

ISH4_23 March PT3

Created on: 2023-03-23 15:29:47

Project Length: 01:14:02

File Name: ISH4_23 March PT3

File Length: 01:14:02

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:05:14 - 00:00:17:29

Good afternoon, everybody. It's now 2:00 and I'm resuming this third session of this issue specific hearing. Can I just check that everybody that wishes to rejoin has been able to.

00:00:24:28 - 00:00:58:21

And then we'll carry on with agenda item seven, which is landscape. Moving directly on to the first question, under that agenda item, the applicant in its responses to the Examining Authority's written questions notes that its landscape and visual impact assessment is not sensitive to any particular layout which might be possible within the design scenarios proposed. The applicant's reasoning for this, as that is that it is the height and scale of equipment, which are the main criteria that determine effects.

00:00:59:25 - 00:01:16:15

The applicant's response goes on as well to note that the precise location of elements on the platform will not determine effects in terms Can I begin, please, by asking the applicant to briefly describe the nature of the platform referred to in this context, please.

00:01:21:27 - 00:01:54:11

Good afternoon. Just to introduce myself, I'm Colin Goodrum, landscape architect for the applicant. So you've asked to describe the platform you'll have seen from your site visit. The site is dished to an extent and clearly there will be a cut and fill process which creates the platform by essentially moving material from one half to the other half in order to create the flat platform.

00:01:55:02 - 00:02:29:03

Clearly, as that process will involve stripping the topsoil, maybe some subsoil storing that away from the platform, then using excavators, etcetera, to move the material to create a formation level. And then I think there's 400mm of stone on top of that to effectively form the foundation on which to build the substation. So it's a process of moving material and replacing material, compacting material.

00:02:31:04 - 00:02:42:16

Okay. Thank you. So excuse me. In essence, it's. It's a landform rather than a platform constructed from structural elements.

00:02:48:09 - 00:02:50:16

Oh, sorry. I'll clarify that from a structural frame.

00:02:51:10 - 00:03:12:19

Yes, clearly the material that stripped and relaid will be compacted, whatever requirements that the engineers dictate. But it's it's to my understanding, it's a platform that's built in that manner. And then stone on top rather than other means of, um.

00:03:14:12 - 00:03:15:12

Making it stable.

00:03:16:07 - 00:03:36:18

Thank you. And you mentioned the use of a cotton fill exercise. Is it the expectation at this stage that that will be the primary primary source of material for the platform, or is it expected that material will need to be to a larger extent, imported to form the platform?

00:03:40:03 - 00:03:44:27

I think I know the answer to that, but I'm going to defer to a colleague just to be absolutely certain.

00:03:45:11 - 00:03:46:02

By all means.

00:04:01:19 - 00:04:03:21

Yes, it's entirely one from the side.

00:04:04:20 - 00:04:34:15

In its entirety. Yes. Okay. Thank you. We will move on then. I'm going to refer to some of your viewpoints, the CGI images that have been submitted so far to the application. I don't know if you want the opportunity to have those to hand. I'm not proposing to put them on screen, but I do have my copy in front of me. Is that something that you feel you might need to have in front of you? And do you need some time to find them?

00:04:34:17 - 00:04:38:02

I have a set upstairs. My colleague is going to run upstairs and get them.

00:04:38:19 - 00:04:54:21

Yeah. By all means. Yeah. Thank you. I will. Excuse me. Will. Will. Carry on in the meantime. There. There may. There may be a point at which you want to refer back to. Back to the images before you answer, which is absolutely fine.

00:04:57:13 - 00:05:13:22

I hope hopefully you can answer the first the first question without having the imagery in front of you that the first part of the question in this regard is in relation to viewpoint two. And the question really is, is it's understood that the images

00:05:15:13 - 00:05:20:01

generated are based on an indicative layout so they

00:05:23:01 - 00:05:40:00

are not fixed by the very nature of them being indicative at this stage. And that is understood. The question, however, is particularly with regard to viewpoint two, is there no possibility that buildings and equipment locations could be swapped from that shown in the photo montage views?

00:05:42:05 - 00:05:48:11

In in the possibility if if the answer to that is. Well, let's let's answer that question first.

00:05:49:09 - 00:06:27:07

Um, just to explain clearly. Um, as you know, it's a, it's a parameters based application and, um, but in order to produce a photorealistic photo montage, we have to have an illustrative scheme. So the clients have provided a 3D model which we've used, um, to then render to make the photo montage. Obviously that illustrative model is one solution to delivering the substation.

00:06:27:14 - 00:06:40:28

And one could imagine that, yes, components could be in different locations, it could be handed, but I'm beyond my expertise here, so I'm just imagining that could be possible.

00:06:41:18 - 00:07:05:18

Okay. That's nevertheless useful. I think the where I'm really going with this is that this viewpoint in particular viewpoint two and three in particular are quite demonstrative in terms of the, the visual effects which which might occur from the substation site in particular. Um, if.

00:07:08:19 - 00:07:30:13

I'm searching for the correct terminology for it. But if the the electrical infrastructure versus the I'm going to call them sheds from now on. But if the enclosed buildings versus the enclosed infrastructure were swapped handed, if in effect from the viewpoint has shown the the visual effect would be significantly worse than shown, would it not?

00:07:31:13 - 00:07:31:28

Um.

00:07:33:26 - 00:08:04:02

I would disagree with that, but I think we need to consider that viewpoints one, two and three are east, north and west of the location. So if one is on that bridleway network, um, clearly you would see a different aspect depending on which view you are. Um, viewing it from the visual impact assessment and indeed the landscape of visual assessment obviously is a is a holistic assessment.

00:08:04:04 - 00:08:42:24

So whilst this is a representative viewpoint from one location on that footpath, clearly as you move around, the components would move around and you'd see more or less of different structures. But to my mind when you're looking at viewpoint two, you can see, um, I suppose the strongest element in the view apart from the overall landscape structure is the pylons, which are part of the baseline. Um, you can see one of the, um, one of the buildings and you can see those cylindrical items which

00:08:44:20 - 00:09:17:07

are quite evident. Plus you can see all the lattice work of all the electrical equipment, the bus bars and all the rest. That makes up a, um, a substation together. To my mind, that that presents itself as a substation. If different components were in slightly different positions in terms of the overall visual effect, it wouldn't change the scale of the fact, in my view, to the extent you come to a different judgement.

00:09:18:23 - 00:09:44:08

Um, okay. Let me go a little bit further into that. So if, if it were the case that the, the, the building, the shed which, which has a building envelope were, were effectively in the centre of the image versus off to the left hand side, it's your view that that would not be a worse visual impact than your presenting in this viewpoint.

00:09:44:20 - 00:09:47:27

No, no, I wouldn't because, um,

00:09:49:27 - 00:09:57:14

one is looking at the substation in totality, which is that collection of, of structures, um, how they're.

00:09:57:16 - 00:09:58:16

Arranged.

00:09:58:23 - 00:10:11:12

Within that view, um, because it wouldn't bring it any closer to you and indeed to an extent, um, potentially the building is the more recessive of those elements in that view.

