you approach everything and how you look forward through through the entire development process. So Aquanaut and its partners made that decision back in 2019 to do, as I've said, to to respond to the integrated great agenda, also to embrace some potential commercial benefits from having an integrated approach



where, as we've said consistently throughout, set out in the scenario statement or preferred outcome is that we have

00:19:38:04 - 00:20:14:06

the two projects built at the same time with a fully integrated grid connection. Then we come to, as it were, the real world, because whilst Equinor simply isn't in a position and its partners isn't in a position to dictate the outcome. But that can only happen if it is facilitated by things that are beyond your and its partners. Control In relation to the way the energy regulation system sets up in different respects and also in relation to the traffic difference auction process.

00:20:14:19 - 00:20:51:12

And we have addressed or we've given a high level explanation of those issues and in the in the scenario statement and as you've seen also in the scenario statement as a summary of the various engagement that equinor on behalf of its partners it has been engaged in with off base and so on and so forth to seek and its participation in the offshore transmission network review process, which is quite a complicated multi standard process and to to maximise the chances of that happening.

00:20:51:29 - 00:21:28:09

But in the end it continues to be the case and this will not be resolved before consent is granted. That that that the that the other things, the CFD process and the regulatory changes that are under contemplation or that are emerging will, will not, which will mean that Ecuador still needs the different scenarios that it has provided for. And again, the point that's in the scenario statement, but it's worth emphasizing that most of those scenarios have been consented multiple.

00:21:28:11 - 00:22:02:15

Times before on the other DCO that I've mentioned where they've had to and sits in them. But it's we, we decided that it was prudent to spell out, to draw out that more expressly so that it was more transparent as to exactly what the scenarios were and what the process was so that nobody could be in any doubt that firstly those scenarios existed and secondly, that they had been assessed and that they were being provided for in a in an effective way, in the way that it was drafted procedurally.

00:22:04:14 - 00:22:06:09

But. So I think that.

00:22:11:05 - 00:22:47:11

In addition to that, there is some the one novel aspect to this is providing for the integrated scenario with two options as you have seen scenario three and scenario four. And that is again, not no other DCO to date has provided for that. That is responding to the coordinated grid agenda, the internal agenda and would and would have as as some estimates, the MP was talking about cost savings that could potentially absent some efficiencies involved in it.

00:22:47:26 - 00:23:20:09

So that as it were, is the something point that we continue to need the flexibility to potentially deliver to our less preferred outcomes while still trying to facilitate, if we can, our preferred outcome. So in terms of your question as to when the decision would be made in relation to the scenarios, firstly, we would have to obviously have a DCO and secondly the other mains point would we would have to know the outcome of the CFD process.

00:23:22:10 - 00:23:22:25

So

00:23:25:20 - 00:23:47:18

that, as it were, is the essence of the answer. Because the CFD will tell us there's a world of difference between those projects getting a CFD at the same time in the same auction and one project getting CFD, and then that will be the key determinant at that point in time. I'm taking into account wider considerations or the other considerations as well as to when that decision will be made.

00:23:49:15 - 00:24:21:21

That's helpful. And that background is actually quite well explained. The new scenario statement. But that background was very helpful. It's just the last thing that you've said that first of all, you need to have the detail. Plus if the outcome of the CFD process, just expound on that a little bit. So once you have this, then assuming consent is granted, what happens next? And when? When do you apply for the CFD process and what would be, you know, what outcome could lead you down a certain path in terms of determining which scenario you think.

00:24:25:29 - 00:24:27:04

Julian. Possible applicant.

00:24:29:04 - 00:24:40:10

I'm going to proceed carefully here. Yeah, because I don't have detailed instructions on answering that that question. And I think that I honestly think the headline from a consenting point of view,

00:24:42:14 - 00:25:13:12

from our perspective, for us, the essence here is that we we have to have the freedom to choose between those scenarios that would ultimately be quite a complicated and balanced decision that will take into account the range of factors. The CFD outcome will be the single most important thing where we are in terms of the regulatory changes, where we are, in terms of the energy market and so on. That will be a range of factors in broad terms. My understanding is that what happens because I'm a mere consenting lawyer, my job is to deliver that consent.

00:25:13:20 - 00:25:48:05

There are other types of lawyers that develop the project finance and so on, is that once you know where you stand in terms of the DCO, there are then certain preconditions that you have to fulfil before whether you are eligible to bid for a CFD, one of which is having the consent. So they would need to satisfy those various preconditions. They would fit into the auction. The auctions are now on an annual basis that used to be on a bi annual basis. So assuming that assuming that maintains, there will be a whole exercise of working out the CFD bids for those projects,

00:25:50:08 - 00:26:11:14

there is discussion about whether the rules of the CFD might be changed to allow so two projects that have separate ownership groups to bid in some sense together. That point hasn't been resolved, as I understand it. So they would have to take into account at that point in time what the rules were, so the rules might change.

00:26:13:12 - 00:26:53:20

And so having made the bids, they would then get the outcome. Doubtless behind the scenes, all sorts of other things would be taking place in anticipation of different outcomes of, of the CFD. Once they've got the CFD in, in it, once they've got the CFD result that I my work, my assumption is and we can confirm this or we can clarify this for in writing, but think we're going to see that quite a high level is that at that point that will be a taking stock of a whole range of considerations as to what the what the appropriate way forward is.

00:26:53:25 - 00:26:58:16

But the CFD, as I've said, will be the single most important thing where now

00:27:00:03 - 00:27:27:10

we now potentially sort of, well, minimum I would say a year after that. Granted the DCO at this point in time and then if there's both CFDs on at auctions, if successful then that, that is obviously potentially for the taking the, the was necessary to facilitate the preferred outcome but it won't be the only consideration at the time.

00:27:29:26 - 00:28:05:06

That's understood. I think our difficulty here is that while the IRS assesses the worst case scenario, it's not telling us what the best case scenario is. And in this particular case, the difference between the best case scenario and the worst case scenario is potentially quite big. And there is a it is in our interest in well, in the secretary of state and the receiving public's interest, that there is an understanding that the applicant is doing its absolute best to deliver to achieve an integrated system.

