

### ISH 3\_22 March PT4

Created on: 2023-03-22 17:24:09

Project Length: 00:42:20

File Name: ISH 3\_22 March PT4

File Length: 00:42:20

#### FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:28 - 00:00:39:12

Okay. Welcome back, everyone. It's 345, so we'll resume the hearing, please. Is everyone logged back in that we know of from. From the case team? Yeah. Fantastic. Thank you. Okay, we'll jump straight on to agenda item number seven, which is in relation to water quality and resources. Um, and the first question is in relation to the change request in relation to the onshore substation.

00:00:40:05 - 00:01:01:06

And there is another similar question on that in relation to item Agenda number three and this subject. So we'll deal with those together. So first off, for the benefit of everyone, please can the applicant just provide a brief overview of the change request submitted in relation to the drainage at the onshore substation? Please.

00:01:03:15 - 00:01:05:12

Julian Boswell for the applicant.

00:01:07:10 - 00:01:51:23

The the change relates to the fact that in the original application or the application, two alternative solutions were proposed to the surface water drainage at the substation, one related to infiltration at that location and the other related to taking the water to an Anglian water facility. And at the point of submission it was felt by Equinor that we couldn't be sufficiently certain of the infiltration position pending the outcome of of ongoing monitoring.

00:01:52:00 - 00:02:25:01

And so we included both that and the Anglian solution as a fallback. And then subsequent to the application going in, sufficient monitoring information has become available for us to be confident that the infiltration solution will work. And whilst I think we may be coming on to more detail on this that is broadly agreed by the lead local flood authority, subject to some final points of ongoing discussion.

00:02:25:11 - 00:03:03:13

And so we reached a point where we were sufficiently confident that rather than leaving the decision until later and potentially post consent, that we were in a position to make a decision now to drop the second option, the Anglian water option. And so the change request that we have made is simply to drop that option and to remove that from the application. That then means that we're committed to the infiltration solution and the detail of that solution was included within the application.

00:03:03:15 - 00:03:21:04

There are a few refinements that are emerging from the that that will lead to refinements in the documentation that we can that we can talk about, I suspect, on other questions. But in summary that that is the change and the reason for it.

00:03:22:29 - 00:03:54:06

Okay. Thank you very much for that overview. Um, the representative from Norfolk County Council as the lead local flood risk authority, I believe you might have some time constraints, so I wonder if it may be we come to you first and maybe if could get your your thoughts on the drainage situation on the substation now and then can come to the more detailed questions to the applicant afterwards. Does that suit you? Okay.

00:03:54:18 - 00:03:55:03

That suits.

00:03:55:05 - 00:04:08:21

Me fine. I have reorganized. Sorry. Sarah Langford, lead local flood authority. Perfect. Thank you. Um. Yes, that suits me well. I have managed to gain some additional time so we can talk for a bit longer.

00:04:08:29 - 00:04:10:01

Okay. Thank you.

00:04:10:04 - 00:04:41:15

So, um, we have been in discussion with the applicant. They have undergone additional survey to identify that infiltration is now possible in the location. It took a significant additional resource and time and effort, which is why it has taken longer to identify it. And it is supported by the alpha to go for the infiltration approach rather than the discharge to a sewer in our neighboring village over the hill and far away.

00:04:43:06 - 00:04:56:13

Okay. Thank you. And in terms of the concerns that were previously expressed by the by the county Council, have those now been resolved to to a large degree or there's still any concerns remaining?

00:04:56:28 - 00:05:14:17

So a significant majority of our concerns have been resolved by going for the infiltration approach. Um, we're now in the process of just ironing out some of the design parameters and that's an ongoing discussion at the moment amongst the two technical sides.

00:05:18:03 - 00:05:22:08

Okay. Thank you very much for for that update. That's appreciated.

00:05:25:12 - 00:05:28:22

Okay. We'll tend to the. Sorry. Did you wish to jump in, Mr. Boswell?

00:05:28:24 - 00:05:30:07

Julian Boswell. The applicant realized.

00:05:30:09 - 00:05:35:27

That we should have introduced two new colleagues. To my left. Was it appropriate?

00:05:36:01 - 00:05:40:07

Absolutely, yes. Now I'm just coming to the detailed questions, so that's useful. Thank you.

00:05:42:07 - 00:05:48:25

Afternoon. Sherry Atkins. I'm the onshore consents manager for Equinor. Thank you.