00:10:12:06 - 00:10:15:16

And it clearly that would depend on how it's treated.

00:10:15:23 - 00:10:23:08

It currently is. But the scenario I'm presenting is that it's less recessive in the view it's, it's more prominent in the view.

00:10:25:15 - 00:10:26:00

Well,

00:10:27:29 - 00:10:29:08

I think perhaps we see things.

00:10:29:18 - 00:10:38:21

Differently, but, um, the, the lace, the lattice work of the overhead electrical equipment.

00:10:39:00 - 00:10:42:26

Is, is, is what stands out. The three cylinders are quite.

00:10:42:28 - 00:10:48:07

Visible from that location. Yeah. So, you know, it's but if those three cylinders were further.

00:10:48:09 - 00:10:53:21

To the right and the building was in the middle and there was lattice work to the left, then it's still that overall.

00:10:53:24 - 00:10:54:15

Composition.

00:10:54:17 - 00:10:58:09

That's clearly a substation. We're not saying it's a thing of beauty.

00:10:58:11 - 00:10:59:12

It's a substation.

00:11:01:28 - 00:11:06:28

And that's an interesting choice. I think there's there's a decent amount of history of

00:11:09:06 - 00:11:15:01

designers striving to make substations as beautiful as they can. It's an interesting standpoint.

00:11:15:10 - 00:11:21:18

Well, it is. And, you know, last time we were together, we would talk about the design and the statement.

00:11:21:20 - 00:11:22:21

And the ways of.

00:11:23:06 - 00:11:28:09

Ensuring that that we do have the best fit with the landscape.

00:11:28:11 - 00:11:30:16
For this this structure.

00:11:32:24 - 00:11:33:09
Um.

00:11:34:00 - 00:11:36:06
I'm sorry. Carry on.

00:11:36:11 - 00:11:38:11
Clearly, the, um.

00:11:40:03 - 00:11:47:05
The arrangement and how ultimately the the different components are.

00:11:47:07 - 00:11:48:19
Designed together.

00:11:49:02 - 00:11:52:00
Is. Is for the future and.

00:11:53:18 - 00:11:55:09
Uh, Ecuador will clearly.

00:11:55:11 - 00:11:57:28
Engage with a contractor, electrical contractor who will.

00:11:58:00 - 00:11:59:10
Be responsible for the design.

00:11:59:12 - 00:12:03:29
Of this. There is likely there are a number of options that come.

00:12:04:01 - 00:12:04:23
Forward.

00:12:05:00 - 00:12:07:22
Which would then be, um.

00:12:10:24 - 00:12:15:24
Submitted to the local authority as part of the requirements that were set out.

00:12:16:26 - 00:12:25:21
Okay. So this this is this is merely illustrative. One option that that electrical contractor might come up with in terms of how our.

00:12:26:21 - 00:12:27:27
How a

00:12:29:23 - 00:12:31:03

substation might be designed.

00:12:31:28 - 00:12:55:18

Yeah. Now that's, that's understood. Before I move on, I just want to finally clarify. It's, it's your viewpoint or it's your position that elements as as described in the viewpoints that you've, you've given us, such as busbar pylons which are inherently perforated by their nature, are

00:12:57:14 - 00:13:02:09

as intrusive in terms of visual effects as solid buildings.

00:13:04:06 - 00:13:05:20

Did I understand that correctly?

00:13:07:04 - 00:13:09:19

I think potentially that is the case, yes.

00:13:10:26 - 00:13:15:11

Okay. I'm bound to disagree with that. But we will we will move on. It's the.

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

Proportions of elements that that.

00:13:18:17 - 00:13:19:23

I mean, I think the.

00:13:22:09 - 00:13:33:24

The extent I think on on on site. Obviously, if you look at Norwich main station, the main substation there, what you see essentially is mostly.

00:13:34:11 - 00:13:35:12

Electrical equipment.

00:13:35:19 - 00:13:45:05

And buzz bars and uprights, etcetera. The buildings aren't particularly visible in some of the views. So it is that overall

00:13:47:24 - 00:13:49:01

arrangement of equipment.

00:13:49:18 - 00:13:51:18

Well, we will overriding character.

00:13:51:20 - 00:13:59:06

We will we will visit the substation tomorrow. We will form a view in light of those comments as well as as as a group.

00:14:02:05 - 00:14:33:03

As you said, the viewpoints indicate or represent an indicative layout. What's the level of and want to specifically separate design versus engineering input here? What's the level of design input that has gone into location of elements? If anything, if the answer is it's purely an engineering layout at the moment, that's that's that's an acceptable answer at this stage. But yeah, the question is what level of design input has gone into the location of elements on the site as shown.

00:14:34:03 - 00:14:34:18

Um.

00:14:36:10 - 00:14:59:16

I've taken as an engineering layout as provided by me, so I haven't had any discussions about possible rearranging the components, whether or not, um, what was presented to equinor by the contractor to what, to what, what precisely what the design process was. I don't know. But essentially this as far as I'm concerned, it's a.

00:14:59:18 - 00:15:01:02

Functional design of a.

00:15:01:04 - 00:15:03:01

Substation which will do its job.

00:15:04:01 - 00:15:23:10

And, and as we've, we've, we've touched upon to some extent it's it is subject to change the orientation the position of elements on site as as depicted within these viewpoints may not be as constructed. Correct.

00:15:28:18 - 00:15:35:15

So the the orientation of elements essentially cannot be secured at this stage.

00:15:37:20 - 00:15:38:08

Correct.

00:15:41:26 - 00:15:45:00

They could be influenced at the detailed design stage though.

00:15:47:27 - 00:16:08:19

So thank you. You may feel that you've answered this already, but if the layout layout can't be secured within within the DCO, how how can the examining authority be certain that the level of effects shown wouldn't be worse than shown currently?

00:16:11:21 - 00:16:14:28

We've carried out an assessment.

00:16:15:01 - 00:16:16:22

At this stage of the project.

00:16:16:29 - 00:16:19:28

And concluded that in terms of that.

00:16:20:00 - 00:16:30:08

Network of footpaths, the immediate locality, major adverse result, major adverse visual effects will occur. Um.

00:16:34:21 - 00:16:59:28

And that is a consequence of developing a substation in this location at a platform height as determined within that landscape setting with no none of the electrical kit greater than 15m and

allowing the potential for the the lightning conductor rods up to 30m. So it's parameter based within that location.

00:17:06:07 - 00:17:08:02

The fact that there might be.

00:17:09:15 - 00:17:11:20

And bearing in mind my assessment.

00:17:11:22 - 00:17:12:13

Was not based.

00:17:12:15 - 00:17:17:17

On this photo montage. Our assessment was based on the proposal.

00:17:18:04 - 00:17:19:12

This this is an.

00:17:19:14 - 00:17:25:17

Illustrative montage from this location. And therefore

00:17:28:06 - 00:17:36:10

our judgment is major adverse effects from these three bridled waves that circumvent the site.

00:17:37:29 - 00:17:44:15

Clearly, you will make a judgment yourself about the effects, but we say major adverse.