00:28:05:08 - 00:28:25:08

Now I know that there is a commercial benefit to you, but I think what we would like to be able to say to the receiving public as well as to Secretary of State them that the applicant is doing its absolute best to ensure that the best case scenario is delivered, which is your preferred, which is your preferred scenario and indeed

00:28:28:08 - 00:28:30:12

is your preferred case scenario. So

00:28:32:06 - 00:28:51:28

the reason this step by step process becomes important is so that we can see at what point, if there is any controls that can be put into the DCO that almost compel you to go down the preferred scenario route rather than the worst case scenario route.

00:28:56:00 - 00:28:57:15

Julian Bosworth. Yeah, and.

00:29:00:16 - 00:29:02:02

The EIA process.

00:29:07:25 - 00:29:18:03

Its heart involves, as you know, identifying likely significant defects. And the Rochdale approach has emerged over the last long, long time

00:29:19:19 - 00:29:22:17

to to assess things in the way that they have.

00:29:24:07 - 00:29:29:11

As an applicant, we are entitled to make an application within

00:29:31:28 - 00:29:33:11

the limitations of the system

00:29:35:08 - 00:29:52:16

that meets our commercial needs. And I've explained and we explain all length in the scenario statement, what the needs of this project of these two projects are in this in this single application. So

00:29:54:19 - 00:30:23:17

I don't think I'm aware of a previous consent where there has been an attempt to, to compel an applicant to make choices in the way that your you've just indicated. So I'd like to reflect on that. And

we can we can respond on that either in our response to this hearing today or to later later point to a different route through through through the system.

00:30:25:15 - 00:30:29:13

I think for now, I would say that

00:30:31:23 - 00:31:02:07

we have given great and careful consideration as I imagine the scenario statement conveys as to what what the different commercial needs are. I think what you saw outlining would almost penalise us for having, you know, or embracing the the coordination approach because as I said earlier, we've taken a brave step by putting these two projects in.

00:31:02:27 - 00:31:30:04

If there were a two if these were two separate applications, which they could very easily be, there would be simply no legal mechanism available to require those two projects to do anything other than what those two projects had separately consented for. We have provided, as I've said, as you can, as you're aware, for the integrated two different versions anyway of the integrated scenario in the consent. And I think that

00:31:32:12 - 00:32:17:04

in doing so, we've acted within the way the system is intended to operate and we're entitled to have the freedom to build out whichever option turns out because of things beyond our control later on, because of the commercial judgement that will be that we would be making at that time, whichever of those scenarios we choose to do. And we have explained, and I think you appreciate that actually there is an identity of interest between in broad terms, there is an identity of interest between Aquanaut and its partners preference to build out the integrated scenario in the single construction phase.

00:32:17:12 - 00:32:35:09

But well, it's a complicated place. We don't know for sure how things are going to play out over the next period of time in the different aspects that I've indicated, and we certainly would resist an attempt to compel us through drafting in the DCO to choose the the

00:32:37:09 - 00:32:39:21

the two to choose a particular scenario.

00:32:41:06 - 00:32:41:21

That's.

00:32:46:25 - 00:32:54:23

My colleague is saying that mine might stop interference. On that point, I can't appreciate that. So we're going to experiment with swapping the mikes.

00:32:54:25 - 00:32:57:18

Okay. Yeah, there is a little bit of interference.

00:33:07:17 - 00:34:03:18

So, Mr. Boswell, on what you just said, I just want to clarify then the attempt of this panel is definitely not to penalize youth for videos that you've made. So, you know, just just to clarify that it's it's just in order to understand what efforts you will make post consent should consent be granted to go down the preferred option. So I'm not going to dwell on this any more with the interest of time. But you said you're going to take this away. So in telling us that step by step process and what you intend to do or what you think is likely to happen, almost like a flowchart, what you think is going to happen

and at what point could you just also add to it the process of consultation and notification and related consents that might accompany it? And again, you have I do appreciate that you set out who you will consent, but it would be helpful who you will consult.

00:34:03:20 - 00:34:14:28

But in the light of the process highlighted, you know, we'd like to see just set out how that consultation will take place. So if it's with the animal, with the planning authority, how that will take place.

00:34:16:29 - 00:34:30:07

Julian, just just to jump in on why there won't be a consultation process linked to the scenarios decision. That's a decision that will be made by Knorr and its partners.

00:34:32:08 - 00:34:38:18

So I'm just going to requirement nine. Paragraph two, which says.

00:34:42:00 - 00:34:44:24

The Sheringham Shoal Extension Project, onshore project. And this is.

00:34:45:13 - 00:34:45:28

The.

00:34:46:00 - 00:34:47:10

Same for paragraph two and three.

00:34:48:26 - 00:35:02:23

Onshore works must not commence until a written scheme setting up the phase of construction of the Sheringham short extension. Onshore work has been submitted to and approved by the relevant Planning Authority, which scheme may be subsequently

00:35:04:19 - 00:35:26:24

be amended from time to time and notified to see. There is a there is a process of approvals required and likewise in the DMS. Apologies, I don't have the exact condition in front of me. There is a process of consulting with the MMO or seeking approval from the animal, so explain that to me in that context then.

00:35:28:22 - 00:35:57:03

The decision there isn't that that will be a decision on which scenario. We are pursuing. The wording you've just read out relates to phasing. Once that decision on which scenario we're going down is has been made and has been notified. Then there will be further procedures thereafter to deliver that that choice. There is consultation provided for in relation to the decision

00:35:58:26 - 00:36:01:13

as to which scenario we're going down in the first place.

00:36:03:03 - 00:36:13:08

Okay, that's understood. So if you could just set that all out for us in this flowchart, is that so crudely called it, then that would be really helpful.

00:36:15:17 - 00:36:23:25

And just to be sure, Mr. Manning, I will be wrapping up in 4 minutes and e in

00:36:25:26 - 00:36:31:29

in again in requirement nine. Then you refer to a written scheme.