00:05:51:00 - 00:05:55:12

Afternoon. Helena Wicks the flood risk technical lead for the applicant.

00:05:55:20 - 00:05:56:18  
Lovely. Thank you.

00:05:59:09 - 00:06:31:12  
Okay. Come on. Just say the slightly more detailed questions. The applicant's response to ricin Question 1.24 .1.6. And the onshore substation drainage study which was rep 2-0 27, referred to the fact that the investigation boreholes will need to continue to be monitored to ensure at least a 12 month period. On that basis, is there still potentially some uncertainty about infiltration if a longer monitoring period is required?

00:06:39:27 - 00:07:13:12  
Helena works on behalf of the applicant, and it's just good practice to monitor for at least a 12 month period. It means you go through a full cycle of groundwater recharge so that when it went in, it was obviously through the summer months and the sort of autumn when we'd expect groundwater to be low. But we wanted to run it through obviously through the winter to show groundwater recharge, to get the full scope of results. So it's just best practice to make sure we've got sufficient data to give us that clarification. The results through the winter still support the infiltration approach.

00:07:13:19 - 00:07:19:09  
The boreholes are still dry and therefore we still believe infiltration is possible.

00:07:19:18 - 00:07:25:09  
Okay. Well, we're at the end of the 12 month period be within the examination or is it likely to fall outside?

00:07:28:27 - 00:07:38:24  
Sherri Atkins. For the applicant, it will. The 12 month period will lapse in June, June, just before the examination closes. Okay.

00:07:38:26 - 00:07:42:19  
So we should know definitely at that point before the examination closes.

00:07:42:25 - 00:07:52:07  
Yeah, but as as Helena has said that the the data to date shows that boreholes are dry. So we're not expecting. Sure. Okay.

00:07:52:09 - 00:07:53:06  
No worries. Thank you.

00:07:57:09 - 00:08:23:07  
Okay. The onshore substation drainage Study revision B again rep two zero 27 Paragraph 152 refers to the need to undertake a preliminary hydraulic assessment. Can I, can I just I just wanted to check whether this was an assessment. In addition to the hydraulic modeling report that was submitted at deadline to.

00:08:42:26 - 00:08:52:23  
Julian Boswell for the applicant. Can we check that point and come back to it a little bit later when we've got the answer?

00:08:52:26 - 00:08:55:01  
Yeah, absolutely. That's fine. No worries.

00:08:58:24 - 00:09:49:16

Okay. The onshore substation hydraulic modelling reports, which is rep 2-055, shows that option two, which is the proposed solution in this case, overlaps with the baseline surface water flood extent in the 1 in 100 year plus 40% for climate change and 45% additions for climate change events. The question which comes to mind is given on the figures, particularly 911, 917 and 920 of the onshore hydraulic modelling report show a small interaction sort of at the top north east corner between the base of the proposed base of the substation and the surface water extent.

00:09:49:21 - 00:10:02:18

Why that area can't be avoided altogether either by reducing the size of the the the base or by slightly repositioning the base a few meters maybe to the south.

00:10:10:15 - 00:10:44:18

Helena works on behalf of the applicant. At the present time, it shows the two options for the substation orientations that might be in there. It is taking deliberately taking a conservative approach to ensure that any interaction with the flood risk has been addressed or considered. Obviously, during the detailed design there may be options to alter that slightly, but at the present time it's taken the Conservative approach to make sure that we've considered the worst case flood risk that we can in that location.

00:10:47:23 - 00:10:59:20

Julian Boswell for the applicant. Just to emphasise an enormous amount of iterations and time and effort has gone in to get to where we are. If we could have straightforwardly achieved that result, we would have done.

00:11:08:22 - 00:11:18:03

Okay. Is the Alpha of Norfolk County Council content with the interaction in that regard?

00:11:21:00 - 00:11:24:18

Yes, we are. Sorry, Sarah. Yes, we are, sir.

00:11:25:04 - 00:11:26:22

Okay. Thank you for that.

00:11:32:01 - 00:12:06:20

Okay, well, come on to agenda item number two then, in relation to the sequential test in why an area of flood risk to the west of Little Burningham could not be avoided having regard to figure 18 .2.7 of the flood risk assessment. There is an area of flood risk to the west of Little Burningham that the onshore cable corridor will pass through. The question really is why was it not possible to avoid this area? For example, bringing the cable corridor along the eastern side of little Burningham.