00:17:49:01 - 00:17:49:17

Okay,

00:17:51:08 - 00:18:02:29

That's not even helpful. Thank you. We'll move on to the next agenda item. In fact, the next two agenda items, because I propose that we'll. I'll deal with both

00:18:06:12 - 00:18:11:27

in 1 in 1 swoop, if you like, coming on. First of all,

00:18:14:03 - 00:18:17:13

I want to discuss I'll move on to viewpoint three as well

00:18:18:28 - 00:18:21:25

and talk a little bit about the siting.

00:18:31:27 - 00:19:04:07

So the indicative proposals shown at Viewpoint three don't. And we've discussed the platforms. Well, they don't closely follow the contours of the site across the entire substation site. So as shown on this viewpoint, how much would the landscape podium that the substation elements sits on be raised above existing ground level and really mean the lowest, lowest point of the substation site, the bottom of the dip, if you like.

00:19:16:03 - 00:19:17:11

So you're asking.

00:19:22:24 - 00:19:27:08

You're asking the height of the platform?

00:19:28:08 - 00:19:32:26

Yeah. Above. Above the lowest point of the substation sites.

00:19:33:00 - 00:19:34:29

I don't have that exact figure.

00:19:35:07 - 00:19:39:18

Okay. Is that something that you could provide? Yes. Thank you. Yeah.

00:19:41:25 - 00:19:50:20

We mean we do. We do have the top, the top level, the base level of the podium. 28.23. Yeah. Which is.

00:19:51:21 - 00:19:56:08

Mean. We can we will point that out to you on the side visit tomorrow.

00:19:57:00 - 00:20:15:27

I'm aware as well that there's some work being done to set out the the substation site which which will be helpful. So I mean whether you can provide that datum level tomorrow or not, we'll leave to you. But if you can provide us with that information, that would be helpful.

00:20:15:29 - 00:20:17:22

I think we can.

00:20:17:24 - 00:20:40:13

It's a it's a it's a few meters, but but you'll be able to see on site, um, effectively the two points where, where the, that platform level marries into the existing level. Yeah. And everything above that is cut and everything below that is Phil I see. So and therefore you can see the deck which will be filled in effectively.

00:20:40:15 - 00:20:56:21

Yeah. That, that will be, that will be helpful. Um, again coming, coming back because viewpoint three shows shows a bit more detail or more of an overview of the indicative layout. The two shared buildings that are indicated there

00:20:58:06 - 00:21:10:06

is that in terms of the worst case scenario, are you depicting two separate substations for the two separate offshore or two separate cable routes? Transmission networks?

00:21:10:08 - 00:21:14:07

Yes. This this this substation is for both developments. Yes.

00:21:15:05 - 00:21:15:20

Okay.

00:21:22:19 - 00:21:56:21

Then I suppose the next question is the need, the need for the platform or the need for the height of the platform above the lowest, the lowest point of the site. The design access statement goes into some

detail to describe the the choice of sites and why the choice of site is appropriate, because it allows you to follow the contours of the site with with the building locations within the substation and that that was a benefit to to to choosing that site.

00:21:56:28 - 00:22:09:14

However, everything sits on a flat platform which is higher than the lowest point of the site. And can you talk to the issues around why that is the case?

00:22:11:27 - 00:22:12:19

Yes, I'm in the.

00:22:13:06 - 00:22:38:24

There's a number of factors why this is the most appropriate site chosen between the various sites. And yes, the fact it's it's well enclosed with vegetation and effectively is in a bit of a dip in the landscape. But it's also got a dip within the dip, if you see what I mean. So it's it's it's generally lower lowest it sits in the landscape lower and you'll have seen that and you'll see that more on your.

00:22:38:26 - 00:22:39:26

Your side visit.

00:22:39:28 - 00:23:20:24

And obviously it has got a low bit within it. Um, clearly if you were to create a and in terms of um the optimum process of creating a flat platform given a platform is a requirement of, of the operators, then um, there's an opt in the height that one does a cut and fill to optimise the, the balance between cut and fill. If you were to literally sink it right down at the lowest possible level, apart from exacerbating drainage issues, you'd have a huge amount of filter dispose of which would go off site etcetera.

00:23:20:26 - 00:23:23:27

So it's the optimum way of balancing cut and.

00:23:23:29 - 00:23:24:29

Fill to create.

00:23:25:01 - 00:23:33:18

A platform at that that height, which isn't the lowest part of the site, but it is the fact that this site.

00:23:33:20 - 00:23:34:10

Sits.

00:23:34:12 - 00:23:44:23

In a bit of a depression that makes it more suitable than some of the others, which means that some of the infrastructure is effectively screened and then further planting.

00:23:44:25 - 00:23:46:07

Will add to the.

00:23:46:09 - 00:23:57:15

Screening over time. But we accept that there will be elements of the infrastructure visible in the long term, hence the adverse effects and understood.

00:23:57:22 - 00:24:23:26

I suppose the reasoning for my question is that given the magnitude of effects and given the opportunity to use um, the possibility rather to use the contours of the site and the natural ground

levels of the site, it would have been the best possible mitigation you could have, you could have chosen in terms of visual effect to to lower to use the lowest possible level.

00:24:25:21 - 00:24:28:22

Yes, of course. And design is the optimisation of a number of.

00:24:28:24 - 00:24:32:16

Factors, and that wouldn't have been the best solution for other reasons.

00:24:32:18 - 00:24:34:27

So can you expand on those?

00:24:35:03 - 00:24:37:17

Well, I've explained previously that.

00:24:37:19 - 00:24:57:20

If you'd have a bearing in mind the lowest part of the site is a relatively small central area. It's not the whole site. Then, um, it's the amount of cut and fill and export off site which have been required is one reason. Plus I'd imagine that a much lower.

00:24:58:04 - 00:25:03:14

Platform would have added to um, drainage concerns.

00:25:04:09 - 00:25:08:28

So that we've, we've looked at um.

00:25:09:18 - 00:25:12:09

The clearly is the part of the design process.

00:25:12:11 - 00:25:24:18

One, the platform has moved around within the site in terms of getting the best site and, and flood risk was one of the factors that um, led the, the platform to be where it is.

00:25:27:07 - 00:25:29:15

Okay. Thank you. We'll move on.

00:25:33:04 - 00:25:39:20

I think I'm optimistically thinking I can put this massive folder away and you can do the same. Thanks.

00:25:42:14 - 00:25:44:01

Coming on then to

00:25:46:24 - 00:25:53:19

the the level of input design input again, so far in terms of the

00:25:55:06 - 00:26:28:17

the built elements, the enclosed elements, the build the sections of the substation site which have a building envelope particularly, um, can you point us to towards evidence which is before us, which demonstrates that the applicant has begun a process of careful consideration of building design and of materials which might be appropriate for the context within which the substation buildings are

proposed. I'm aware that the design and access statement includes some wording related to materials and design,

00:26:30:04 - 00:26:31:19
but there is

00:26:33:29 - 00:26:43:11
nothing more than words and nothing that I've seen to date which represent anything beyond indicative massing.