00:36:33:26 - 00:36:37:04

In paragraphs two and three. What is that written scheme?

00:36:45:07 - 00:36:47:19

It's it's the phasing plan that I believe.

00:36:49:14 - 00:36:49:29

Okay.

00:36:52:02 - 00:36:59:12

Let's just put a pin on this in the interest of time, and I will revert back to this when I'm doing these. Your questions because there is a related question to this.

00:37:01:17 - 00:37:02:18

Okay. Yeah. Okay.

00:37:03:21 - 00:37:05:21

Is this better in terms of interface?

00:37:05:23 - 00:37:07:12

Yes, it is. Yeah, much better.

00:37:09:04 - 00:37:14:04

And just one final question. Under what circumstances could the preferred scenarios change?

00:37:19:06 - 00:37:52:13

Julian was of the opinion. We've discussed this. We think it's pretty unlikely that it would change, but it may be prudent to put in drafting that provides for that possibility. But we it's not in our interest to start going down one track and then change our minds. And we're certainly mindful and I think this point has come from the animatic, that we wouldn't want to waste other people's time by going down one track and changing. So I don't think we want to rule out that possibility altogether. But I would stress that it's unlikely that very unlikely that that would happen.

00:37:53:12 - 00:37:58:09

So when you said that you would put it in drafting to preclude that from happening, does that mean that. I didn't.

00:37:58:11 - 00:38:24:12

Say that. I said actually, I think the opposite. I said we will put forwards. We're contemplating putting forward some drafting to make it clear that it could happen, but in doing so, because it might as well be clear one way or the other that it could happen or not happen. But it's it is very unlikely though a lot an awful lot of thought would go into that decision. It is unlikely that it would change, having been notified, but

00:38:26:03 - 00:38:34:25

we would we think it's prudent. The question having been raised by the MMO to make it clear that it could it could by exception happen.

00:39:02:08 - 00:39:23:13

So does that mean that you could decide to do just sharing them in isolation and then later on decide that you're going to do Depp as well? And so make it. And I know that there is a scenario which allows that to happen anyway. But once you've made that decision, is that a possibility.

00:39:25:09 - 00:39:28:06

To dispose of the applicant? Well, I think.

00:39:30:08 - 00:39:37:00

We haven't discussed this point within the team or not. Not, not that I have been involved in. My working assumption is that

00:39:38:25 - 00:40:03:21

whichever one it was assuming, Seth, as you've just done, we would I would be very, very surprised if we gave a notification that said that at the point that we were progressing the set, we were, we were somehow saying, and we don't think that's going to happen. I'm my very, very strong expectation would be that we would say SAP's going ahead.

00:40:05:27 - 00:40:37:02

And it's you know, whether that happens depends on future events. And we will let you know in due course if we're if DEP is if we're proceeding with that. I think an awful lot of time would have to pass before the owners of DAP would. Give any kind of indication that they had abandoned the project. Mean there are one or two examples of projects being consented and abandoned, but there aren't very many.

00:40:39:13 - 00:41:03:23

Mr. BOSWELL Then you know, the drafting that you've just mentioned, which is to make it clear one way or another, and that's it would be helpful if you can provide to us the implications of a change in direction. Halfway through, what in your view are the implications and whether you feel that that's been adequately or, you know, every aspect of those implications as has been assessed in the is.

00:41:23:21 - 00:41:34:22

Julian, both of them. And I think it's best if we if we reply in writing, we're keen not to make a mate of this point because we think it is unlikely. But equally, it having been raised,

00:41:36:19 - 00:41:41:24

I appreciate that you need to or we all need to just make sure we thought it through.

00:41:42:12 - 00:41:44:18

That's understood and our preferred option as well.

00:41:46:12 - 00:42:21:14

Okay. Thank you. I'll be taking over now, probably early afternoon. So apologies for that. But just before I move on to the next question, I'll just ask out because we've got an awful lot to get through today. Just the approach to how I will run the next few items. I plan to ask the questions to the relevant parties that I have, and rather, after each subsection of the agenda, open it up to interested parties. I will have the opportunity at the end of each topic for interested parties to have their say.

00:42:22:01 - 00:42:35:26

I know you might be keen to chip in individual points of the discussion, but please do refrain them till the end of the topic when I will open it out. And obviously you can discuss anything that we discussed beforehand at that appropriate time.

00:42:37:22 - 00:42:49:21

Okay. Moving on to the second question of item three. The draft of a draft of consent order allows the construction of second DAP is complete independent projects.

00:42:51:18 - 00:43:09:27

So question for the applicant. Does the draft eco system allow the construction of one to be started and then the construction of the other completely independently and ultimately be started partway through the construction of the first? And if so, has that been assessed in the environmental statement?

00:43:11:17 - 00:43:36:13

Julian Bond of the applicant. The answers Yes to both questions. The DCO provides for a continuum of concurrent meaning of the word concurrent, including what in the question is referred to as some crossover through to what might call fully parallel construction and yes, as assessed the full temporal spread of works and also the maximum peaks on that basis.

00:43:37:08 - 00:43:58:18

Okay. From my understanding of the various topics of the environmental statements, in some cases, the sort of parameters and level of works for the concurrent scenario are not significantly different to the isolation scenario. That's assuming because there's efficiencies, because the instructions put in together by one workforce,

00:44:00:24 - 00:44:14:14

if there was if the asset assessed do separate workforces at the same time along the corridor, for example, one working at the bottom because it was a long way through its construction process

00:44:16:00 - 00:44:30:23

and then once maybe starting at the landfill, for example, does the actually access assess that scenario? Because the common sense, I guess, to me would suggest that there would have to be much bigger gaps in the parameters of the two.

00:44:35:24 - 00:44:47:10

My I guess I want to just rely on the general statement that I made. I think we can come back to that specific point in writing just to make sure that that's that's covered off.

00:44:48:11 - 00:44:52:22

I think it'd be useful to understand exactly what the concurrent scenario in the S actually assesses.

00:44:55:09 - 00:45:00:23

If you could, maybe I your reaction to that? Come back on that point, please.