00:12:18:11 - 00:12:36:05

Helena works on behalf of the applicant. Think there's two two elements to that are maybe from a flood risk point of view in the sense of with a project of that that nature, there's going to be multiple crossings over watercourses that the cable has to pass through. I think we've

00:12:38:02 - 00:12:44:23

picked out most of those. Is that in the location around Roads Road presumably that we're we're talking about?

00:12:44:28 - 00:12:47:15

It's is that area of flood risk that.

00:12:47:20 - 00:13:19:24

I wanted to just just recap that we sort of addressed that in the flood risk at technical note and rep 254 that there's some uncertainty regarding the flood extent in that location. Anyway, it's relatively coarse modelling. The Environment Agency did mention this morning in the earlier earlier session that they were content with the outcome of that. Um, it is. It is. It is. There is a considerable uncertainty whether there's actually a flood extent in that location.

00:13:20:07 - 00:13:45:12

It the modelling is rather, rather coarse. It's called flow modelling. It's a sort of national scale and therefore there may not be the extent of flood risk we expect in that location. Um, and therefore through the code of construction practice, we've got mitigation measures in place to address that, if that makes sense. With regard to whether you could go to the east of Little Birmingham, I personally can't comment on that one myself.

00:13:45:14 - 00:13:58:15

Yeah. My question is more of a sort of a high level. When the initial site selection process was being undertaken, why that particular area couldn't be avoided, given on the other side of the village, there's there's no flood risk at all.

00:14:00:02 - 00:14:05:19

And whether there are any other constraints, which ultimately meant that the corridor couldn't go to the east.

00:14:27:29 - 00:14:55:02

Sherri Atkins for the applicant during the site selection stage are a number of factors that we considered when selecting the route for the cable. Flood risk was one of them. There were many other environmental constraints, and the the approach that we took at the time is that the current route, as proposed of the cable corridor, is the the best option for that that location.

00:14:56:17 - 00:15:10:07

Okay. Can you give any more specific detail about what it was about that particular location? Why say the cable corridor couldn't come to the east with the other constraints that you can help us with?

00:15:15:23 - 00:15:19:23

It is not something that I have to hand. So it's something that I'll have to come back to you with.

00:15:20:01 - 00:15:21:04

Okay. Thank you.

00:15:28:23 - 00:15:33:26

Okay, we'll come in 2.4, which is the disaggregation.

00:15:34:03 - 00:15:35:06

Julian Boswell. Yes.

00:15:35:08 - 00:15:42:15

Would it be possible to hear from the lead local flood authority on this point? The point you've just covered, whether they're content with our approach.

00:15:43:24 - 00:15:49:20

Little Birmingham. Yeah. Yes, of course. Ms.. Luff, would you like to jump in?

00:15:50:18 - 00:15:51:04

Hello, Sarah.

00:15:53:00 - 00:16:12:13

Um, broadly, yes, we are content. We are aware that any detail information that we might need or have come forward at the detailed design stage and also when we come to do the ordinary water course, consenting to ensure that the temporary works do not increase flood risk while they're operating.

00:16:13:01 - 00:16:25:12

Okay. In terms of the more slight selection question in terms of why the area of flood risk couldn't be avoided west of little Burningham, is that anything that you'd like to add to that particular.

00:16:26:09 - 00:16:28:17

Not really, no. Sorry.

00:16:29:03 - 00:16:35:09

Okay. No, thank you very much. Okay. Thank you. Mr. Aldous, you've got your hand.

00:16:36:13 - 00:17:11:06

Thank you, sir. If I can just take you back to the onshore substation just for a moment before we move on. Yes. The local folklore is that much of this area has a substratum of gravel at certain depth. And this is why the so-called Mangan quarry was, in fact, a gravel extraction pit. Gravel extraction ceased quite a long time ago because of the poor quality of the gravel. But there is a feeling locally that groundwater communicates through that gravel substratum. The question is what assumptions have been made concerning the Hornsea three onshore substation, which is a much larger development, uphill, so to speak.