00:26:45:25 - 00:26:50:07
Oh, that's great. It's what you had before you. It was in the dad's.

00:26:53:00 - 00:27:02:00
And it's it's your position that that demonstrates a process of careful consideration of building design and materials.

00:27:05:29 - 00:27:06:29
In the context.

00:27:07:01 - 00:27:20:19
Of an app and an iterative design process which continues post consent into the detail stage, then I think what has what's been done to date is appropriate.

00:27:22:05 - 00:27:40:23
The reason the reason for my wording, a very specific wording you may have guessed, relates back to the NPS in one section 5.9.22 concludes by saying that materials and designs of buildings should always be given careful consideration.

00:27:49:04 - 00:27:59:23
That. That is correct. And that does makes it clear that those aspects are important and.

00:28:00:17 - 00:28:02:04
The does covers them.

00:28:02:22 - 00:28:04:23
And there is a design process and approval.

00:28:04:25 - 00:28:05:20
Process.

00:28:05:27 - 00:28:08:01
Governed by the requirements.

00:28:08:03 - 00:28:09:10
That enable

00:28:11:12 - 00:28:15:20
the design to be optimized through the through the next process post consent.

00:28:16:17 - 00:28:32:17

So coming back to the level of consideration you can give could give at this stage, what is it that's preventing the applicant from, from or has prevented the applicant from submitting proposals showing indicative designs for the buildings proposed for the site at this stage?

00:28:34:06 - 00:28:34:21

Um.

00:28:36:06 - 00:28:38:05

Well, there isn't a contractor in place in.

00:28:38:07 - 00:28:44:00

Order to begin the detailed design process of the substation. That's a future activity.

00:28:44:02 - 00:28:45:23

By a.

00:28:45:25 - 00:28:49:26

Party that Equinor will contract with later on in the process.

00:28:50:19 - 00:28:56:27

Is it normal for buildings to to not undergo a process of design until a contractor is on board?

00:28:59:26 - 00:29:00:11

Um.

00:29:00:29 - 00:29:05:06

It can be in the design and build operation. If you if you.

00:29:05:08 - 00:29:06:18

Relate this discussion to an outline.

00:29:06:20 - 00:29:09:01

Application for a for a large.

00:29:09:24 - 00:29:12:18

Housing development, then, you know, there may not be.

00:29:12:20 - 00:29:16:15

Detailed designs of every aspect at an outline stage.

00:29:18:04 - 00:29:26:24

There may well be design access statement. They may be able to design code. But you know, detailed design is something which feeds into

00:29:29:08 - 00:29:30:21

later processes.

00:29:32:17 - 00:29:41:07

So in answer to the question, the thing that has prevented the applicant thus far from from from doing that work is its choice of procurement.

00:29:43:02 - 00:29:44:11

For its procurement route.

00:29:46:14 - 00:29:51:14

I think maybe Equinor need to answer that themselves. But but I think that's.

00:29:51:16 - 00:29:53:15

That's as I understand it, Yes.

00:29:57:18 - 00:30:20:27

So it all of the applicant. Yeah. I don't have much to add to that, I'm afraid. Um, it's, it's pretty normal that, um, you know, later in the development process, we will appoint contractors to do the detailed design work. And at that stage, that's when we will discharge the requirement for the onshore detailed design that will go to the local authorities. I'm not clear on.

00:30:22:21 - 00:30:25:10

Well, yeah. I don't have much else to add. I'm afraid.

00:30:26:14 - 00:30:26:29

It.

00:30:29:16 - 00:30:50:18

You've mentioned the phrase detailed design a couple of times. I'm not really referring to detail. This isn't about detail design. This is. This is straightforward, basic conceptual design. The the indicative proposals. These are sheds the applicant to to greater extent, knows what would be in them.

00:30:54:00 - 00:30:55:07

The scenarios

00:30:56:23 - 00:31:29:12

proposed by the applicant wouldn't have a fundamental impact on the type of design work that's required. At this stage, I'm really struggling to understand why there's there's nothing within the application documents which tells us what your design thinking is in terms of how these should respond, bearing in mind that you are unable to mitigate the impact of these buildings and the impact is quite severe. Why There's no design work which which is by far and away the only thing you can do to mitigate the impact of these buildings.

00:31:29:14 - 00:31:31:12

Why? None of that work's been done.

00:31:33:21 - 00:31:36:21

We've done a lot of work in order to mitigate.

00:31:36:23 - 00:31:45:17

The impact of the substation, and that is outlined in the design and access statement and relates to siting.

00:31:48:17 - 00:31:50:22

The planting strategy, all of those.

00:31:50:24 - 00:31:51:11

Things.

00:31:52:12 - 00:32:04:10

In terms of mitigating the impact of the buildings, which you're clearly focusing on, then there is mitigation available

00:32:06:07 - 00:32:08:14

through choice of materials.

00:32:08:18 - 00:32:12:11

Detailed design choice of color, which will be determined.

00:32:12:13 - 00:32:12:28

At.

00:32:13:00 - 00:32:14:13

A later date and approved.

00:32:14:15 - 00:32:15:23

By the local authority.

00:32:19:17 - 00:32:34:12

So there is mitigation, there is some mitigation proposed within the application materials and there's further mitigation which should be delivered through the detailed design. I mean,

00:32:36:07 - 00:32:46:18

I wouldn't be saying these things if this wasn't an unfamiliar route that I've been involved with on many, many projects, whether they're infrastructure projects or development projects where,

00:32:48:12 - 00:32:55:14

you know, whether it's an outline application or a a DCO, then it's parameters based.

00:33:00:01 - 00:33:02:11

And that is what we're asking you to consent.

00:33:35:05 - 00:33:36:29

Okay, I.

00:33:41:00 - 00:33:54:13

I'm hesitant to move on. I'd like to I'd like to spend more time on this, but I don't think we will progress very much further than the position that you've taken already. I will leave it.

00:33:58:14 - 00:34:00:10

With perhaps obvious

00:34:02:10 - 00:34:06:19

conclusion that we are not necessarily satisfied with that position.

00:34:09:08 - 00:34:26:18

It's difficult. Let me carry on that, please. It's difficult for the examining authority to see at this stage how the proposed development can can be said to fully comply with Section 5.9.22 in particular, notwithstanding the comments that you've made.

00:34:28:05 - 00:34:31:23

As I say, we're not wholly satisfied.

00:34:35:02 - 00:35:00:28

Moving on, though, is that the applicant's proposals that that all of the items addressed during a potential post consent design detail design process. Does that not leave the determining authority with the possibility of being asked to agree a design proposal which bears very little other than a functional relationship? Very little resemblance to anything presented in this examination.

00:35:07:01 - 00:35:08:03

What's been presented.

00:35:08:05 - 00:35:16:21

In this examination is the proposal for a substation on this location at a fixed platform height with fixed parameters

00:35:18:10 - 00:35:29:18

which will comprise the elements of substation as described in the project description. So that is what you're being asked to

00:35:31:06 - 00:35:32:03

consent.