00:45:07:09 - 00:45:45:18

Okay. We swiftly on to question three, please. Table 17 two of Chapter 17 of the environmental statement, which is IP 103 shows that excavated material would be some 542,000 cubic meters for the concurrent scenario and 686 cubic meters with sequential scenario. This appears to be driven by double counting of the amount of material excavated for all roads and for temporary construction compounds.

00:45:46:21 - 00:45:57:24

The inference here is that the haul roads and compounds would be taken up after they have served their purpose for the first projects and then relaid and redone for the purposes of the second projects.

00:45:59:25 - 00:46:08:24

If it is known that both projects are going to go ahead, obviously the sequential scenario, why would that be a need to take up the whole roads and temporary compounds?



00:46:10:14 - 00:46:16:15

I'm going to ask my colleague, Harris Harris, of Regus to respond to that.

00:46:18:05 - 00:46:51:13

The fellows say, Oh, they're here. So you're Harris for the applicant? Yes. So in this in the environmental statement, what we are setting is the worst case scenario, right? And the worst case scenario is when the gap is such that then you're finishing the first project and then you will likely reinstate everything, because at that point you have not the start of the review. Then you have a longer time for the second project. So it's there because that would be the worst case. Now, if you are still working on the first project and then you know, the second part is going ahead so the gap is shorter.

00:46:52:03 - 00:47:18:20

Then of course, it's engagement also with the local authorities is engagement. So it's actually a commercial agreement between the two that you want, are selling them to then agree on the logistics of that and the practicalities of it, because everything will depend on that gap. So you pick up, you say, three months. So clearly there's a different scenario, but if you are in a two year gap. Right. So that is really what will determine the practicality of it.

00:47:18:23 - 00:47:37:07

I think it is likely to be a scenario where at the end of the construction of the first project, it's still uncertain whether the second one will go ahead given the length of construction period that's involved. And ultimately requirement one in terms of having to commence development based in seven years.

00:47:39:16 - 00:47:40:01

So

00:47:41:22 - 00:48:00:14

yes, it is for the applicant. There is a possibility depending on the gap. So what we're saying is that if you see the maximum gap that you can have in commencement of the second the second project, you may be in a situation where you have finished your two year estimated construction time of the cable corridor for the first project. But at some.

00:48:07:23 - 00:48:11:00

Your questions before you connect to this one.

00:48:24:13 - 00:48:32:01

Okay. Thank you. And are there any interested parties who have anything on the scenario item? You may wish to say anything.

00:48:34:01 - 00:48:36:01

You outer space. Thank you, sir.

00:48:36:03 - 00:48:36:20

Just to confirm.

00:48:36:22 - 00:48:39:24

That whole discussion is against the background of a seven year period.

00:48:39:26 - 00:48:40:14

From starters.

00:48:40:25 - 00:48:43:18

From Grant of DCO as different from the five year.

00:48:43:20 - 00:48:47:07

Period in some previous applications. Is that correct?

00:48:50:05 - 00:48:56:15

So on what basis is it that your understanding that the the lapsing period in the.

00:48:56:19 - 00:48:59:15

DCO is seven years from grant consent.

00:49:00:07 - 00:49:01:01

And that all of this.

00:49:01:03 - 00:49:04:02

Uncertainty around scenarios and decision making.

00:49:04:15 - 00:49:05:24

Whether it's one capable trench.

00:49:05:26 - 00:49:08:10

Or two capable trenches, if you like, all that.

00:49:08:12 - 00:49:09:19

Uncertainty remains open.

00:49:09:21 - 00:49:12:24

For a period of seven years from Grant of DCO. Is that correct?

00:49:12:26 - 00:49:13:11

Please.

00:49:13:13 - 00:49:13:28

Thank you.

00:49:25:16 - 00:49:29:22

You have no requirement. One of the DCI, if that's. I think you.

00:49:31:12 - 00:49:39:06

Okay. And so we got several hands up. I'm not sure who was first, but I'll come and see me. Staples first place.

00:49:43:12 - 00:49:46:21

Thank you. Yes. Louis Staples for the National Farmers Union

00:49:48:21 - 00:49:51:20

from a landowner's and farmers point of view.

00:49:54:09 - 00:50:25:16

We do need to. Yeah. Try and get some more certainty as soon you know, to find out soon as possible whether the second project would go ahead or not so that we can reduce the length of time that there

is interference on the land. So our understanding at the moment is that the maximum interference will be eight years for both projects. Which we do not want at all. But that but that could be reduced.

00:50:26:20 - 00:50:46:15

So as was raised under point one. We would be really interested to see what the step by step process is and if there can be a control put on so that the best scenario is taken forward that reduces impact and length of time on landowners and farmers like.

00:50:51:13 - 00:51:01:03

Okay. Thank you very much for that. I think I'll have more Jersey parties and then offer the applicant the right to reply. So in past council, I think you've also got your hand up.

00:51:06:14 - 00:51:26:12

Hi there. Yes. I'm interested in the scenarios where the projects might go one after the other. Is there any. Are they going to predict with the first scenario? As in as Vattenfall had.

00:51:27:09 - 00:51:27:24

And.

00:51:28:27 - 00:51:29:12

Were.

00:51:29:14 - 00:51:29:29

Going to do?

00:51:33:04 - 00:51:44:16

And there is a scenario where the one project would lay the ducks for the one coming afterwards. But there was always this scenario that they would be completely independent. So that's. Yeah. So there is two options there.

00:51:48:08 - 00:51:51:04

Okay, so that. Yes. Is your query?

00:51:51:17 - 00:51:52:10

Yes. Thank you.

00:51:53:00 - 00:51:57:22

Okay. Thank you. Okay. Anything from the applicant before we swiftly move on?

00:52:04:05 - 00:52:05:26

Tulane bosses of the out and

00:52:08:13 - 00:52:12:25

response to Mr. Alder. Yes, it's correct that we're seeking a seven year commencement

00:52:14:12 - 00:52:14:27

period.

00:52:18:06 - 00:52:19:18

The in terms of.