00:17:11:08 - 00:18:01:06

Is that also infiltration or is that discharging into a sewer network? And the two situations are firstly the ordinary operation of the substation and secondly, the incorporation of industrial scale battery storage on the same site, which introduces the risk of thermal runaway. Our understanding at the moment is that in the event of thermal runaway, the remedial action involves a discharge of a very large quantity of water. And the question is, does that then discharge into the gravel substratum or is that taken away by sewers? And how is that incorporated into the decision here, which way to go, whether to go with infiltration or whether to go with discharging to a sewer system? The implication being that if you go into the sewer system, there are some kind of subsequent water treatment, which would be a factor that would relate to the thermal runaway situation.

00:18:01:17 - 00:18:24:27

If you go for infiltration, then whatever is discharged from Hornsea three in the event of thermal runaway is then in that gravel substratum and may interact with the infiltration proposal here. So from the point of view of the applicant and the flood authority, what assumptions have been made about what is going to be built on the Hornsea three substation site and how that will be drained? Thank you.

00:18:26:18 - 00:18:46:19

Okay. Thank you. In terms of the proposed solution, that is an infiltration solution now that the applicant is proposing, um, is the applicant able to suggest whether there's any likely to be any interaction in terms of that the infiltration solution in the area and any interaction in the water environment?

00:18:55:25 - 00:19:37:03

Sherry Atkins for the applicant. I can't comment on Hornsea three and what drainage it's proposed for Hornsea three and their associated infrastructure for what we're proposing at the substation. We're carrying out we've carried out some modelling and following discussions with the we've got to do some more modelling. But what the intention is that the solution that we propose is such that the drainage flow would in effect replicate what's existing, so it would be no worse than what's existing at present and I can't comment on Hornsey three.

00:19:46:17 - 00:19:55:28

Okay. Thank you. In terms of the cumulative impact of the two substations, is that something that's being looked at or taken into account in the hydraulic modelling?

00:20:35:17 - 00:20:49:09

Sherry Atkins for the applicant. When we consider surface water drainage, we do consider the cumulative impacts. When we consider the drainage solution as such that is specific to the sites to our sites.

00:20:49:22 - 00:21:01:17

Okay. Kim, potential interaction in terms of the drainage solution be ruled out with the other substation or is that a question that maybe the applicant could come back to us on?

00:21:03:14 - 00:21:07:16

Again, Sherry Sassoon for the applicant, and that is something that we will need to come back to you.

00:21:07:24 - 00:21:08:23

Okay. Thank you.

00:21:21:19 - 00:21:22:22

Okay. Thank you.

00:21:24:17 - 00:22:09:03

Okay. We'll move on to our next agenda item, which is the misapplication of relevant provisions and securing appropriate protective provisions which will govern the process for securing the relevant watercourse consents. And the applicant's reply to written question. 1.2.4.3.1 sets out that it is in discussions with the Environment Agency, Norfolk County Council and the Water Management Alliance on behalf of the relevant internal drainage boards with regards to confirming their consent to the application of the relevant provisions and with regards to securing appropriate protective provisions

00:22:10:27 - 00:22:12:03

to ultimately

00:22:13:27 - 00:22:17:24

govern the process for securing the relevant watercourse consents.

00:22:20:08 - 00:22:28:24

Could the applicant please just explain why this is necessary and provide an update on the discussions which are taking place with those relevant parties?

00:22:32:04 - 00:22:35:15

Laura Fuller for the applicant, the.

00:22:37:27 - 00:23:11:06

So I'll probably start from the beginning. So as we've obviously already acknowledged, there are various other consents that could be sought outside the development consent order regime. The provisions of the Planning Act allow us to seek for relevant DIS applications. This is one of those situations where it's felt that it would be more effective for that to be rolled into the draft DCO and also gives us the opportunity to discuss more detail in terms of protected provisions with the relevant bodies.

00:23:11:25 - 00:23:24:22

So that is the approach that we have taken. That is a that is an approach that has been taken on other offshore wind farms. I think in the explanatory memorandum at paragraph 51, we give the precedents for those.

00:23:26:13 - 00:23:56:21

So where we are at the moment is we are obviously aware that we need to provide that or the relevant bodies will need to provide that consent in accordance with section 150 of the Planning Act 2008 before they will provide that consent. We will need to have agreed the provisions with regard to the Environment Agency and the Norfolk Rivers, IDB.

00:23:57:01 - 00:24:28:27

Those protections or the starting point for those protected provisions was provided at submission of the application in parts four and five of Schedule 14. They are not concluded just yet, but we are continuing to to make progress on those with those bodies. At the point of submission, we were still discussing with the Alpha if they were happy to take this approach in terms of providing for watercourse consents through protective provisions.