00:35:33:14 - 00:35:41:08

And again, coming back to the that that's in your view satisfies the criteria for a good design within the NPS.

00:35:44:00 - 00:35:44:15

Yes.

00:35:44:17 - 00:35:47:15

Mean can I just look at five 922?

00:35:48:19 - 00:35:49:12

By all means. Yeah.

00:36:06:27 - 00:36:08:26

I believe we have met the requirements.

00:36:08:28 - 00:36:10:06

Of five 922.

00:36:12:13 - 00:36:14:28

We could have put an application in with no days

00:36:16:17 - 00:36:23:07

where there was no reference to buildings, materials, colours, etcetera.

00:36:23:09 - 00:36:36:10

The fact we've mentioned them, the fact that they're in the desert as the fact they're going to be they are covered by a requirement shows that we have considered it. We haven't provided you with the full details. I fully accept that it's not appropriate to.

00:36:36:19 - 00:36:38:00

What is appropriate is to.

00:36:38:02 - 00:36:41:21

Make sure those matters are before you and you will consider them and you.

00:36:41:23 - 00:36:42:15

Will be.

00:36:43:25 - 00:36:51:24

Hopefully satisfied that the requirement and the the approval processes and the design scrutiny that local authority will undertake.

00:36:51:26 - 00:36:53:04

Will determine that.

00:36:53:17 - 00:36:54:15

The scheme.

00:36:55:03 - 00:37:00:01

Is appropriate and the levels of effects are as mitigated as far as possible.

00:37:01:00 - 00:37:34:09

Okay. Thank you. To clarify and to avoid any further doubt. It's not the examining authority's position that you should be presenting us with full details of anything, and I don't believe that's anything that's ever been stated. It is the examining authority's view that in order to carry out a successful, detailed design proposal, you have to have a design stage which precedes that. You cannot start to design everything at detailed design.

00:37:34:11 - 00:37:45:00

By its nature, that doesn't work. It's not a design process. And when we're talking, particularly in terms of what what might be the closest

00:37:47:01 - 00:37:59:05

a simulation to what would be called architecture. So, so buildings with a building envelope that has a recognised design process. It does not start at detailed design.

00:38:03:28 - 00:38:14:29

That's that's what those more initial stages of design work are, what the examining authority would like to see at this stage.

00:38:15:18 - 00:38:17:10

Well, what has been undertaken.

00:38:17:15 - 00:38:22:12

Undertaken is a it's been described as a front ended engineering design.

00:38:24:29 - 00:38:30:22

That is what's presented illustrative in the photo montages and I mean so clearly.

00:38:32:18 - 00:38:35:25

There's a difference and we can.

00:38:35:27 - 00:38:37:07

Take your thoughts away.

00:38:38:01 - 00:38:39:17

And think about it further.

00:38:40:07 - 00:38:43:07

My perception is it is the buildings.

00:38:43:09 - 00:38:53:00

Which you are seeking further information. Clearly, there are other components within a substation. So

00:38:54:15 - 00:38:56:19

on the basis, we'll take this away.

00:38:59:03 - 00:39:04:02

Can you be clear about what sort of information would be helpful to you?

00:39:05:25 - 00:39:32:22

Absolutely. And yes, it is. It is buildings. It's recognized on the NPS is very clear that there are elements within in any infrastructure project which you will not have design control over. And some of those elements are are shown on your indicative layouts. But for for us, I mean, in terms of I touched on one one of those points previously which

00:39:36:11 - 00:39:42:05

general general indicative designs for the buildings, the elements that have a building envelope

00:39:44:24 - 00:40:08:04

proposals demonstrate the design thought given to materials and colour. This this is not an unusual suite of information to accompany an application for this type of development. The Planning Inspectorate sees the level of information is often there, if not at the start of examination, certainly at the end.

00:40:10:20 - 00:40:34:12

And then I think the other issue, which we haven't really talked about, which isn't necessarily related specifically to building envelopes, but the way that the site fencing, security, fencing and screening generally, the way that that or the design thought that has gone into that given that that ultimately is is the primary interface between the general public and the substation.

00:40:35:25 - 00:40:36:24

That's helpful. Thank you.

00:40:44:04 - 00:41:02:04

Given that you're you're going to to come back to us with with further thoughts on that matter. I'm not going to dwell much further on this. I just before moving on, would like to ask South Norfolk District Council whether they have anything that they wish to add at this stage.

00:41:08:15 - 00:41:46:06

Thank you. Clare Curtis, South Norfolk District Council. No, sir, I don't have anything further to add at this stage. Um, I will say, however, that I get the point that's been made in terms of if you have an outline planning permission for 1300 houses, normally there is an element of illustrative work put

forward as part of those considerations and equally that is subject to a further reserved matters application for that design to be um, dealt with again by the local planning authority through an application.

00:41:46:08 - 00:41:46:28

Thank you.

00:41:48:23 - 00:42:01:27

Thank you. Can I ask a just ask before you before you go away, whether you have any any views generally on the design access statement? I suppose perhaps in light of other other similar ones that you may have seen.

00:42:03:09 - 00:42:42:02

Um, like Curtis Norfolk Council. Yes, I have seen the Hornsea Project three substation, which is on the other side of the Norwich Main. Um. The details of that were again, a parameter led. They were a bit the some of the design information was a little bit more detailed, however. So you got a bit of a bit more of an understanding of what the building would be like. Um, and we have said about using appropriate materials and, and agreeing those at, at the stage end of the requirement, which would I believe will help try and mitigate.

00:42:42:04 - 00:42:50:06

But clearly it is a building of a significant size that will be seen from public foot. So think it will always have an impact.

00:42:53:04 - 00:43:08:20

Thank you, Miss Curtis. That's helpful. I will move on now to the next item, a question item. And before I do with the applicant, I'd like to respond to anything that they've heard from South Norfolk District Council.

00:43:09:26 - 00:43:11:05

Nothing further, sir. No.

00:43:11:18 - 00:43:49:11

Thank you. So we'll come on to the next agenda item. Question The applicant's current position in relation to mitigation of visual effects is is clear from its responses to the questions that we've posed so far. We discussed project timeframes in some detail this morning, and I really don't wish to revisit them in any great depth. But for the sake of clarity, can I. Excuse me. Can I first of all confirm with the applicant what the maximum length of time that the atoll bridge construction compound, main construction compound would be in place for and under which scenario this would occur?

00:44:27:21 - 00:44:47:12

Yeah, he is Rodriguez for the applicant. So in the concurrent scenario, we're looking at the the longest period of the main compound also to be in place as that is the longest period consecutively that you will have constructions on the on short cable.

00:44:50:04 - 00:44:52:15

And that is how long.

00:44:54:08 - 00:44:55:12

26 months.

00:44:55:22 - 00:44:56:25

Six months? Yes.

00:45:11:15 - 00:45:30:27

How does that sit with the discussion that we had this morning in terms of the the maximum construction period being eight years accepting that some of that is offshore, but 26 months versus eight years, this is quite a difference.