00:52:21:22 - 00:52:43:01

Staples. I think we've already said what in headline terms in response to the first line of questioning why we need the flexibility that we need. And I don't think our position on that is going to change. And in terms of the.

00:52:46:06 - 00:53:17:03

Alton Parish Council, we're providing for the possibility of ducting. The situation is fundamentally different from the other projects. For the reasons I've already stressed, namely that we have got differently owned projects. All the examples of that thing being put in for a second project. When the first project was being constructed, relate to situations where the developer of both projects was the same. And that is not the case here.

00:53:21:03 - 00:53:21:18

Don't.

00:53:27:02 - 00:53:28:01

And I think it's very.

00:53:31:22 - 00:53:44:29

Okay. I think we've got some hands up still and watch what they'd like to see. Hands or whether you staples or pressurize or have anything more to say. Just this one. Go out. Mr. Staples, would you ask him? And again, thank you.

00:53:45:21 - 00:53:49:22

Thank you. Yes. I would just like to pick up the point about the ducting that we have raised also

00:53:51:18 - 00:54:07:11

with that. Know about ducting and have said that we would prefer to say ducting did happen with the first project for the second project again, then that enabling to reduce the interference and the impact on landowners and farmers going forward.

00:54:08:27 - 00:54:27:06

We. We have had the response that they may not be able to do that because of the two different ownerships. But I'm afraid we're slightly then not able to understand. Aquanaut being a pathfinder, what what benefit it brings in regards to.

00:54:29:14 - 00:54:47:15

Faith project. I know now admitted only one DCA, but what are the benefits out on site? Because at the minute we can't see any because. Because of this statement they're saying about the two ownerships. And so then actually afterwards, everything probably might have to stay completely separate.

00:54:49:03 - 00:54:49:18

Thank you.

00:54:53:00 - 00:54:57:15

Okay. Thank you for that. Anything else for.

00:54:59:15 - 00:55:34:10

And Julian Bond. And I think the whole Pathfinder process hasn't taken place before, and it's an emerging process. And therefore technologies and its partners are trying to steer it to the extent they have influence in a direction that increases the chances of the integrated option and the two wind farms being out in one go taking place.

00:55:35:27 - 00:55:51:13

As I said in my opening remarks, we these these things are dependent on decisions by others. Things are emerging. It's a dynamic situation. So if this was an established process, things might be different.

00:55:56:22 - 00:55:58:08

So, Mr. Wallace, do you have a question?

00:55:59:01 - 00:56:06:15

Yes, indeed. Just in terms of this seven year construction period that's allowed in requirement one.

00:56:08:04 - 00:56:42:08

But that basically mean in a sequential scenario. Obviously, it's said that the maximum construction period would be eight years, one taking place immediately after the other. But is there a case here with it? There could be a gap of up to three years in the sense that the first project takes place in year zero to give full stock. Then there's a three year gap up until that seventh year and then the second project takes place. Is that a possibility of the way that it's drafted there and is that your intention?

00:56:49:18 - 00:56:56:15

Julian Boston for the applicant, it's my understanding that he has assesses a gap of up to four years. What actually happens

00:56:58:13 - 00:57:08:05

is dependent on a range of a range of events. I mean, the other point to bear in mind is that it's a general principle of planning rule. All you have to do is stop.

00:57:09:21 - 00:57:40:18

And if you look at the case on what it takes to start a scheme, it's not very much. And once you've started the scheme, you commence development. In practice, you can then take as long as you like to finish it. So whilst in practice, if you start something, you tend to follow through. One justice does have to bear in mind that it's a general principle of the planning system that exists. In addition to the focus, the natural focus there is on the commencement date.

00:57:42:02 - 00:58:13:01

So if I can just follow up on that then. In which case, would any act of commencement under this order Them on the order authorizes both wind farm extensions. Would any act on either count as commencement for the other project as well? Julian Bosworth No, that point is separated out, which has been common practice. On the other DCO, I've had two schemes, so you have to take a positive step to commence both schemes.

00:58:14:05 - 00:58:16:23

Commencing one doesn't commence. The other one.

00:58:21:12 - 00:58:24:06

Okay. Thank you very much. We'll move on to.

00:58:25:22 - 00:58:31:26

You've got your hand up again. Would you like to very quickly come in before we move on? Thank you.

00:58:31:29 - 00:59:01:00

Sorry. Thank you. Louis Stokes with the National Farmers Union. I just want to confirm so that I haven't misunderstood and what I've read in the environmental statement. So my understanding was

that project one could start in year one could take. For years. And what it states in the environmental statements I've understood is that then you could with the second project, could start then in year five.

00:59:03:18 - 00:59:28:24

Because it won't it won't start any later than that. And then that project, which could take four years. So the environmental statement is saying that the maximum time of construction for both projects would be eight years from the first project starting in year one. So, yes, I'd like that to be confirmed if that's possible, that I've understood that correctly.

00:59:29:27 - 00:59:45:25

But yeah, in in responding to Mr. Apple's question, basically I think the confusion here is that if there is an available gap for years, isn't it possible that the maximum construction compared to both the projects sequentially could be as much as 11 years rather than eight?

00:59:47:16 - 00:59:58:29

But what's assessed in the year is eight. But what the DCO, the draft DCO potentially allows is for a maximum construction period of 11 years.

01:00:00:15 - 01:00:04:27

With a gap of four between the two or 12. That makes 12, I think. But yeah.

01:00:10:24 - 01:00:11:09

Yeah.

01:00:13:13 - 01:00:17:03

Yeah. I'm going to ask Miss Rodriguez to respond to this.

01:00:21:07 - 01:00:27:24

So. I mean, the political ads. Sorry. Let me just find them.

01:00:29:20 - 01:01:11:23

Document. So in the present description chapter, that is the AP zero 19. There we have a couple of diagrams trying to explain the point. I guess the key aspect here is that we are talking about a gap in commencement of one project and the commencement of the project. So it's not when you finish one project. So if you look at the time that is estimated for, for example, the cable corridor, the total estimated time is two year construction. And then what we're saying is that once you start a first project, you may have a gap of four years and the commencement of the second project that will make it, that actually the gap between finishing the first project and starting the second one will be two years.