00:24:29:14 - 00:25:04:15

We have now reached a reached a point where they have indicated to us, and I'm sure Ms.. Love will hopefully confirm this position. They have written to us and confirm that they are happy to use protective provisions for this project in the way that we have requested. So there is now a draft of protective provisions circulating between the parties and we are discussing those. What we what we can do is count. We are very confident that those will be agreed before the end of the examination.

00:25:04:28 - 00:25:43:22

I'm not sure that we will be ready at deadline three, but what we could what we can provide at deadline three is a draft in the same way as we have done for the and the IDB that, you know, provides an indication of what those protective provisions, how they are shaping up. They are, in many respects very similar to what you will already see in there with regards to the Environment Agency provisions and the Norfolk well, it's the Water Management Alliance provisions, but those are being negotiated on behalf of the Norfolk Rivers.

00:25:45:23 - 00:25:54:00

Okay. Thank you very much. Um, Ms.. Are you able to, to add anything to those discussions?

00:25:58:05 - 00:25:59:03

Hello? Sarah Lafferty.

00:26:01:26 - 00:26:16:29

Yes, I can confirm we have sent a letter saying we're happy to go down the protective provisions route. Um, we are slightly further behind than the IDPs and the version of those protective provisions, but we'll get there.

00:26:18:13 - 00:26:26:11



Okay. Thank you very much. Anything to add from the Environment Agency at all on this particular matter before we move on?

00:26:30:09 - 00:26:57:27

Bob Ross Taylor for the Environment Agency. I don't really have anything significant to add. We are in discussion and we do expect to get to a position of agreement in due course. Of course, we have the backstop position that if we're not in agreement, then we will revert to our position under the Planning Act.

00:26:59:22 - 00:27:03:11

Okay. Thank you very much. Okay.

00:27:06:18 - 00:27:08:06

Okay. Okay.

00:27:09:25 - 00:27:13:11

Okay. In that case, we'll move on to our next agenda item. Thank you.

00:27:16:06 - 00:27:53:09

Okay, which is in relation to the adequacy of the outline code of construction practice and securing necessary mitigation and whether more detail is needed, particularly in relation to landfall, the onshore substation and walk to coarse crossing methodologies. The applicant's reply to written question 1.24 .4.7 sets out that the final code of construction practice will be updated to provide greater clarification in relation to the inclusion of the landfall compound and necessary control measures in relation to flood risk there.

00:27:54:12 - 00:28:07:12

Can can just clarify the reference to the final code of construction practice? Is that meant post consents or did the applicant suggest that that would be updated as part of the examination?

00:28:43:21 - 00:28:44:16

Julian Boswell for the.

00:28:44:18 - 00:28:55:15

Applicant am instructed that there needs to be some updating to refer to the landfall. But I think the substantive detail is proposed to be post consent.

00:28:57:00 - 00:29:01:24

Okay, but there will be some updates. Will that be at the next deadline?

00:29:04:05 - 00:29:05:02

Yes. Yes.

00:29:05:04 - 00:29:06:17

Okay. Fantastic. Thank you.

00:29:14:03 - 00:29:44:01

Okay, next question. The applicants responses to written questions. 1.2.4.4.5 and 0.6 both relate to the substation sites. Those are noted. However, given the mitigation set out in the flood risk assessment is relatively specific to the substation site. Should all of this be included in the outline code of construction practice rather than relying on more generic mitigation expressed in those as currently drafted?

00:30:03:10 - 00:30:19:24

Julian Boswell for the applicant. Think our assumption is that because that information is so readily available that it will you know as and when the final document is being put together that it will naturally cross over or be or be signposted as appropriate.

00:30:22:23 - 00:30:35:01

Given it's very specific in the it is quite a specific chunk of mitigation that's proposed with the applicant. Have any particular concerns about lifting that out into the existing code of construction practice?

00:30:42:21 - 00:30:43:25

Julian Bond of the applicant.

00:30:45:04 - 00:30:56:04

Obviously, I can see where you're coming from. We'll consider it. I'm getting the impression you're quite keen. And so we're generally trying to not disappoint you where we can, so we will certainly look at it.

00:30:56:18 - 00:30:58:06

Okay. Appreciate that. Thank you.