00:45:32:22 - 00:45:57:27

Rodriguez for the applicant. So when we're talking about the eight years, we're talking about the sequential scenario with a gap and that is the longest possible gap. So the the thought is that once we finish the first project, we reinstate the site and then we reestablish the main compound for the second project when we're talking about this long, long gaps. So that's how each when you separate the time.

00:45:59:04 - 00:46:32:20

So, so to be clear in the sequential in any of the sequential sorry scenarios, one, C and Andy, which is sequential to but particularly with with scenario one, C, which which in which there's a potential for year gap between construction start periods. If that scenario were to come forward, the main construction compound would be decommissioned for that period and then reinstated.

00:46:33:22 - 00:46:38:06

Your heat is produced for the applicant? That's correct. If you have a long gap, then you are. Yeah.

00:46:39:10 - 00:46:40:08

Okay. Thank you.

00:46:41:23 - 00:47:01:20

In in both of those scenarios of the 26 month maximum, one position, one in place for 26 months versus in place for a similar period in sequential terms, then decommissioned and then reinstated for a similar period again.

00:47:03:13 - 00:47:09:26

Joe. Here's what he has for the applicant. As discussed this morning for single scenarios for single project is 24 months.

00:47:10:02 - 00:47:40:12

So similar, but slightly shorter. Yeah. Correct. Okay. Thank you. If can come to Broadland District council then and ask whether they hold the view that it's reasonable at this stage to view the length of construction compound existence, the amount of time that the potential construction compound would be in place. Whether they view that as sufficiently temporary to not warrant any form of visual mitigation.

00:47:44:17 - 00:47:55:00

In answer to that question. Clare Curtis Broadland District Council. Um, yes. Think given that it is temporary enough not to require. Formal mitigation.

00:47:58:09 - 00:47:58:26

Okay.

00:47:59:08 - 00:48:09:17

Thank you. And you hold that view for both scenarios. I guess given that in one scenario it would be a shorter period of time, albeit twice.

00:48:11:00 - 00:48:38:11

Yes, because if my my view of mitigation and I know you're going to touch on this in the next question is if you're removing vegetation, for example, then when you restaurant, restaurant put putting restoration of a site for a period of time, that then will then get moved and vegetation removed again, There seems little point in doing that mitigation between the two time periods.

00:48:40:26 - 00:48:48:05

Okay. Thank you. We will. Then again. Does the applicant have anything that they wish to add before I move on?

00:48:54:01 - 00:48:59:06

I think we align ourselves with with the council in that

00:49:00:26 - 00:49:02:29

we don't feel there's a specific requirement.

00:49:03:01 - 00:49:04:29

For mitigation for.

00:49:05:02 - 00:49:06:05

The temporary works.

00:49:06:07 - 00:49:06:27

Of, of.

00:49:06:29 - 00:49:07:21

Of, of the.

00:49:07:23 - 00:49:08:17

Compound.

00:49:09:06 - 00:49:09:21

Um.

00:49:11:24 - 00:49:44:09

That's our, that's our position. Of course, when the compound is established, um, bearing in mind between the bridge, the, the edges of the village there, um, and the actual compound, the, the corridor comes between the two, the corridor and then you've got the compound. Um, the compound, obviously you've seen the site. So, so in terms of how, again, the topography works.

00:49:44:11 - 00:50:03:24

So there's a bit of a rise, there's a bit of a dip and the compound will be in that slightly lower area before the land rises up to the up to the woodland. The reality is that the site would be stripped of all its topsoil temporarily stored. And it's, um, more or less universal practice in

00:50:05:13 - 00:50:27:29

an operation like that. Such the topsoil would be sorted, would be stored around the edges, um, and in bunds of up to a couple of metres, no higher to protect the quality of the soil. So in a sense the just the way the compound will operate will mean that there will be a degree of visual mitigation. Um.

00:50:30:03 - 00:50:37:19

Delivered just through the normal processes. The actual laying out that compound in the details of it

00:50:39:15 - 00:50:59:21

would be discussed and approved through the go to construction plan. So again, there's the opportunity for the local authority to be involved in that, the detail of that. If they wanted to be involved. But so there's the formal position is no mitigation is required.

00:51:02:21 - 00:51:08:27

The reality is, because of the nature of the site and how it would actually operate, then,

00:51:10:17 - 00:51:15:14

um, and he, there'd be a degree of mitigation as a consequence of that.

00:51:17:07 - 00:51:37:22

Okay. Thank you. Mr. Goodrum That's helpful. Before I move on to the next agenda item, which relates to one aspect of the change request submitted by the applicant. Can I just do a double check that there are no other issues, no other questions that anybody wants to raise on the items that I've covered so far?

00:51:42:15 - 00:51:46:03

And I'm seeing no hands raised online or in the room, so I will move on.

00:51:49:15 - 00:52:05:17

So coming onto the description of the change proposal, the removal of an additional area of hedgerow close to the main construction compound. The applicant. What Can I ask the applicant rather to give a brief overview of the proposed change request for the benefit of those in attendance.

00:52:07:21 - 00:52:08:06

Please.

00:52:09:18 - 00:52:12:13

Yes. Julian Boswell for the applicant.

00:52:14:00 - 00:52:48:28

Hedgerow H0103 is located to the southwest of the proposed access SEC. 33 to the main construction compound for SAP and DEP at the junction of the A10 67 and the old Fakenham Road. I'm during stakeholder engagement with Norfolk County Council Council identified it had some concerns with the existing forward visibility of traffic at this junction and it was subsequently agreed that visibility would need to be improved either by coppicing the hedgerow or removing it.

00:52:49:22 - 00:53:10:10

And that is the trigger for the change. And then we have put forward the necessary documentary changes. It's within the red line so it doesn't have a red line issue. Simply to give ourselves the ultimate ability to remove it in practice, we're hoping to only need to coppice it.

00:53:13:22 - 00:53:16:00

I've got all the other references if you need them.

00:53:18:18 - 00:53:39:21

I think we don't need them for now. Thank you. Can I. Can I then ask, can the applicant clarify whether whether it believes that there are any adverse environmental effects which would be associated with this change request and and which have not been assessed within the today?

00:53:40:22 - 00:53:49:26

Julian Boswell. We have considered that question and our view is that it will not result in any new or materially different effects from the conclusions in the chapter.

00:53:51:16 - 00:54:01:17

Thank you, Mr. Boswell. I will then invite comments on the proposed change from local authorities, starting with Broadland District Council, please.

00:54:06:11 - 00:54:08:19

By Curtis Boland District Council.

00:54:10:11 - 00:55:05:22

We've been we have been made aware of the proposed change. And, um, from Borden's point of view, if that is required for safety, highway safety grounds, which I'm very much sure that is the case for um, Norfolk County Council Highway Authority, then, then that is something that we would accept. What we have talked to the applicant about is what, what can be mitigation could be put in place following the compounds actually being completely closed down, not used again about if they do need to remove a hedgerow, could it be could it be reinstated or could we, you know, replanted? And is there a is a mechanism for that to be actually put into, um, a requirement or the plant related to a requirement to enable that to be to happen? So that would be our view.