01:01:12:17 - 01:01:13:02

Right.

01:01:13:15 - 01:01:33:17

So that clarifies it to me. It's just noting that requirement one in the draft issue is not as clear as that, even if there is might be that the drafting in the draft ECO is different I think is not tight enough.

01:01:35:16 - 01:01:37:06

So it's just worth trying to find that.

01:01:42:09 - 01:01:42:24

I'm

01:01:44:22 - 01:02:19:21

like, okay, I think we're ready to move on to item agenda number four, please, in terms of construction effects, onshore will deal with points one and two on the agenda together, please. And set of context the outline code of construction practice, which is app308. Seeing a table one and one sets out a number of environmental management plans that will form part of the final code of construction practice and will be prepared, submitted and approved consents.

01:02:21:15 - 01:03:01:04

Now, within the code of construction practice, there's reference to a pre construction drainage plan, a scheme to deal with the contamination of any land, including groundwater and materials management plan, a soil management plan, Site Waste Management Plan, High Growth Fractions Survey in relation to bentonite breakouts and the construction surface water drainage plan, saying they're all referred to in the main body of the code outline of construction practice but ultimately aren't included in table one one.

01:03:01:29 - 01:03:06:28

I just wondered why, if you could expand why those aren't included in that table, please.

01:03:12:16 - 01:03:13:28

Julian Bond for the applicant.

01:03:15:15 - 01:03:26:18

The we've listed the plans that are going to be developed. Is your point about what those plans are or whether they're sufficiently developed at this point?

01:03:28:29 - 01:03:46:24

They will come on to what should be developed. But I just wondered why. Table 1.1 seems to be quite a comprehensive list of environmental plans to be prepared. And although there was some reference to the other plans within the main text, they didn't seem to be sort of part of that table schedule.

01:04:11:05 - 01:04:30:13

Two members of the applicant will confirm it in writing or clarify. But we think the explanation is that that the plans that you've referenced that owns in that table are secured through another route and therefore the ones that are in there, because if they weren't in there, they wouldn't otherwise have a route to being secured. But we can confirm that in writing.

01:04:32:10 - 01:04:46:21

That would be useful. As I said, we think that the site waste management plan I haven't seen anywhere else where it would be secure, so that would suggest that it should be in table one one if the applicant could maybe review all of those and and reply in writing, that would be useful.

01:04:47:07 - 01:04:47:22

Okay.

01:04:48:12 - 01:04:48:27

We won't.

01:04:57:08 - 01:04:58:20

Okay. In terms of the

01:05:00:09 - 01:05:20:09

the contents of those management plans, I mean, ultimately the outline code of construction practice includes sort of skeletal details of the numerous different management plans. Is it the applicant's intention to provide sort of full drafts of those as part of the examination? And if so, when would we expect to see those things?

01:05:21:01 - 01:05:35:17

Due to most of the applicant, it's not our intention to do that. We're following practice from other discos where we've tried to strike a balance between what's provided at this stage and what is more sensibly done post consent

01:05:37:10 - 01:05:51:04

in the light of detailed design and where relevant appointment of contractors. Anything more that we did now would still be generic and we think that we should follow the approach that's been followed before.

01:05:52:21 - 01:05:53:06

I'm

01:05:54:29 - 01:06:08:18

just talking about approaches that have been taken before. Very often you do find Sorry, I am falling into that trap, isn't it? This is an examination of a scheme and what we have in front of that is what we are examining. So

01:06:10:04 - 01:06:32:06

but the outline code of construction practices, the the management plans, it I, I think it is proper practice to provide details of what at least they would contain, even if not the. Because ultimately the detailed code of construction practice and all the management plans that fit within that and Rella

01:06:34:11 - 01:07:00:10

a you know sets the direction of travel for the finalized code of construction practice and the management plan sits in sit within it. So it would be it is practice to provide at least an indication of the contents that it contains and what kind of. Analysis and surveys that content is based on that is regularly seen in. Development consent order examinations.

01:07:04:26 - 01:07:06:07

Julian possible for the applicant.

01:07:09:21 - 01:07:34:23

I hear what you're saying. We can come back as to our thinking further on this, but this is obviously a point that comes up regularly and we've sort of reached a judgment call on that. And so we can we can come back on it, but it is something that has been considered. So I'm not I'm not promising that we are going to change our position, but we will we will respond.

01:07:46:23 - 01:08:01:15

Okay. At this point, I just like to ask any of the local authorities whether there's any potential management plans that you have any strong views on, whether, you know, full drafts of those should be considered as part of the examination.

01:08:04:11 - 01:08:07:03

Says anyone with any thoughts.

01:08:10:00 - 01:08:11:00

Illustrates Mr. Grima.



01:08:16:00 - 01:08:46:16

At this time. So I am lecturing for Portland Scientific Council. From the information that's been provided so far, there is a potential of significant impact due to noise and vibration from the actual construction process, with in particular reference to the horizontal drilling techniques. No information has been provided of that, although there is some indication in the report that there will be a high impact on residents from the horizontal drilling techniques.

01:08:48:17 - 01:08:50:11

So that would be required.

01:08:51:02 - 01:09:02:00

Yeah. Okay. We will come on to such masses under noise vibration a bit later today. So I'll have that one until then. But thank you. Mr. Staples, would you like to come in and.

01:09:02:27 - 01:09:06:25

Thank Hillary Staples for the National Farmers Union and Land Interest Group?

01:09:08:18 - 01:09:20:03

Yes, just to raise that. Normally, we we would have seen like an outline environmental management plan, say, for treatment of soils where we would expect to see more detail.

01:09:21:25 - 01:09:53:22

But because as it stands at the moment, the outline code of construction doesn't include enough detail. But we would like to say, well, what we've agreed in previous decisions in regard to how soils will be treated, also field drainage. There's nothing on water supplies. So there's quite a few sections where the detail is is lacking at the moment within the outline code of construction. Yes, and we haven't been given any other outline management plans to look through either.