00:31:04:24 - 00:31:22:18

Okay. In relation to crossing methodologies, the outline code of construction practice does not specifically commit to these the detailed design stage. Again, given that specific mitigation referred to in the flood risk assessment, should this be made explicit?

00:31:27:27 - 00:31:36:12

I'm Sherry. Sherry Atkins. Even for the applicant. Are you referring to trench and trench crossing through watercourses?

00:31:36:14 - 00:31:37:17

Is that specific?

00:31:37:19 - 00:31:57:20

Yeah, it's the crossing methodologies. I think they're the reply to written questions. 1.24 .4.8 and nine. Um, suggested that that was secured and the outline code of construction practice. Um, but I don't think it is. So it's whether it needs to be explicitly referred to in that.

00:32:09:01 - 00:32:17:02

Sherry Atkins for the applicant. So that information is set out in the crossing schedules rather than the outline code of construction practice.

00:32:17:13 - 00:32:37:13

Okay. It's more the commitment to actually undertake crossing methodologies in terms of the detailed design of how those will be undertaken. Think detailed design might be referred to, but actual the production of crossing methodologies to be agreed with the relevant authorities isn't explicitly set out.

00:32:38:11 - 00:33:16:22

I'm Sherry Atkins for the applicant, So Section 6.1. Point three of the outline code of construction practice sets out what assessments will be carried out prior to works taking place at watercourse crossings. So for crossing locations, we'll need to do a hydrogeological risk assessment where trenched crossings are proposed. So we'd need to do work such as installing dams and other other works to ensure that there's no adverse impacts arising.

00:33:16:24 - 00:33:24:05

So that will be they'll all be agreed as part of the outline code of construction practice and secured under requirement 19.

00:33:24:11 - 00:33:36:18

Okay. So, so you're of the view that the individual components of those methodologies are secured? Yes, but it's maybe just not the overall term is included in the construction practice.

00:33:36:20 - 00:33:38:29

Yeah. Sherri Atkins for the applicant. Yes. Yes. Okay.

00:33:39:01 - 00:33:41:13

Thank you. That's that's fine. Thank you for the clarification.

00:33:53:00 - 00:33:53:15

This one.

00:34:02:28 - 00:34:09:25

Okay. Does anyone else wish to say anything in relation to the adequacy of the outline code of construction practice?

00:34:14:03 - 00:34:19:21

No. Okay. Thank you. Okay. Point number six of the agenda.

00:34:21:13 - 00:34:50:18

The lead local flood authority set out in their reply to written question 1.24.3.8 that some initial site investigations would be appropriate to mitigate some of the associated risks. Could I ask you, please, ultimately to set out where in your view these should be undertaken with an explanation of why don't we have Ms.. Love? You can love you can help on that one.

00:34:53:25 - 00:35:01:08

Could you put. Sorry, Sarah, the lead. Could you actually phrase the question for me? I don't have it in front of me. Please.

00:35:01:27 - 00:35:31:20

Yeah, absolutely. It's the agenda item. Was the lead local flood authority. Consider that some initial site investigations at crossings would be appropriate to mitigate some of the associated risks and discussion on this matter and clarification on where those might be. So I was looking for clarification from yourself whether you can provide any detail on where those additional investigations should be done and why.

00:35:32:12 - 00:36:03:12

So on some of their crossings, because ordinary watercourses vary in size quite dramatically. Um. Even the smaller ones do. We would like to have some topographical information and include some information on bed levels so that we are confident about where they put in any temporary damming. We are not going to get a backwater effect, but could cause a flood flood risk further upstream.

00:36:05:02 - 00:36:33:25

Okay. In addition, when it comes to the pumping round of water on watercourses that actually do have water in, we would need to have further information but actually assesses the size of the pumping and what capability and capacity you would need to actually ensure a constant flow so that there's no negative impacts both in flood risk terms but also in ecological terms downstream.

00:36:35:09 - 00:36:40:28

Okay. And are you seeking those as part of the examination rather than post consents?

00:36:42:19 - 00:36:44:24

We could get that in detailed design.

00:36:45:03 - 00:36:46:06

Detailed design. Okay.

00:36:46:08 - 00:37:05:09

Yeah. So I mean, the outline, they just need to provide outline. When we get to detailed design, we would need a higher level of detail, greater confidence, because that information would then principally lead into the consent application information for the ordinary watercourse consents.