00:55:07:20 - 00:55:12:15

Thank you, Miss Curtis. Can I ask the applicant to respond on that point before we move on?

00:55:15:05 - 00:55:50:00

Sherri Atkins for the applicant. So I'd just like to refer you to requirement 11 of the DCA, which requires us to submit a landscaping scheme to the local planning authority prior to commencement of works. And that requires us to provide details of So sorry, requirement 11 subparagraph two Subparagraph E requires us to provide details of existing trees and hedges to be removed, um, and those to be retained with measures for their protection during construction period.

00:55:50:23 - 00:56:02:17

It also requires us under subparagraph F to provide implementation timetables for all landscaping works at any landscaping, restoration or reinstatement would be covered by that same plan.

00:56:05:01 - 00:56:22:29

Thank you. So. So can I can I clarify, therefore, that you believe that the requirements that you've just cited deal with the concerns raised by Broadland District Council? Yes. Thank you. Um, back to Broadland District Council. Can I just confirm that you agree?

00:56:26:03 - 00:56:32:20

By Curtis Borden District Council. Yes, I do agree. And we have been working with the applicant on this matter. Thank you.

00:56:33:18 - 00:56:44:02

Thank you. Miss Curtis, before you before you go off screen again, can I ask you to put your South Norfolk District Council hat on and ask for any comments from from from that side?

00:56:46:01 - 00:56:47:24

In relation to in.

00:56:47:26 - 00:56:51:17

Relation to this change request. Appreciate. You may not have any from that point of view.

00:56:52:16 - 00:56:56:09

Curtis South Norfolk Council. No, don't have any comments to make. Thank you.

00:56:56:23 - 00:57:10:14

Thank you very much. And then I will ask whether there are any further comments on this change request submitted by the applicant from anybody else in the room.

00:57:27:20 - 00:57:31:07

I'm not seeing any hands, but I will just

00:57:33:24 - 00:57:46:05

see if if Norfolk County Council are still available. I would like to ask whether they have any comments from a highways perspective based on what they've heard today.

00:57:54:27 - 00:58:01:16

It does look like they're not with us. So we'll we'll hold that question on to and make it a written question.

00:58:03:08 - 00:58:13:24

Um, I'm going to move on then, unless there's anything further from the applicant on, on this agenda item.

00:58:22:23 - 00:58:31:27

Nothing further. Thank you. So we'll come on to agenda item eight, which is seascape, and we will move swiftly on from that agenda item.

00:58:33:15 - 00:59:10:12

It may be, may or may not be clear, but the questions raised for this hearing are fairly similar to the questions which we raised at the first issue specific hearing on this topic. They were there because we had anticipated that Norfolk Coast Partnership would be in attendance today. They've not been able to come to this hearing. So we will carry these questions forward in written questions for for a response from them. In general terms, the responses that we've had on this topic have been noted by the examining authority, and we don't have anything further that we wish to raise specifically on seascape matters.

00:59:10:17 - 00:59:22:03

But we do still want to hear from Norfolk coast partnerships. But that won't be today. So we will move on to again unless anybody else has anything they wish to raise on Seascape matters.

00:59:26:18 - 00:59:27:03

Nope.

00:59:28:27 - 00:59:54:23

And in a similar vein. Agenda Item nine Design. I'm going to take questions 1 to 3 on design as as essentially dealt with because of the way that the questioning has evolved on these topics. I believe we've essentially covered these items under the landscape agenda. So again, unless anybody have got a hand up, actually, I can't see who that is.

00:59:59:04 - 01:00:21:07

This is Kathy Batchelor from North Norfolk District Council. Thank you. Sorry, just hadn't realized you would be not dwelling on seascape matters. Um, because you're hoping to hear from the Coast Partnership. Um, and I just thought really, it might be worth North Norfolk District Council just reiterating our position on this.

01:00:21:16 - 01:00:23:00

By all means. Yes, please.

01:00:23:05 - 01:00:44:23

Okay, So, um, you know, think what's the, the the work that's been done, the viewpoints do give some indication of the cumulative impact, um, from the various points along the coast. Um, the council's position is there will clearly be harm to the,

01:00:46:15 - 01:01:19:21

um, from various points along the coast and that some of those special qualities define special qualities of the, um, particularly the sense of remoteness, tranquility and wildness will be adversely affected. I mean the, we acknowledge the baseline has already altered um, from several years ago. So there are now. Wind farm wind turbines apparent along the coast, but at times they're not that evident.

01:01:19:23 - 01:01:52:07

And think with this application because of the the scale of the structures, um, the, the view that all various points will become the turbines will be much more apparent. So it will alter the experience of being in the air and be and looking out to see. But our view is that actually over time, the whole landscape of the A and B has had a human influence on it.

01:01:52:12 - 01:02:05:14

And one way of looking at this is that this is just a contemporary human influence, um, of the sort of intertidal link between the land and the sea. And.

01:02:07:04 - 01:02:34:00

I think our view also is we do want the nocturnal character of the coast and the. To be taken into account. I know they have to be lighting on the turbines. But that is something that that can also influence the experience of the OMB. The the dark night skies are stated feature of the Norfolk coast and be.

01:02:35:29 - 01:02:59:13

And it's suppose it's about identifying the harm. Is that and then is there any scope for mitigation through the citing the site selection of the turbines? I'm aware that Natural England have put a case for some relocation of the turbines perhaps further off the coast so they don't appear to be so big. Um.

01:03:02:08 - 01:03:03:12

But really, you know.

01:03:05:03 - 01:03:16:16

The North Norfolk District Council's view is that there clearly will be identified harm, but that obviously has to be weighed into the planning balance. Um.

01:03:18:08 - 01:03:43:08

For the whole project. We don't have issues with the onshore corridor. There are certain things we're dealing with. For example, the the route coming through Weybourne Woods. Um, but we've been dealing with the applicant directly on that and that issue is, is being resolved at the moment. Anyway, just wanted to put the council's case today for you. Thank you.

01:03:43:29 - 01:03:46:08

That's very helpful. Thank you. Can I.

01:03:47:27 - 01:04:12:21

Can I ask a follow up question then, in terms of you've identified your the belief that there will be additional harm, albeit that you also take the view that that should be seen within the context of of human intervention generally across across the aonb? Is there a view held within within the Council as to the extent of additional harm

01:04:14:26 - 01:04:20:16

as you perceive it, within within the local authority which would result from from this proposed development?

01:04:22:29 - 01:04:53:08

I think that's very hard to quantify because I suppose because it's so far reaching, you know, all the view points demonstrate that from brancaster right round to trimming them. Your views will be altered. Your experience will be slightly different of being on Cromer pier of being out on the salt marsh at Morton. Um, but how you quantify that changed experience and is that necessarily harm. I think is quite difficult to do

01:04:54:29 - 01:04:55:18

appreciate.

01:04:55:22 - 01:05:01:06

I appreciate that. Thank you. Um, I will come back to the applicant to respond to, please.