01:09:54:23 - 01:09:55:09

Thank you.

01:09:58:22 - 01:10:08:14

Okay. Thank you. Does she say anything else other than that, though? The reviewing? I should not put the previous answer to my question. Would you like anything further?

01:10:10:18 - 01:10:12:11

No, it will stick with that. Thank you, sir.

01:10:14:24 - 01:10:15:22

Okay. Thank you.

01:10:19:16 - 01:10:53:19

Okay. 70.3 then, please. And chapter four of the environmental statement, which is ap090 at paragraph 251, identifies the ground investigation campaign involving all homes was undertaken in 2021 at the landfill, providing a high degree of confidence in the feasibility of at this location. Is the applicant able to provide any further details on the finding of that ground investigation place?

01:10:58:26 - 01:11:31:12

It is for the applicant. I guess also I want to make reference to the document cable landfill concept, a study that is the hundred 76. And actually, one of the points here that we that we state is the fact that we know the site as that was a landfill for the regional village and international. So one of the reasons

for selecting Weyburn was precisely that knowledge and that that we know that it works and we have done it before. So we have information from the regional HDD somewhere down there.

01:11:31:27 - 01:12:08:08

So that's sort of like this, let's say minimizing that uncertainty if it cost them the details of the campaign we have done now in general information, I can tell you that the data that we obtained was from the British Analytical Service Geoscience Data Index. The applicant undertook and both onshore and offshore seismic and seismic data seismic surveys, which a physical survey and that was for the regional sharing project. We had to bore holes done originally, also for dudgeon and sharing a shell, and that we have the borehole done now for extensions.

01:12:10:02 - 01:12:12:09

Yeah, I guess that's a complete database.

01:12:14:11 - 01:12:19:24

Okay. Thank you. Is this through any uncertainty about the use of the landfill?

01:12:22:27 - 01:12:25:12

No, he just put have because we don't feel that there is a risk.

01:12:28:07 - 01:12:29:01

Okay. Thank you.

01:12:30:18 - 01:12:56:04

Figure 17 .1.5, which refers to potential sources of a contamination of the land quality test study and preliminary risk assessment report, which is AP 206, shows a form of sewage works on the line of the cable corridor at landfill. I just wondered if anything could be done to assess the potential effects of that place.

01:13:12:18 - 01:13:45:14

So your hearing for the applicant? We have aerial historical mapping of the sites. So that's from 1999 that confirms that transition joint bay that we have now will not be at the same location of the switch. So in that historical maps, you can see the location of the Jewish and we are not our our construction is not on the same site. Obviously, if then when starting construction, we work to see any contaminants, then we will we will handle those. We will do with any other instance where you may find contaminants in soil.

01:13:55:03 - 01:14:00:24

Thank you. Has that risk been assessed, though, in the environmental statement that potentially would be issues?

01:14:13:21 - 01:14:17:01

Your hearing is for the applicant. I will come back to you to confirm the point.

01:14:23:07 - 01:14:30:14

Thank you. Did the Environment Agency have any views in relation to the that point place?

01:14:34:06 - 01:14:36:15

Bob Ross Taylor for the Environment Agency.

01:14:37:00 - 01:14:39:21

It wasn't a matter that.

01:14:39:23 - 01:14:41:23

Was raised by any of.

01:14:41:25 - 01:14:42:27

Our contaminated lands.

01:14:43:13 - 01:14:44:04

Specialists.

01:14:54:26 - 01:15:02:03

Okay. Thank you very much for that. Okay. Obviously, I'll notice here in action for for the applicant to come back to us on that one. Thank you.

01:15:04:02 - 01:15:40:16

Okay. Well, come on. 2.4, please. Which is justification for the cable corridor width for trenched and trenches crossings will deal with trench crossings. First place the project description in the environmental statements. Again, app090. Notice that the working easement is expected to be narrower approximately 27 meters for single project, 38 meters for the two projects constructed concurrently and approximately 45 meters for key projects sequentially.

01:15:40:24 - 01:15:46:22

And then the width and the sorry the width and all the limits sets out is 60 meters.

01:15:48:09 - 01:16:00:07

It sets out that this is to allow room for microsities criticizing, drawing detailed design and for onward connection to the existing surface water drainage network for the proposed construction drainage

01:16:02:13 - 01:16:14:03

fees for the applicant. Sort of explain a bit further to us in terms of microsities and why this might be required, particularly as the vast majority of the cable corridor is through agricultural land.

01:16:18:10 - 01:16:20:02

So, you know, through Vegas would have to count.

01:16:22:13 - 01:16:57:22

They are different. I mean, the first the first approach we have had for the selection of the cable corridor or the you know, the boundary for that issue has been to avoid features. Right. So but clearly then when you're on site, you may have a tree, you may have a side of the hedgerows that is actually of lesser quality if another side of the hedgerow. So this sort of lights, more variations, there's a local variations may meet that microsite and also you may have a low and the topography that may be more acceptable for for flooding.

01:16:57:24 - 01:17:02:23

So you would like to avoid that. So is this sort of local, local features that you will look to microsite?

01:17:09:20 - 01:17:33:06

Okay. Thank you. The diagrams in that plate. 417 to plate 419 in the project description of the yes app 090 show the provision is made for pre-construction drainage. So ultimately is drainage already therefore taken care of in terms of the the width of the cable corridor.

01:17:38:06 - 01:17:45:20

You hate us for that. And then the drainage related to the water is also accounted for and the work away.

01:17:45:22 - 01:17:52:21

So it's really simply for micro siting there, not in terms of any drainage needs. That's the extra width is needed.

01:17:54:08 - 01:17:56:18

Is microsecond and.

01:18:05:11 - 01:18:25:27

Okay. It's also set out in the project description paragraph 283 that to minimize the impacts of crossing sensitive features such as hedgerows and watercourses. The working width will be reduced to the whole road and cable trenching areas only, which is about approximately 20 metres.

01:18:27:18 - 01:18:31:16

Is that reflected in the order limits at the moment?