00:37:08:08 - 00:37:13:03

Okay. Thank you very much for that clarification. Anything from the applicant on that question?

00:37:18:19 - 00:37:22:18

I'm Sherry Atkins. No, no further comment from us. Okay. Thank you.

00:37:25:11 - 00:38:05:08

Okay. The last matter on the agenda for water quality and resources is whether the lead local flood authority is or is not content that sufficient drainage information and mitigation is before the examination to reassure the examining authority that the approach to surface water drainage for all onshore infrastructure matters is sound. Um, again, it's just to come to Ms. Luff, if possible, just to set out where the local lead local authority is with the application and whether you're satisfied at the moment and if not, where those areas of disagreement still lie.

00:38:05:10 - 00:38:05:25

Please.

00:38:06:29 - 00:38:38:27

We've been having ongoing discussions, so Sarah love the lead local flood authority. We've been having ongoing discussions with the applicant over several months. Um, they have recently provided us with the outline drainage design for the onshore substation. This we have been discussing some of the parameters that they have included in their report. Um, as the report is not clear, we've requested for some further clarification.

00:38:39:20 - 00:38:44:00

They are yet to provide them, but I believe they are working on these at the moment.

00:38:45:12 - 00:38:52:13

Okay. Thank you. Is that the additional modelling that the applicant referred to just now? I don't know whether you could just confirm that, please.

00:38:53:20 - 00:39:05:27

Sherry Atkins. Yes, that's correct. So there are a few points of clarification and some additional work to be done on the modelling and hopefully at that point we would have reached a grid position with the LFA.

00:39:06:21 - 00:39:13:12

Okay. When are we likely to know the sort of outcomes of those extra modelling that's been undertaken?

00:39:13:14 - 00:39:19:09

And we're working towards deadline, either deadline three, but if not, it'll be deadline for.

00:39:24:23 - 00:39:25:14

Okay.

00:39:27:21 - 00:39:32:28

Thank you very much. Anything else from anyone in relation to Mr. Boswell? Yes. You've just put your hand up.

00:39:33:10 - 00:39:34:18

Julian Boswell. For the applicant.

00:39:34:20 - 00:39:39:20

We promised we'd come back to you with an answer a few minutes ago. And we do now have the answer.

00:39:42:05 - 00:39:43:01

Okay. Thank you.

00:39:44:07 - 00:40:25:02

Helena. On behalf of the applicant. I believe your question was regarding the onshore substation drainage study and whether paragraph 152 and the preliminary hydraulic assessment that was regarding further work that was needed with with regards to the infiltration option. To put it in context, the study sort of was predated almost the drainage strategy. It was being produced to aid in the sort of drainage strategy documents. So that bullet point does refer to the sort of assessment that's been undertaken in the current drainage strategy with regards to the Ted's work and the micro drainage verifications that have been undertaken.

00:40:25:15 - 00:40:39:28

It's probably worth noting that as part of some of the updates that we're providing for the Alpha, there's going to be some more iterations of that. Nothing new per se, but just some refinement of the parameters, etcetera. So that's where that bullet point reflects.

00:40:40:05 - 00:40:47:06

Okay. Thank you. Yeah, I was just checking that there wasn't going to be some significant more modeling to be expected. That's all. Thank you. Perfect.

00:40:48:26 - 00:40:53:10

Okay. Anything from anyone else before we finish this agenda item?

00:40:55:15 - 00:41:08:16

Okay. Can't see any hands. In that case, that concludes our discussion on item seven. And thank you for your contributions this afternoon. And I'll hand over to Mr. High for item.

00:41:08:18 - 00:41:10:11

Agenda number eight, please. Thank you.

00:41:12:20 - 00:41:49:27

Thank you, Mr. Manning. Um, if we don't have any other matters to discuss on the issues in our agenda today, then if we can adjourn for about 15 minutes so we can tidy up the post hearing actions, come back and relay them here. Um, because deadline three is when post hearing action submissions would be requested as well as responses to written questions. We are suggesting that the actions that emerge from today's hearing, even though we will read them out today, are actually embedded in written questions.

00:41:50:03 - 00:42:09:12

Um, so this is the same approach we've taken last time. Um, so yeah, so the time now is 4:27. We'll take a 15 minute break and be back at 4:45. 4:45.

00:42:11:07 - 00:42:13:10

So. Very good. Yeah. Thank you very much.