01:05:02:21 - 01:05:10:00

Um, Colin Goodrum for the, for the applicant. Now it's helpful to have that further explanation.

01:05:10:02 - 01:05:10:17

Of.

01:05:10:19 - 01:05:18:20

North Norfolk's position. I was, um, I've got in front of me their responses to.

01:05:18:22 - 01:05:21:27

First written first written questions to.

01:05:22:05 - 01:05:26:09

Your questions. 118 three one and 3.2 which.

01:05:27:01 - 01:05:30:02

Succinctly say much the same in the sense that.

01:05:30:04 - 01:05:33:01

Some adverse effects there already we're.

01:05:33:03 - 01:05:35:00

Adding to it. I think the.

01:05:35:15 - 01:05:36:11

The term.

01:05:36:21 - 01:05:53:11

It will be slightly different is a good way of considering it because there's turbines out there. There'll be a few more turbines there, larger turbines. But the overall experience of looking out to the seascape with turbines slightly altered by the addition of further further.

01:05:54:00 - 01:06:03:09

Turbines is a is a good way to consider it really. So we don't really have anything more to add than to what we've already said in previous.

01:06:03:26 - 01:06:15:19

Responses regarding our position on seascape. Um, and you know, the alignment of the general agreement, I would say, in terms of North Norfolk, and.

01:06:15:21 - 01:06:17:12

You've yet to hear the partnership's.

01:06:17:14 - 01:06:18:04

View, but.

01:06:18:28 - 01:06:20:16

I know they are comfortable.

01:06:21:00 - 01:06:21:15

Um.

01:06:21:23 - 01:06:26:25

And you've seen our responses to natural England, so I don't really have anything more to add today.

01:06:26:27 - 01:06:31:01

But if there is going to be another session, um.

01:06:31:09 - 01:06:32:21

When the partnership here and maybe.

01:06:32:23 - 01:06:34:27

Natural England here, we can have a further discussion.

01:06:36:07 - 01:06:56:05

Thank you. Mr. Goodrum We will certainly follow up with further written questions and that that will be your first opportunity to respond further. But for now, thank you. Um, and with that, unless there are any further points anybody wishes to raise on seascape matters,

01:06:57:24 - 01:06:58:22

I will

01:07:00:09 - 01:07:21:12

move on to agenda item nine, which is designed and as I was saying, I believe that we've essentially covered items 1 to 3. And under that heading with the discussions that we had during the landscape agenda item. So unless anybody wishes to raise anything further

01:07:23:07 - 01:07:32:00

in terms of the design questions 1 to 3 in the agenda, I will move straight on to item number four,

01:07:34:05 - 01:07:49:01

which is relates to the requirement or otherwise for independent design review process to inform the design development of the substation buildings. So yes, we are back to the substation and

01:07:50:18 - 01:07:51:03

um.

01:07:54:05 - 01:08:21:02

Specifically in terms of NPS. Ian, one paragraph 4.5.5. The guidance within the the NPS reference, paragraph 4.5.5, accepting that some of the wording within there is is somewhat out of date, but nevertheless recognizing the intent that the intent behind this section remains intact. And further in light of the discussions that we have had today.

01:08:22:23 - 01:08:30:13

Would the applicant commit to seeking independent design review of its proposals for the onshore works, specifically the substation?

01:08:36:09 - 01:08:46:16

Um Colin Goodrum for the for the applicant. Um we stated it is two that we hadn't ruled out independent design review.

01:08:47:05 - 01:08:47:25

And would be.

01:08:47:27 - 01:08:48:22

Supportive if.

01:08:48:24 - 01:08:49:25

If one is required.

01:08:49:27 - 01:08:52:10

Post consent. Um.

01:08:54:21 - 01:09:03:12

Clearly it's our position in terms of the low level of landscaping, visual effects, the functional nature of the onus, the fact that the scope.

01:09:03:14 - 01:09:04:24

Of design is limited.

01:09:04:26 - 01:09:07:09

In relation to operational safety requirements.

01:09:08:11 - 01:09:10:24

And the extent of design thinking to date.

01:09:13:05 - 01:09:14:10

The the

01:09:16:21 - 01:09:19:20

weather that justifies the design review

01:09:21:09 - 01:09:26:15

is a question. So whilst we would question the value.

01:09:27:18 - 01:09:28:16

Of.

01:09:29:08 - 01:09:45:21

Undertaking one, I think it's the local authority's view which is most important to them because ultimately they will be the arbiters of the of the design that's put forward to them. And if if they feel they would be assisted.

01:09:45:23 - 01:09:46:15

By.

01:09:46:17 - 01:10:02:01

A design review to consider that the design as submitted, um, or to shape the proposal, then equinor would be open to partaking

01:10:03:16 - 01:10:07:00

in a design review process. It obviously.

01:10:08:06 - 01:10:09:21

Would draw on the local authority's.

01:10:09:23 - 01:10:11:00

Own resources because they'd need to be.

01:10:11:02 - 01:10:14:06

Involved in the design review process to have its true value.

01:10:14:11 - 01:10:26:00

And they may feel that their officer time is is best spent elsewhere. So to summarize, if we would be happy to partake in it, but.

01:10:27:10 - 01:10:30:11

I would say it's very much if.

01:10:30:13 - 01:10:32:11

The local authority.

01:10:35:06 - 01:10:36:02

Would want one.

01:10:39:05 - 01:11:01:26

Thank you, Mr. Goodrum. So if if in its recommendation stage, the examining authority found that on balance, an independent design review would benefit this application. How how might that best be secured within the draft DCO?

01:11:11:06 - 01:11:12:13

Laura Fuller for the applicant.

01:11:13:29 - 01:11:35:27

There I'm aware of a precedent where that has been included in the onshore design parameters requirement. So presumably the recommendation would just include wording that would be similar to that precedent, as I understand it, and that would go into requirement ten of this DCO.

01:11:37:14 - 01:11:38:09

Okay. Thank you.

01:11:40:09 - 01:11:54:26

Uh, since Mr. Goodrum mentioned the the buy in the input from Broadland South Norfolk District Council in this case, can I ask for their views on on this topic, please?

01:11:57:16 - 01:12:20:03

Thank you. Claire Curtis. South Norfolk District Council. Um. Think need with a great respect. Think. Need. Time to think about the implications of what's been suggested in terms of our input and officer availability to do such as to do that. So is that something that we can have a chance to consider?

01:12:21:06 - 01:12:32:03

Yes, by all means we will take this forward as a written question and we will direct it to to both you and the applicant for for further response.

01:12:32:23 - 01:12:33:11

Thank you.

01:13:10:26 - 01:13:32:08

So that then concludes the design section of of this issue specific hearing. The time is now. 3:13. I propose that we have a brief adjournment where we will.

01:13:35:20 - 01:13:41:01

20, 20 minutes. So we will return at 325.

01:13:42:25 - 01:13:43:10

Thank you.

01:13:47:22 - 01:13:49:26

So do you mean 325?

01:13:51:00 - 01:13:55:05

No, don't mean 335. Thank you, Mr. Boswell. 335.