01:18:36:21 - 01:18:45:19

So he just put an applicant within the order limits. We have under we have the 66 metre width. But when you look at our outline,

01:18:47:05 - 01:18:59:05

the online ecology management plan and the outlined landscape management plans, then we have the commitments of the reduction of the working with for the crossing of hedgerows, for example, sensitive issues.

01:18:59:18 - 01:19:07:02

Okay. Does applicant know where exactly? Along the cable corridor there will be a need for a smaller 20 metre corridor.

01:19:12:16 - 01:19:31:09

Do this for have to. Certainly we have identified hedgerows. We have notified the crossing that we have for crossing a schedule that I can give you a reference. But quickly. So we're crossing schedule. Is it hundred 78? And then we have all the crossings that we have identified on the assessment features.

01:19:43:17 - 01:19:44:25

Okay. Thank you for that.

01:19:48:11 - 01:20:14:21

Just a more general question. If it's possible to reduce the cable corridor to 20 meters in sensitive locations, which is not considered slightly wider across the whole corridor in terms of allowing for topsoil when subsoil storage areas having to go along the cable corridor rather than a continuous surveillance in width of the cable corridor.

01:21:17:01 - 01:21:31:24

James, I have to say believe and here probably better is to come in details in writing so that we can have specified the order, how the how the space is is used specifically for that part of the topsoil and and subsoil, how that will be managed.

01:21:58:25 - 01:22:36:00

Okay. Thank you. If it's if I think you referred to this, thought that you would get back to us, was that is that correct? In terms of another hearing action, please. Thank you. Okay. Moving on to trenches crossings, please. The order limits include a 100 metre corridor where trenches is the the to be used to

compete provides more justification on the need for the 100 meter width. And what is it about that technique which requires more space than the sort of 60 meter width which is in the position limits for the crossing space?

01:22:37:19 - 01:22:38:28

So your heat is what have become,

01:22:41:00 - 01:23:13:23

As we have said, each stretch, this crossing will need to have a detailed design. So what we are allowing for in our boundary is for them what we call flat formation. So that means that you have, if you're thinking of the two predict scenarios, so you have the two circuits, each of them with three cables. So in flat formation you have separators. And depending on the depth, depending on the ground conditions and the length of the of the drill, essentially you need to make sure that these cables are thermally independent.

01:23:14:07 - 01:23:32:19

So then you account for ten meters in between them. So if you think that you have this sort of two projects plus consider that we need to have contingency in case of a failure of one of the of one of those wheels that we're accounting for one contingency on each of them. So then that's how it becomes something.

01:23:37:15 - 01:23:52:09

It's not set out anywhere in the U.S. because it was unclear whether it was in terms of sort of the construction practice or the requirement for equipment or anything like that. Is that possible to provide maybe grammatically?

01:24:16:10 - 01:24:21:05

So just to clarify, so you're saying to helping us get this showing more information would look like it's.

01:24:21:10 - 01:24:33:17

Similar to the plate diagrams that I referred to earlier, which are for the trenched crossings, whether something similar could be provided for the HDD and that would be much appreciated to help our understanding.

01:24:33:28 - 01:24:34:24

So thank you.

01:24:43:17 - 01:24:57:21

Okay, That's the end of my questions on construction effects. So I'll open up to any interested parties who would like to jump in. I can see my mother. You have your hand up for auction. Pass, Counsel, if you'd like to come in, please.

01:24:59:24 - 01:25:22:21

Hello. Susan Mather, Olton Parish Council. I have a particular interest in the horizontal directional drilling, specifically in Alton, where the solar farm is proposed. I understand that that's going to be 600 meters in length. Can I have some explanation as to how that.

01:25:22:23 - 01:25:25:05

Will be done in.

01:25:25:07 - 01:25:42:01

That particular part? And also confirmation on the decks? Because the solar farm, relevant representations seem to suggest that they require 10 to 20 meters. And I'm not sure whether that was just an.

01:25:42:03 - 01:25:45:15

Error in where they put the point. Thank you.

01:25:48:16 - 01:25:49:13

Okay. Thank you.

01:25:51:04 - 01:25:54:27

I'm happy to answer that question. Okay. Parish council.

01:26:06:03 - 01:26:43:03

So he is an applicant. The solar farm has been in the process of permitting themselves, so they currently they have been changing also their plans and they have a much shorter set of process for permitting. So the way that we have designed the cable route there has been to account for the possibility of the different scenarios that they may have in their constructions. So currently the longest that we would could be is the 550, as I have understood. And then of course, it will have to be depending on where and how they finally made their construction is how we will adapt the drill.

01:26:43:05 - 01:26:46:04

That could be two drills instead of one one.

01:26:50:14 - 01:26:55:00

And would that be through the detailed design consent, that decision?

01:27:05:12 - 01:27:05:28

You can just up.

01:27:08:04 - 01:27:08:19

Thank you.

01:27:10:04 - 01:27:16:09

Okay. Is there anyone else in relation to anything else on construction effects that we've discussed so far?

01:27:19:15 - 01:27:21:15

Okay. So the applicant. Yes, please.

01:27:22:00 - 01:27:33:23

Julian Boswell, For the applicant, we we'd like to come back in writing on the question of the death that was asked by Alton Parish Council. So we'll we'll address that in writing.

01:27:39:21 - 01:27:41:26

I think he will know that is another hearing action.

01:28:09:06 - 01:28:39:20

Okay. Thank you very much. Just before we go to our break, I will just say ultimately, I did ask the question of local authorities in terms of the detail of any of the environmental management plans in the code of construction practice. And no, none did come forward and have any views at this time. I would just ultimately ask the local authorities to consider that a bit further in order to help help us come to a view on that matter. So I'm sure they're listening virtually. Thank you.

01:28:41:19 - 01:29:12:25

Okay. In that case, we will. The time is 1128 and we will take a short break at this point and resume at 1145. Face for the attendees online. If you do decide to leave the meeting during the break, please rejoin using the same invitation provided. And if you're watching the livestream, then refresh your browser to resume each subsequent session, please. Okay, we're adjourned until 1145.

01:29:12:27 - 01:29:13:09

Thank you.